

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that, as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has prepared an Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration for the project referenced below. This Negative Declaration is available for public review and comment.

- Project Title/File#:** NERSP PCL 25 – Sutter Roseville ED/Critical Care Expansion – File #PL16-0441
- Project Location:** One Medical Plaza Drive (APN: 015-450-051-000; Roseville; Placer County
- Project Owner:** Joan Touloukian, Sutter Roseville Medical Center; One Medical Plaza Drive; Roseville CA 95661; (916) 781-1203
- Project Applicant:** Denis J. Stroup, Hammel, Green & Abrahamson, Inc.; 1200 R Street, Suite 100; Sacramento CA 95811; (916) 787-5129
- Project Planner:** Ron Miller, Associate Planner, (916) 774-5272

Project Description: The Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) is proposing an expansion to its Emergency Department and Critical Care Unit within the existing medical campus. The proposed expansion consists of a three-story building with 76,291 departmental square footage and 92,319 building gross square footage. This space will be occupied by an expanded emergency department, additional intensive care space, a catheterization lab, and other supporting uses. A new covered canopy for patient drop-off and pickup will also be constructed.

Document Review and Availability: The public review and comment period begins on March 31, 2017 and ends on April 19, 2017. The Negative Declaration may be reviewed during normal business hours (8:00 am to 5:00 pm) at the Planning Division offices, located at 311 Vernon Street. It may also be viewed online at http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/environmental_documents_n_public_notices.asp. Written comments on the adequacy of the Negative Declaration may be submitted to Ron Miller, Planning Division, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678, and must be received no later than 5:00 pm on April 26, 2017.

This project will be scheduled for a public hearing before the City's Planning Commission. At this hearing, the Planning Commission will consider the Negative Declaration and *associated project entitlements*. *The date and time of the public hearing is currently unknown*; a separate notice will be published when a public hearing before the Planning Commission has been scheduled.

Greg Bitter
Planning Manager

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that, as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has prepared an Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration for the project referenced below. This Negative Declaration is available for public review and comment.

- Project Title/File#:** NERSP PCL 25 – Sutter Roseville ED/Critical Care Expansion – File #PL16-0441
- Project Location:** One Medical Plaza Drive (APN: 015-450-051-000; Roseville; Placer County
- Project Owner:** Joan Touloukian, Sutter Roseville Medical Center; One Medical Plaza Drive; Roseville CA 95661; (916) 781-1203
- Project Applicant:** Denis J. Stroup, Hammel, Green & Abrahamson, Inc.; 1200 R Street, Suite 100; Sacramento CA 95811; (916) 787-5129
- Project Planner:** Ron Miller, Associate Planner, (916) 774-5272

Project Description: The Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) is proposing an expansion to its Emergency Department and Critical Care Unit within the existing medical campus. The proposed expansion consists of a three-story building with 76,291 departmental square footage and 92,319 building gross square footage. This space will be occupied by an expanded emergency department, additional intensive care space, a catheterization lab, and other supporting uses. A new covered canopy for patient drop-off and pickup will also be constructed.

Document Review and Availability: The public review and comment period begins on March 31, 2017 and ends on April 19, 2017. The Negative Declaration may be reviewed during normal business hours (8:00 am to 5:00 pm) at the Planning Division offices, located at 311 Vernon Street. It may also be viewed online at http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/environmental_documents_n_public_notices.asp. Written comments on the adequacy of the Negative Declaration may be submitted to Ron Miller, Planning Division, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678, and must be received no later than 5:00 pm on April 26, 2017.

This project will be scheduled for a public hearing before the City's Planning Commission. At this hearing, the Planning Commission will consider the Negative Declaration and associated project entitlements. *The date and time of the public hearing is currently unknown*; a separate notice will be published when a public hearing before the Planning Commission has been scheduled.

Greg Bitter
Planning Manager

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

- Project Title/File Number:** NERSP PCL 25 – Sutter Roseville ED/Critical Care Expansion – File #PL16-0441
- Project Location:** One Medical Plaza Drive (APN: 015-450-051-000; Roseville; Placer County)
- Project Applicant:** Denis J. Stroup, Hammel, Green & Abrahamson, Inc.; 1200 R Street, Suite 100; Sacramento CA 95811; (916) 787-5129
- Property Owner:** Joan Touloukian, Sutter Roseville Medical Center; One Medical Plaza Drive; Roseville CA 95661; (916) 781-1203
- Lead Agency Contact Person:** Ron Miller, Associate Planner; (916) 774-5276
- Date:** March 30, 2017
- Project Description:** The Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) is proposing an expansion to its Emergency Department and Critical Care Unit. The proposed expansion consists of a three-story building with 76,291 departmental square footage and 92,319 building gross square footage. This space will be occupied by an expanded emergency department, additional intensive care space, a catheterization lab, and other supporting uses. A new covered canopy for patient drop-off and pickup will also be constructed.

DECLARATION

The Planning Manager has determined that the above project will not have significant effects on the environment and therefore does not require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. The determination is based on the attached initial study and the following findings:

- A. *The project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.*
- B. *The project will not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.*
- C. *The project will not have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.*
- D. *The project will not have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.*
- E. *No substantial evidence exists that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.*
- F. *This Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.*

INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number:	NERSP PCL 25 – Sutter Roseville ED/Critical Care Expansion – File #PL16-0441
Project Location:	One Medical Plaza Drive (APN: 015-450-051-000; Roseville; Placer County)
Project Description:	The Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) is proposing an expansion to its Emergency Department and Critical Care Unit. The proposed expansion consists of a three-story building with 76,291 departmental square footage and 92,319 building gross square footage. This space will be occupied by an expanded emergency department, additional intensive care space, a catheterization lab, and other supporting uses. A new covered canopy for patient drop-off and pickup will also be constructed.
Project Applicant:	Denis J. Stroup, Hammel, Green & Abrahamson, Inc.; 1200 R Street, Suite 100; Sacramento CA 95811; (916) 787-5129
Property Owner:	Joan Touloukian, Sutter Roseville Medical Center; One Medical Plaza Drive; Roseville CA 95661; (916) 781-1203
Lead Agency Contact Person:	Ron Miller, 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 application. The document relies on the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan (NERSP) EIR (SCH #86042805), the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH # 20131020570) and site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. Where documents were submitted by consultants working for the applicant, 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 only relied on documents that reflect their independent judgment, and has not accepted at face value representations made by consultants for the applicant.

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. 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 to which the applicant agrees, the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared.

Table of Contents

Project Description	4
City of Roseville Mitigation Ordinances, Guidelines, and Standards	5
Other Environmental Documents Relied Upon	6
Explanation of Initial Study Checklist	7
Initial Study Checklist	
I. Aesthetics	8
II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources	9
III. Air Quality	11
IV. Biological Resources	20
V. Cultural Resources	24
VI. Geology and Soils	25
VII. Greenhouse Gases	28
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	32
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality	35
X. Land Use and Planning	38
XI. Mineral Resources	39
XII. Noise	40
XIII. Population and Housing	42
XIV. Public Services	43
XV. Recreation	44
XVI. Transportation / Traffic	45
XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources	47
XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems	50
XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance	52
Environmental Determination	54
Attachments	54

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) is located at One Medical Plaza Drive, within the City's NERSP area. Specifically, the campus is located directly north of East Roseville Parkway and west of Secret Ravine Parkway. The Interstate 80 freeway is approximately 990 feet west of the project site (see Figure 1). The subject property has a General Plan land use designation of Business Professional (BP) and a zoning designation of Planned Development for a Medical Campus (PD247).

Figure 1: Surrounding Uses & Zoning



Background

Location	Zoning	General Plan Land Use	Actual Use of Property
Project Site	PD457 - Medical Campus	Business Professional (BP)	Surface Parking Lot
North	PD457 - Medical Campus & Open Space (OS) beyond	BP & OS	Medical Offices & Open Space
South	PD457 - Medical Campus & Open Space (OS) beyond	BP & OS	Medical Offices & Open Space
East	Business Professional (BP/SA-SR)	BP	Medical Offices & Assisted Living
West	PD457 – Medical Campus & Open Space beyond	BP & OS	Medical Offices & Open Space

Environmental Setting

The project site is fully developed and is within the existing SRMC, a ±49-acre site, which is comprised of the Main Hospital (including emergency room/trauma center), medical office buildings and rehabilitation facilities, surface parking lots and two parking garages. The SRMC Emergency/Critical care expansion will take place within an existing parking lot area adjacent to the Main Hospital and Emergency Room structure. The proposed three-story structure will connect with the Main Hospital building to the west and south. A two-story, 76,000 square foot medical office building is adjacent to the east and a four-story parking garage is approximately 100 feet north of the project site (see Exhibit A). The campus is accessed via North Sunrise Avenue and East Roseville Parkway to the south and Secret Ravine Parkway to the east.

Proposed Project

The applicant proposes an expansion to its Emergency Department and Critical Care Unit. The proposed expansion consists of a three-story building of 92,319 square feet (gross). The building’s net (departmental) square footage will be approximately 76,291 square feet. This space will be occupied by an expanded emergency department, additional intensive care space, a catheterization lab, and other supporting uses. A new covered canopy and drive aisle for patient drop-off and pickup will also be constructed.

The building’s construction will maintain design consistency with the existing SRMC buildings by matching using the same construction materials for and colors for the wall surfaces, and roof. The project will also reinforce way-finding and arrival to the Emergency Department through appropriate scale of entry and the composition of the building’s façade.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITIGATION ORDINANCES, GUIDELINES, AND STANDARDS

For projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, CEQA Guidelines section 15183(f) 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 §15183(f)). The City of Roseville adopted CEQA Implementing Procedures (Implementing Procedures) which are consistent with this CEQA Guidelines section. The current version of the Implementing Procedures were adopted in April 2008, along with Findings of Fact, as Resolution 08-172. The below regulations and ordinances 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 2035 General Plan
- City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 19)
- City of Roseville Improvement Standards (Resolution 02-37)
- City of Roseville Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208)
- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])
- West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual (Resolution 16-152)
- Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (RMC Ch. 14.20)
- 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)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)
- Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347)
- Specific Plan 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 12-217)
 - Creekview Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 12-320)
 - Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 16-273)

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON

- Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2013102057)
- Northeast Roseville Specific Plan EIR (SCH#86042805)

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, any project that is consistent with the development densities established by zoning, a Community Plan, or a General Plan for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR updated the City's General Plan to 2035, and updated Citywide analyses of traffic, water supply, water treatment, wastewater treatment, and waste disposal. The proposed project is consistent with the adopted land use designations examined within the environmental documents listed above, and thus this Initial Study focuses on effects particular to the specific project site, impacts which were not analyzed within the EIR, and impacts which may require revisiting due to substantial new information. When applicable, the topical sections within the Initial Study summarize the findings within the environmental documents listed above. 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 on 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. Within each topical section (e.g. Air Quality), a description of the setting is provided, followed by the checklist responses, thresholds used, and finally a discussion of each checklist answer.

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

- 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, an EIR is required.
- 2) A "Less Than Significant With Mitigation" answer is appropriate when the lead agency incorporates mitigation measures to reduce an impact from "Potentially Significant" to "Less than Significant." For example, floodwater impacts could be reduced from a potentially-significant level to a less-than-significant level 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 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 level.
- 4) A "No Impact" answer is appropriate where it can be demonstrated that the impact does not have the potential to adversely affect the environment. For instance, a project in the center of an urbanized area with no agricultural lands on or adjacent to the project area clearly would not have an adverse effect on agricultural resources or operations. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the Initial Study. Where a "No Impact" answer is adequately supported by the information sources cited in the Initial Study, further

narrative explanation is not required. A “No Impact” answer is explained when it is based on project-specific factors as well as generous standards.

All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off- and on-site, indirect, direct, construction, and operation impacts, except as provided for under State CEQA Guidelines.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

I. Aesthetics

The proposed project consists of a three-story medical building of 92,319 square feet, which will be constructed on a site that is fully developed with a ±49-acre medical campus. The building will be occupied by an expanded emergency department, additional intensive care space, a catheterization lab, and other supporting uses. A new covered canopy and drive aisle for patient drop-off and pickup will also be constructed. The building’s footprint is approximately 43,700 square feet.

The height of the proposed building will be ±59 feet, which is similar to other structures throughout the SRMC campus whose heights range from 52 to 68 feet. An emergency red light will be placed at all four corners of the roof due to the building’s close proximity to the hospital’s helipad that is located on the top floor of the parking structure north of the project site. The building’s materials and colors will match those of existing buildings throughout the SRMC campus.

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	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of an environmental impact cannot always be determined through the use of a specific, quantifiable threshold. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b) affirms this by the statement “an ironclad definition of significant effect is not always possible because the significance of an activity may vary with the setting.” This

is particularly true of aesthetic impacts. As an example, a proposed parking lot in a dense urban center would have markedly different visual effects than a parking lot in an open space area. For the purpose of this study, the significance thresholds are as stated in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, as shown in a–d of the checklist below. The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Zoning Ordinance (e.g. building height, setbacks, etc), Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Ch. 18), Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347), and applicable Specific Plan Policies and/or Specific Plan Design Guidelines will prevent significant impacts in urban settings as it relates to items a, b, and c, below.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a–b) There are no designated or eligible scenic vistas or scenic highways within or adjacent to the City of Roseville.

c) The project site is in an urban setting, and as a result lacks any prominent or high-quality natural features that could be negatively impacted by development. Additionally, there are multiple multi-story structures with associated parking, lighting and landscaping located throughout the developed medical campus site. The proposed three-story building expansion is located approximately 1,400 feet north of East Roseville Parkway, ±1,200 feet west of Secret Ravine Parkway, ±1,110 feet east of the Interstate 80 freeway, and approximately 1,000 feet south of the nearest residential community (The Phoenician Apartments). The project prepared a visual analysis which shows the proposed project will have minimal impacts on visual resources (see Exhibit D). In addition, the project's setback from nearby streets greatly minimizes any potential visual impact. From this analysis staff has concluded that the visual impacts from the proposed expansion of SRMC's Emergency and Critical Care Departments will be mitigated by the project's setbacks from nearby roadways and adjacent properties, as well screening by existing buildings, landscaping, topography and natural features.

The City of Roseville has adopted Community Design Guidelines (CDG) for the purpose of creating building and community designs which are a visual asset to the community. The CDG includes guidelines for building design, site design and landscape design, which will result in a project that enhances the existing urban visual environment. The City's approving authority (Planning Commission) will review the Design Review Permit (DRP) for conformance with City standards and requirements. The project will not result in any new aesthetic impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR. Accordingly, the aesthetic impacts of the project are less than significant.

d) The project involves nighttime lighting to provide for the security and safety of project users, as well as associated red safety lighting for the nearby heliport. However, the project is already located on a fully developed site within an urbanized setting with many existing lighting sources. Lighting is conditioned to comply with City standards (i.e. CDG) to limit the height of light standards and to require cut-off lenses and glare shields to minimize light and glare impacts. The project will not create a new source of substantial light. None of the project elements are highly reflective, and thus the project will not contribute to an increased source of glare.

II. Agricultural & Forestry 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. According to the current California Department of Conservation Placer County Important Farmland Map (2012), the majority of the City of Roseville is designated as Urban and Built Up Land and most of the open space areas of the City are designated as Grazing Land. There are a few areas designated as Farmland of Local Importance and two small areas designated as Unique Farmland located on the western side of the City along Baseline Road. 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. None of the land within the City is considered forest land by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Would the project:

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) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) 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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Prime Farmland are called out as protected farmland categories within CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. Neither the City nor the State has adopted quantified significance thresholds related to impacts to protected farmland categories or to agricultural and forestry resources. For the purpose of this study, the significance thresholds are as stated in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, as shown in a–e of the checklist above.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a–e) The project site is not used for agricultural purposes, does not include agricultural zoning, is not within or adjacent to one of the areas of the City designated as a protected farmland category on the Placer County Important Farmland map, is not within or adjacent to land within a Williamson Act Contract, and is not considered forest land. Given the foregoing, the proposed project will have no impact on agricultural resources.

III. Air Quality

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. 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	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

In responding to checklist items a, b, and d, 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. To assist in making this determination, the PCAPCD adopted thresholds of significance, which

were developed by considering both the health-based ambient air quality standards and the attainment strategies outlined in the State Implementation Plan. The PCAPCD-recommended significance threshold for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x) is 82 pounds daily during construction and 55 pounds daily during operation, and for particulate matter (PM) is 82 pounds per day during both construction and operation. For all other constituents, significance is determined based on the concentration-based limits in the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards. Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) are also of public health concern, but no thresholds or standards are provided because they are considered to have no safe level of exposure. Analysis of TAC is based on the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook – A Community Health Perspective* (April 2005, California Air Resources Board), which lists TAC sources and recommended buffer distances from sensitive uses. For checklist item c, the PCAPCD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook (Handbook)* recommends that the same thresholds used for the project analysis be used for the cumulative impact analysis.

With regard to checklist item e, there are no quantified significance thresholds for exposure to objectionable odors. Significance is determined after taking into account multiple factors, including screening distances from odor sources (as found in the PCAPCD CEQA Handbook), the direction and frequency of prevailing winds, the time of day when odors are present, and the nature and intensity of the odor source.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a–b) 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, and the SVAB is in attainment for these constituents. Likewise, carbon monoxide is not analyzed because the SVAB is in attainment for this constituent, and it requires high, localized concentrations (called carbon monoxide “hot spots”) before the ambient air quality standard would be exceeded. “Hot spots” are typically associated with heavy traffic congestion occurring at high-volume roadway intersections. The Amoruso Ranch EIR analysis of Citywide traffic indicated that 198 out of 226 signalized intersections would operate at level of service C or better—that is, they will not experience heavy traffic congestion. It further indicated that analyses of existing CO concentrations at the most congested intersections in Roseville show that CO levels are well below federal and state ambient air quality standards. The discussions below focus on emissions of ROG, NO_x , or PM. A project-level analysis has been prepared to determine whether the project will, on a singular level, exceed the established thresholds.

The City of Roseville is located within the boundaries of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) require that federal and State ambient air quality standards (AAQS) be established, respectively, for six common air pollutants, known as criteria pollutants. The criteria pollutants include particulate matter (PM), ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and lead. At the federal level, the SVAB area is designated as nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone and the 24-hour particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$) AAQS, and attainment or unclassified for all other federal criteria pollutant AAQS. At the State level, the SVAB area is designated as nonattainment for the 1-hour ozone, 8-hour ozone, particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) AAQS, and attainment or unclassified for all other State AAQS.

The CAA requires each state to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as a State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIPs are modified periodically to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, and rules and regulations of the air basins, as reported by their jurisdictional agencies. Due to the nonattainment designations, PCAPCD, along with the other air districts in the SVAB region, periodically prepares and updates air quality plans that provide emission reduction strategies to achieve attainment of the NAAQS, including control strategies to reduce air pollutant emissions through regulations, incentive programs, public education, and partnerships with other agencies.

The current applicable air quality plan for the proposed project area is the *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (Ozone Attainment Plan), adopted September 26, 2013. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) determined the motor vehicle emission budgets in the Plan to be adequate and made such findings effective August 25, 2014. On January 9, 2015, the USEPA approved the 2013 Ozone Attainment Plan.

The 2013 Ozone Attainment Plan demonstrates how existing and new control strategies would provide the necessary future emission reductions to meet the CAA requirements, including the NAAQS. It should be noted that in addition to strengthening the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the USEPA also strengthened the secondary 8-hour ozone NAAQS, making the secondary standard identical to the primary standard. The SVAB remains classified as a severe nonattainment area with an attainment deadline of 2027. On October 26, 2015, the USEPA released a final implementation rule for the revised NAAQS for ozone to address the requirements for reasonable further progress, modeling and attainment demonstrations, and reasonably available control measures (RACM) and reasonably available control technology (RACT). With the publication of the new NAAQS ozone rules, areas in nonattainment must update their ozone attainment plans and submit new plans by 2020/2021.

General conformity requirements of the regional air quality plan include whether a project would cause or contribute to new violations of any NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. In order to evaluate ozone and other criteria air pollutant emissions and support attainment goals for those pollutants that the area is designated nonattainment, the PCAPCD recommends significance thresholds for emissions of PM₁₀ and ozone precursors – reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). On October 13, 2016, the PCAPCD adopted updated significance thresholds for the aforementioned pollutants.

The significance thresholds, expressed in pounds per day (lbs/day), listed in Table 1 are the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for use in the evaluation of air quality impacts associated with proposed development projects. The City of Roseville, as lead agency, utilizes the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for CEQA evaluation purposes. Thus, if the proposed project's emissions exceed the pollutant thresholds presented in Table 1, the project could have a significant effect on air quality, the attainment of federal and State AAQS, and could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Pollutant	Construction Threshold (lbs/day)	Operational Threshold (lbs/day)
ROG	82	55
NO _x	82	55
PM ₁₀	82	82

Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Placer County Air Pollution Control District Policy. Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA. October 13, 2016.

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute local emissions in the area during construction and operation of the proposed project. The proposed project's short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.1 software (CalEEMod) – a statewide model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify air quality emissions, including GHG emissions, from land use projects. The model applies inherent default values for various land uses, including trip

generation rates based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual, vehicle mix, trip length, average speed, etc. However, where project-specific data is available, such data should be input into the model. As such, the proposed project's modeling assumed the following:

- Construction was assumed to commence in June 2017 and would occur over an approximately 3.5-year period;
- Approximately 30,000 sf of parking lot area would be demolished, and the debris exported, during the demolition phase of the proposed project;
- Approximately 40 CY of material would be exported during site preparation;
- Approximately three acres would be disturbed, and 630 CY of material would be exported during grading of the site;
- An average daily trip rate of 13.22 was assumed, based on trip generation information provided by Fehr & Peers;
- Considering the inherent site features described in the project description, and location of the project site within the Sutter Roseville Medical Center, the total vehicle miles travelled (VMT) related to project operations would be 1,909 miles per day and approximately 696,785 miles per year, based on information provided by Fehr & Peers;
- Operations of the proposed project would involve use of an on-site generator to provide emergency power only; and
- Compliance with the 2016 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards Code.

The proposed project's estimated emissions associated with construction and operations are presented and discussed in further detail below.

Construction Emissions

During construction of the project, various types of equipment and vehicles would temporarily operate on the project site. Construction exhaust emissions would be generated from construction equipment, vegetation clearing and earth movement activities, construction worker commutes, and construction material hauling for the entire construction period. The aforementioned activities would involve the use of diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment that would generate emissions of criteria pollutants. Project construction activities also represent sources of fugitive dust, which includes PM emissions. As construction of the proposed project would generate air pollutant emissions intermittently within the site, and the vicinity of the site, until all construction has been completed, construction is a potential concern because the proposed project is in a non-attainment area for ozone and PM.

All projects under the jurisdiction of PCAPCD are required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations. Accordingly, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, which would be noted on City-approved construction plans. The applicable rules and regulations for construction would include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- Rule 202 related to visible emissions;
- Rule 217 related to cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials;
- Rule 218 related to architectural coatings;
- Rule 228 related to fugitive dust; and
- Rule 501 related to general permit requirements.

It should be noted that PCAPCD prohibits open burning of cleared site vegetation during construction activities through Rule 3. The project site is currently used as a parking lot; thus, little vegetation clearing would be necessary during construction. However, when landscaping vegetation is cleared, open burning of such material would be prohibited by the City of Roseville's Municipal Code, Section 16.16.070. Thus, open burning of vegetation during construction would not occur.

According to the CalEEMod results, which inherently accounts for applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations, the proposed project would result in maximum construction criteria air pollutant emissions as shown in Table 2. Assumptions used for the modeling are presented above.

Pollutant	Project Emissions (lbs/day)	PCAPCD Significance Threshold (lbs/day)	Exceeds Threshold?
ROG	3.68	82.0	NO
NO _x	17.26	82.0	NO
PM ₁₀	1.80	82.0	NO

Source: CalEEMod, February 2017 (see Appendix A).

As shown in the table, the proposed project's maximum unmitigated construction-related emissions would be well below the applicable thresholds of significance. Therefore, construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone or PM. Accordingly, construction of the proposed project would not violate any AAQS or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, and a less-than-significant impact would occur associated with construction.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ would be generated by the proposed project from area, energy, and mobile sources. Area sources include architectural coating vapors, landscape maintenance equipment exhaust, and use of consumer products (e.g., deodorants, cleaning products, spray paint, etc.). Energy sources include electricity and natural gas consumption. Mobile-source emissions would result from the future employee and patron vehicle trips. When in use, the emergency generator would contribute emissions of NO_x, ROG, and PM₁₀.

As stated above, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations, including the following related to operations:

- Rule 205 related to nuisances;
- Rule 242 related to stationary internal combustion engines;
- Rule 231 or Rule 247 related to commercial water heaters and boilers; and
- Rule 502 related to review of new sources of emissions.

According to the CalEEMod results, the proposed project would result in maximum unmitigated operational emissions as shown in Table 3. Assumptions used for the modeling are presented above. The proposed project would include installation of an emergency generator; however, the emergency generator would only be operated

in emergencies and for periodic testing and maintenance. Nevertheless, the worst-case scenario for emissions was considered to occur during full operation of the proposed hospital expansion on a day when the emergency generator was simultaneously in operation for testing. Therefore, Table 3 separates the emissions that would result from operation of the proposed project without the generator, operation of the generator alone, and total operational emissions including generator operations. As shown in the table, the proposed project's operational emissions would be well below the applicable thresholds of significance.

	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀
Proposed Project	4.33	11.66	1.8
Emergency Generator	1.81	8.09	0.27
Total Operational Emissions	6.14	19.75	2.07
PCAPCD Thresholds	55	55	82
Exceed Thresholds?	NO	NO	NO
<i>Source: CalEEMod, February 2017 (see Appendix A).</i>			

In addition, it should be noted that a permit would be required to be obtained from the PCAPCD for operation of the emergency generator, which would ensure that the associated emissions are monitored and regulated.

Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone or PM during operations. Accordingly, operation of the proposed project would not violate any AAQS or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, and a **less than significant** impact would occur associated with operations.

Conclusion

The proposed project's construction and operational emissions would not exceed the applicable thresholds of significance. In addition, the project would be required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations. Because the project would not exceed the thresholds of significance, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the region's nonattainment status of ozone or PM. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and a **less than significant** impact related to air quality could occur.

c. A cumulative impact analysis considers a project over time in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects whose impacts might compound those of the project being assessed. Due to the dispersive nature and regional sourcing of air pollutants, air pollution is already largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants, including ozone and PM, is a result of past and present development, and, thus, cumulative impacts related to these pollutants could be considered cumulatively significant.

To improve air quality and attain the health-based standards, reductions in emissions are necessary within nonattainment areas. The project is part of a pattern of urbanization occurring in the greater Sacramento ozone nonattainment area. The growth and combined vehicle usage, and business activity within the nonattainment area from the project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within Roseville and surrounding areas, could either delay attainment of the standards or require the adoption of

additional controls on existing and future air pollution sources to offset emission increases. Thus, the project could cumulatively contribute to regional air quality health effects through emissions of criteria and mobile source air pollutants.

The PCAPCD recommends using the region's existing attainment plans as a basis for analysis of cumulative emissions. If a project would interfere with an adopted attainment plan, the project would inhibit the future attainment of AAQS, and thus result in a cumulative impact. As discussed above, the PCAPCD's recommended thresholds of significance for ozone precursors and PM₁₀ are based on attainment plans for the region. Thus, the PCAPCD concluded that if a project's ozone precursor and PM₁₀ emissions would be less than PCAPCD project-level thresholds, the project would not be expected to conflict with any relevant attainment plans, and would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. As a result, the PCACPD established operational phase cumulative-level emissions thresholds identical to the operational thresholds identified above, in Table 1.

As shown in Table 3 above, the proposed project would not result in emissions in exceedance of the applicable thresholds of significance for ozone precursors or PM₁₀. Accordingly, impacts related to the cumulative emissions of criteria pollutants for which PCAPCD is in non-attainment would be considered **less than significant**.

d. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others, due to the types of population groups or activities involved. Heightened sensitivity may be caused by health problems, proximity to the emissions source, and/or duration of exposure to air pollutants. Children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with existing health problems are especially vulnerable to the effects of air pollution. Accordingly, land uses that are typically considered to be sensitive receptors include residences, schools, childcare centers, playgrounds, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and medical clinics. The proposed project involves the expansion of a hospital building for emergency medical operations. Patients at the existing nearby medical structures and future patients of the expanded hospital structure would be considered sensitive receptors due to the expected presence of persons with existing health problems.

The major pollutant concentrations of concern are localized CO emissions and toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions, which are addressed in further detail below.

Localized CO Emissions

Localized concentrations of CO are related to the levels of traffic and congestion along streets and at intersections. Implementation of the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on streets near the project site; therefore, the project would be expected to increase local CO concentrations. High levels of localized CO concentrations are only expected where background levels are high, and traffic volumes and congestion levels are high. The Statewide CO Protocol document identifies signalized intersections operating at Level of Service (LOS) E or F, or projects that would result in the worsening of signalized intersections to LOS E or F, as having the potential to result in localized CO concentrations in excess of the State or federal AAQS, as a result of large numbers of cars idling at stop lights.¹

Consistent with the State CO Protocol, the PCAPCD recommends further analysis for localized CO concentrations if the project would cause a signalized intersection to be degraded from an acceptable LOS (i.e., LOS A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or F), or substantially worsen an already existing unacceptable peak-hour LOS at an intersection, as determined by a traffic study. Substantially worsen is defined by PCAPCD as an increase in delay by 10 seconds or more.

¹ California Department of Transportation. *Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol*. December 1997.

To assess potential traffic impacts that could result from operation of the proposed project, Fehr and Peers completed a *Transportation Impact Study* for the proposed project. Fehr and Peers concluded that while several intersections in the project area currently operate at unacceptable LOS E, the proposed project would not result in the degradation of any intersections from acceptable to unacceptable LOS. The proposed project would increase the delay at the intersections of Roseville Parkway/Galleria Boulevard, and East Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road, both of which currently operate at unacceptable LOS. However, the maximum increase in delay at the aforementioned intersections would be a four second increase during the PM peak hour at Roseville Parkway/Galleria Boulevard, while the intersection of East Roseville Parkway/Taylor Road would only experience a two second increase in delay during the PM peak hour. A maximum increase in delay of four seconds would not be considered to substantially worsen the intersection according to the PCAPCD. Thus, the proposed project would not result in the degradation of an intersection operating at an acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS, nor would project substantially worsen operations at an intersection already operating at an unacceptable LOS.²

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in substantial concentrations of localized CO at any affected intersection. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of CO.

TAC Emissions

Another category of environmental concern is TACs. The *CARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (Handbook) provides recommended setback distances for sensitive land uses from major sources of TACs, including, but not limited to, freeways and high traffic roads, distribution centers, and rail yards. The CARB has identified diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel-fueled engines as a TAC; thus, high volume freeways, stationary diesel engines, and facilities attracting heavy and constant diesel vehicle traffic are identified as having the highest associated health risks from DPM. Health risks from TACs are a function of both the concentration of emissions and the duration of exposure. Health-related risks associated with DPM in particular are primarily associated with long-term exposure and associated risk of contracting cancer.

As part of the *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* case, the California Supreme Court granted limited review to the question: Under what circumstances, if any, does CEQA require an analysis of how existing environmental conditions will impact future residents or users (receptors) of a proposed project? In the opinion published on December 17, 2015, the Supreme Court stated that even in those specific instances where evaluation of a project's potentially significant exacerbating effects on existing environmental hazards is appropriate, the evaluation of how future residents or users could be affected by the exacerbated conditions is still compelled by the project's impact on the environment, and not the environment's impact on the project.³

Considering the recent court rulings, while the proposed project would be considered a sensitive receptor, due to the presence of medical patients, consideration of potential impacts related to existing sources of TACs on future patients at the proposed medical office are outside of the scope of CEQA. However, potential sources of TACs related to operation or construction of the proposed project could have the potential to expose existing sensitive receptors to TACs. As discussed previously, the closest sensitive receptor to the project site are the medical patients in the surrounding Sutter Roseville Medical Center.

² Fehr and Peers. *Draft Transportation Impact Study for Sutter Roseville Medical Center Expansion*. February 6, 2017.

³ Alameda County Superior Court. *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*. A135335 and A136212. Filed August 12, 2016.

The proposed project would involve the operation of a new stationary diesel emergency generator on-site, for which a permit from the PCAPCD would be required to be obtained for operation. Per the permit, the generator would be regulated and monitored to ensure any associated emissions are under specified limitations. In addition, the generator is intended to be used only for emergency situations in order to provide continuous power operation during utility power outages, as required by the California Building Standards Code. Periodic testing of the generator would also occur at least 12 times per year as specified by Section 41514.1 of the California Health and Safety Code. As such, the generator would not be used regularly and, per the permit, would be limited to a maximum operation time for maintenance and testing of 100 hours per year. Therefore, the emergency generator is not anticipated to be associated with, or expose sensitive receptors to, any substantial pollutant concentrations. Thus, the emergency generator would not generate any substantial pollutant concentrations during operations of the proposed project.

Construction-related activities could result in the generation of TACs, specifically diesel particulate matter (DPM), from on-road haul trucks and off-road equipment exhaust emissions. However, construction is temporary and occurs over a relatively short duration in comparison to the operational lifetime of the proposed project. All construction equipment and operation thereof would be regulated per the State's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. Project construction would also be required to comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations, particularly associated with permitting of air pollutant sources. In addition, construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day, would be restricted to daytime hours per Chapter 9.24 of the City's Municipal Code, and would likely only occur over portions of the project site at a time. According to PCAPCD, if construction emissions are below the applicable mass emissions thresholds of significance and grading would disturb less than 15 acres per day, construction DPM would not be generated such that associated health risks would result.⁴ As discussed above, and presented in Table 2, construction activity related to the proposed project would not result in mass emissions in excess of the thresholds of significance, nor would the project disturb more than 15 acres per day. In fact, construction of the proposed project would only disturb approximately three acres of land. As such, construction of the proposed project would not be expected to generate substantial DPM emissions that could result in health risks.

Considering the short-term nature of construction activities, the limited extent of ground disturbance, and the regulated and intermittent nature of the operation of construction equipment, the likelihood that any one sensitive receptor would be exposed to high concentrations of DPM for any extended period of time during construction would be low. In addition, the intermittent testing of the emergency generator would be conducted for a limited amount of time and in accordance with the PCAPCD's permitting requirements. As such, the emergency generator included in the proposed project would be unlikely to expose any one sensitive receptor to high concentrations of DPM for any extended period of time. For the aforementioned reasons, project construction would not be expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Conclusion

Based on the above, the proposed project would not expose any sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of any pollutants. Therefore, impacts related to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be ***less than significant***.

e. Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, quantitative methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact do not exist. Certain land uses such as wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, confined animal facilities, composting operations, food manufacturing plants, refineries, and chemical plants have the potential to generate considerable odors. The project site is located in a developed area and is not located in the vicinity of any existing

⁴ Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Personal communication with Angel Green, Associate Planner. September 21, 2015.

or planned such land uses. Hospital land uses are not typically associated with the creation of objectionable odors. Additionally, the proposed hospital expansion is consistent with the surrounding medical uses in the Sutter Roseville Medical Center; as such, the proposed project would not be anticipated to change the odor setting of project area by introducing new land uses. Thus, the project would not introduce any new sources or be exposed to any existing sources of potential objectionable odors.

Although less common, diesel fumes associated with substantial diesel-fueled equipment and heavy-duty trucks, such as from construction activities or operations of emergency generators, could be found to be objectionable. However, as addressed above, construction is temporary and construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day, would be restricted to certain hours per the City's Municipal Code, and would likely only occur over portions of the improvement area at a time. The emergency generator would only operate intermittently for limited testing activities and in emergency situations. All construction equipment, emergency generators and operation thereof would be regulated per the statewide In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation and the CARB's Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Stationary Compression Ignition Engines. Construction equipment and the emergency generator would also be required to comply with applicable PCAPCD rules and regulations, particularly associated with permitting of air pollutant sources. The aforementioned regulations would help to minimize air pollutant emissions as well as any associated odors. Considering the short-term nature of construction activities and the regulated and intermittent nature of the operation of construction equipment and the emergency generator, construction of the proposed project and operation of the emergency generator would not be expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

PCAPCD Rule 205, Nuisance, addresses the exposure of "nuisance or annoyance" air contaminant discharges, including odors, and provides enforcement of odor control. Rule 205 is complaint-based, where if public complaints are sufficient to cause the odor source to be considered a public nuisance, then the PCAPCD is required to investigate the identified source, as well as determine and ensure a solution for the source of the complaint, which could include operational modifications to correct the nuisance condition. Thus, although not anticipated, if odor or air quality complaints are made upon development of the proposed project, the PCAPCD would be required (per PCAPCD Rule 205) to ensure that such complaints are addressed and mitigated, as necessary.

For the aforementioned reasons, construction and operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be ***less than significant***.

IV. Biological Resources

The SRMC campus is completely developed with medical office buildings, surface parking lots, parking structures, roadways, and landscaping. The specific project site is developed with a parking lot, drive aisles, lighting and landscaping. No natural resources exist on the subject property; therefore, no impacts to biological resources are expected.

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 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 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

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

There is no ironclad definition of significance as it relates to biological resources. Thus, the significance of impacts to biological resources is defined by the use of expert judgment supported by facts, and relies on the policies, codes, and regulations adopted by the City and by regulatory agencies that relate to biological resources (as cited and described in the Discussion of Checklist Answers section). Thresholds for assessing the significance of environmental impacts are based on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–f, above. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15065, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if:

The project has the potential to substantially 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; [or] substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species . . .

Various agencies regulate impacts to the habitats and animals addressed by the CEQA Guidelines checklist. These include the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration–Fisheries, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The primary regulations affecting biological resources are described in the sections below.

Checklist item a addresses impacts to special status species. A “special status” species is one which has been identified as having relative scarcity and/or declining populations. Special status species include those formally listed as threatened or endangered, those proposed for formal listing, candidates for federal listing, and those classified as species of special concern. Also included are those species considered to be “fully protected” by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (California Fish and Wildlife), those granted “special animal” status for tracking and monitoring purposes, and those plant species considered to be rare, threatened, or endangered in California by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). The primary regulatory protections for special status species are within the Federal Endangered Species Act, California Endangered Species Act, California Fish and Game Code, and the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Checklist item b addresses all “sensitive natural communities” that may be affected by local, state, or federal regulations/policies while checklist item c focuses specifically on one type of such a community: federally-protected wetlands. Focusing first on wetlands, there are two questions to be posed in examining wet habitats: the first is whether the wetted area meets the technical definition of a wetland, making it subject to checklist item b, and the second is whether the wetland is subject to federal jurisdiction, making it subject to checklist item c. The 1987 Army Corps Wetlands Delineation Manual is used to determine whether an area meets the technical

criteria for a wetland. A delineation verification by the Army Corps verifies the size and condition of the wetlands and other waters in question, and determines the extent of government jurisdiction as it relates to Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act and Section 401 of the State Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act protects all “navigable waters”, which are defined as traditional navigable waters that are or were used for commerce, or may be used for interstate commerce; tributaries of covered waters; and wetlands adjacent to covered waters, including tributaries. Non-navigable waters are called isolated wetlands, and are not subject to either the Federal or State Clean Water Act. Thus, isolated wetlands are not subject to federal wetland protection regulations. However, in addition to the Clean Water Act, the State also has jurisdiction over impacts to surface waters through the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne), which does not require that waters be “navigable”. For this reason, isolated wetlands are regulated by the State of California pursuant to Porter-Cologne. The City of Roseville General Plan also provides protection for wetlands, including isolated wetlands, pursuant to the General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element. Federal, State and City regulations/policies all seek to achieve no net loss of wetland acreage, values, or function.

Aside from wetlands, checklist item b also addresses other “sensitive natural communities,” which includes any habitats protected by local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The City of Roseville General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element includes policies for the protection of riparian areas (streamside habitat) and floodplain areas; these are Vegetation and Wildlife section Policies 2 and 3. Policy 4 also directs preservation of additional area around stream corridors and floodplain if there is sensitive woodland, grassland, or other habitat which could be made part of a contiguous open space area. Other than wetlands, which were already discussed, US Fish and Wildlife and California Department of Fish and Wildlife habitat protections generally result from species protections, and are thus addressed via checklist item a.

For checklist item d, there are no regulations specific to the protection of migratory corridors. This item is addressed by an analysis of the habitats present in the vicinity and analyzing the probable effects on access to those habitats which will result from a project.

The City of Roseville Tree Preservation ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66) requires protection of native oak trees, and compensation for oak tree removal. The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City of Roseville Tree Preservation ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66) will prevent significant impacts related to loss of native oak trees, referenced by item e, above.

Regarding checklist item f, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans within the City of Roseville.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a-c) The site of proposed three-story medical office building is currently fully developed with a surface parking lot, associated drive aisles, lighting and landscaping. There are no biological resources on the project site.

d) The City includes an interconnected network of open space corridors and preserves located throughout the City to ensure that the movement of wildlife is not substantially impeded as the City develops. The development of the project site will not negatively impact these existing and planned open space corridors, nor is the project site located in an area that has been designated by the City, United States Fish and Wildlife, or California Department of Fish and Wildlife as vital or important for the movement of wildlife or the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) The City does have a Tree Preservation Ordinance for the protection of native oak trees; however, there are no native oak trees on the project site, as it is fully developed with a surface parking lot, associated drive aisles, lighting and landscaping.

f) There are no Habitat Conservation Plans; Natural Community Conservation Plans; or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that apply to the project site.

V. Cultural Resources

As described within the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, the Roseville region was within the territory of the Nisenan (also Southern Maidu or Valley Maidu). Two large permanent Nisenan habitation sites have been identified and protected within the City’s open space (in Maidu Park). Numerous smaller cultural resources, such as midden deposits and bedrock mortars, have also been recorded in the City. The gold rush which began in 1848 marked another settlement period, and evidence of Roseville’s ranching and mining past are still found today. Historic features include rock walls, ditches, low terraces, and other remnants of settlement and activity. A majority of documented sites within the City are located in areas designated for open space uses.

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 an 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 dedicated cemeteries?			X	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts to cultural resources is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–e listed above. The Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources section of the City of Roseville General Plan also directs the proper evaluation of and, when feasible, protection of significant resources (Policies 1 and 2). There are also various federal and State regulations regarding the treatment and protection of cultural resources, including the National Historic Preservation Act and the Antiquities Act (which regulate items of significance in history), Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.9 of the California Public Resources Code (which regulates the treatment of human remains) and Section 21073 et seq. of the California Public Resources Code (regarding Tribal Cultural Resources). The CEQA Guidelines also contains specific sections, other than the checklist items, related to the treatment of effects on historic resources.

The CEQA Guidelines contains specific sections, other than the checklist items, related to the treatment of effects on historic and archeological resources. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, if it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (Section 21083.2 (a), (b), and (c)). A *historical resource* is a resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Section 21084.1); a resource included in a local register of historical resources (Section 15064.5(a)(2)); or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant (Section 15064.5 (a)(3)). Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 requires evaluation of historical resources to determine their eligibility for listing on the CRHR.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a–b and d) The project site is fully developed with a surface parking lot for the SRMC campus. No resources are known to occur in the area. However, mitigation measures are included in the NERSP EIR that are designed to reduce impacts to resources, should any be found on-site. The NERSP EIR includes an “unanticipated discoveries” mitigation measure, requiring that contractors stop work if any cultural resources are uncovered during construction, which remains applicable to the proposed project. In response to tribal requests, the City has developed modified language for the “unanticipated discoveries” mitigation to include tribal notification of a start-date for a project’s earthwork, and for a tribal representative to visually inspect the site within the first five days of initial earthwork to determine if there is any evidence that tribal cultural resources have been unearthed. The updates to mitigation measure NERSP EIR – Chapter 16, Cultural Resources: “Stop Work if Cultural Resources are Discovered During Construction” are equivalent or more effective than the existing mitigation and will not cause any potentially significant effects on the environment. Language included in the measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. This mitigation need not be applied herein, as it is already applicable and required of the project pursuant to the NERSP. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NERSP EIR; project-specific impacts are ***less than significant***.

c) No paleontological resources are known to exist on the project site per the Northeast Roseville Specic Plan EIR; however, standard mitigation measures apply which are designed to reduce impacts to such resources, should any be found on-site. The measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NERSP EIR; project-specific impacts are ***less than significant***.

VI. Geology and Soils

As described in the Safety Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, there are three inactive faults (Volcano Hill, Linda Creek, and an unnamed fault) in the vicinity, but there are no known active seismic faults within Placer County. The last seismic event recorded in the South Placer area occurred in 1908, and is estimated to have been at least a 4.0 on the Richter Scale. Due to the geographic location and soil characteristics within the City, the General Plan indicates that soil liquefaction, landslides, and subsidence are not a significant risk in the area.

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) Ruptures 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	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to geology and soils is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–e listed above. Regulations applicable to this topic include the Alquist-Priolo Act, which addresses earthquake safety in building permits, and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, which requires the state to gather and publish data on the location and risk of seismic faults.

The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80) and Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107) will prevent significant impacts related to checklist item b. The Ordinance and standards include permit requirements for construction and development in erosion-prone areas and ensure that grading activities will not result in significant soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The use of septic tanks or alternative waste systems is not permitted in the City of Roseville, and therefore no analysis of criterion e is necessary.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a) The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic shaking, ground failure or landslides.

i–iii) According to United States Geological Service mapping and literature, active faults are largely considered to be those which have had movement within the last 10,000 years (within the Holocene or Historic time periods)⁵ and there are no major active faults in Placer County. The California Geological Survey has prepared a map of the state which shows the earthquake shaking potential of areas throughout California based primarily on an area’s distance from known active faults. The map shows that the City lies in a relatively low-intensity ground-shaking zone. Commercial, institutional, and residential buildings as well as all related infrastructure are required, in conformance with Chapter 16, *Structural Design Requirements*, Division IV, *Earthquake Design* of the California Building Code, to lessen the exposure to potentially damaging vibrations through seismic-resistant design. In compliance with the Code, all structures in the Project area would be well-built to withstand ground shaking from possible earthquakes in the region; impacts are **less than significant**.

iv) Landslides typically occur where soils on steep slopes become saturated or where natural or manmade conditions have taken away supporting structures and vegetation. The existing and proposed slopes of the project site are not steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project. In addition, measures would be incorporated during construction to shore minor slopes and prevent potential earth movement. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are **less than significant**.

b) Grading activities will result in the disruption, displacement, compaction and over-covering of soils associated with site preparation (grading and trenching for utilities). Grading activities for the project will be limited to the project site. Grading activities require a grading permit from the Engineering Division. The grading

⁵ United States Geological Survey, <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/?term=active%20fault>, Accessed January 2016

permit is reviewed for compliance with the City’s Improvement Standards, including the provision of proper drainage, appropriate dust control, and erosion control measures. Grading and erosion control measures will be incorporated into the required grading plans and improvement plans. Therefore, the impacts associated with disruption, displacement, and compaction of soils associated with the project are **less than significant**.

c, d) A review of the Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Placer County, accessed via the Web Soil Survey (<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>), indicates that the soils on the site are Exchequer very stony loam, which are not listed as geologically unstable or sensitive. Additionally, the Roseville General Plan finds such impacts to be **less than significant** since new buildings and structures are required to comply with all applicable building codes. A soil report is required with the submittal of the improvement plans. The City of Roseville Building Department will review construction plans before a building permit is issued and the Engineering Division will review and approve all rough grading plans to ensure that all grading and structures would withstand shrink-swell potentials and earthquake activity in this area.

e) The City’s General Plan Policy requires that new development connect to the City’s sanitary sewer system. The City’s Environmental Utilities Department has reviewed the project and determined that City’s sanitary sewer system can accommodate the project. No septic tanks will be permitted as part of the project. Therefore, no impact to soils relative to supporting use of septic tanks would occur.

VII. Greenhouse Gases

Greenhouse gases trap heat in the earth’s atmosphere. The principal greenhouse gases (GHGs) that enter the atmosphere because of human activities are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorinated gases. As explained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency⁶, global average temperature has increased by more than 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit since the late 1800s, and most of the warming of the past half century has been caused by human emissions. The City has taken proactive steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which include the introduction of General Plan policies to reduce emissions, changes to City operations, and climate action initiatives. These are all described in a fact sheet available at http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/_planning/general_plan_n_development_guidelines.as

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

In Assembly Bill 32 (the California Global Warming Solutions Act), signed by Governor Schwarzenegger of California in September 2006, the legislature found that climate change resulting from global warming was a threat to California, and directed that “the State Air Resources Board design emissions reduction measures to

⁶ <http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/overview.html>. Accessed January 2016

meet the statewide emissions limits for greenhouse gases . . .”. The target established in AB 32 was to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. CARB subsequently prepared the *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) for California, which was approved in 2008. The Scoping Plan provides the outline for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions. CARB’s updated August 2011 Scoping Plan calculated a reduction needed of 21.7% from future “Business As Usual” (BAU) conditions in the year 2020. The current Scoping Plan (adopted May 2014) indicates that statewide emissions of GHG in 1990 amounted to 431 million metric tons, and that the 2020 “Business As Usual” (BAU) scenario is estimated as 509⁷ million metric tons, which would require a reduction of 15.3% from 2020 BAU. In addition to this, Senate Bill 32 was signed by the Governor on September 8, 2016, to establish a reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The Air Resources Board is currently updating the Scoping Plan to reflect this target.

The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) recommends that thresholds of significance for GHG be related to AB 32 reduction goals, and has adopted thresholds of significance which take into account the 2030 reduction target. The thresholds include a de minimis and a bright-line maximum threshold. Any project emitting less than 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year (MT CO₂e/yr) during construction or operation results in **less than significant** impacts. The PCAPCD considers any project with emissions greater than the bright-line cap of 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr to have significant impacts. For projects exceeding the de minimum threshold but below the bright-line threshold, comparison to the appropriate efficiency threshold is recommended. The significance thresholds are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: GHG Significance Thresholds

Bright-line Threshold 10,000 MT CO ₂ e/yr			
Residential Efficiency (MT CO ₂ e/capita ¹)		Non-Residential Efficiency (MT CO ₂ e/ksf ²)	
Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
4.5	5.5	26.5	27.3
De Minimis Threshold 1,100 MT CO ₂ e/yr			
1. Per Capita = per person			
2. Per ksf = per 1,000 square feet of building			

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a,b) Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, and city, and virtually every individual on earth. An individual project’s GHG emissions are at a micro-scale level relative to global emissions and effects to global climate change; however, an individual project could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact. As such, impacts related to emissions of GHG are inherently considered cumulative impacts.

Recognizing the global scale of climate change, California has enacted several pieces of legislations in an attempt to address GHG emissions. Specifically, Assembly Bill (AB) 32, and more recently Senate Bill (SB) 32, have established statewide GHG emissions reduction targets. Accordingly, the CARB has prepared the Climate Change Scoping Plan for California (Scoping Plan), which was approved in 2008 and updated in 2014. The Scoping Plan provides the outline for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions and achieve the emissions reductions targets required by AB 32. In concert with statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions, air districts,

⁷ Includes Pavey and Renewables Portfolio Standard reduction

counties, and local jurisdictions throughout the State have implemented their own policies and plans to achieve emissions reductions in line with the Scoping Plan and emissions reductions targets, including AB 32 and SB 32.

As a means of achieving the regional GHG emissions reductions goals required by AB 32, on October 13, 2016, the PCAPCD adopted GHG emissions thresholds to help the district attain the GHG reduction goals established by AB 32 and SB 32. The common unit of measurement for GHG, used by PCAPCD, is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MTCO₂e/yr). The updated thresholds begin with a screening emission level of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr. Any project below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold is judged by the PCAPCD as having a less-than-significant impact on GHG emissions within the District, and thus would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Projects that would result in emissions above the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold would not necessarily result in substantial impacts, if certain efficiency thresholds are met. The efficiency thresholds, which are calculated on a per capita or square foot basis, are presented in Table 4.

Table 4			
PCAPCD Operational Thresholds of Significance			
Efficiency Thresholds			
Residential (MT CO₂e/capita)		Non-Residential (MT CO₂e/1,000 sf)	
Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
4.5	5.5	26.5	27.3
<i>Source: Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Placer County Air Pollution Control District Policy. Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA. October 13, 2016.</i>			

Projects that fall below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold or meet the efficiency thresholds are considered to be in keeping with statewide GHG emissions reduction targets, which would ensure that the proposed project would not inhibit the State’s achievement of GHG emissions reductions. Thus, projects with emissions below the 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold or below the efficiency thresholds presented in Table 4, are considered to result in less-than-significant impacts in regards to GHG emissions within the District and thus would not conflict with any state or regional GHG emissions reduction goals. Finally, the PCAPCD has also established a Bright Line Cap, which shall be the maximum limit for any proposed project. The Bright Line Cap is 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr for all types of projects.

Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, the generation of solid waste, and the use of the emergency generator. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions.

Buildout of the proposed project would contribute to increases of GHG emissions that are associated with global climate change during construction and operations. The proposed project’s short-term construction-related and long-term operational GHG emissions are presented below.

Short-Term Construction GHG Emissions

Construction-related GHG emissions are a one-time release and are, therefore, not typically expected to generate a significant contribution to global climate change, as global climate change is inherently a cumulative effect that occurs over a long period of time and is quantified on a yearly basis. However, the proposed project’s construction GHG emissions have been estimated and compared to the PCAPCD’s operational thresholds of significance for informational purposes. The proposed project’s total construction-related GHG emissions are presented in Table 5. The construction modeling assumptions are described in the Air Quality section above.

Table 5	
Total Unmitigated Project Construction GHG Emissions	
Construction GHG Emissions (MTCO₂e)	Threshold of Significance (MTCO₂e/yr)
538.53	1,100
<i>Source: CalEEMod, February 2017 (see Appendix A).</i>	

As shown in Table 5 above, the proposed project's total unmitigated construction-related GHG emissions would be below the applicable 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr threshold. It should be noted that construction activity would occur over 3.5 years, and the maximum annual construction emissions related to the proposed project would only be 259.13 MTCO₂e/yr. Accordingly, the proposed project would not be expected to have a significant impact related to GHG emissions during construction.

Long-Term Operational GHG Emissions

The proposed project's estimated operational GHG emissions are presented in Table 6. It should be noted that modeling for operation of the proposed project was adjusted to reflect the CO₂ intensity factor for energy provided by Roseville Electric, based on Roseville Electric's progress towards meeting the State's Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards. All other operational modeling assumptions are described in the Air Quality section above.

Table 6	
Unmitigated Project Operational GHG Emissions	
Emission Source	Annual GHG Emissions (MTCO₂e/yr)
Area	0.0018
Energy	790.20
Mobile	451.68
Emergency Generator	84.30
Solid Waste	501.31
Water	34.51
TOTAL ANNUAL GHG EMISSIONS	1,862.00
<i>Source: CalEEMod, February 2017 (see Appendix A).</i>	

As shown in the table, the proposed project would result in operational GHG emissions in excess of the 1,100 MTCO₂e threshold. Accordingly, the project must be further reviewed under the efficiency thresholds presented in Table 4. The PCAPCD maintains efficiency thresholds for both urban and rural commercial developments. Because the proposed project is located within the City of Roseville, and is surrounded by existing developments, the project is considered to be located in an urban setting. The efficiency thresholds adopted by PCAPCD rely on GHG emissions in MTCO₂e per 1,000 sf of non-residential space to determine significance for non-residential projects. As such, the proposed project's estimated annual operational emissions of 1,862.00 MTCO₂e must be divided by the floor area of the proposed hospital expansion. The proposed project would include 92,300 sf of expanded emergency care hospital space. Thus, the proposed project would result in an efficiency rate of 20.17 MTCO₂e/1,000 sf. The PCAPCD urban non-residential efficiency threshold is 26.5 MTCO₂e/1,000 sf. Therefore, the proposed project would result in operational GHG emissions below the applicable PCAPCD efficiency thresholds.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not be considered to generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change would not be cumulatively considerable and would be considered **less than significant**.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Roseville Hospital replacement EIRs evaluated the hazardous materials impacts of development of a medical campus on the site. It was noted that hospitals typically involve the use and storage of hazardous materials. The California Health and Safety Code, and local City Ordinances regulate the handling, storage and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials. These conditions would require the following programs:

- A Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) shall be required of uses that handle toxic and/or hazardous materials in quantities regulated by the California Health and Safety Code and/or the City.
- Businesses that handle toxic or hazardous materials shall complete a Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP) pursuant to local, State, or Federal requirements.

Based on this information, potential impacts associated with hazardous materials are expected to be **less than significant**.

The project is not located within an airport land use plan area, no airports are located within two miles of the project site, and the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There is a private helipad for trauma center patients atop of the current parking garage located in the center of the Sutter campus. The proposed expansion to the SRMC’s emergency and critical care departments will be located approximately 220 feet south of the helipad and will not impact the flight path of helicopters to and from the Sutter campus. The SRMC Heliport’s designated flight path (inbound and outbound) is within a 180-degree radius arc northward from the center of the landing pad, bearing 135 degrees, clockwise through 295 degrees magnetic (see Attachment 3). Because the proposed expansion project will not be in the flight path of inbound or outbound helicopters, no impact would occur.

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 though 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 on-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to hazardous materials is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–h listed above. A material is defined as hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state or local regulatory agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. The determination of significance based on the above criteria depends on the probable frequency and severity of consequences to people who might be exposed to the health hazard, and the degree to which Project design or existing regulations would reduce the frequency of or severity of exposure. As an example, products commonly used for household cleaning are classified as hazardous when transported in large quantities, but one

would not conclude that the presence of small quantities of household cleaners at a home would pose a risk to a school located within ¼-mile.

Many federal and State agencies regulate hazards and hazardous substances, including the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board), and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA). The state has been granted primacy (primary responsibility for oversight) by the US EPA to administer and enforce hazardous waste management programs. State regulations also have detailed planning and management requirements to ensure that hazardous materials are handled, stored, and disposed of properly to reduce human health risks. California regulations pertaining to hazardous waste management are published in the California Code of Regulations (see 8 CCR, 22 CCR, and 23 CCR).

The project is not within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport and there are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project areas. The SRMC campus does utilize a private helipad for trauma center patients which is located on the top level of the current parking garage located in the center of the Sutter campus. As discussed above, the proposed expansion to the SRMC's emergency and critical care departments will be located approximately 220 feet south of the helipad and will not impact the flight path of helicopters to and from the Sutter campus. The SRMC Heliport's designated flight path (inbound and outbound) is within a 180-degree radius arc northward from the center of the landing pad, bearing 135 degrees, clockwise through 295 degrees magnetic (see Attachment 3). The proposed expansion project will not be in the flight path of inbound or outbound helicopters; therefore, the potential impact is **less than significant**.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a, b) Standard construction activities would require the use of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, lubricants, glues, paints and paint thinners, soaps, bleach, and solvents. These are common household and commercial materials routinely used by both businesses and average members of the public. The materials only pose a hazard if they are improperly used, stored, or transported either through upset conditions (e.g. a vehicle accident) or through mishandling. In addition to construction use, the operational project (medical facility) would result in the use of other hazardous materials, including diesel, nitrous oxide, liquid oxygen, carbon dioxide and helium. SRMC has a Material Management Program for all chemicals/hazardous materials, as well as an Emergency Response Contingency Program for all chemicals/materials onsite. The City's Fire Department conducts regular inspections to ensure compliance with established programs and regulations.

Regulations pertaining to the transport of materials are codified in 49 Code of Federal Regulations 171–180, and transport regulations are enforced and monitored by the California Department of Transportation and by the California Highway Patrol. Specifications for storage on a construction site are contained in various regulations and codes, including the California Code of Regulations, the Uniform Fire Code, and the California Health and Safety Code. These same codes require that all hazardous materials be used and stored in the manner specified on the material packaging. Existing regulations and programs are sufficient to ensure that potential impacts as a result of the use or storage of hazardous materials are reduced to **less than significant** levels.

c) See response to Items (a) and (b) above. While development of the site will result in the use, handling, and transport of materials deemed to be hazardous, the materials in question are commonly used in both residential and commercial applications, and include materials such as bleach and herbicides. The project will not result in the use of any acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.

d) The project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5⁸; therefore, no impact will occur.

⁸ <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/SectionA.htm>

g) This project is located within an area currently receiving City emergency services and development of the site has been anticipated and incorporated into emergency response plans. As such, the project will cause a **less than significant** impact to the City's Emergency Response or Management Plans. Furthermore, the project will be required to comply with all local, State and federal requirements for the handling of hazardous materials, which will ensure less-than-significant impacts. These will require the following programs:

- A Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) is required of uses that handle toxic and/or hazardous materials in quantities regulated by the California Health and Safety Code and/or the City.
- Businesses that handle toxic or hazardous materials are required to complete a Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP) pursuant to local, State, or federal requirements.

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, and is not in a CAL FIRE responsibility area; fire suppression is entirely within local responsibility. The project site is in an urban area, and therefore would not expose people to any risk from wildland fire. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, the City is located within the Pleasant Grove Creek Basin and the Dry Creek Basin. Pleasant Grove Creek and its tributaries drain most of the western and central areas of the City and Dry Creek and its tributaries drain the remainder of the City. Most major stream areas in the City are located within designated open space.

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)				
c) 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	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) 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	
e) 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	
f) 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	
g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water?			X	
h) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) 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
j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
k) 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
l) Inundation by seiches, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to hydrology and water quality is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–j listed above. For checklist item a, the Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City of Roseville Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107), Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (RMC Ch. 14.20), and Stormwater Quality Design Manual (Resolution 16-152) will prevent significant impacts. The standards require preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan for construction activities and includes designs to control pollutants within post-construction urban water runoff. Likewise, it is indicated that the Drainage Fees for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Watersheds (RMC Ch.4.48) and City of Roseville Design/Construction Standards (Resolution 07-107) will prevent significant impacts related to item e. The ordinance and standards require the collection of drainage fees to fund improvements that mitigate potential flooding impacts, and require the design of a water drainage system that will adequately convey anticipated stormwater flows. Finally, it is indicated that compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch. 9.80) will prevent significant impacts related to items g, h, and i. The Ordinance includes standard requirements for all new construction, including regulation of development with the potential to impede or redirect flood flows, and prohibits development within flood hazard areas. Impacts from tsunamis and seiches were screened out of the analysis (item j) given the fact that the project is not located near a water body or other feature that would pose a risk of such an event.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a,c,d, f) The project will involve the disturbance of on-site soils and the construction of impervious surfaces, such as asphalt paving and buildings. Disturbing the soil can allow sediment to be mobilized by rain or wind, and cause displacement into waterways. To address this and other issues, the developer is required to receive approval of a grading permit and/or improvement plans prior to the start of construction. The permit or plans are required to incorporate mitigation measures for dust and erosion control. In addition, the City has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit issued by the Central Valley

Regional Water Quality Control Board which requires the City to reduce pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. The City does this, in part, by means of the City’s 2013 Design/Construction Standards, which require preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. All permanent stormwater quality control measures must be designed to comply with the City’s Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Standards for New Development, the City’s 2013 Design/Construction Standards, Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance, and Stormwater Quality Design Manual. For these reasons, impacts related to water quality are ***less than significant***.

b) The project does not involve the installation of groundwater wells. The City maintains wells to supplement surface water supplies during multiple dry years, but the effect of groundwater extraction on the aquifer was addressed in the Water Supply Assessment of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR, which included a Citywide water analysis. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation, and is thus consistent with the citywide Water Supply Assessment. Project impacts related to groundwater extraction are ***less than significant***.

g, h) According to the City’s floodplain data, the project is not located within the City’s Regulatory Floodplain. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not place housing or any structures within an area at risk of flood flows. There would be no impact with regard to these criteria.

i) Folsom Dam, which is located approximately 10 miles southeast of the project site, is the closet dam to the project site. While portions of the City could be subject to flooding in the event of failure or damage of Folsom Dam, the project site is not located in an area that would be subject to inundation due to dam failure. Therefore, there would be no impact.

i) Because the proposed project is located within an area of flat topography and is furthermore not within a floodplain there is no risk of debris flow or mudflow. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

X. Land Use and Planning

The project site is located within the City’s Northeast Roseville Specific Plan area with a zoning designation of Planned Development 457 (PD457) for a Medical Campus, with a General Plan and Specific Plan land use designation of Business Professional. The proposed SRMC emergency/critical care department expansion is consistent with the zoning designation. In addition, the project is also consistent with the Conditional Use Permit that was approved in 2006 for the medical campus expansion. As such, the project is considered to be consistent with the zoning and land use designations.

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

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to land use is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–c listed above. Consistency with applicable City General Plan policies, Improvement Standards, and design standards is already required and part of the City’s processing of permits and plans, so these requirements do not appear as mitigation measures.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

- a) The project area has been master planned for development, including adequate roads, pedestrian paths, and bicycle paths to provide connections within the community. The project will not physically divide an established community.
- b) The project is consistent with, and does not conflict with the City’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, Northeast Specific Plan’s Land Use Plan and the SRMC’s Conditional Use Permit/Master Plan approved in 2006.
- c) There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans covering the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

XI. Mineral Resources

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 requires the State Geologist to classify land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ’s) based on the known or inferred mineral resource potential of that land. The California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) was historically responsible for the classification and designation of areas containing—or potentially containing—significant mineral resources, though that responsibility now lies with the California Geological Survey (CGS). 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 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.

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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to mineral resources is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a and b listed above.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a–b) The project site is not in the area of the City known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the project has no impacts on mineral resources.

XII. Noise

The project site is fully developed and is within the existing SRMC campus, a ±49-acre site, which is comprised of the Main Hospital (including emergency room/trauma center), medical office buildings and rehabilitation facilities, surface parking lots and two parking garages. The project site is approximately 990 feet east of the Interstate 80 Freeway. Additionally, the hospital has a helipad for emergency/trauma patients that is located on the top level of the parking structure adjacent to the hospital. 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 ground borne vibration of ground borne noise levels?			X	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

Standards for transportation noise and non-transportation noise affecting existing or proposed land uses are established within the City of Roseville General Plan Noise Element Table IX-1 and IX-3, and these standards are used as the thresholds to determine the significance of impacts related to items a and c. The significance of other noise impacts is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items b, and d–f listed above. The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the City Noise Regulation (RMC Ch. 9.24) will prevent significant non-transportation noise as it relates to items a, b, and c. The Ordinance establishes noise exposure standards that protect noise-sensitive receptors from a variety of noise sources, including non-transportation/fixed noise, amplified sound, industrial noise, and events on public property. The project is not within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport and there are also no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project area. Therefore, items e and f have been ruled out from further analysis.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a,c) The principally permitted use on the site, (medical office use), typically generates low to moderate noise levels through the use of mechanical equipment such as roof top air conditioning units. The site is adjacent to other office buildings, and bound on two sides by roads. Consistent with the City’s Community Design Guidelines the mechanical equipment will be required to be screened. It is anticipated that long-term noise impacts will be minimal and well within the limits established by the City’s Municipal Code Section 9.24.

b,d) Surrounding uses may experience short-term increases in groundborne vibration, groundborne noise, and airborne noise levels during construction. However, these impacts are temporary in nature and are not anticipated to result in any unusual or excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. When conducted during daytime hours, construction activities are exempt from Noise Ordinance standards, but the standards do apply to construction occurring during nighttime hours. While the noise generated may be a minor nuisance, the City Noise Regulation standards are designed to ensure that impacts are not unduly intrusive. Because the project would comply with the provisions of the City's General Plan and Noise Ordinance, impacts related to noise are considered ***less than significant***.

e, f) The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan area nor is it located within two miles of an airport. As discussed above, the medical campus does have an existing helipad located on the parking garage adjacent to the hospital. The proposed project will not affect or alter the operation of the helipad (number of flights or established flight paths). No housing is proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur relative to exposing people to excessive airport related noise levels.

XIII. Population and Housing

The project site is located within the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan and has a land use designation of Business Professional. The City of Roseville General Plan Table II-4 identifies the total number of residential units and population anticipated as a result of buildout of the City, and the Specific Plan likewise includes unit allocations and population projections for the Plan Area. 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

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to population and housing is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–c listed above.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a) The CEQA Guidelines identify several ways in which a project could have growth-inducing impacts (Public Resources Code Section 15126.2), either directly or indirectly. Growth-inducement may be the result of fostering economic growth, fostering population growth, providing new housing, or removing barriers to growth. Growth inducement may be detrimental, beneficial, or of no impact or significance under CEQA. An impact is only deemed to occur when it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services, or if it can be shown that the growth will significantly affect the environment in some other way. The project is consistent with the land use designation of the site. Therefore, while the project in question may induce some level of growth, this growth was already identified and its effects disclosed and mitigated within the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan, Roseville Hospital Replacement EIRs and Sutter Campus expansion Mitigated Negative Declaration EIR. Therefore, the impact of the project is **less than significant**.

b, c) The proposal is not a housing-related project, does not induce growth beyond that anticipated in the General Plan EIR and does not displace any existing housing. No housing exists on the project site, and there would be no impact with respect to these criteria.

XIV. Public Services

Fire protection, police protection, park services, and library services are provided by the City. The project is located within the Roseville City School District. 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 government 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 facilities?			X	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The General Plan EIR identifies and adopts mitigation for impacts to public services, including police and fire protection, wastewater services, and solid waste disposal. The proposed project may incrementally increase the need for public services and utilities from the current vacant parking area. However, the project is within the scope (approved building square feet) of Sutter Medical Campus Use Permit which was approved in 2006. The Use Permit allowed for the development of 1.1 million square feet of medical uses on the Sutter Roseville medical campus. The City’s Fire, Police, Parks, and Utilities Departments have all reviewed the project plans and have not identified any significant impacts to City services.

The significance of impacts related to public services is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–e listed above. The EIR for the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan addressed the level of public services which would need to be provided in order to serve planned growth in the community. Development Agreements and other conditions have been adopted in all proposed growth areas of the City which identify the physical facilities needed to serve growth, and the funding needed to provide for the construction and operation of those facilities

and services; the project is consistent with the Specific Plan. In addition, the project has been routed to the various public service agencies, both internal and external, to ensure that the project meets the agencies' design standards (where applicable) and to provide an opportunity to recommend appropriate conditions of approval.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a) Existing City codes and regulations require adequate water pressure in the water lines, and construction must comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes used by the City of Roseville. Additionally, the applicant is required to pay a fire service construction tax, which is used for purchasing capital facilities for the Fire Department. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure **less than significant** impacts.

b) Pursuant to the Development Agreement for the project area, the developer is required to pay fees into a Community Facilities District, which provides funding for police services. Sales taxes and property taxes resulting from the development will add revenue to the General Fund, which also serves to fund police services. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure **less than significant** impacts.

c) The applicant for this project is required to pay school impact fees at a rate determined by the local school districts. School fees will be collected prior to the issuance of building permits, consistent with City requirements. School sites have already been designated as part of the Specific Plan process. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure **less than significant** impacts.

d) Pursuant to the Development Agreement for the project area, the developer will be required to pay fees into a Community Facilities District, which provides funding for park services. Future park and recreation sites and facilities have already been identified as part of the Specific Plan process. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure **less than significant** impacts.

e) Pursuant to the Development Agreement for the project area, the developer will be required to pay fees into a Community Facilities District, which provides funding for the library system and other such facilities and services. In addition, the City charges fees to end-users for other services, such as garbage and greenwaste collection, in order to fund those services. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure **less than significant** impacts.

XV. Recreation

The proposed project will not provide on-site recreational areas for the patients and visitors of the office building. However, three City parks are located within six-tenths of a mile of the project site (Harry Crab Park, 0.6 mile northeast, Cambria Park, 0.5 mile east, and John G. Piches Park, 0.6 mile south). Additional facilities will not need to be added as a result of the project. Therefore, the project will have a **less than significant** impact on the existing and planned park facilities.

Would the project:

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	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to recreation services is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–b listed above.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a) The EIR for the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan addressed the level of park services (including new construction, maintenance, and operation) which would need to be provided in order to serve planned growth in the community. Given that the project is consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan, the project would not cause any unforeseen or new impacts related to the use of existing or proposed parks and recreational facilities. Existing codes, regulations, funding agreements, and facilities plans are sufficient to ensure **less than significant** impacts.

b) Park sites and other recreational facilities were identified within the Specific Plan, and the plan-level impacts of developing those facilities were addressed within the Final EIR for the Specific Plan. The project will not cause any unforeseen or new impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

The proposed project has frontage on two roadways: East Roseville Parkway, a six-lane arterial roadway, and Secret Ravine Parkway, a four-lane arterial roadway. The project site’s primary access is via a four-lane extension of North Sunrise Avenue north of the intersection of North Sunrise Avenue and East Roseville Parkway. A secondary access drive is provided off Secret Ravine Parkway, approximately 1,200 feet north of East Roseville Parkway. There are multiple internal drive-aisles providing access to multiple medical office buildings, surface parking lots and two parking structures.

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 a design feature(s) (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			X	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of checklist items c–f are based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist descriptions. For checklist items a and b, the Circulation Element of the General Plan establishes Level of Service C or better as an acceptable operating condition at all signalized intersections during a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to this policy may be made by the City Council, but a minimum of 70% of all signalized intersections should maintain LOS C. The Findings of the Implementing Procedures indicate that compliance with the Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch. 4.44) will fund roadway projects and improvements necessary to maintain the City’s Level of Service standards for projects consistent with the General Plan and related Specific Plan. An existing plus project conditions (short-term) traffic impact study may be required for projects with unique trip generation or distribution characteristics, in areas of local traffic constraints, or to study the proposed project access. A cumulative plus project conditions (long-term) study is required if a project is inconsistent with the General Plan or Specific Plan and would generate more than 50 pm peak-hour trips. The guidelines for traffic study preparation are found in the City of Roseville Design and Construction Standards - Section 4.

A Transportation Impact Study was prepared by Fehr & Peers for the project to analyze the existing transportation conditions along with the expected transportation conditions with the proposed expansion project. (see Attachment 2).

The project site is not located within an airport planning area or within any height restriction area established around an airport for the purpose of protecting navigable airspace. Consequently, impacts to changes in air traffic patterns (checklist item c) were screened out of the analysis. As discussed above, the hospital does have a helipad located on the top floor of the adjacent parking structure. The proposed project will not impact helicopter operations (number of flights, nor flight path) at the facility.

Impacts with regard to items d and e are assessed based on the expert judgment of the City Engineer and City Fire Department, as based upon facts and consistency with the City’s Design and Construction Standards.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a,b) The proposed project is consistent with the land use designations of the General Plan and Specific Plan, and therefore does not contribute more traffic to the roadways system than was anticipated in Citywide analyses. The traffic study prepared by Fehr & Peers that focused on examining the project access design and the intersection of six potentially-impacted City intersections, as shown below.

1. Roseville PW/Galleria BL
2. Roseville PW/Creekside Ridge DR
3. East Roseville PW/Taylor RD
4. East Roseville PW/North Sunrise AV
5. East Roseville PW/Secret Ravine PW
6. Secret Ravine PW/Medical Plaza DR – Falcon Pointe DR

The study analyzed the existing transportation conditions along with the expected transportation conditions with the proposed hospital expansion in place (existing plus project conditions). The study found that the project

would not cause LOS to worsen at any study intersections; therefore, project impacts to intersection operations are considered **less than significant** and no mitigation is required. The study prepared by Fehr & Peers included specific design recommendations for the project access, which have been incorporated into the site design. The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, nor will it conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

The study found that the intersection of Rocky Ridge Drive and Eureka Road would operate at LOS C or better, and would have adequate storage length to accommodate the proposed project. Impacts are **less than significant**.

d,e) The project has been reviewed by the City Engineering and City Fire Department staff, and has been found to be consistent with the City's Design Standards. The study prepared by Fehr & Peers included specific design recommendations for the project access, which have been incorporated into the site design. Furthermore, standard conditions of approval added to all City project require compliance with Fire Codes and other design standards. Compliance with existing regulations ensure that impacts are **less than significant**.

f) The City of Roseville has adopted a Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, and Short-Range Transit Plan. The project was reviewed for consistency with these documents and found that:

- i. The project would not be inconsistent with any applicable policies and guidelines of Roseville's Bikeway Master Plan. Therefore, project impacts to bicycle facilities are considered **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.
- ii. The project would not have a negative impact on transit operations, travel times, and/or circulation. Therefore, project impacts to transit facilities are considered **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.
- iii. The project would not interfere with the operation of an existing pedestrian facility or preclude the construction of a planned pedestrian facility. Therefore, project impacts to pedestrian facilities are considered **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources

As described within the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Roseville General Plan, the Roseville region was within the territory of the Nisenan (also Southern Maidu or Valley Maidu). Two large permanent Nisenan habitation sites have been identified and protected within the City's open space (in Maidu Park). Numerous smaller cultural resources, such as midden deposits and bedrock mortars, have also been recorded in the City. A majority of documented sites within the City are located in areas designated for open space uses.

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically

defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?			X	
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

In addition to archeological resources, tribal cultural resources are also given particular treatment. Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, as either 1) a site, feature, place, geographically-defined cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register or Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources or as 2) a resource determined by the lead agency, supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code section 5024.1(c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a) The Northeast Roseville Specific Plan EIR included a historic and cultural resources study, which included research on whether any listed or eligible sites had been documented in the project area. No such sites were found within the project site’s boundaries. However, standard mitigation measures apply which are designed to reduce impacts to any previously undiscovered resources, should any be found on-site. The measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. This mitigation need not be applied herein, as it is already applicable and required of the project pursuant to the NERSP. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NERSP EIR; project-specific impacts are ***less than significant***.

b) Notice of the proposed project was mailed to tribes that had requested such notice pursuant to AB 52. A request for a meeting, site visit and potential consultation was received. As discussed in item a) above, no resources are known to occur in the area. However, mitigation measures are included in the NERSP EIR which are designed to reduce impacts to resources, should any be found on-site. The NERSP EIR includes an “unanticipated discoveries” mitigation measure, requiring that contractors stop work if any cultural resources are uncovered during construction, which remains applicable to the proposed project. In response to tribal requests, the City has developed modified language for the “unanticipated discoveries” mitigation to include tribal notification of a start-date for a project’s earthwork, and for a tribal representative to visually inspect the site within the first five days of initial earthwork to determine if there is any evidence that tribal cultural resources have been unearthed. The updates to mitigation measure NERSP EIR – Chapter 16, Cultural Resources: “Stop Work if Cultural Resources are Discovered During Construction” are equivalent or more effective than the existing mitigation and will not cause any potentially significant effects on the environment. Language included in the measure requires an immediate cessation of work, and contact with the appropriate agencies to address the resource before work can resume. This mitigation need not be applied herein, as it is already applicable and required of the project pursuant to the NERSP. The project will not result in any new impacts beyond those already discussed and disclosed in the NERSP EIR; project-specific impacts are **less than significant**.

XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems

Water and sewer services are provided, by the City of Roseville. It is expected that minimal work will need to be completed to the existing utility services serving the site. Storm water will be collected on-site and transferred via the existing storm drain system into an off-site storm drain system. Solid waste will be collected by the City of Roseville’s Refuse Department. The City of Roseville will provide electric service to the site, while natural gas will be provided by PG&E. Comcast will provide cable. The project has been reviewed by the City’s Engineering Division, Environmental Utilities, Roseville Electric and PG&E. Adequate services are available for the project.

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 storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	

Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to utilities and service systems is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–g listed above.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a,e) The proposed project would be served by the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP). The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates water quality and quantity of effluent discharged from the City's wastewater treatment facilities. The DCWWTP has the capacity to treat 18 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently treating 8.9 mgd. The volume of wastewater generated by the proposed project could be accommodated by the facility; the proposed project will not contribute to an exceedance of applicable wastewater treatment requirements. The impact would be **less than significant**.

b,c) The project is consistent with the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan, and will be required to construct any lines necessary to serve the project, as well as pay fees which fund the operation of the facilities and the construction of major infrastructure. The construction impacts related to building the major infrastructure were disclosed in the EIR for the Specific Plan, and appropriate mitigation was adopted. Minor additional infrastructure will be constructed within the project site to tie the project into the major systems, but these facilities will be constructed in locations where site development has already occurred as part of the existing medical campus; there are no additional substantial impacts specific or particular to the minor infrastructure improvements.

In terms of overall treatment capacity, sewage treatment was discussed in section a, above. An expansion of sewage treatment facilities is not required. Domestic water in the City of Roseville is treated at the City's Water

Treatment Plant on Barton Road. The City’s water treatment plant currently has a treatment capacity of 100 mgd, though due to pipe sizes a slightly smaller total capacity of 96.1 mgd can be conveyed to the plant for treatment. The Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Water Supply Assessment (AR WSA, Appendix E of the Amoruso Ranch FEIR), dated May 2016, analyzed water demand at City buildout. The analysis indicates that peak treatment demand will be approximately 115 mgd, which is insufficient to serve the treatment plant has insufficient capacity to serve peak demand at City buildout. However, the additional water demand will be provided through contracts with other water suppliers, such as the Placer County Water Agency and the San Juan Water District, rather than through a treatment plant expansion. The project is consistent with existing land use designations and will not require an expansion of water treatment capacity.

d) The City of Roseville 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), adopted May 2016, estimates water demand and supply for the City through the year 2040, based on existing land use designations and population projections. In addition, the AR WSA estimates water demand and supply for ultimate General Plan buildout. The project is consistent with existing land use designations, and is therefore consistent with the assumptions of the UWMP and AR WSA. The UWMP indicates that existing water supply sources are sufficient to meet all near term needs, estimating an annual water demand of 45,475 acre-feet per year (AFY) by the year 2020 and existing surface and recycled water supplies in the amount of 70,421 AFY. The AR WSA estimates a Citywide buildout demand of 64,370 AFY when including recycled water, and of 59,657 AFY of potable water. The AR WSA indicates that surface water supply is sufficient to meet demand during normal rainfall years, but is insufficient during single- and multiple-dry years. However, the City’s UWMP establishes mandatory water conservation measures and the use of groundwater to offset reductions in surface water supplies. Both the UWMP and AR WSA indicate that these measures, in combination with additional purchased water sources, will ensure that supply meets projected demand. The project, which is consistent with existing land use designations, would not require new or expanded water supply entitlements.

f, g) The Western Placer Waste Management Authority is the regional agency handling recycling and waste disposal for Roseville and surrounding areas. The regional waste facilities include a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL). Currently, the WRSL is permitted to accept up to 1,900 tons of municipal solid waste per day. According to the solid waste analysis of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan FEIR, under current projected development conditions the WRSL has a projected lifespan extending through 2058. There is sufficient existing capacity to serve the proposed project. Though the project will contribute incrementally to an eventual need to find other means of waste disposal, this impact of City buildout has already been disclosed and mitigation applied as part of each Specific Plan the City has approved, including the most recent Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan. All residences and business in the City pay fees for solid waste collection, a portion of which is collected to fund eventual solid waste disposal expansion. The project will not result in any new impacts associated with major infrastructure. Environmental Utilities staff has reviewed the project for consistency with policies, codes, and regulations related to waste disposal services and has found that the project design is in compliance.

XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, threatened or rare species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
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	

Significance Criteria and Regulatory Setting:

The significance of impacts related to mandatory findings of significance is based directly on the CEQA Guidelines checklist items a–c listed above.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a–c) Long term environmental goals are not impacted by the proposed project. The cumulative impacts do not deviate beyond what was contemplated in the Specific Plan EIR, and mitigation measures have already been incorporated via the Specific Plan EIR. With implementation of the City’s Mitigating Ordinances, Guidelines, and Standards and best management practices, mitigation measures described in this chapter, and permit conditions, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on the habitat of any plant or animal species. Based on the foregoing, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of any wildlife species, or create adverse effects on human beings.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

*In reviewing the site specific information provided for this project and acting as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that the impacts are 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 foregoing initial study:***

I find that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** has been prepared.

Initial Study Prepared by:

Ron Miller, Associate Planner
City of Roseville, Development Services – Planning Division

Exhibits:

- A. Site Plan (2 Sheets)
- B. Landscape Plan
- C. Elevations (2 Sheets)
- D. Site Line Study/Renderings (5 Sheets)

Attachments:

1. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, Sutter Roseville ED-Critical Care Expansion, March 2017
2. Fehr & Peers Transportation impact Study for Sutter Roseville Medical Center Expansion, February 2017
3. Helipad Flight Path Map