# Appendix C

# Initial Study/Environmental Checklist

CITY OF ROSEVILLE CALIFORNIA

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**
311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 (916) 774-5331

# INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Project Title/File Number** | City of Roseville 2020 Transportation System Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Update | |
| **Project Location** | City of Roseville | |
| **Project Description** | The proposed project is an update to the City's current 2020 CIP to reflect citywide buildout conditions using an updated traffic model. The proposed project includes the following: (1) updating base year traffic model conditions from 2001 to 2004 conditions; (2) incorporating revised citywide buildout conditions into the CIP's traffic model; (3) adding additional roadway and intersection improvements to the CIP; (4) changing improvements at 30 intersections and 6 roadways identified in the current CIP; and (5) changing level of service at certain intersections in the City. | |
| **Project Applicant** | City of Roseville Public Works Department | |
| **Property Owner** | City of Roseville | |
| **Lead Agency Contact Person** | Rob Jensen, Director of Public Works | Phone (916) 774-5331 |

This initial study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the above described project application. The document relies on previous environmental documents (see Attachments) and site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.).

In reviewing the information provided for this project, the City of Roseville Public Works Department has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that at least one impact is considered to be potentially significant. Therefore, **on the basis of the following initial evaluation,** we find that the proposed project **may** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **Environmental Impact Report** will be required. As documented in this Initial Study, impacts in many resource areas will be less than significant, and the EIR will be focused on those areas where potentially significant impacts may occur.

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____
Rob Jensen, Director of Public Works

## SETTING

The proposed project is an update to the City's current 2020 CIP to reflect citywide buildout conditions using an updated traffic model. The proposed project includes the following: (1) updating base year traffic model conditions from 2001 to 2004 conditions; (2) incorporating revised citywide buildout conditions into the CIP's traffic model; (3) adding additional roadway and intersection improvements to the CIP; (4) changing improvements at 30 intersections and 6 roadways identified in the current CIP; and (5) changing level of service (LOS) at certain intersections in the City. The proposed improvements include 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments that would require widening the affected right-of-way area identified in the current CIP, 17 intersections that would require modification but not widening (i.e., restriping); and 3 intersections and 3 roadway segments that would reduce the affected right-of-way identified in the current CIP. The list of intersections and roadway improvements proposed as part of the project are listed in Section 3.0, Project Description, of the Subsequent EIR for the 2020 Transportation System CIP Update (2020 CIP Update).

The 2020 CIP Update (the proposed project) encompasses the entire roadway system within the City of Roseville. One of the intersection improvements (Intersection 105) would affect an area located within unincorporated Placer County, just outside the City of Roseville's border. In addition, the following three proposed improvements are situated in an area subject to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Placer County: one of the roadway segment improvements (widening of Fiddyment Road from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Baseline Road) and two of the proposed intersection improvements (Intersection 69 at Fiddyment Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard; and Intersection 65 at Fiddyment Road and Westlake). The MOU was established in 1997 to foster cooperative land use planning. The MOU applies to a "Transition Area" west of Fiddyment Road and north of Baseline Road. This MOU sets forth additional requirements for processing of project approvals in this area, including submittal of certain information, input by the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding annexation, adherence to minimum Development Standards, and mitigation of traffic impacts to less-than-significant levels. If mitigation to less-than-significant levels is infeasible, both the City and the County must so agree. As part of the approval process for the West Roseville Specific Plan, the City and the County agreed that Roseville would accept ownership, control, and maintenance of Fiddyment Road from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Baseline Road and widen that section to six lanes.

## PREVIOUS STUDIES/REPORTS

The following documents that relate to the project have been prepared and are available for review at the Roseville Planning & Redevelopment Department (311 Vernon Street, Roseville, California, 95678):

1. City of Roseville's 2020 Transportation System CIP (current CIP)
2. City of Roseville's 2015 CIP EIR (approved in 2000)
3. City of Roseville's 2020 CIP Supplemental EIR (approved in 2002)
4. Placer County's Environmental Questionnaire for Eureka Road and Sierra College Boulevard widening prepared in September 2006
5. West Roseville Specific Plan and SOI Amendment Area EIR (approved 2002)
6. NCRSP Parcel 35 - Galleria Mall Expansion Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (approved August 2006)

## CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITIGATING ORDINANCES, GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows the use of uniformly applied, previously adopted development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects of future projects when those standards have been adopted by the City, with findings based on substantial evidence that the policies or standards will substantially mitigate environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines §15183(f)). The City's Zoning Ordinance, Noise Ordinance, Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Construction Standards, Improvement Standards, Tree Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and Community and Specific Plan Design Guidelines include standards and policies that are uniformly applied to development projects throughout the City. In March 2003, the City of Roseville adopted Findings of Fact confirming that certain environmental impacts for the following issue

areas are mitigated by the uniform application of the above ordinances, guidelines, and standards (Resolution 03-169):

- Flooding
- Urban Form/Aesthetics
- Tree Impacts
- Cultural Resources Impacts
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Water Quality
- Drainage
- Traffic

The City's mitigating ordinances, guidelines and standards are referenced, where applicable, in this Initial Study Checklist. Because the City of Roseville has adopted CEQA Findings that these Mitigating Policies and Standards substantially mitigate environmental impacts, no additional project-specific mitigation is required for the specified impact areas.

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The initial study checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines is used to describe the potential impacts of the proposed project on the environment. Environmental issues identified in the checklist are followed by a discussion that includes recommended mitigation measures.

1. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

2. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

3. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

4. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the impact does not require mitigation or result in a substantial or potentially substantial change of any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D).

6. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page(s) or section(s) where the statement is substantiated.

# I. Aesthetics

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | | **X** |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | | **X** |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | | **X** |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | **X** | |

**Discussion:**

a–c) The roadway and intersection improvements are located within the City of Roseville and a small section of unincorporated Placer County, including the MOU area shared with Placer County. None of the roadways or intersections are considered scenic, nor are they located within a scenic vista. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d) The proposed project would result in roadway and intersection improvements that may increase the amount of lighting that is used, along with increased amounts of paved surfaces that may contribute to additional glare. However, the proposed project improvements are considered minor, and would be within an urbanized area along existing roadways; therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

# II. Agricultural Resources

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use? | | | | **X** |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | **X** |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

a–c) The proposed roadway and intersection improvements are adjacent to existing urban development. Improvements to the roads would occur within and adjacent to designated roadway rights-of-way where there are no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or areas which are part of Williamson Act contracts. The west side of Fiddyment Road between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Baseline Road is currently zoned Farmlands (F-B-X) and the widening of this road would encroach onto land zoned for agricultural uses. However, these lands are not designated as Prime Farmlands, Unique Farmlands, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and this location is identified in the City's General Plan as an area for future urbanization. In addition, widening a road is not considered a zoning conflict. No significant impacts would occur to agricultural resources.

# III. Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | **X** | |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | **X** | |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | **X** | | | |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | **X** | |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | **X** | |

**Discussion:**

The City of Roseville is located in southern Placer County within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). Weather patterns throughout the SVAB are, in part, affected by the geography (i.e., terrain). The SVAB is bounded by the northern Coast Ranges to the west, the northern Sierra Nevada mountains to the east, and the Cascade Range to the north. The area to the south is within these mountain ranges and is relatively flat. This area is also known as the Sacramento Valley, which is the northern portion of the Central Valley. The Carquinez Strait breaches the Coast Range, exposing the middle portion of the SVAB to the influence of Pacific Coast marine weather. This geography channels winds through the Sacramento Valley, but inhibits dispersion of pollutant emissions in portions of the valley.

a,b) Construction emissions from roadway widening would result from construction equipment and worker vehicle exhaust, and from fugitive dust generated from grading activities. Construction-related air pollutant emissions were modeled for the proposed roadway and intersection widening improvements. Results demonstrated that the proposed project would not result in significant air emissions when compared to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) significant thresholds. Results from the modeling are detailed in the *Roseville 2020 Transportation System Capital Improvement Program Update Subsequent*

*Environmental Impact Report* (Subsequent EIR). Air Quality impacts were evaluated in the Subsequent EIR based on potential significant cumulative air quality impacts. In addition, LOS at certain intersections in the City would change with implementation of the proposed project, whereby LOS would improve at some intersections and LOS would degrade at some intersections. When compared to No Project conditions, the proposed project would improve LOS at 22 intersections and degrade LOS at 4 intersections. Traffic data also show that the volume to capacity ratio is expected to reduce at 69 other intersections with implementation of the proposed project, but not significantly enough to change the LOS. Therefore, the proposed improvements would improve traffic conditions at over 50 percent of the intersections with the City's 2020 CIP Update. Based on these factors, operational air pollutant emissions under 2020 Plus Project conditions are expected to be less than significant and the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable air quality attainment plans.

c) Although construction emissions of the largest roadway widening, Fiddyment Road and Westlake, would not exceed the significance thresholds, cumulative construction emissions from all construction projects within Placer County would exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District's significance thresholds. The implementation of all feasible and applicable control measures would reduce emissions to the extent possible during construction activities. Despite implementation of these measures, construction activities would generate unavoidable, temporary increases in the nonattainment pollutants and their precursors on air quality. This would be a significant cumulative impact of construction. This topic is discussed further in the Subsequent EIR for the 2020 CIP Update.

d) Modeling was conducted to determine whether the project would create any carbon monoxide (CO) hot-spots, which would indicate whether any sensitive receptors would be exposed to significant levels of air pollutants. The modeling demonstrated that the predicted CO concentrations at all the intersections would not violate the State's 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards during the p.m. peak traffic hour. Therefore, the operation of the proposed project would not result in any CO hot-spots at any intersections. In addition, as discussed in a,b) above, the project would improve traffic conditions at over 50 percent of the intersections with the City's 2020 CIP Update. Based on these factors, operational air pollutant emissions are not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of air pollutant concentrations; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

e) The proposed project would result in modifying 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments, including widening of 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments to improve traffic flow. Odors from intersection improvement construction equipment would be minimal and short term. Odors from vehicles on the roadways would also be minimal. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

# IV. Biological Resources

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | **X** | | |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | **X** | | |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | **X** | | |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | **X** | |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | **X** | |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

a) The proposed project would modify 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments. Most modifications would occur within existing rights-of-way, including landscaped medians and shoulders. However, 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments would involve widening the right-of-way designated in the current CIP. Some of the areas affected by the proposed widening improvements could disturb habitat for special-status species, including Swainson's hawk, other legally-protected raptors, burrowing owls, western spadefoot, Sandford's arrowhead, and rose mallow. In addition, the proposed widening improvements at Intersections 69 (Fiddyment Road/Pleasant Grove Boulevard) and 165 (Fiddyment Road/Westlake) as well as the widening of Fiddyment Road from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Baseline Road have the potential to result in the disturbance or loss of habitat for vernal pool crustaceans, which is a federally listed species. Based on these factors, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to special-status species, and this topic is discussed further in the Subsequent EIR for the 2020 CIP Update. Mitigation measures will be presented in the Subsequent EIR, including preconstruction surveys and consultation with

the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

b–c) An intermittent stream (Curry Creek), a seasonal wetland swale, and a seasonal wetland are located along Fiddyment Road in the vicinity of Intersection 165 (Fiddyment Road/Westlake). The proposed improvements in this area could adversely affect Curry Creek and associated riparian vegetation. In addition, improvements at Intersection 105 (Eureka Road/Sierra College Boulevard) could have potential impacts to a tributary to Linda Creek as well as a ditch along at Intersection 178 (Washington Avenue/All America). For this reason, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to riparian habitat identified by the CDFG or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and federally protected wetlands. This topic is discussed further in the Subsequent EIR for the 2020 CIP Update. Mitigation measures will be presented in the Subsequent EIR, including agency consultation and compliance with agency permitting requirements, to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. Although impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project are less than significant with mitigation incorporated, this topic will be covered in the Subsequent EIR to evaluate cumulative impacts to biological resources.

d) The intermittent drainage and seasonal wetlands located within the project area are expected to support both aquatic and semi-aquatic species. Aquatic habitat of Curry Creek is expected to support bullfrogs, mosquitofish, and possibly other warm water fish species; however, no anadromous (migratory) fish or resident cold water fish species are expected to occur in Curry Creek or other drainages of the project area (as indicated in the 2002 *West Roseville Specific Plan and Sphere of Influence Amendment Area EIR*). Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

e) The Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19, Zoning, contains a section on tree preservation (Article IV). The code protects native oak trees that have a diameter of six inches or more at breast height (dbh). A permit is required for any activity which would harm, destroy, kill, or remove a protected tree within a protected zone. The replacement of trees in kind, relocation of trees, revegetation, or an In-Lieu Mitigation fee is required.

The proposed project would widen 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments. All modifications would occur within and adjacent to existing rights-of-way, including landscaped medians and shoulders. Some modifications may result in the removal or relocation of trees. However, if the removal of trees is required, an In-Lieu Mitigation fee would be paid or replacement of trees in kind would occur.

The proposed project would comply with Article IV of the Roseville Municipal Code and the Placer County Tree Ordinance and ensure impacts to protected trees are mitigated. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with Roseville tree preservation policies and the impact would be less than significant.

f) There are no conservation plans applicable to the project area (either on or along the roadways, intersections and rights-of-way). Therefore, there would be no impact to conservation plans.

# V. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | | **X** | | |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | | **X** | | |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | **X** | | |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | **X** | | |

**Discussion:**

The City of Roseville's Mitigating Policies and Standards include Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208) to prevent impacts to cultural resources. The proposed project would be constructed in compliance with these standards. The Construction Standards requires a contractor to halt construction if signs of an archaeological site are discovered: "work shall be halted, and the Community Development Department notified. A qualified archaeologist shall be notified, and additional mitigation may be required."

a–d) The project would widen 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments. Of these, 6 intersections have not been subject to previous archaeological surveys. Further, during construction of any of the proposed project widening improvements, previously undiscovered cultural resources could be inadvertently exposed during grading or excavation activities. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the Subsequent EIR for the 2020 CIP Update. Mitigation measures will be presented in the Subsequent EIR, including conducting cultural resources inventory studies, to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

# VI. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.) | | | **X** | |
| ii) Strong seismic groundshaking? | | | **X** | |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | **X** | |
| iv) Landslides? | | | **X** | |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | **X** | |
| c) Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | | | **X** | |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | | | **X** | |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

a) The proposed project consists of roadway and intersections improvements within the City of Roseville. The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure, or landslides.

*i–ii)* The project area is located in Roseville, which is in Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the South Placer area as a low-severity earthquake zone. No active faults are known to exist within the County. The project area is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, groundshaking, seismically related ground failure, and liquefaction. The Uniform Building Code (UBC) and California Building Bode (CBC) for seismic safety include standards for roadway improvements and construction. The project would be constructed in compliance with the UBC and CBC, which includes seismic standards to protect the public and reduce the risk of roadway damage or collapse. Therefore, no impact would occur in association with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic-related ground failure, and these impacts are considered less than significant.

*iv)* Landslides due to slope instability do not typically occur in Roseville. The proposed project construction would comply with the City of Roseville's Design/Construction Standards and Improvement Standards. In the grading sections of these Standards, a site-specific geotechnical report and an erosion and sedimentation plan are required to be prepared. In addition, the UBC also outlines site development standards for the protection of slopes. The proposed project would minimize the potential of landslides by implementing state and local regulations for grading and slope stabilization. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

b) The City has established protocols for construction projects to minimize soil erosion or loss of topsoil. These are discussed further in Hydrology and Water Quality, below. There are no roadway or intersection improvements that would require extensive excavations or hillside cut and fills. Any exposed soils from the construction phase of the proposed project would be covered by landscaping and semi-impervious and/or impervious surfaces, which would minimize soil erosion. The proposed project would adhere to the City of Roseville's requirements for a site-specific geotechnical report and erosion and sedimentation control plan for any grading activities needed. Therefore, the impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

c–d) The proposed project is not located in a sensitive geologic area, and the City of Roseville area does not typically experience subsidence. However, foundations and roadways may be damaged depending upon soil characteristics such as shrink-swell potential, permeability, and low strength; foundations and roadways could fail, especially if located on soils of differing properties. The proposed project would comply with the Design/Construction Standards and Improvement Standards to reduce impacts related to soil, including on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or expansive soils. Therefore, these impacts would be considered less than significant.

e) The proposed project would not require wastewater disposal systems, therefore, no impact is anticipated.

# VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | **X** | |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | **X** | |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | **X** | |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | **X** | | |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | **X** |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? | | | | **X** |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | **X** |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | **X** | |

**Discussion:**

a, b) Equipment and vehicles used during the construction phase of the proposed project would use minimal amounts of hazardous materials such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and grease. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented for construction activities to minimize impacts to the environment and public

health. Transportation, storage and disposal of hazardous materials would be in compliance with federal, state, and local regulations. Therefore, the impact is considered to be less than significant.

c) The proposed project includes roadway and intersection improvements throughout the City of Roseville, and a small section of unincorporated Placer County, including the MOU area shared with Placer County.. The improvements may occur within a quarter-mile of existing or proposed schools. The proposed project would be in compliance with federal, state, and local regulations to minimize the risk of hazardous materials near schools. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) The proposed project would modify 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments. Most modifications would occur within existing rights-of-way, including landscaped medians and shoulders. However, 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments would involve widening the right-of-way designated in the current CIP, which could result in a potentially significant impact unless mitigated. These areas are located directly adjacent to existing roadways with no known hazardous materials releases. However, the following mitigation measure would ensure that appropriate protocol is followed prior to initiating soil disturbing activities:

> **Mitigation Measure 1:** Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the City shall evaluate areas where widening will occur to evaluate the potential for historical or existing hazardous materials. This evaluation shall include visual inspections of the site for evidence of hazardous materials releases (i.e., dumping) or evidence of nearby land uses, which may indicate the use of hazardous materials or hazardous waste generation (i.e., aboveground storage tanks, placarding). If such evidence is observed, the City shall retain a qualified consultant to evaluate the potential for hazardous materials releases at the site prior to initiating construction to determine whether these releases may constitute a potential recognized environmental condition. If such a condition is determined to exist, the City shall prepare and implement a remediation plan prepared in accordance with the applicable regulatory agency (i.e., Department of Toxic Substances Control or Regional Water Quality Control Board) prior to proceeding with construction.

e, f) The proposed roadway and intersection improvements are not within an airport land use plan, and would not result in a safety hazard to the surrounding airports (Sacramento International Airport, Rio Linda Airport, and McClellan Air For Base). Therefore, there would be no impact.

g) The proposed project would modify 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments. The project would not interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. The project would improve intersections, which would facilitate emergency traffic. During construction, emergency routes would remain open and emergency response plans would not be affected. Therefore, there would be no impact.

h) The proposed project is located within an urban area of the City of Roseville and a small section of unincorporated Placer County, including the MOU area shared with Placer County. There would be no exposure to wildland fires, and the proposed project would not create a use that would expose people or structures to hazards related to wildland fires. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

# VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | X | |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | X | |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | X | | |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | X | |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water? | | | X | |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | X | |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | X |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | X | |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | | X |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | X |

**Discussion:**

a, f) During construction of the proposed project, areas disturbed along existing roadways may be subject to minor soil erosion, which could increase sediment loads in stormwater runoff. The City would comply with the State of California's General Permit for Construction Storm Water Discharges. Stormwater discharges from activities such as grading and stockpiling are regulated under this permit. This would require the City to file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board for construction projects disturbing one acre or more. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be filed as part of the NOI, as required. The SWPPP would address water pollution control measures and outline BMPs such as erosion controls, sediment controls, nonstormwater runoff controls, and waste management controls.

The City also has established protocols for construction projects as promulgated by the City's Grading Ordinance and Stormwater Ordinance. These regulations stipulate that appropriate erosion control measures be implemented to reduce sedimentation within any creek systems. The Grading Ordinance requires prompt revegetation of disturbed areas, avoidance of grading activities during wet weather, and avoidance of disturbance within drainageways as well as other erosion and sedimentation control measures. A Major Grading Plan is required where grading or stockpiling would degrade important natural features (e.g., removal of or damage of native oak trees) or result in the excavation or placement of fill within any channel or tributary that would convey stormwater with a flow of 200 cubic feet per second or more for a 10-year event. In addition, and as applicable, the City will comply with the EPA stormwater management regulations as enforced by the State Water Resources Control Board. These regulations include requirements under the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (No. CAS000004). Under this permit, the City is required to regulate the entry of pollutants and non-stormwater discharges into the City stormwater conveyance system. The City's Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance stipulates that the City will establish requirements identifying BMPs for any activity, operation, or facility that may cause or contribute to pollution or contamination of stormwater, the storm drain system, or waters of the United States. The BMPs are promulgated to control the volume, rate, and potential pollutant load of stormwater runoff from new development projects as may be appropriate to minimize the generation, transport, and discharge of pollutants.

By complying with established local and state regulations regarding construction and operational discharge requirements, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standard or waste discharge requirement; therefore, any impact would be less than significant.

b) The project would widen 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments and reduce the rights-of-way for 3 intersections and 3 roadway segments. The proposed project roadway and intersection improvements would slightly increase the amount of impervious surface area. This slight increase would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge; therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c) The proposed project would modify 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments. Of these, 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments would require widening beyond the rights of way identified in the current CIP. The following intersections and roadways are located in the vicinity of culverts and waterways (creeks/channels/ditches), which could be affected by implementation of the proposed improvements:

- Intersection 15 (Cirby Way/Orlando Avenue)
- Intersection 105 (Eureka Road/Sierra College Boulevard)
- Fiddyment Road widening (from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Baseline Road)
- Intersection 165 (Fiddyment Road/Westlake)
- Intersection 178 (Washington Boulevard/All American)

Placement of permanent or temporary fill in waters of the United States is regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The potential temporary and permanent impacts to nonwetland waters of the U.S. due to placement of fill and or culverts could be potentially significant. This impact would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the following Mitigation Measures:

**Mitigation Measure 2:** The project shall comply with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers "no net loss" policy and the conditions of a Nationwide or Individual Permit authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of

Engineers. As part of these permit requirements, vegetation disturbed during construction shall be replanted and the topography of the sites shall be restored after construction activities have been completed.

Where working areas encroach on live or dry streams, lakes, or wetlands, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)-approved physical barriers adequate to prevent the flow or discharge of sediment into these systems shall be constructed and maintained between working areas and streams, lakes and wetlands. Erosion control and sediment detention devices (e.g., well-anchored sandbag cofferdams, straw bales, or silt fences) shall be incorporated into the project design, included in the SWPPP, and implemented at the time of construction. These devices shall be in place during construction activities, and after if necessary, to minimize sediment impact to the wetlands and input to waters of the United States. These devices shall be placed at all locations where the likelihood of sediment input exists. A supply of erosion control materials shall be kept on hand to cover small sites that may become bare and to respond to sediment emergencies.

The Major Grading Plan (discussed above) would also ensure that there are no impacts to adjacent properties or downstream impacts from encroachment and/or fill in the waterway. Potential impacts to the biological resources from these improvements are discussed in Biological Resources section of the Subsequent EIR for the proposed 2020 CIP Update.

d) The project would widen 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments and reduce the right-of-way for 3 intersections and 3 roadway segments. The proposed project roadway and intersection improvements would slightly increase the amount of impervious surface area. This slight increase would not substantially increase the amount of runoff. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

At some locations, fill and/or culverts would be placed adjacent to or within waterways (creeks/channels/ditches) and new ditches would be required. Roads, culverts, and ditches would be sized in accordance with City's design guidance and Placer County Stormwater Management Manual. As described in h) below, placement of fill within waterways would not be allowed to adversely affect hydraulic flow conditions or create flooding.

Project-specific drainage reports for each future construction project that could potentially impact flooding would be prepared. The report(s) would include detailed evaluation of the proposed onsite facilities and evaluation of the capacity of downstream offsite drainage facilities to assess the need to upgrade, mitigate, or replace those facilities. Design would need to evaluate flow path changes and the contribution of those changes to offsite storm drain systems. The drainage report(s) would be reviewed and approved by the City.

With preparation, submittal, review, and approval of the drainage reports, the impact of the proposed project on flooding on or off site is considered less than significant.

e) As indicated in c) above, drainage patterns could be affected by improvements in the vicinity of waterways. The proposed project would only slightly increase impervious surfaces; therefore, there would not be a substantial increase in the amount of runoff. The project would not introduce any new sources of pollutants. No erosion, siltation, flooding, or polluted runoff is anticipated with compliance with the NPDES permit; the City's Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance; and implementation of BMPs. Because the proposed improvements would not substantially increase the amount of runoff and would not introduce new pollutants, the impact would be less than significant.

g) Housing is not an element of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

h) The proposed project would not place any structures within a 100-year floodplain. Two of the intersections proposed to be widened, however, are located within or adjacent to the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain: Intersection 104 (Roseville Parkway/West Mall) and Intersection 15 (Cirby Way/Orlando Avenue). With construction of these intersections, there is the potential for encroachment into the floodplain due to placement of fill and/or culverts. The amount of fill and/or culverts that would be placed within the floodplain would be expected to be minimal and would not be expected to significantly increase the baseline flood elevation. Therefore, this impact would be expected to be less than significant.

i) No people or structures would be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of construction under the proposed facilities. No levees or dams are located in the project vicinity. No impacts are anticipated.

j) There are no bodies of water near the project area that could create a seiche or tsunami. Similarly, the proposed project would not be subject to, or create, mudflows based on soil types and slopes found in the area. Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

# IX. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | **X** |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | **X** | | | |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

a) The proposed project will update the City of Roseville's 2020 Transportation System Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to reflect revised citywide buildout conditions from that of the current 2020 CIP using an updated traffic model. The proposed project would modify 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments. The improvements would be made to existing roadways and intersections—no new intersections or roadways would be developed. Therefore, the proposed project would not divide any established communities and no impact would occur.

b) The proposed project would reflect the updated traffic model and would not result in changes to existing land use, zoning, or specific plans in the City of Roseville. With construction of the improvements proposed in the 2020 CIP Update, the proposed project would comply with the City's existing LOS policy to maintain an LOS C at a minimum of 70 percent for all signalized intersections in the City. Therefore, there would be no impact from the proposed project. However, the Cumulative Plus Project conditions (Scenario 7) evaluated in the traffic analysis anticipated that approximately 63 percent of 179 intersections will be at an LOS of C or better in 2020. This is still considered an improvement from the Cumulative No Project conditions (Scenario 6), for which it is projected that 56 percent of the intersections will be at an LOS of C or better in 2020. Although the proposed project would improve traffic conditions in 2020, since the Cumulative Plus Project conditions (2025 plus additional development outside of the City limits) would not comply with the City's current LOS policy, this issue is considered a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated further in the Subsequent EIR for the 2020 CIP Update (under Section 5.2.3.1 of the Subsequent EIR when discussing the cumulative impact analysis for Transportation and Circulation).

c) There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans in the project area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

# X. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | **X** | |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | | | **X** | |

**Discussion:**

a, b) The proposed project includes the widening of 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments located within a developed urban area. There are aggregate and clay resources in the City of Roseville General Plan planning area; however, the resources are generally found along drainage systems, in isolated areas.

Some of the proposed intersection-widening areas are located in Mineral Resource Zone-1 (MRZ-1), Mineral Resource Zone-2 (MRZ-2), and Mineral Resource Zone-3 (MRZ-3), as identified by the California Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification Map in the Roseville 2010 General Plan EIR.

- MRZ-1 designates areas defined as “areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.”
- MRZ-2 designates areas defined as “areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists.”
- MRZ-3 designates areas defined as “areas containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.” (Source: Roseville 2010 General Plan EIR, exhibit 4.1-3)

All proposed improvements would occur within or adjacent to existing roadways and intersections. The proposed project does not propose to excavate for mineral resources; the existing land uses surrounding the mineral resources are incompatible with mining and excavation. Therefore, impacts to mineral resources would be less than significant.

# XI. Noise

Would the project result in:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | X | |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | X | | |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | X | | |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |

**Discussion:**

a,c) Construction of the proposed project roadway and intersection improvements would result in temporary noise from construction equipment. In addition, temporary groundborne vibration or noise may increase from construction events. The project would adhere to the City's Noise Ordinance, which prohibits construction activity from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. on weekdays and 8 p.m. to 8 a.m. on weekends. Noise modeling conducted for the proposed widening improvements demonstrated that operational noise would not exceed noise standards identified in the Noise Element of the City's General Plan. Therefore, the project would have less-than-significant impacts.

b,d) Although the project will comply with the City's noise ordinance, the ordinance does not specify an allowable noise level for construction activity within the allowable time periods. Therefore, even with implementation of the City's noise ordinance, potentially significant noise impacts could occur if construction activities occurred in the vicinity of sensitive noise receptors (i.e., schools and hospitals) during allowed construction hours. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the Subsequent EIR for the 2020 CIP Update. Mitigation measures will be presented in the Subsequent EIR, including preparation of a construction noise abatement program, to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

e, f) The proposed project is not located within or in the vicinity of an airport land use plan or private airstrip; therefore, there would be no impact.

# XII. Population and Housing

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | **X** | |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | **X** |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

a) The proposed project is a response to revised citywide buildout conditions in the City of Roseville. Intersections modifications proposed in the 2020 CIP Update would accommodate growth that is currently entitled through 2020. The project does not account for, or contribute to, any additional development. The project proposes to modify 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments with in the City. All of these improvements would be made to existing intersection and roadways. The project would not result in new development or new roadways, and therefore would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly and result in a less-than-significant impact.

b,c) The proposed project does not include residential development and would not displace existing housing or people. The intersection improvements would occur within or adjacent to designated roadway rights-of-way. The project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impact would occur.

# XIII. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Fire protection? | | | | **X** |
| b) Police protection? | | | | **X** |
| c) Schools? | | | | **X** |
| d) Parks? | | | | **X** |
| e) Other public facilities? | | | **X** | |

**Discussion:**

a–d) The proposed project would not result in the need for new or altered fire protection, police protection, schools, or parks because the project would not add new residents or change land uses. During

construction of the proposed project, no additional public services would be required (other than what already is provided). Therefore, there would be no impact.

e) The proposed project would not require additional road maintenance facilities (other public services), other than those currently provided by the City. Therefore, the impacts associated with this project on public services are considered less than significant.

## XIV. Recreation

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | | **X** |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | | **X** |

**Discussion:**

a,b) The proposed project would not add new residents or create new land uses that would impact existing recreation. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks or recreation facilities, nor would these facilities need to be expanded. Therefore, the project would have no impact on recreation.

# XV. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | **X** | | | |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways? | **X** | | | |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | | | | **X** |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | | **X** |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | **X** |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | | | | **X** |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | **X** | | | |

**Discussion:**

a, b, g) In order to more accurately reflect the land use absorption rate in the City of Roseville, the proposed project would update the 2020 CIP to reflect revised citywide buildout conditions from that of the current CIP using an updated traffic model. The City's current level of service policy stipulates maintenance of an LOS of C or better at a minimum of 70 percent of signalized intersections. The City has identified improvements to certain intersections and roadways that would ensure that the City's LOS policy is maintained while accommodating future projected growth in the City through 2020. The proposed project would not increase the number of vehicle trips generated by development in the City but may redistribute the trips. The project would modify 30 intersections and 6 roadway segments. Of these, 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments would require widening. The project would improve LOS at certain intersections while degrading LOS at others. Potentially significant impacts to traffic could occur through increased traffic on City roadways as well as areas outside the city limits. Based on these factors, impacts to traffic and transportation will be evaluated in the Subsequent EIR for the proposed 2020 CIP Update.

c) The proposed project would not affect air traffic patterns because the project would not involve aircraft operations. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d, e) The proposed project roadway and intersection improvements would be in compliance with the City of Roseville's design standards and would avoid design hazards. In addition, the improvements would conform to City standards for compatibility with surrounding land uses. Compliance with these standards

would also ensure and maintain the existing level of emergency access; therefore, there would be no impact.

f) The proposed project does not include construction of new facilities that would require parking; therefore, there would be no impact.

## XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | X |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | X |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | X | | |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | | X |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments? | | | | X |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | X | |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | X | |

**Discussion:**

a,b,d,e) The proposed project would not require the construction of new water or wastewater facilities, nor would it affect wastewater treatment facilities. No water supplies would be necessary beyond those needed for construction activities; therefore, there would be no impact.

c) As described in Section VIII above, project-specific drainage reports for each future construction project that could potentially affect flooding would be prepared. The report(s) would include detailed evaluation of the proposed onsite facilities and evaluation of the capacity of downstream offsite drainage facilities to assess the need to upgrade, mitigate, or replace those facilities. The drainage report(s) would be reviewed and approved by the City. The report may conclude that modifications are required to existing drainage facilities resulting from flow path changes associated with the proposed project and the contribution of those changes to offsite storm drain systems. Potentially significant environmental

impacts could occur if the City determines that additional construction is required at downstream offsite drainage facilities to accommodate proposed project improvements. The following mitigation measure would reduce these potential environmental impacts to less-than-significant levels.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** If the results of the drainage report conclude that modifications are required to existing drainage facilities located downstream of specific intersection improvements, the City shall design and construct these modifications in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance, Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Construction Standards, Improvement Standards, and Tree Ordinance, all of which include standards and policies that are uniformly applied to development projects throughout the City. Construction shall be in compliance with the City's NPDES permit and the City's Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance. BMPs will be implemented during construction. The City shall obtain and comply with permit requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Game, as applicable, for impacts to wetlands, waters of the United States, riparian habitat, and threatened and endangered species.

f, g) The proposed project would generate some solid waste during the construction phase. The solid waste would be disposed of at the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (in accordance with the City of Roseville General Plan 2010, November 1992), which complies with all federal, state, and local regulations. The solid waste generated during construction would be mostly roadway materials (earthwork and asphalt concrete). The amount of solid waste anticipated to be generated would be minimal and not substantially reduce the lifespan of the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill. No operational phase solid waste is anticipated; therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.

## XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | X | | | |
| b) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). | X | | | |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | X | | | |

**Discussion:**

a) The proposed project consists of roadway and intersection improvements within a developed urban area. The project would include widening of 10 intersections and 3 roadway segments. Some of the areas potentially affected by these widening projects contain seasonal wetlands, creeks, and habitat for special-status species. Based on this information, impacts to biological resources are potentially significant and will be evaluated in the Subsequent EIR for the proposed 2020 CIP Update.

b–c) The proposed project may result in cumulative impacts to land use (General Plan policy), traffic and transportation, noise, air quality, and biological resources. These impacts are individually limited but may be cumulatively considerable and potentially affect the general public and environment. Therefore, the proposed project may be considered potentially significant and would require further analysis in the Subsequent EIR for the proposed 2020 CIP Update.

## Environmental Determination

In reviewing the site-specific information provided for this project, the City of Roseville Public Works Department has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that at least one impact is considered to be significant. Therefore, **on the basis of the following initial evaluation,** we find that the proposed project **may** have a significant effect on the environment, and a Subsequent **Environmental Impact Report** will be required to evaluate the following impacts:

- Air quality impacts associated with construction and transportation sources ($NO_X$, ROG, CO, $PM_{10}$);
- Biological resource impacts from proposed widening projects;
- Cultural resource impacts from proposed widening projects;
- Noise impacts associated with construction and transportation sources;
- Traffic and transportation impacts;
- Cumulative land use impacts due to noncompliance with the City's General Plan Level of Service policy;
- Cumulative biological resources impacts;
- Cumulative air quality impacts;
- Cumulative noise impacts; and
- Cumulative traffic and transportation impacts.