

## CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

---

### 4.0 INTRODUCTION

#### 4.0.1 Scope of the EIR Analysis

This chapter of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) discusses the environmental and regulatory setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for each of the following technical issue areas (Sections 4.1 through 4.12):

- 4.1 Aesthetics
- 4.2 Air Quality
- 4.3 Biological Resources
- 4.4 Climate Change
- 4.5 Cultural Resources
- 4.6 Land Use and Planning
- 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality
- 4.9 Noise
- 4.10 Public Services
- 4.11 Public Utilities
- 4.12 Transportation and Circulation.

#### 4.0.2 Environmental Setting

According to subdivision (a) of Section 15125 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, an EIR must include a description of the existing physical environmental condition in the vicinity of the project as they exist at the time when the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published. This “environmental setting” will normally constitute the “baseline condition” against which project-related impacts are compared. Therefore, the baseline conditions for this EIR, unless noted otherwise, are based on conditions that existed in March 2013, when the NOP was published. The CEQA Guidelines recognize that the data for establishing an environmental baseline cannot be rigid. Because physical environmental conditions may vary over a range of time, the use of environmental baselines that differ from the date of the NOP is reasonable and appropriate in certain circumstances when doing so results in a more accurate or conservative environmental analysis.

In *Pfeiffer v. City of Sunnyvale* (2011) 200 Cal.App.4th 1552, 1569-1574 (*Pfeiffer*), a California Appellate Court specifically addressed baseline issues. Citing CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, subdivision (a), and following the California Supreme Court’s interpretation of the guideline in *Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management District* (2010)

48 Cal.App.4th 310 (“*CBE*”), the Court of Appeal held that the traffic analysis in an EIR for a hospital expansion did not use an improper baseline where that baseline reflected both existing traffic and anticipated increases in traffic predicted by the city’s traffic model. Although the EIR included information on existing traffic based on traffic counts obtained in 2007, the baseline was augmented to also reflect “background” traffic conditions, which applied a growth factor from the respondent city’s traffic model to existing conditions, and added trips from other approved projects in the area. According to the court, the city had discretion to take this approach in determining baseline traffic conditions, noting that “the California Supreme Court has instructed that *predicted conditions* may serve as an adequate baseline where environmental conditions vary. “[T]he date for establishing baseline cannot be a rigid one. Environmental conditions may vary from year to year and in some cases it is necessary to consider conditions over a range of time periods.”” (*Id.*, quoting *CBE, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at pp. 327-328 [italics added].) The *Pfeiffer* court added, again quoting the Supreme Court in *CBE*, that “[n]either CEQA nor the CEQA Guidelines mandate a uniform, inflexible rule for determination of the existing conditions baseline. Rather, an agency enjoys considerable discretion to decide, in the first instance, exactly how the existing physical conditions without the project can most realistically be measured[.]” (*Pfeiffer, supra*, 200 Cal.App.4th at p. 1570.)

For analytical purposes, impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Life Time Fitness Project (proposed project) are compared against two different baselines: first, project-specific effects are assessed against existing conditions at the time the NOP was first published; and second, cumulative effects are assessed against future, or “cumulative,” conditions, generally defined as buildout of the City of Roseville General Plan. Existing conditions and the cumulative baseline can differ by issue area. Each technical section defines the existing conditions and cumulative baseline for the impacts being analyzed.

In determining the level of significance of environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, the analysis in this EIR assumes that the proposed project would comply with relevant federal and state laws and regulations, City General Plan policies, ordinances, and other adopted City documents, unless otherwise noted. Therefore, such mandatory policies, ordinances, and standards are not identified as mitigation measures, but rather are discussed as part of the “Regulatory Setting” governing the proposed project.

### 4.0.3 Section Format

Each section begins with a description of the project’s **environmental setting** and **regulatory setting** as it pertains to a particular issue.

The regulatory setting provides a summary of applicable federal, state, and local regulations, plans, policies, and laws that are relevant to each issue area. The regulatory setting description in

each section is followed by a discussion of project-level **impacts**. The project-specific impacts discussion is followed by an analysis of the **cumulative impacts** of the project. This section addresses what the project’s incremental contribution to cumulatively significant impacts would be and identifies mitigation measures if required. The impact portion of each section includes an impact table or box, prefaced by a number for ease of identification that includes an impact statement followed by a list of applicable policies or regulations. An explanation of each impact and an analysis of its significance follow each impact statement. All **mitigation measures** are identified at the end of each section. The degree to which the identified mitigation measure(s) would reduce the impact is also described. Compliance with applicable laws, policies, and City regulations is assumed and will be identified in the impact analysis. In many cases, compliance with applicable laws, policies, or regulations would reduce the significance of an impact.

An example of an impact statement is shown below.

Impact 4.1-1	Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollution Concentrations
Applicable Policies and Regulations	None applicable
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than significant
Mitigation Measures	None required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than significant

A discussion of potential impacts of the proposed project is presented in paragraph form. The project-specific impacts associated with construction and operation of the project are evaluated and compared to the threshold of significance for the particular impact. The analysis discusses the applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations that would reduce impacts, and assumes that the project would comply with applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations, and that the project applicant would obtain all necessary permits and comply with all required conditions of those permits. In many instances, the actions that are necessary to reduce a project impact are already required by existing laws or requirements. The impact analysis concludes with a determination of the impact’s significance in **bold type** (e.g., **significant impact/significant and unavoidable impact/potentially significant impact/less-than-significant impact/results in no impact**).

#### 4.0.4 Cumulative Analysis

An analysis of cumulative impacts follows the evaluation of project impacts under existing conditions in each section in Chapter 4. As defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355, cumulative impacts refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The

cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project together with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects causing related impacts. An introductory statement that defines the cumulative analysis methodology and the cumulative context being analyzed for respective sections (e.g., buildout of the City’s General Plan, development within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin) is included under the “Cumulative Analysis” discussion. In some instances, a project-specific impact may be considered less than significant, but would be considered potentially significant in combination with other development within the surrounding area. Or, in some instances, a potentially significant impact could result on a project level, but would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact. The cumulative impacts analysis is presented in the same format as the impacts section, shown above.

#### 4.0.5 Mitigation Measures

At the end of each section is a discussion of the applicable mitigation measures identified to reduce the significance of an impact.

In Chapter 4, this section includes a statement indicating whether the mitigation measure will reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**. As noted earlier, none of the impacts of the proposed project will remain **significant and unavoidable** due to the absence of any available mitigation that could reduce the impact below the applicable threshold. A discussion of how the mitigation would reduce the impact is included before the mitigation measure.

Mitigation measures, if applicable, are numbered and presented in the following format.

**4.X-X:** Statement of what, if any, mitigation measures are required.

Note that CEQA Guidelines, Section 15370, defines mitigation as:

- Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of magnitude of the action and its implementation;
- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and
- Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

In addition, provided there is a “reasonable plan for mitigation” and contributions are “sufficiently tied to the actual mitigation” of the project’s impacts, a commitment to contribute a fair share to such a program discharges an agency’s mitigation duty under CEQA (*Save Our Peninsula Com. v. Monterey County Bd. of Supervisors*, (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 99, 141); see also CEQA Guidelines,

Section 15130, subd. (a)(3) ([recognizing that a project’s contribution to a cumulative impact may be less than cumulatively considerable where “the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact”]). See also *Anderson First Coalition v. City of Anderson*, (2005) 130 Cal.App.4th 1173).

#### 4.0.6 Terminology Used in the EIR

This Draft EIR uses the following terminology to describe environmental effects of the proposed project:

- **Standards of Significance:** A set of criteria used by the lead agency to determine at what level or “threshold” an impact would be considered significant. Standards of significance used in this EIR include those set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance) and those derived from questions set forth in Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines; criteria based on regulatory standards of local, state, and federal agencies; and criteria based on goals and policies identified in the *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*. In fashioning criteria based on these sources, City staff have also relied on their own professional judgment and experience in some instances. In determining the level of significance, the analysis assumes that the proposed project would comply with relevant federal, state, and local regulations and ordinances.
- **Less-than-Significant Impact:** A project impact is considered less than significant when it does not reach the standard of significance, indicating that there would be no substantial change in the environment. No mitigation is required for less-than-significant impacts.
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** A potentially significant impact is an environmental effect that could cause a substantial adverse change in the environment; however, additional information is needed regarding the extent of the impact to make the determination of significance. For CEQA purposes, a potentially significant impact is treated as if it were a significant impact.
- **Significant Impact:** A project impact is considered significant if it results in a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment. Significant impacts are identified by the evaluation of project effects in the context of specified significance criteria. When available, potentially feasible mitigation measures and/or project alternatives are identified to reduce these effects to the environment.
- **Cumulative Impacts:** According to CEQA, “cumulative impacts refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355). CEQA requires that cumulative impacts be discussed when the “project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (a)).

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK