



**PLANNING & REDEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**  
311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 (916) 774-5276

**INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

**Project Title/File Number:** NERSP Parcel 13A – Automall Wall Renovation Project - File # 2009PL-012 (CUP-000056)

**Project Location:** 100 Automall Drive; Roseville; Placer County; APNs 048-450-030-000, 048-450-038-000, 048-450-034-000, 048-450-029-000, 048-450-027-000, 048-450-028, 048-450-026-000, 048-450-074-000, 048-450-073-000, 048-450-063-000, 048-450-060-000, 048-450-023-000, 048-450-031-000, 048-450-071-000, 048-450-070-000, 048-450-069-000, 048-450-072-000.

**Project Description:** The applicant requests approval of a Conditional Use Permit Modification to renovate the Roseville Automall’s existing perimeter wall, which will include the addition of six (6) vehicle display pads with associated signage. Additionally, the applicant has requested modifications to the existing Master Use Permit which governs operation of the Roseville Automall, including the addition of the proposed display platforms, revised building setback standards, expanded uses, including sale of recreational vehicles & motorcycles, and increased design flexibility through the Design Review Permit process. The proposed modifications to the site are confined to the existing footprint of the Roseville Automall on property that is fully developed.

**Project Applicant:** Borges Architecture – Adam O. Lovern – 1478 Stone Point Drive, Suite 350, Roseville, California 95661, (916) 782-7200.

**Property Owner:** Roseville Automall Association – c/o Eberhart & Co. – Bruce Westrup – 3300 Douglas Boulevard, Suite 350, Roseville, California, (916) 783-9900.

**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 previous environmental documents and site-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

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

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

In reviewing the site-specific information provided for this project, the City of Roseville Planning and Redevelopment Department has analyzed the potential environmental impacts and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. As demonstrated in the initial study checklist, there are no significant effects resulting from the project (CEQA Section 15183) and therefore an EIR **is not** required. Therefore, **on the basis of the following initial evaluation**, we find that the proposed project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **Negative Declaration** will be prepared.

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Miller, Assistant Planner

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

The applicant has requested a Conditional Use Permit Modification to renovate the Roseville Automall's existing perimeter wall, which will include the addition of vehicle display platforms and new landscaping at six locations around the existing automall. The display areas will include raised platforms, approximately four feet (4') above existing grade of the sidewalks along the surrounding streets. The platforms will be constructed of colored concrete, with brick veneer. Columns will be placed at each end of the platform(s), which will serve as architectural "bookends." A narrow, cantilevered aluminum canopy, covering the span of the platform(s) will be connected to the columns. Signage identifying Roseville Automall will be affixed to the canopy of each display area. The signs will be constructed of the same material as the canopy. All platforms will include display lighting for nighttime display of vehicles.

The locations for the display platforms are as follows; 1) the entry drive to the vehicle storage lot on North Sunrise Avenue, 2) the southeast corner of Automall Drive and North Sunrise Avenue, at the main entry to the Automall, 3) the southwest corner of Automall Drive and North Sunrise Avenue, also at the main entry, 4) the northeast corner of North Sunrise Avenue and Lead Hill Boulevard, 5) immediately across from the Wal-Mart entry drive on Lead Hill Boulevard, and 6) at the northwest corner of Lead Hill Boulevard and Rocky Ridge Drive (see Attachment 2)

The existing wall consists of a stucco finish over foam block, and is in need of repair due to cracking and peeling in many locations. In addition to the vehicle display platforms, the renovation project will also include repairing and restoring the wall as needed, including repainting.

The applicant has also requested modifications to the Automall's existing Master Use Permit which governs operation of the Roseville Automall. Additionally, the applicant has requested modifications to the existing Master Use Permit which governs operation of the Roseville Automall. Modifications include, but are not limited to: 1) the addition of vehicle display platforms, 2) revisions to building setback standards, 3) expansion of permitted uses to include "stand-alone" pre-owned vehicle dealerships, and sale of recreational vehicles, boats and motorcycles, 4) increased design flexibility through the City's Design Review Permit process, and 5) use of tents and other exterior structures for display, detailing, etc.

All proposed modifications to the project site are confined to the existing footprint of the Roseville Automall on property that is fully developed.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

---

The project site, known as the Roseville Automall (Automall), is located in the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Area (NERSP) of the City of Roseville. The Automall is comprised of 17 parcels totaling approximately 75 acres in size. The Automall is bordered by Lead Hill Boulevard to the south, North Sunrise Avenue to the west, Rocky Ridge Drive to the East, and commercial development to the north.

The Automall site is fully developed with auto dealerships, parking lots and associated lighting and landscaping. All adjacent and nearby properties are also fully developed with various commercial use types, including automobile dealerships, automobile service and tire sales, home improvement center, professional office, retail sales, and restaurants (see Attachment 1).

The site has a General Plan land use designation of Regional Commercial, with a zoning designation of Planned Development for an auto center and automall. Per the Zoning Ordinance, the existing and proposed uses are permitted within the Planned Development zoning district.

LOCATION	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	ACTUAL USE OF PROPERTY
On-Site	Planned Development (PD 247, PD 253 & PD 261 – Auto Center & Automall)	Regional Commercial (RC)	Automall
North	Regional Commercial/Special Area – Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Area (RC/SA – NE)	Community Commercial (CC)	Commercial/Retail, Restaurants
South	Planned Development (PD 16 – Commercial, Light Industrial, Office) & Community Commercial/Special Area – Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Area (CC/SA – NE)	Business Professional (BP) & Community Commercial (CC)	Commercial/Retail, Professional Office
East	Business Professional/Special Area – Northeast Specific Plan	BP	Professional Office
West	RC/SA - NE	RC	Commercial/Retail

The site plan, grading plan, elevations, and landscaping plan have been included in this document as Attachments 2 through 5.

## PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

The City has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the General Plan and Northeast Roseville Specific Plan EIR, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan certified EIR and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies 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 site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards then an additional EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

Section 15168 relating to program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier program EIR. A program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It can also be incorporated by reference to deal with regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

Regarding the subject project, the **Northeast Roseville Specific Plan** and **General Plan EIRs** serve as the program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference can occur.

### 1. NORTHEAST ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN EIR

The Northeast Roseville Specific Plan (NERSP) was adopted April 8, 1987 by the City of Roseville City Council. The plan area encompasses approximately 955 acres in the northeast area of the City. The primary purpose of the NERSP is to provide a guide to development within the plan area. The NERSP EIR (SCH #86042805) was certified on March 11, 1987, and is one of the previous environmental documents used in preparation of this Initial Study.

The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations when they certified the NERSP EIR, identifying the following impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- Conversion of the project area from a large open space area to an urbanized area

- Contribution to regional air quality problems
- Contribution to increased difficulty in attaining air quality standards in the Regional Air Quality Plan
- Elimination of approximately 130 vernal pools and associated habitat for rare plant species
- Growth inducement
- Increase in traffic congestion

## **2. GENERAL PLAN EIR**

The City's 2020 General Plan was adopted on February 4, 2004 by Resolution #04-39. The current General Plan contains in large part the same goals, policies, and implementation measures as the previous 2010 General Plan (adopted on November 18, 1992, by Resolution #92-321), for which a formal General Plan EIR was prepared. However, the current General Plan has been updated to reflect the current level of development in the City and to reflect the 3,100-acre West Roseville Specific Plan annexation that was approved in 2004. Changes between the 2010 General Plan and the current 2020 General Plan were analyzed as part of the West Roseville Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (WRSP EIR) (SCH #2002082057).

Each element of the General Plan (GP) references and provides policies relating to specific plans. The specific plans are viewed as the primary mechanism for implementing the goals and policies of the GP. The plans are consistent with, and incorporated by reference into, the Land Use Element of the GP (page II-59 of the GP). Specific plan land uses are reflected on the GP land use map. The specific plans establish detailed policies and implementation programs for portions of the City, consistent with the goals and policies established in the GP.

The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations when they certified the GP EIR, identifying the following impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- flood hazard
- vehicular air emissions (ozone)
- construction air emissions (ozone)
- vehicle noise
- railroad noise
- noise from fixed sources
- conversion of open space outside of infill area
- jobs/housing imbalance
- affordable housing
- increased traffic/degraded LOS
- loss of annual grasslands
- loss of oak trees and oak woodlands
- loss of riparian woodlands
- loss of vernal pools
- loss of intermittent drainages and other seasonal wetland habitat
- habitat fragmentation and loss of wildlife habitat
- risk of hazardous materials-related emergencies due to rail operations
- cumulative air quality, land use, jobs/housing, traffic, biological, cultural, risk of upset, open space, public services and utilities, and water impacts
- growth inducement

## **3. WEST ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN EIR**

The West Roseville Specific Plan is referenced and utilized in the evaluation of this project as it represents the most significant change in land use and allocation of new land use to the City following the adoption of the 1992 General Plan. The project added approximately 3,100 acres to the City's corporate limits, and included a mixed-use land use plan of commercial, business professional, industrial, park, open space, and school land uses, and included 8,430 new residential dwelling units. As mentioned above, processing of this plan also resulted in an update to the City's 2010 General Plan.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), it was determined that the West Roseville Specific Plan had the potential to have a significant adverse impact upon the environment, and the WRSP EIR

(SCH #2002082057) was prepared for the project. A Notice of Completion was filed with the State of California Office of Planning and Research. The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was certified by the City Council on February 4, 2004. A copy of the WRSP EIR is available for review within the Planning Department at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations when they certified the WRSP EIR. The EIR identified the following impacts associated with development of the WRSP area as significant and unavoidable:

- Potential incompatibility of internal land uses
- Conversion of agricultural land to developed uses
- Inducement of substantial population growth
- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways
- Increased traffic on State Highways
- Increased traffic on Placer County roadways
- Increased emissions of fugitive dust and PM10 from grading and trenching activities (short term)
- Increased emissions of ozone precursors during construction (short-term)
- Increased emissions of air pollutants during operation
- Loss of oak trees of greater than 6 inches DBH (short-term)
- Removal of historically significant properties and/or loss of historic integrity of such resources
- Increased demand for solid waste services at the landfill
- Increased demand for solid waste services at the MRF
- Construction debris demand for solid waste services
- Alteration of the visual character of the site and vicinity
- New sources of light and glare

For buildout of the WRSP project area, the WRSP EIR also identified the following cumulative impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- Agricultural land conversion
- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways with Kaiser Medical Center
- Air quality emissions from construction
- Air quality emissions from operation
- On-site noise levels that exceed City standards
- Off-site noise levels that exceed City standards
- Loss of historic resources
- Increased demand for water
- Increased demand for recycled water distribution system
- Increased generation of solid waste
- Increased stormwater runoff in the Curry Creek Watershed
- Change in visual character

## **CLIMATE CHANGE**

---

### **Background**

Global climate change is a change in the average weather of the earth, which can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. It is exacerbated by greenhouse gases, which trap heat in the atmosphere (thus the “greenhouse” effect). Greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide, and are emitted by natural processes and human activities. The accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere regulates the earth’s temperature, and is natural and desirable, as without it the Earth’s surface would be about 61 degrees cooler.<sup>1</sup>

Scientific evidence suggests that emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle emissions, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere, and are increasing the rate and magnitude of climate change to a degree that could present hazardous conditions. Potential adverse effects of global

---

<sup>1</sup> “Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents, Comment Draft” . March 5, 2007.

warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels, changes to ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.<sup>2</sup>

The potential for climate change impacts at specific locations remains uncertain, and to assign specific impacts to the project site would be speculative. Some conclusions can be drawn about the potential in general for the project area to be subject to increased likelihood of flooding, drought, and susceptibility to the increased potential for infectious diseases as cited above. An individual project, even a very large project, does not in itself generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Global climate change is a cumulative process. A project contributes to this potential impact through its cumulative incremental contribution combined with the emissions of all other sources of greenhouse gases.

## **Legislation**

In 2006, the State Legislature signed AB 32, in 2006, which acknowledged global climate change and charged the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with developing regulations to address global climate change. CARB is mandated to achieve feasible and cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gases by 2020, and to approve an implementation plan no later than January 1, 2009.

There are currently no established thresholds for measuring the significance of a project's cumulative contribution to global climate change. However, individual projects can contribute to greenhouse gas emission reductions by incorporating features that reduce vehicle emissions, and maximize energy-efficiency. The City has existing programs in place that reduce and minimize greenhouse gas emissions:

- City Adopted National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency (2006)
- Solar Electric (PV) Incentive Programs
- Joined California Climate Action Registry (2006)
- Asphalt Recycling
- City adopted "Smart Choices for Roseville's Future: Implementation Strategies to Achieve Blueprint Project Objectives (June 2005)
- Residential Energy Efficiency Programs
- City has installed solar electric generation (PV) on several City Facilities.
- Energy Efficiency Programs for Low Income Residents
- City's Civic Center and Roseville Electric buildings with clean, renewable power by purchasing 100% of their energy use from Green Roseville.
- Commercial Energy Efficiency Programs
- 20% renewable power resources in Roseville Electric's power portfolio.
- Tree Mitigation Ordinance
- Shade Tree Program
- Parking Lot Shade Tree Ordinance
- Roseville Electric goal to reduce energy requirements by 5% by 2012
- Recycling Drop-Offs throughout City
- Alternatively Fueled City Vehicles
- Summer Youth Bus Pass
- Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
- Bicycle Incentive Programs
- City Traffic Signal Head Retrofit from traditional incandescent to LED
- ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) for traffic management

---

<sup>2</sup> Division 25.5 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, Part 1. General Provisions. Section 38501 (a).

- City facilities retrofitted with a HVAC efficiency management program
- Alternatives to Paper at the Library

Since there are no thresholds of significance against which to measure the impacts of the project, the project has been evaluated qualitatively relative to its incremental contribution to the overall issue of global warming. The magnitude of global warming is such that the contributions of the proposed project itself are negligible. It is acknowledged that the project would include sources of greenhouse gas emissions; however, the project also includes mitigating features that are beneficial in terms of minimizing greenhouse gas emissions.

## **CITY OF ROSEVILLE MITGATING POLICIES AND STANDARDS**

---

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines<sup>3</sup> allow the use of previously adopted development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects of future projects, 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 that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the effects (§15183[f]). In March 2003, the City of Roseville adopted findings applicable to the following regulations and ordinances, which include standards and policies that are uniformly applied throughout the City, and will substantially mitigate specified environmental effects of future projects.

- City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 19)
- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch.4.44)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])
- City of Roseville Improvement Standards (Resolution 02-37)
- City of Roseville Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)
- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347)
- Specific 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)
  - West Roseville Specific Plan (Resolution #04-38)

## **INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

---

The initial study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project. Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions, as follows:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

---

<sup>3</sup> California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387.

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.
5. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the impact does not require mitigation or result in a substantial or potentially substantial change of any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.
6. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D).
7. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

**I. Aesthetics**

Would the project:

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

- a-c. The project site does not abut and is not visible from any scenic vista or scenic highway. The project will add six vehicle display areas to an existing Automall which is consistent with the site's land use and zoning designations. The grading and project construction will occur entirely within the Automall's existing footprint on fully developed land. The City's approving authority (Planning Commission) will review the Conditional Use Permit Modification for conformance with City standards and requirements. The project is consistent with and will not result in any new aesthetic impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR.
- d. The vehicle display areas will include display lighting for nighttime display of vehicles; however, the impact will be less than significant since the display areas will be located along the perimeter wall of the Automall, adjacent to arterial and major arterial roadways that are already fully illuminated with street lights along the sidewalks and curbs. Additionally, existing parking and vehicle display areas of the Automall, which are illuminated with overhead parking lot lighting, are adjacent to the new display areas. As part of the review process for the proposed modifications, site lighting is examined for aesthetic concerns as well as off-site affects. A condition of the project approval will be to ensure that light and glare impacts on the adjacent properties are reduced to less than significant levels.



**II. Agricultural Resources**

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-c. No agricultural resources are present on the site. The proposed project would have no impact on agricultural resources.

**III. Air Quality**

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

Would the project:

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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	

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-d. Under the California Clean Air Act, Placer County has been designated a "serious non-attainment" area for ozone and a "non-attainment" area for PM10 (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Under the Federal Clean Air Act, Placer County is designated as severe non-attainment for ozone, and South Placer County is in attainment for the federal PM10 standards. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) is responsible for administration of air quality standards.

The City of Roseville, along with the South Placer County area, is located in the Sacramento Air Quality Maintenance Area (SAQMA). The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), in conjunction with SAQMA air quality management districts, and the California Air Resources Board, developed the SAQMA portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP is required to demonstrate compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments. The U.S. EPA approved the SIP in 1996, and the SAQMA has since been operating under the SIP control measures.

Air quality impacts due to construction projects have been addressed in the Roseville 2020 General Plan EIR (Resolution No. 92-320). The City determined that proposed development would create potentially unmitigatable impacts to air quality and has adopted statements of overriding considerations relative to unavoidable and unmitigatable air quality impacts.

The construction activities associated with the proposed project will impact a small area for a short time, but will result in short-term air quality impacts. CEQA requires that adverse impacts of the proposed project be reduced as much as feasible. The City's Grading Ordinance includes the following General Plan EIR mitigation measures for construction-related air quality impacts, which are applicable to the proposed project:

**Dust Control:** Water all excavated or graded areas sufficiently to prevent excessive dust. Water or cover all material transported to and from the site to prevent excessive dust release. Minimize the total construction area disturbed by clearing, earth moving, or excavation.

**Clean Construction:** Sweep paved streets adjacent to the project site at least once a day to remove silt accumulated from construction activities. Clean construction vehicles before exiting work site. Maintain all construction-related internal combustion engines according to the manufacturer's specifications.

The City has assessed the impacts to air quality of continued development in the City in the General Plan EIR and its cumulative impact analyses. This project is consistent with the findings and statement of overriding considerations adopted by the City for the General Plan. Therefore, with the City's Grading Ordinance air quality control measures incorporated into the project, the air quality impacts of this project would be less than cumulatively considerable.

e. No new odor-producing activities are proposed, other than that associated with equipment exhaust during construction activities. Diesel fuel fumes may be noticeable in the vicinity of the site; however, this is a short-term effect. All equipment must comply with California emissions standards. Therefore, a less than significant impact is expected.

**IV. Biological Resources**

Would the project:

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-f. The subject site, and adjacent properties are fully developed with existing, active commercial uses. The project area is not known, nor has it been observed to contain any rare or endangered plant or animal species, trees, large shrubs, or wetland habitat.

Therefore, no impacts to biologic resources are expected.

**V. Cultural Resources**

Would the project:

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-d. No cultural resources are known to exist on the project site; however, the General Plan Environmental Impact Report contains mitigation measures to reduce impacts to cultural resources should any be found on-site.

Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on cultural resources.

**VI. Geology and Soils**

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as			X	

defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

**Discussion 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) The project site is located in Roseville, which is in Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the South Placer area as a low severity earthquake zone. No active faults are known to exist within the County. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. Therefore, no impact would occur in association with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic related ground failure.
  - 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 are not steep enough to present a hazard during development or upon completion of the project. In addition, during construction, measures would be incorporated to shore slopes and prevent potential earth movement. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are considered 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. The Engineering Department will review the Grading and Improvement Plans for consistency with the City’s improvement standards.
 

Grading activities require a grading permit from the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department. The grading permit will be 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. As conditioned, the project will be consistent with the City Improvement Standards. Therefore, impacts associated with disruption, displacement, compaction and overcovering of soils associated with site preparation are considered less than significant.
  
- c-d. The project site is not located in a sensitive geologic area and does not expose people to potential geologic impacts. 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. 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 insure that all grading and structures would withstand shrink-swell potentials and earthquake activity in this area.
- e. No septic tanks are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, no impact to soils relative to supporting use of septic tanks would occur.

**VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the				

public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-c. The California Health and Safety Code and local City Ordinances regulate the handling, storage, and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials. The California Health and Safety Codes require a Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) for those uses that handle specified quantities of toxic and/or hazardous materials. Also, businesses that handle toxic or hazardous materials are required to complete a Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP). All plans would specify what to do in the event of an accident, and which transportation routes would be used.

During construction activities, there is also the possibility that potentially hazardous materials might be stored or used at the project site. The developer (during construction) is required to comply with all California Health and Safety Codes and local City Ordinances regulating the handling, storage and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials. The California Health and Safety Codes require a Risk Management and Prevention Program (RMPP) for those uses that handle specified quantities of toxic and/or hazardous materials.

However, any potential impacts as a result the of the use or storage of hazardous materials, or the potential soil contamination, are reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the HMMP, business plan requirements, and soil contamination remediation plan.

- d-f. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, nor is it located within two miles of an airport. Therefore, the project will not create a safety hazard to the public, the environment, or people working or residing in the area.
- g. This project is located within an area currently receiving City emergency services. The project will not increase the demand for emergency services beyond that identified in the General Plan EIR, and therefore will have a less than significant impact to the City's Emergency Response or Management Plans.
- h. The project is not located in or adjacent to wildlands area; therefore the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

**VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality**

Would the project:

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

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-f. The site is fully developed; therefore, construction of the proposed project will not result in any substantial water-related impacts. No groundwater withdrawal is proposed, and the proposed project will have no effect on groundwater supplies. The developer is required to receive approval of a grading permit prior to the start of construction. The permit is required to incorporate mitigation measures for dust and water erosion control consistent with the City’s improvement standards. The project grading plan must be conditioned to be consistent with the City improvement standards. Based upon this information, the impacts resulting from this project are considered less than significant.

A grading permit, with associated mitigation measures for dust control, will be required before construction starts. There may be minor amounts of wind and/or water erosion associated with construction of the facility. Standard erosion control measures will be required during construction.

g, h. The project does not include a residential component, and the project site is not within a designated 100-year flood boundary. Therefore, no impact would occur.

i, j. There are no levees or dams in the area of the project site. Seiches and tsunamis are seismically induced large waves of water. Because there are no large bodies of water nearby, the threat of seiche and tsunami is non-existent. Similarly, mudflows are not a concern in Placer County. Therefore, based on the soil types found in Placer County, the proposed project would have no impact relative to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

Based on the information provided above, impacts regarding water/earth are considered less than significant.

**IX. Land Use and Planning**

Would the project:

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



**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-c. The project site has a General Plan land designation of Regional Commercial with a Zoning designation of Planned Development for an Automall/Auto Center. The proposed development project will add additional vehicle display areas to an existing Automall. General Plan states that the Regional Commercial land use category is intended to accommodate larger commercial activities, including automalls. Automalls are also a permitted use type within the Planned Development zoning designation. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans covering the project site. No land use and planning impacts would occur in association with the proposed project.

**X. Mineral Resources**

Would the project:

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-b. The project site is not known to include any mineral resources that would be of local, regional, or statewide importance; therefore, the project is not considered to have any impacts on mineral resources.

**XI. Noise**

Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has				

not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

- a-d. Short term impacts, such as construction activities, could expose nearby tenants/landowners to increased noise levels. These impacts would be temporary and are considered less than significant since construction hours are limited by the City’s Municipal Code to daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8:00a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Saturday, Sunday and holidays).
- 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 or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur related to exposing people to excessive airport related noise levels.

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.

**XII. Population and Housing**

Would the project:

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

- a-c. The proposal is not a housing-related project, does not induce growth and does not displace any existing housing. The project is consistent with the expected impacts identified in the General Plan EIR and will have no impact with regards to population and housing.

**XIII. Public Services**

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

Would the project effect:

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

The subject property is in an area of the City that currently receives city services. The General Plan anticipated commercial development for the site and planned for services accordingly. The project is not residential and is not anticipated to have an impact on school services. All projects are required to pay applicable school impact fees. The project site is fully developed and currently receives fire and other services in an amount that was anticipated by the General Plan. The project will be conditioned to comply with the Uniform Fire and Building Codes used by the City of Roseville to ensure that adequate water pressure is provided on the site, and it is anticipated that fire services to the site will be provided in conformance with City standards. This project is not expected to result in an increase in the types and amounts of services than those originally anticipated for the site, and the impacts upon public services would be considered less than significant.

For these reasons, the impacts to public services are considered less than significant.

**XIV. Recreation**

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

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-b. The proposed project will not generate additional demand for recreation opportunities or impact the recreational facilities in Roseville. Therefore, the project will not significantly impact the existing and planned park facilities.

**XV. Transportation/Traffic**

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street			X	

system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways?			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-g. The project is consistent with what was assumed in the General Plan EIR and the CIP update EIR. No new traffic/circulation impacts are anticipated with the project other than those evaluated within the General Plan.

The project is not in the vicinity of any airports; therefore, it will have no impact on air traffic patterns. The City's Fire Department reviewed the project and determined that the design will provide adequate emergency access. No impact to emergency access would occur as a result of the proposed project. The project has been designed to provide vehicle parking in compliance with the City's parking standards, therefore, impacts to parking are considered less than significant.

Based on the information noted above, potential transportation impacts are considered to be less than significant.

**XVI. Utilities and Service Systems**

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause				X

significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

**Discussion of Checklist Answers:**

a-g. The project site is fully developed with an Automall. The General Plan anticipated the need for services to the site, and the proposed project will not increase the need for said services. All of the noted utility services are available to the site. The utility providers have reviewed the request and determined that adequate capacity is present to service the project without impacting their ability to maintain existing levels of service. The project will not create additional utility need for utility services. Therefore, there is no impact on utility services.

**XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance**

Would the project:

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but			X	

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).				
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

**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 by the 2020 General Plan EIR. The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of any wildlife species nor create adverse effects on human beings.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Vicinity Map/Aerial Photograph (2007)
2. Overall Site Plan
3. Display Platform Grading & Utility Plan (typical)
4. Landscaping Plan (typical)
5. Display Platform Rendering (typical)