



INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number	Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016; PL16-0053
Project Location	Citywide
Project Description	The City of Roseville proposes to update the City's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) consistent with the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA2000) which requires all local agencies to submit and receive approval of a MHMP by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in order to receive post-disaster mitigation funds. Consistent with the Stafford Act, the City's MHMP is required to be updated every five years. The last update occurred in 2011, and the City is currently amending the Plan as part of the required five year update. With this update, the MHMP will incorporate a standalone chapter addressing climate change, update the Human-Caused Hazards and Human Health Hazards Sections, include additional demographic information, and update references related to individuals with disabilities. In addition, a guiding principle has been incorporated into the MHMP.
Project Applicant	City of Roseville
Lead Agency Contact	Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner; Phone: (916) 774-5276

This initial study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the above-described project. The document relies on project-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. Where documents were submitted by consultants working for the City, City staff reviewed such documents in order to determine whether, based on their own professional judgment and expertise, staff found such documents to be credible and persuasive. Staff has relied on documents that reflect their independent judgment, and has not accepted at face value representations made by consultants for the City.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a negative declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared.

In reviewing the project-specific information, the City of Roseville Planning Division has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that with mitigation the impacts are considered to be less than significant. As demonstrated in the initial study checklist, there are no "project specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site" that cannot be reduced to less than significant effects through mitigation (CEQA Section 15183) and therefore an EIR is **not** required. Therefore, **on the basis of the following initial evaluation**, we find that the proposed project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **Mitigated Negative Declaration** will be prepared.

Prepared by: Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner Date: _____

BACKGROUND

The Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA2000) requires all local agencies to submit and receive approval of a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in order to receive post-disaster mitigation funds. Communities without a MHMP in place will not be eligible to receive disaster assistance under the Stafford Act, which is the federal law governing disaster recovery funds. The purpose of the federal mandate is to encourage local agencies to plan in advance for any type of hazards or disasters for which the community is at risk and to have programs and projects in place to mitigate the disaster should one ever occur. As required, the City of Roseville's MHMP includes the following components: (1) Planning Process and Community Profile - which outlines the process by which the Plan was updated and outreach efforts undertaken to update demographic information; (2) Risk Assessment - which provides the basis for activities proposed to reduce losses from identified hazards, describes potential natural hazards in Roseville (including historical information on previous hazard events and probability of future events), and assesses Roseville's vulnerability and exposure to hazards; and (3) Mitigation Strategy - which includes mitigation goals for citizens, businesses, and the City of Roseville to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities and exposure to the identified hazards.

Currency of the MHMP is also integral to the City maintaining its Community Rating System "Class 1" rating (Roseville is currently the only community in the nation with this designation). The City has coordinated the preparation of the Plan with the FEMA, the State Office of Emergency Services (the agency that is responsible for writing California's mitigation plan), Placer County, and has incorporated the expertise of several city departments. A copy of the City of Roseville MHMP is included for reference as Attachment 1 of this checklist.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project will update the City's MHMP consistent with the Stafford Act (Public Law 100-707), which requires local agencies to update their MHMP on a five year basis in order to address changes affecting the planning area since the previous performance period. The proposed update will comprehensively revise the City's 2011 MHMP as noted below. However, due to the success of the initial Plan, no major changes were made to the Plan's approach and function and as a result no changes were made to the Action Plan recommendations outlined in MHMP Table 19-1. Accordingly, the Plan will continue to provide a viable planning framework for all foreseeable natural hazards and will identify resources, information, and strategies for reducing risk from natural hazards, similar to the base format of the 2011 plan.

To further ensure the comprehensiveness of the MHMP, the 2016 update provides additional analysis related to climate change impacts, human-caused hazards, human health hazards, demographic information, language revisions, and establishes a guiding principle for the Plan. These updates and revisions have been incorporated into Chapters 4 through 18 of the Plan and are summarized below:

- **Climate Change Impacts** - The most recent version of the California hazard mitigation plan noted specific hazards that are created or augmented by the environmental impacts of climate change. Additionally, the recent passage of Senate Bill 379 brings the effects of climate change into focus as it relates to mitigation and general planning. As a result, instead of briefly reviewing the impact of climate change in each individual hazard profile, the 2016 plan update dedicates a comprehensive chapter to the issue of climate change and its effects on the state-identified climate-related hazards.
- **Human-Caused Hazards** - The human-caused hazards noted in the 2011 effort were updated for the 2016 plan. These human-caused hazards were moved within the document to after the natural hazards due to the difference in assessing risk. Cyber threat was included as a new human-caused hazard, due to the increase in connectivity, technological advances, and emergence of "hacktivist" groups.
- **Human Health Hazards** - The human health hazards noted in the 2011 effort were updated for the 2016 plan. These human health hazards were moved within the document to after the natural hazards due to the difference in assessing risk. Ebola was included as a new human health hazard due to the 2014 West Africa Ebola outbreak that threatened the United States. Zika virus was included in the discussion, as well.
- **Additional Demographic Information** - Additional demographic data are included (beyond age and disability/access and function need) addressing Roseville's industry, business and institutional footprint. In addition, employment trends and occupations are included to develop a fuller understanding of the

population of Roseville.

- **Disabilities, Access and Functional Need Language Revision** - The entire plan was updated to reflect appropriate references when discussing individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs. This includes person-first language and references to individuals instead of the more general term of populations.
- **Guiding Principle** - A guiding principle for the hazard mitigation plan was developed. The goals and objectives of the plan support the guiding principle.

The updated sections of the Plan were selected because they meet a program requirement and because they best meet the needs of the community by helping to guide and coordinate mitigation activities throughout the City of Roseville. It also will meet the planning requirements of the CRS, allowing the City of Roseville to maintain its CRS Class 1 rating.

Based on the scope of the proposed project, the initial study checklist evaluates potential impacts of the Plan update at a program level. Given that the details of individual projects are still to be developed, examining specific project-level impacts would be speculative at this time. Sections 15145 and 15146 of the State CEQA Guidelines specifically state that impacts which are too speculative should not be discussed, and that an environmental document on a policy-level project need not be as detailed as the environmental document for the specific construction projects which may follow. The majority of action plan recommendations address the ongoing need for inspections and information gathering. They also recommend development of vulnerability assessments, feasibility studies, enhanced emergency response capability, and continued implementation of certain City policies, programs, and activities.

Should the City decide to approve one of the individual projects or actions contained in the MHMP, a supplemental project level Initial Study would be prepared to confirm that related environmental impacts would remain within the scope of this Initial Study. Should the project level Initial Study find the project would result in significant unavoidable impacts, a project level EIR would be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Roseville lies in the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada Range, about 16 miles northeast of downtown Sacramento. It is the largest city in Placer County and includes 43.39 square miles of incorporated lands and an additional 796 acres making up the City's sphere of influence. The City's area is characterized by gently sloping terrain with areas of steep ravines in the northeast. It is segmented by topographical and physical features, including streams, natural parkways, open space, Interstate 80 and Highway 65, the Southern Pacific railroad, and industrial facilities. The City is primarily built out, with the greatest area of undeveloped property located in the western portion of the city (including the remainder of the developing West Roseville Specific Plan, and the undeveloped specific plan areas consisting of Sierra Vista, Creekview and Amoruso Ranch).

UNIFORMLY APPLIED POLICIES AND STANDARDS

For projects that are consistent with the development densities established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, CEQA Guidelines section 15183 allows a lead agency to rely on previously-adopted development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects, when the standards have been adopted by the City, with findings based on substantial evidence that the policies or standards will substantially mitigate environmental effects, unless substantial new information shows otherwise (CEQA Guidelines §1583(f)). The City of Roseville adopted CEQA Implementing Procedures (Implementing Procedures) which are consistent with the CEQA Guidelines. The current version of the Implementing Procedures were adopted in April 2008, along with Findings of Fact, as Resolution 08-172. The regulations and ordinances listed below were found to provide uniform mitigating policies and standards, and are applicable to development projects. The City's Mitigating Policies and Standards are referenced, where applicable, in the Initial Study Checklist.

- City of Roseville CEQA Implementing Procedures
- City of Roseville General Plan Policies
- City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 19)
- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch.4.44)
- Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority Improvement Fee (Resolution 2008-02)
- South Placer Regional Transportation Authority Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee (Resolution 09-05)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])
- City of Roseville Improvement Standards (Resolution 02-37)
- City of Roseville Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)
- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347)
- Specific Plans and associated Design Guidelines
 - Development Guidelines Del Webb Specific Plan (Resolution 96-330)
 - Landscape Design Guidelines for North Central Roseville Specific Plan (Resolution 90-170)
 - North Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 00-432)
 - Northeast Roseville Specific Plan (Olympus Pointe) Signage Guidelines (Resolution 89-42)
 - North Roseville Area Design Guidelines (Resolution 92-226)
 - Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines (Resolution 87-31)
 - Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines (Resolution 88-51)
 - Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 98-53)
 - Highland Reserve North Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 97-128)
 - West Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 04-40)
 - Sierra Vista Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 10-215)
 - Creekview Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 12-318)

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON

- Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report

The Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP) project included an overall Amendment of the City of Roseville General Plan, including updates to policy text. The Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the ARSP included an analysis of the updated General Plan land use designations and policies, including amending the General Plan from a 2025 to a 2035 horizon year. This analysis included some updated city-wide analysis. When applicable, the topical sections within the Initial Study summarize the findings within the ARSP EIR. The analysis, supporting technical materials, and findings of the environmental document are incorporated by reference, and are available for review at the Civic Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

EXPLANATION OF INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines recommend that lead agencies use an Initial Study Checklist to determine potential impacts of the proposed project to the physical environment. The Initial Study Checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by this project. This section of the Initial Study incorporates a portion of Appendix “G” Environmental Checklist Form, contained in the CEQA Guidelines.

There are four (4) possible answers to the Environmental Impacts Checklist on the following pages. Each possible answer is explained herein:

- 1) A “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from the information that a fair argument based on substantial evidence can be made to support a conclusion that a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change may occur to any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. When one or more “Potentially significant Impact” entries are made, and EIR is required.
- 2) A “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” answer is appropriate where the applicant has agreed to incorporate a mitigation measure to reduce an impact from “Potentially Significant” to a “Less than Significant.” For instance, impacts to flood waters could be reduced from a “potentially significant impact” to a “less than significant impact” by relocating a building to an area outside of the floodway. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are identified as MM followed by a number.
- 3) A “Less Than significant Impact” answer is appropriate if there is evidence that one or more environmental impacts may occur, but the impacts are determined to be less than significant, or that the application of development policies and standards to the project will reduce the impact(s) to a less than significant level. For instance, the application of the City’s Improvement Standards reduces potential erosion impacts to a less than significant impact.
- 4) A “No Impact” answer is appropriate where it can be clearly seen that the impact at hand does not have the potential to adversely affect the environment. For instance, a project in the center of an urbanized area will clearly not have an adverse effect on agricultural resources or operations.

All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers, provided they are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the applicable section. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as generous standards.

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines is used to describe the potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment.

I. Aesthetics

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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

a-c. The MHMP does not include specific proposals for new development, or identify physical modifications to existing development, beyond a general recommendation for the retrofit of existing structures and infrastructure. Therefore, no aesthetic impacts will occur as a result of the proposed MHMP. Globally, the strategies incorporated in the plan propose consideration of elements of broad scale land development criteria that would be incorporated into the design of future development and promotion of open space land use in high risk areas. These policy-level changes would be consistent with the General Plan, and other applicable City standards in the Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18), Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347), and Specific Plan Design Guidelines. In addition, any changes to these policy documents or ordinances to further comply with the MHMP would require additional environmental review at the time such changes are proposed. Therefore, no impact will occur at this time.

d. The plan does not propose any actions that would introduce a new source of light or glare.

II. Agricultural Resources

The State Department of Conservation oversees the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, which was established to document the location, quality, and quantity of agricultural lands, and the conversion of those lands over time. The primary land use classifications on the maps generated through this program are: Urban and Built Up Land, Grazing Land, Farmland of Local Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Prime Farmland. Only the latter three categories are called out as protected farmland categories within CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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 non-agricultural 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 non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

a-c) According to the California Department of Conservation Placer County Important Farmland Map (2010), the majority of the City of Roseville is designated as Urban and Built Up Land, most of the open space areas of the City are designated as Grazing Land, and there is one area designated as Farmland of Local Importance. None of the land within the City boundaries is designated as a protected farmland category. The current Williamson Act Contract map (2013/2014) produced by the Department of Conservation shows that there are no Williamson Act contracts within the City, and only one (on PFE Road) that is adjacent to the City. In addition, none of the land within the City is considered forest land by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. The proposed updates to the MHMP will not impact agricultural activities or agricultural operations. Given the foregoing, the proposed project will have no impact on agricultural resources.

III. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

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	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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 non-attainment 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	
f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
g) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

a–d) The City of Roseville, along with the south Placer County area, is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB is within the Sacramento Federal Ozone Non-Attainment Area. Under the Clean Air Act, Placer County has been designated a "serious non-attainment" area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, "non-attainment" for the state ozone standard, and a "non-attainment" area for the federal and state PM₁₀ standard (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Within Placer County, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) is responsible for ensuring that emission standards are not violated. Project-related air emissions would have a significant effect if they would result in concentrations that either violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation.

The discussions below focus on emissions of ROG (reactive organic gases), NO_x (nitrogen oxides), PM, and CO (carbon monoxide). Analyses are not included for sulfur dioxide, lead, and other constituents because there are no mass emission thresholds; these are concentration-based limits in the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards which require substantial, point-source emissions (e.g. refineries, concrete plants, etc.) before exceedance will occur; the SVAB is in attainment for these constituents. Analysis of toxic air contaminants (TAC) is likewise excluded, because they are typically generated by stationary sources like gas stations, facilities using solvents, and heavy industrial operations, and the project neither directly nor indirectly involves such uses.

The indirect effects of the MHMP related to construction activities is the potential for minor increases in emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM, and CO as a result of implementing certain building code and/or other design related improvements that reduce potential hazard impacts. However it's expected that such increases would not in and of themselves significantly alter a project's overall construction emissions. Rather, it's expected that MHMP recommendations implemented during construction would be combined with other routine construction tasks and therefore would not individually generate substantial emissions. The related impact is considered less than significant. It should be noted that future project level CEQA analysis will confirm that any incremental addition of construction related criteria emissions generated as a result of MHMP implementation would not cause a project to exceed applicable thresholds of significance. Should future project level analysis show that criteria pollutant thresholds would be exceeded, all feasible mitigation would be applied. Should the impact remain significant, a project level EIR would be required.

- e) Diesel fumes from construction equipment and delivery trucks are often found to be objectionable; however, construction is temporary and diesel emissions are minimal and regulated. Typical urban projects related to residences and retail businesses generally do not result in substantial objectionable odors when operated in compliance with City Ordinances. Any impacts associated with the recommendations of the MHMP are anticipated to be similar to any other typical urban development that lacks any characteristics that would cause the generation of substantial unpleasant odors. Thus, the implementation of the Plan's mitigation measures are not expected to result in the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts related to odors are less than significant.

- f–g) Emissions generated by projects associated with the Plan would be primarily limited to temporary construction activity, and therefore would result in minor or no operational emissions of greenhouse gases or air pollutants. As described in section a–d, above, the project may result in very slight changes to construction profiles which would only slightly increase mass construction emissions. In addition, construction emissions contribute only a fractional amount of annual emissions and a much smaller subset of these emissions can be attributed to building retrofit projects. Future project level CEQA analysis will confirm that any incremental addition of greenhouse gas emissions generated as a result of MHMP implementation remain below applicable thresholds of significance. Should future project level analysis show that greenhouse gas thresholds would be exceeded, a project level EIR would be required.

IV. Biological Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife 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

a-d. The MHMP proposes actions that would reduce the threat of wildfires through nondescript methods (i.e. regular mowing, using fire retardant materials, incorporating fire resistant landscaping, etc.). In addition, the Plan does not identify specific locations where these actions would be proposed. Therefore, no impact is associated with approving the updated MHMP and future project-specific environmental review will be required to identify the presence of biologically sensitive species or habitat, and identify any necessary project-specific measures to mitigate any potential impacts of projects undertaken pursuant to the MHMP.

- e. It is not anticipated that projects associated with the Plan would impact protected tree resources. However, should that be the case, the determination of the City’s adopted Findings for Mitigating Policies and Standards is that oak tree impacts are effectively mitigated by on-site plantings or in-lieu mitigation fees required by the City of Roseville Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Chapter 19.66). The Tree Preservation Ordinance establishes an in-lieu fee to be distributed into two funds: the Native Oak Tree Propagation Fund to be used to propagate and protect native oak trees within Roseville; and the Non-Native Tree Fund to be used to purchase and plant non-native trees within Roseville. The requirements of the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance preclude the need for additional mitigation. Therefore, impacts to tree resources would be less than significant based on the City’s adopted Findings for Mitigating Policies and Standards.

- f. Presently, there are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Conservation Community Plans in the City of Roseville. Therefore, the project will not result in any impact to any local conservation plan.

V. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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?				
e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in §21074?				X

- a-b. There are no mitigation strategies outlined within the MHMP that includes proposals for new development, or physical modification to existing development, beyond a general recommendation for retrofit of existing structures and infrastructure to reduce risks associated with seismic activity (earthquake). The Plan does not identify specific retrofit projects that would require groundbreaking or construction activities. However because the potential exists that older buildings could be considered historically or archaeologically

significant structures, or contain historically significant resources, the following mitigation measure would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level:

CR-1: *Prior to seismic retrofit older buildings shall be evaluated by a qualified architectural historian to determine eligibility as an historic resource. Should a building subject to retrofit be determined to be eligible, impacts will be mitigated in accordance with applicable regulations to the extent feasible.*

- c-d The proposed Plan recommends retrofit of structures built prior to UBC requirements for seismic safety. Such structures would be located in existing developed, urbanized areas, and therefore does not include the potential for disturbance of areas identified as having paleontological resources unique geologic features, or human remains. There would be no impact.
- e. The City of Roseville has received three (3) letters from California Native American Tribes that request tribal consultation under AB52. Therefore the City of Roseville is responsible for compliance with all applicable requirements under this statute. The City is unaware of the existence of any known Tribal Cultural Resources (as defined in Section §21074) within the City.

The City sent a subsequent consultation request letter dated July 18, 2016 to each tribe that requested consultation. No response has been received to date and therefore the City's consultation requirements for the project under AB52 have been fulfilled. No Impact would occur.

VI. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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:				X
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 ground shaking?				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 waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

a.-e. The mitigation strategies outlined within the MHMP include measures intended to educate residents and reduce risks associated with seismic activity, and would likely result in the beneficial impact of retrofitting existing facilities to increase safety, and increasing public awareness regarding appropriate actions to take in the event of an earthquake. This information would be provided as recommendations and would not be mandated. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of implementation of the MHMP. However, when such projects are implemented, compliance with the City of Roseville’s Grading Ordinance, Construction Standards, and Improvement Standards will ensure that any project impacts are less than significant.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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

- a.-d. The purpose of the MHMP and the associated mitigation strategies, is to identify, assess, and mitigate the potential for hazards and hazardous materials. Therefore, no adverse impact would occur.
- e, f. The City of Roseville is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- g. The purpose of the Plan is to increase preparedness and reduce risks associated with emergency response and evacuation procedures. Therefore, no adverse impact would occur.
- h. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is the state agency responsible for wildland fire protection and management. As part of that task, CAL FIRE maintains maps designating Wildland Fire Hazard Severity zones. The City is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Furthermore, the MHMP identify measures to reduce the risks and potential losses associated with wildland fires. Therefore, the proposed Plan will not increase the risk of wildland fires.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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 stormwater drainage systems or				X

	provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
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

- a,e,f. The MHMP's mitigation strategies propose rehabilitation and retrofit programs to reduce local flooding, and would reduce the potential for uncontrolled runoff that could result in violations of water quality standards during severe storm events. Flood control projects generally necessitate permits from state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over creeks and other waterways (i.e., the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and National Marine Fisheries Service). Mitigation is typically required as conditions of permits issued by those agencies and no adverse impacts would be anticipated from implementation of the proposed Plan. However, future projects would be subject to further environmental review and applicable regulatory permits.
- b. The proposed mitigation strategy does not include proposals for new development, or physical modification to existing development, beyond general recommendations for retrofit/hardening of infrastructure and older structures. No impacts associated with groundwater depletion would occur.
- c,d,g,h. The MHMP, and associated mitigation strategies, identify measures to reduce the risks and potential losses associated with flooding. The mitigation strategies propose rehabilitation and retrofit programs to facilitate proper drainage, reduce local flooding, and would reduce the potential for uncontrolled runoff that could result in violations of water quality standards during severe storm events. Flood control projects generally necessitate permits from state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over creeks and other waterways (i.e., the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and National Marine Fisheries Service). Mitigation is typically required as conditions of permits issued by those agencies. No adverse impacts would be anticipated from implementation of the proposed Plan.
- i,j. The MMHMP, and the associated mitigation strategies, identify measures to reduce the risks and potential losses associated with flooding, or natural hazards such as mudflow. In addition, the MHMP recommends the purchase of three repetitive loss structures located within the floodplain in order to minimize the risk associated with these structures. No adverse impact would occur.

X. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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

- a. The proposed Plan does not include any components that would divide an existing community.
- b. The proposed Plan has been prepared consistent with the elements of the City's General Plan.
- c. No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans have been adopted by the City of Roseville. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans and no impact would occur.

XI. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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

- a-b. The California Divisions of Mines and Geology (CDMG) published Open File Report 95-10, which provides the mineral classification map for Placer County. A detailed evaluation of mineral resources has not been conducted within the City limits, but Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ's) have been identified. There are four broad MRZ categories (MRZ-1 through MRZ-4), and only MRZ-2 represents an area of known significant mineral resources. The City of Roseville General Plan EIR included Exhibit 4.1-3, depicting the location of

MRZ's in the City limits. There is only one small MRZ-2 designation area located at the far eastern edge of the City, which will not be impacted by approval of the MHMP. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XII. Noise

Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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

- a-d. The MHMP includes mitigation strategies for retrofitting existing structures and infrastructure. This work would be temporary in nature and is not anticipated to result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels. In addition, construction activities will be subject to the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance (RMC Chapter 9.24). The City's Findings for Mitigating Policies and Standards find that projects constructed or operated in compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance would prevent exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of established noise standards. The Ordinance establishes maximum noise exposure standards that apply to construction and operational activities for private development projects. The thresholds provide for the protection of noise-sensitive receptors. Based on the discussion above, noise impacts would be less than significant.
- e.f. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or with in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, implementation of the MHMP would not expose people residing or working in the area to aircraft-generated noise; therefore, no impact would occur.

XIII. Population and Housing

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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	

- a. The MHMP does not propose construction of additional homes or businesses, or expansion of infrastructure that would accommodate population growth. Therefore, no impact will occur.
- b, c. The MHMP does not propose removal of existing housing or require relocation of people, other than repetitive loss structures within the City’s regulatory floodplain. There are only three identified repetitive loss structures within the City, which would be acquired on a “willing-seller” basis as funds become available. The potential removal of these three structures is insignificant in comparison to the 50,777 dwelling units constructed citywide, and will result in less than significant impacts to population and housing.

XIV. Public Services

Fire protection, police protection, and park services are provided by City agencies. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?				X
b) Police protection?				X
c) Schools?				X
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public services?				X

- a-e. The purpose of the MHMP, and the associated mitigation strategies, is to identify, assess, and mitigate the potential for natural and technological hazards. As such, the proposed Plan does not include components

that would adversely affect public services, including Fire, Police, Schools, Parks, or other facilities. Therefore, no adverse impacts would occur.

XV. Recreation

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project 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) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

- a. - b. Implementation of the MHMP mitigation strategies would not require additional recreation facilities or cause existing facilities to degrade. The proposed Plan does not include components that would affect the use or demand for recreational facilities.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or 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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X

- a.-b. The only traffic which could be generated by the project would be a slight increase in the amount of construction trips which may result from retrofitting existing structures and infrastructure. However, vehicle related construction impacts would result in only a minor increase in the number of trips that occur to complete the project. As such, the project will not conflict with the City's Level of Service standards or any congestion management programs, because it will not significantly increase congestion on a long term basis.
- c. The proposed project would not introduce air traffic to the area or in any way alter existing air traffic patterns. No impact on air traffic patterns would occur.
- d. The proposed Plan does not include measures that would increase hazards. No impact would occur.

- e. The proposed Plan is intended to facilitate and improve emergency access and response. No impact would occur.
- f. The proposed Plan does not include measures that would impact parking capacity. No impact would occur.
- g. The proposed Plan does not include any measures that would affect alternative transportation programs. No impact would occur.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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 stormwater 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

- a.-e. The proposed Plan includes measures intended to upgrade existing drainage facilities, which would result in a beneficial impact to stormwater drainage and water quality. Construction impacts related to the individual projects, would be subject to environmental review to identify and mitigate potential project-specific impacts. No adverse impacts would occur as a result of MHMP implementation.
- f, g. The proposed MHMP does not include any measures that would affect the generation of solid waste.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that 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	

a-e. The proposed MHMP is consistent with and implements policies in the adopted General Plan, for which an EIR was certified. The impacts of the proposed MHMP that have potential to adversely affect historic resources will be mitigated to less than significant levels by mitigation measure CR-1. Any other impacts that may occur would be evaluated and mitigated to the extent feasible in future project level CEQA documents. Adoption of the MHMP will not have any direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Attachment

1. Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan