

1 INTRODUCTION

This document is a draft environmental impact report (Draft EIR) on the proposed Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project (proposed project), a multi-use trail along Dry, Cirby, and Linda Creeks from Riverside Avenue to Old Auburn Road in the City of Roseville. It has been prepared by the City of Roseville (City) as lead agency, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21000-21177) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387). The proposed project would be a shared-use trail for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized vehicle users that would connect neighborhoods, parks, schools, businesses, natural areas, and the on-street bikeway system across the south side of the City.

1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THIS DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1.1.1 Type and Purpose of the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA (PRC Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulation, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 1500, et seq.) to evaluate the physical environmental effects of the proposed Dry Creek Greenway East Trail. CEQA requires that public agencies consider the potentially significant adverse environmental effects of projects over which they have discretionary approval authority before taking action on those projects (PRC Section 21000 et seq.). CEQA also requires that each public agency avoid or mitigate to less-than-significant levels, wherever feasible, the significant adverse environmental effects of projects it approves or implements. If a project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts (i.e., significant effects that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less-than-significant levels), the project can still be approved, but the lead agency's decision makers, in this case the City of Roseville City Council, must prepare findings and issue a "statement of overriding considerations" explaining in writing the specific economic, social, or other considerations that they believe, based on substantial evidence, make those significant effects acceptable (PRC Section 21002; State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093).

According to the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064[f][1]), preparation of an EIR is required whenever a project may result in a significant adverse environmental impact. An EIR is an informational document used to inform public agency decision makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify feasible ways to mitigate or avoid those effects, and describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while substantially lessening or avoiding any of the significant environmental impacts. Public agencies are required to consider the information presented in the EIR when determining whether to approve a project. The City of Roseville is the lead agency for the project and is responsible for preparation of the EIR; other public agencies with jurisdiction over the project are described below in Subsection 1.3.3, Responsible, Trustee, and Other Interested Agencies.

In accordance with Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this document is a project EIR that examines the environmental impacts of a specific proposed project. A project EIR is an informational document designed to provide the basis for the local planning and decision-making process that would lead to project implementation without the need for further environmental review. This type of EIR focuses on the changes in the environment that would result from the proposed project. In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, a project EIR must examine the environmental effects of all phases of

the project, including construction and operation. A detailed description of the proposed project is included in Chapter 3, “Project Description,” of this Draft EIR.

1.2 SCOPE AND ORGANIZATION OF THIS DRAFT EIR

1.2.1 Scope of the Draft EIR

In accordance with PRC Section 21092 and CCR Section 15082, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on November 18, 2013 to inform agencies and the general public that an EIR was being prepared and to invite comments on the scope and content of the document (Appendix A). The NOP was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, posted on the City of Roseville website (http://www.roseville.ca.us/transportation/bikeways/dc_study.asp), made available at the City clerk’s office and the City of Roseville Permit Center, and distributed directly to potential responsible and trustee agencies. The NOP was circulated for 30 days, through December 19, 2013. In accordance with PRC Section 21083.9 and CCR Section 15082(c), a noticed scoping meeting for the EIR occurred on December 3, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. at the Maidu Community Center, 1550 Maidu Drive, Roseville, California, 95661.

Recognizing the NOP release precedes the effective date of Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), statutes of 2014, the procedural elements of AB 52 do not apply to the project (see Regulatory Setting, in Section 4.4, “Cultural Resources,” for additional information on AB 52). Nonetheless, the EIR includes consideration of the potential for the presence of tribal cultural resources as part of the environmental analysis in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources. In addition, Native American consultation was conducted throughout preparation of the technical studies prepared for the EIR (see “Native American Consultation and Other Interested Parties” in Section 4.4).

A summary of the comments received on the NOP is included in each technical section. Appendix A contains a copy of the NOP, while scoping comments and comment letters received on the NOP are included in Appendix B. Table 1-1 below lists the NOP comments received and the location of the response in this EIR, as applicable.

Table 1-1 Comment Letters and Discussion Location in Draft EIR

NOP Comment Letter	Comment/Topic	Addressed in Draft EIR Chapter/Section
Letter 1 Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Hydrology and Water Quality 1. Addresses requirements for a board permit for the placement, construction, reconstruction, removal, or abandonment of any landscaping, culvert, bridge, conduit, fence, projection, fill, embankment, building, structure, obstruction, encroachment, excavation, the planting, or removal of vegetation, and any repair or maintenance that involves cutting into the levee. 2. Requests mitigation measures to avoid decreasing floodway channel capacity. 3. Requests mitigation measures for channel and levee improvements and maintenance to prevent and/or reduce hydraulic impacts.	Subsection 1.3.3 Responsible, Trustee and Other Interested Agencies; Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Letter 2 Placer County Air Pollution Control District	Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change 1. The District recommends using the CEQA Air Quality Handbook (Handbook) to assist with recommended	Section 4.2, Air Quality Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Table 1-1 Comment Letters and Discussion Location in Draft EIR

NOP Comment Letter	Comment/Topic	Addressed in Draft EIR Chapter/Section
	analytical approaches and feasible mitigation measures when preparing air quality analyses for land use projects.	
Letter 3 UAIC	Cultural Resources 1. Expresses interest in holding conservation easements for culturally significant prehistoric sites. 2. Requests the opportunity to provide Tribal representatives to monitor project excavation. 3. Requests receipt of cultural materials from prehistoric sites where excavation and data recovery has been performed. 4. Requests copies of environmental notices and documents for the project and requests a meeting to discuss cultural resources of importance to the UAIC.	Section 4.4, Cultural Resources
Letter 4 Friends of Linda Creek (1)	Project Description 1. Supports a setback of at least 20' from the creek or use of an alternate route if setbacks are not included along Mallard, Condor, Blue Jay and along the Eich school area. 2. Expresses the opinion that the route will meet the City's goal of a Regional Bike Trail Connecting the Parks and Open Space.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.5, Geology ad Soils Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Letter 5 Friends of Linda Creek (2)	Project Description, Biological Resources 1. Requests that the total distance from the creek be a minimum of 20 to 30 feet from the top of the creek bank. 2. Expresses concern for the creek related to the removal of trees. 3. Expresses support for natural creek restoration. 4. Addresses the potential to acquire a small amount of additional property.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.5, Geology ad Soils Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning
Letter 6 Friends of Linda Creek (3)	Project Description, Biological Resources 1. Requests the use of bio-engineering and native rock bank restoration rather than the use of concrete.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.3, Biological Resources
Letter 7 Bobbi Knapp	Project Description 1. Requests elements such as underpasses at the crossings at Oak Ridge and Rocky Ridge. 2. Addresses the junction at Meadowlark.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Letter 8 Jim Williams	Project Description 1. Requests renovation of Oak Ridge bridge to allow trail to go under Oak Ridge. 2. Requests that the alignment from Sierra Gardens (Eich) soccer fields to Rocky Ridge be flat and requests an underpass at Rocky Ridge.	Chapter 3, Project Description
Letter 9 David Allen	Project Description, Land Use and Planning 1. Requests an assessment in the EIR of the degree to which the proposed alignment supports the goal of a highly connected trail. 2. Expresses an opinion that the intersection at Sunrise is not the best route for providing connectivity to/from northbound and southbound Sunrise.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning

Table 1-1 Comment Letters and Discussion Location in Draft EIR

NOP Comment Letter	Comment/Topic	Addressed in Draft EIR Chapter/Section
Letter 10 Andrea Walker	Biological Resources; Hazardous Waste 1. Requests an assessment in the EIR of the impact to potential salmon run. 2. Requests an assessment in the EIR of the environmental impact to the creek of littered dog waste and proposed measures to encourage proper disposal (if it is deemed to adversely impact the water quality of the creek).	Section 4.3, Biological Resources Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Letter 11 Rosalynd Clement	Hydrology and Water Quality; Biological Resources 1. Expresses concern regarding downstream effects due to the underpass at Rocky Ridge or any creek bank work. 2. Expresses concern regarding habitat for river otters, western pond turtle, red-winged hawks, and pheasants. 3. Expresses concern for the 30-year old native oaks on Meadow Oaks along the creek trail.	Section 4.3, Biological Resources Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Letter 12 Jim Holland	Hydrology and Water Quality; Biological Resources 1. Addresses the natural drainage path of rainwater run-off for Quail Circle and Swallow Way. 2. Addresses the maintenance of dense growth oak trees behind properties on Meadow Lark Way in open space.	Section 4.3, Biological Resources Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality
Letter 13 David Schmidt	Land Use and Planning 1. Addresses property values and limiting future development.	Not a CEQA/EIR-related comment.
Letter 14 Jim Williams	Project Description 1. Requests keeping the trail flat and level. 2. Addresses the existing uphill grade from the creek up to Meadow Lark Drive; 3. Addresses existing skateboarders and young cyclists who use the existing downhill grade that may jeopardize pedestrians at the blind curve.	Chapter 3, Project Description Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning
Letter 15 Shirley Brown	Project Description; Biological Resources 1. Expresses support for leaving this area in its natural state without pavement. 2. Addresses existing wildlife, including ducks, mink, otter, and Western Pond turtle.	Section 4.3, Biological Resources

The City has considered the relevant NOP comments in preparation of this Draft EIR and has determined that the project may result in environmental effects in the following resource areas. Pursuant to CCR Section 15063 (a), of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study has not been prepared for the proposed project. Rather, this EIR analyzes project-related impacts to the following resource areas:

- ▲ Aesthetics
- ▲ Air Quality
- ▲ Biological Resources
- ▲ Cultural Resources
- ▲ Geology and Soils
- ▲ Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change
- ▲ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ▲ Hydrology and Water Quality
- ▲ Land Use and Planning
- ▲ Noise
- ▲ Public Services
- ▲ Recreation
- ▲ Transportation and Circulation
- ▲ Utilities

Resource areas that would not be affected by the proposed project are addressed in Chapter 2, “Summary.”

1.2.2 Draft Environmental Impact Report Organization

This Draft EIR is organized into chapters as briefly described below.

Chapter 1, Introduction: This chapter provides a description of the lead and responsible agencies, the legal authority and purpose of the EIR, the public review process, and organization of the EIR.

Chapter 2, Summary: This chapter summarizes the Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project and the environmental review process. A description of effects found not to be significant and key environmental issues is provided. Finally, this chapter includes a summary table of the project’s significant environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Chapter 3, Project Description: This chapter describes the project location, background, and purpose and need. The Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project elements and anticipated phasing are described in detail.

Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures: The resource sections in this chapter (Sections 4.1 through 4.14) evaluate the environmental effects anticipated from implementation of the proposed Dry Creek Greenway East Trail and Alignment Options 1A, 1C, and 5A. Within each section of Chapter 4, the regulatory background, environmental setting, significance criteria, and analysis methodology and assumptions are described. Environmental impacts are identified and evaluated for each resource. For each significant or potentially significant impact that would result from project or alignment option implementation, mitigation measures are recommended, and the level of significance after mitigation disclosed. Environmental impacts are numbered sequentially throughout the sections of Chapter 4 (e.g. Impact 4.2-1, Impact 4.2-2, etc.). Any required mitigation measures are numbered to correspond to the impact numbering; therefore, the first mitigation measure for Impact 4.2-1 would be Mitigation Measure 4.2-1.

Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations: This chapter assesses the potential cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project together with other past, present, and probable future projects; and identifies and assesses potential direct and indirect growth inducing impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, and significant and irreversible commitment of resources.

Chapter 6, Alternatives: This chapter provides a discussion of alternatives to the proposed Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project, including the No Project Alternative, alternatives considered but eliminated from further consideration, and the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 7, References: This chapter identifies the organizations and persons consulted during preparation of this Draft EIR and the documents used as sources for the analyses.

Chapter 8, Report Preparation: This chapter identifies the lead and responsible agency contacts as well as the preparers of this Draft EIR.

Chapter 9, Acronyms and Abbreviations: This chapter identifies the acronyms and abbreviations used in this Draft EIR.

Appendices: This section contains various technical data or reports and official publications (such as the NOP) which were summarized or otherwise used for preparation of the Draft EIR.

1.2.3 Standard Terminology

This Draft EIR uses the following standard terminology:

No Impact means no change from existing conditions (no mitigation is required).

Less-than-Significant Impact means no substantial adverse change in the physical environment (no mitigation is required).

Potentially Significant Impact or **Significant Impact** means an impact that might or would cause a substantial adverse change in the physical environment (all feasible mitigation must be adopted).

Significant and Unavoidable Impact means an impact that would cause a substantial adverse change in the physical environment and that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation.

Significance Criteria means criteria or criterion used to define what level of impact would be considered significant. Standards are defined by a lead agency based on examples found in CEQA or the State CEQA Guidelines, scientific and factual data, views of the public in affected areas, the policy/regulatory environment of affected jurisdictions, and other factors.

1.3 CEQA PROCESS

1.3.1 Public Review of the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR is being circulated for public review and comment for a period of at least 45 days, from April 13, 2018 to May 29, 2018. During this period, comments from the general public, organizations, and agencies on the Draft EIR may be submitted to the City. The Notice of Availability and the Draft EIR are being posted on the City's website:

<http://www.roseville.ca.us/EnvironmentalDocs>

Additional project information can be obtained from the project website:

<http://www.roseville.ca.us/DryCreek>

Copies of this Draft EIR are also available for review at the following locations:

City of Roseville Permit Center
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678
(Open to the public Monday – Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm)

Maidu Library
1530 Maidu Drive
Roseville, CA 95661 (Open to the public: Monday - Wednesday 10:00 am - 7:00 pm; Thursday / Saturday 10:00 am - 5:00 pm)

Written comments on the Draft EIR should be submitted by May 29, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. to:

City of Roseville City Manager's Office
Mark Morse, Environmental Coordinator
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678
Phone: (916) 774-5499
Email: mmorse@roseville.ca.us

In addition, a public hearing will be held to receive public and agency comments on the Draft EIR during the public comment period. The meeting date, time, and location and will be noticed via the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR and posted on the City's website.

Upon completion of the public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared that will include written comments on the Draft EIR received during the public review period and the City's responses to those comments. The Final EIR will also include the Mitigation Monitoring Program. The Final EIR will address any revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to public comments or at the direction of the lead agency. The Draft EIR and Final EIR together will comprise the EIR for the proposed project.

Before the City of Roseville can approve the project, it must first certify that the EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA, that the City Council reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City. If significant environmental effects are identified, the lead agency must adopt "Findings" indicating whether feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist that can avoid or reduce those significant effects. If the impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable because there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that render such impacts less than significant, the lead agency may still approve the project if it determines that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. On this basis, the lead agency would then be required to prepare a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" for review and approval by the decision makers that discusses the specific reasons for approving the project, based on information in the EIR and other information in the record.

1.3.2 Lead Agency

The City of Roseville is the lead agency for this EIR under CEQA, as defined in CCR Section 15367. As such, the City has the principal responsibility for conducting the environmental review process, including scoping, preparing appropriate environmental documentation, and obtaining required permits and other regulatory approvals. After the EIR public review process is complete and the Final EIR is prepared, the City is responsible for certifying the EIR and rendering a decision to approve or deny the Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project.

1.3.3 Responsible, Trustee, and other Interested Agencies

A responsible agency is a non-federal public agency other than the lead agency that has legal responsibility for reviewing, carrying out, or approving elements of a project (CCR Section 15381). A trustee agency is a state agency that has jurisdiction by law over resources affected by a project which are held in trust for the people of the State of California (CCR Section 15386). The California Department of Fish and Wildlife is a trustee agency with jurisdiction over fish and wildlife and their habitats that may be affected by the Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project. Responsible and trustee agencies are consulted by the lead agency to ensure the opportunity for input during the environmental review process.

Responsible agencies should participate in the lead agency's CEQA process, review the lead agency's CEQA document, and use the document for decision making on project elements over which they have discretionary approval. The following state agencies may have responsibility for, or jurisdiction over, implementation of portions of the Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project.

- ▲ California Department of Transportation,
- ▲ Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board,
- ▲ Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and
- ▲ California Department of Fish and Wildlife

In addition, the following federal agencies may provide funding for project implementation or have responsibility for, or jurisdiction over, permits required prior to implementation of portions of the Dry Creek Greenway East Trail Project.

- ▲ Federal Highway Administration (see below),
- ▲ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
- ▲ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and
- ▲ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is serving as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lead agency as a result of the expectation that Federal Department of Transportation funding would help construct the project. FHWA has an agreement with the State of California that allows delegation of NEPA compliance to Caltrans. Through this NEPA Assignment Memorandum of Understanding, Caltrans is serving FHWA's role as NEPA lead agency. At this time, it is anticipated that NEPA compliance will be satisfied with a Categorical Exclusion based on technical studies.