

Belvedere Townhomes Project

Addendum to the Downtown Roseville Specific
Plan Environmental Impact Report
(SCH #2007102090, Certified April 6, 2009) Minor Design Review Permit,
Tentative Subdivision Map, and Tree Permit (File #PL20-0050)

August 2020 | ORL-02

Prepared for:

City of Roseville
Development Services Department – Planning Division
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Prepared by:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
11 Natoma Street, Suite 155
Folsom, CA 95630



ADDENDUM TO THE DOWNTOWN ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH # 2007102090, CERTIFIED APRIL 6, 2009) MINOR DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT, TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP, AND TREE PERMIT (FILE # PL20-0050)

Project Title/File Number:	Belvedere Townhomes – Minor Design Review Permit, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Tree Permit (File # PL20-0050)
Project Location:	510 Lincoln Street, 430 Lincoln Street, 502 Lincoln Street, and a portion of 512 Lincoln Street (APNs 011-147-014, 011-147-012, 011-147-003, 011-147-015)
Project Description:	Construction of 18 single-family townhomes on 18 residential lots and one common lot. Approval of Minor Design Review Permit; Approval of Tentative Subdivision Map; and Issuance of Tree Permit.
Project Applicant:	Derrek Lee, Old Roseville LLC
Property Owner:	Old Roseville LLC
Lead Agency Contact:	Charity Gold, Associate Planner

The City of Roseville certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan (DTSP; State Clearinghouse No. 2007102090) on April 6, 2009. The current project applicant, Old Roseville LLC, proposed minor changes to the approved project. Consequently, the proposed Belvedere Townhomes Project (proposed project) has been evaluated in an Initial Study (IS), contained in this Addendum to determine whether those changes would result in any new or more substantial impacts from those identified in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

An Addendum to a previously certified EIR may be prepared for a project if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred (California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines [CEQA] Section 15164). Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, the IS contained in this Addendum has been prepared to demonstrate that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred and that only minor technical changes or additions are necessary in order to deem the certified EIR adequate to describe the impacts of the proposed project. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 also states that an Addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the certified EIR for consideration by the hearing body.

Table of Contents

Project Description	3
Purpose and Scope of Addendum	5
Initial Study Checklist	
I. Aesthetics	9
II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources	12
III. Air Quality	14
IV. Biological Resources	18
V. Cultural Resources	22
VI. Energy	25
VII. Geology and Soils	27
VIII. Greenhouse Gases	30
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	33
X. Hydrology and Water Quality	36
XI. Land Use and Planning	41
XII. Mineral Resources	43
XIII. Noise	45
XIV. Population and Housing	51
XV. Public Services	53
XVI. Recreation	55
XVII. Transportation/Traffic	57
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources	61
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems	63
XX. Wildfire	66
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance	67
Environmental Determination	69
References	70

Attachments:

- Attachment A – Project Figures
- Attachment B – Biological Resources Evaluation
- Attachment C – Arborist Report
- Attachment D – Cultural Resources Assessment
- Attachment E – Architectural History Evaluation
- Attachment F – Noise Impact Assessment
- Attachment G – Traffic Memorandum

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Background

The Belvedere Townhomes Project (proposed project), is located within the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan (DTSP) area which is a 167-acre infill area in the central part of the City of Roseville, in western Placer County, CA (City; 2009 DTSP EIR, p. 1-1). The DTSP area is surrounded by built-out neighborhoods and is bisected by the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) J.R. Davis Rail Yard, resulting in a segment of the Plan area to the northwest and a segment to the southeast of the UPRR facilities. Washington Boulevard passes under the railroad tracks, connecting the segments.

The DTSP area is comprised of the existing Historic Old Town, Vernon Street Civic Core, and Royer and Saugstad Park. The Historic Old Town and Vernon Street Civic Core areas are further subdivided into a total of ten distinct character districts (five for each), and the two parks. Each district incorporates an anticipated look and feel designed to promote the core goals established in the DTSP.

The DTSP was originally approved anticipating 1,020 new residential units and 900,000 square feet of new ground floor retail use on corresponding with 23.96 acres of medium-density and high-density residential, approximately 112.73 acres of commercial, and 36.52 acres of park, and 0.12 acre of right-of-way land uses (2009 DTSP pp. 4-1, 4-4). For detailed project location, background, environmental setting, and project descriptions of the DTSP, refer to Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of the DTSP and Chapters 1 and 3 of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the DTSP. The DTSP was approved by the City on April 6, 2009, and the accompanying EIR was certified at that time (State Clearinghouse No. 2007102090). Information on where to find copies of these documents is included in the Purpose and Scope of Addendum section, below.

Project Location

The proposed project site is an approximately one-acre area in the southeastern portion of the City of Roseville, Placer County, CA, and is in the northeastern portion of the DTSP area. The site is located on the east side of Lincoln Street, near its intersection with Sierra Boulevard, and consists of three parcels, a portion of a fourth, and an easement for site access. The parcels are Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 011-147-014, 011-147-003, and 011-147-012; and a portion of APN 011-147-015, and the addresses are 510 Lincoln Street, 502 Lincoln Street, 430 Lincoln Street, and 512 Lincoln Street, respectively.

The project site is located in Section 34 of Township 11N, Range 6E, as shown on the Roseville, CA 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle map. Refer to Figure 1 for the regional project location and Figure 2 for an aerial image of the project site with the APN boundaries shown (Attachment A).

Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is located within a commercial and residential area of the City, and is surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential development. The site is generally bordered by residential and commercial parcels on the north, south, and west, and by UPRR tracks and an undeveloped parcel to the east. The site partially surrounds the property containing the Moose Association building (i.e., Moose Lodge). The properties directly north and south of the project site are developed with paved parking lots.

A substantial portion of the site is vacant, with roughly seventy percent of the site undeveloped with only a few trees and shrubs; however, APNs 011-147-003 and 011-147-012 are developed with former residential land uses, and a portion of an existing parking lot extends into the northern portion of the site (APNs 011-147-014 and 011-147-015). The structure at APN 011-147-003 is a vacant hotel/apartment building (formerly the Belvedere Hotel), and the structures at 011-147-012 consist of a vacant single-story house (W. Seitz Residence), a shed and a dilapidated building in the backyard. As described in the Architectural History Evaluation, the

PC Exhibit A

Belvedere Hotel “has been dormant since at least the 1990s and has not operated as a hotel for many years, likely since Pearl Manning [the former owner] was alive [1989]” (ECORP Consulting, Inc. [ECORP], 2019a). No information was identified which indicated how long the W. Seitz Residence has been vacant. Both parcels feature trees associated with the residential buildings.

The zoning designation for all four parcels affected by the proposed project is Historic District/Downtown Specific Plan - Old Town Commercial (HD/SA-DT-4) and the General Plan land use designation is Central Business District (CBD). Table 1 summarizes the zoning, General Plan land use, and the actual use of the property for the project site and surrounding areas.

Table 1. Zoning, General Plan Land Use and Property Use			
Location	Zoning	General Plan Land Use	Actual Use of Property
Site	Historic District/Downtown Specific Plan - Old Town Commercial (HD/SA-DT-4)	Central Business District (CBD)	Mostly vacant, parking lot entrance in northern portion, former residential development with structures remaining
North	HD/SA-DT-4	Central Business District (CBD)	Parking lot
South	HD/SA-DT-4	Central Business District (CBD)	Surface parking lot
East	Light Industrial/Downtown Specific Plan - Old Town Commercial Extension (M1/SA-DT-5)	Industrial	UPRR
	HD/SA-DT-4	Central Business District (CBD)	Vacant
West	HD/SA-DT-4	Central Business District (CBD)	Moose Lodge
	RMU/SA-DT-3	Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Residential

Proposed Project

The following elements constitute the proposed project analyzed in this Addendum (see Attachment A, Figure 3 for the site plan).

Approval of Minor Design Review Permit: The proposed project would create one common lot and develop 18 single-family townhomes on 18 residential lots (Tentative Map dated May 2020). No modifications to the site’s land use designations or zoning would be required.

The development would be comprised of six buildings with two or four townhome units in each. Proposed townhomes would be three-stories tall (approximately 46 feet, 10 inches total building height from grade) with garages at ground level. Each unit would have three bedrooms, 3½ bathrooms, two-car garage, covered patio, a second-floor balcony, and rooftop outdoor space. The proposed buildings and their units are:

- Building 1 – Four attached townhouse units
- Building 2 – Two attached townhouse units
- Building 3 – Two attached townhouse units
- Building 4 – Two attached townhouse units
- Building 5 – Four attached townhouse units
- Building 6 – Four attached townhouse units

PC Exhibit A

The common lot, Lot A, would include driveway access from Lincoln Street, a drive aisle compliant with the fire department turning radii, nine guest parking spaces, utilities, drainage, and landscaping. Pedestrian access from Lincoln Street would be provided via two walkways. Site drainage would convey stormwater to four water quality basins located throughout the project site.

Other proposed features include an 8-foot-high concrete masonry soundwall along the eastern boundary of the project site and a 26-foot-wide trash enclosure at the north end of the project site.

A two-hour fire wall separation would be placed between each townhouse, one-hour rating each unit with one-inch air space along the property line. Fire walls would extend from the foundation to the underside of the roof deck. Horizontal continuity of firewalls would be maintained per 2019 California Building Code Section 706.5.

The area of disturbance would be approximately 42,673 square feet (SF). Earthwork would include approximately 1,320 cubic yards (CY) of excavation (including footings and utilities) and 2,385 CY of embankment for a net import of approximately 1,065 CY. The project would also require the demolition of two existing structures: the W. Seitz Residence, located at 430 Lincoln Street and built in 1926 (APN 011-147-012), and the Belvedere Hotel, located at 502 Lincoln Street and built in 1914 (APN 011-147-003).

Approval of Tentative Maps: The proposed project includes a: (1) Tentative Parcel Map to divide existing parcels 011-147-014, 011-147-003, and 011-147-012 into 18 single family lots and Lot A (common lot for ingress/egress, access easement, public utility easement, landscape easement, and drainage easement).

Issuance of Tree Permit: The proposed project includes a request for a Tree Permit, that would allow the removal of two valley oak trees (*Quercus lobata*). This permit would be issued by the City.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

As discussed in the Background Section, an EIR was certified for the DTSP on April 6, 2009. The 2009 DTSP and DTSP EIR are available on the City of Roseville's website at the following web address: <https://www.roseville.ca.us/cms/One.aspx?portalId=7964922&pageId=8775091>.

Basis for Addendum

This Addendum has been prepared pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21166. An Addendum is an appropriate subsequent document to a previously certified EIR when some changes to a project are necessary, but those changes do not create new or increased significant environmental impacts that warrant major revisions to the previous EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a), 15164(a); see *Save Our Heritage Organization v. City of San Diego* (2018) 28 Cal.App.5th 656, 668.) Also, an addendum is appropriate when circumstances surrounding a project have not substantially changed and when no new information of substantial importance has been uncovered that indicates the project would create new significant impacts or increase the severity of the previously identified significant impacts; see discussion immediately below. (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a), 15164(a).) Substantial evidence presented in this Addendum demonstrates that the proposed project does not create any new significant impacts or increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts. Nor are there any new circumstances or new information that would create such impacts or require more robust analysis as discussed in more detail below. (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a).) Therefore, an Addendum is the appropriate CEQA document, and a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not warranted. (Id., Section 15164(e).)

No New Circumstances or New Information

Circumstances surrounding the project area have not substantially changed nor has any new information of substantial importance come to light since certification of the previous EIR, that indicates the current proposed

PC Exhibit A

project would create new significant impacts or increase the severity of existing significant impacts beyond those listed in the 2009 DTSP EIR (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)). No new projects or other development beyond those contemplated in the previously certified EIR have been approved or proposed within the vicinity of the project site that could increase the severity of the proposed project's environmental effects nor is there new information of substantial importance showing that: (i) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found to be infeasible would actually now be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the proposed project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (ii) mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different from those analyzed in the previously certified CEQA documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects, but the proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. Further, the City is not aware of any other new information that might be relevant to the proposed project's CEQA analysis. In summary, there is no evidence on the record, or otherwise reasonably discoverable, indicating that any new circumstances or new information exist that that: (a) would create new significant impacts; (b) substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts; (c) or require additional analysis or verification. As a result, all boxes in the "New Circumstances" and "New Information" columns in the accompanying checklist, below, are marked "No."

Significant and Unavoidable Impact Conclusions in Previous EIRs

The 2009 DTSP EIR identified the following impacts as significant and unavoidable:

- Impact 4.6-2: Transportation and Circulation—Unacceptable p.m. Peak Hour LOS at Signalized Intersections under Cumulative (2020) Plus Project Conditions.
- Impact 4.7-1: Cultural Resources—Disturbance of Architectural Resources.
- Impact 4.10-1: Generation of Short-term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors.
- Impact 4.10-2: Generation of Long-Term Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors.
- Impact 4.10-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.
- Impact 4.11-5: Land Use Compatibility of On-site Sensitive Receptors with Future Railroad Noise Levels.
- Impact 5.4-1: Increases in Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

The analyses within this Addendum rely on the 2009 DTSP EIR and project-specific *Biological Resources Evaluation Letter Report for the Proposed Belvedere Townhomes Project (City of Roseville File # PL20-0050)*, *City of Roseville, Placer County, CA* (HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. [HELIX] 2020a), *Arborist Report for Old Roseville Townhomes Project, City of Roseville, California* (HELIX 2019), *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Belvedere Townhomes Project, City of Roseville, Placer County, California* (HELIX 2020b), *Architectural History Evaluation, The Beverly Hotel, 502 Lincoln Street, Roseville* (ECORP 2019), *Trip Generation and Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis for the Proposed Belvedere* memorandum (LSA Associates, Inc. [LSA] 2020), and *Noise Impact Assessment* (ECORP 2020). These studies are included as Attachments B through G, respectively. Most of the project impacts remain identical to the impacts described in the EIRs because the proposed project is less intensive than the use types envisioned and analyzed for the subject property. The proposed project uses reduce or maintain the same level of potential impacts, as discussed in this Addendum.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR ADDENDUM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the environmental issue categories in terms of any "changed condition" (i.e., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result. A "no" answer does not necessarily mean there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed in prior environmental documents.

PC Exhibit A

2018 CEQA Checklist Update

Since certification of the previous EIR, the Appendix G Checklist in the State CEQA Guidelines has been updated, effective early 2019. Although not required, the updated checklist is included in this Addendum along with the prior version, as part of a good-faith effort to provide the most up-to-date information to decision makers and the public (PRC Section 21002.1(e), 210065; see State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15002(a)(1), 15003(c)). The updated checklist is presented in strike out/underline to clearly show the 2019 changes and they are discussed in the analysis where appropriate. This revised checklist material is not considered “new information” as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3) (See *Citizens Against Airport Pollution v. City of San Jose* (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 788, 808; *Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Assn. of Governments* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 413, 426).

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

Where Impact was Analyzed

This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the prior environmental documents where information and analysis may be found relative to each of the environmental issues.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the current project will result in new significant impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the prior environmental review documents and related approvals, or will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any new Circumstances Involving New Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there have been changes to the project site or the vicinity (circumstances under which the project is undertaken) which have occurred subsequent to the certification of prior environmental documents, which would result in the current project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or that substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any new Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A–D) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified is available requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigation measures remain valid. Either “yes” or “no” will be answered to indicate whether there is new information showing that: (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. If “no,” then no additional environmental documentation (supplemental or subsequent EIR) is required.

Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the prior environmental documents provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigation measures have already been implemented. A “yes” response will be provided in any instance where mitigation was included, regardless of whether the mitigation has been completed at this time. If “none” is indicated, this environmental analysis concludes a significant impact does not occur with this project, no mitigation was previously included, and no mitigation is needed.

PC Exhibit A

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION SECTIONS

Discussion

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category in order to clarify the answers. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the proposed project relates to the issue and the status of any mitigation that may be required or has already been implemented.

Mitigation Measures

Applicable mitigation measures from the prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are listed under each environmental category. Mitigation measures that are included in this section as applicable are ones that require ongoing or future implementation, such as mitigation that is timed to occur prior to issuance of a building permit or during construction. It is noted in the discussion sections below where mitigation measures are either not relevant to the proposed project because they pertain to a different area or land use or have already been implemented.

Conclusions

A discussion of the conclusion relating to the analysis contained in each section.

CHECKLIST

I. Aesthetics

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.5 P. 4.5-9	No	No	No	None
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.5 P. 4.5-9	No	No	No	None
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.5 P. 4.5-9	No	No	No	None
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.5 P. 4.5-10	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.5-3
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
<u>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, W</u> would the project:					
c) <u>In non-urbanized areas, sSubstantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</u>	See a, b, and c above.	No	No	No	None

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following aesthetics impacts:

- Impact 4.5-1 – impacts on scenic vistas (less than significant);
- Impact 4.5-2 – degradation of visual character (less than significant);
- Impact 4.5-3 – impacts from lighting (less than significant with mitigation);

The 2009 DTSP EIR found that impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant because views towards the Sierra Foothills and Sierra Nevada are not generally visible from the DTSP area and views of any scenic resources would not be reduced because development would be similar in nature to existing development in the DTSP area. The 2009 DTSP EIR also found that impacts to visual character would be less than significant because all development projects would occur at currently developed sites with existing urban land uses and would be consistent with design criteria in the DTSP. Impacts from lighting and reflective surfaces were found to be potentially significant; although it found that the potential increase of reflective surfaces and nighttime lighting or glare from redevelopment projects involving development of urban land uses similar in nature to existing urban land uses in Downtown Roseville would not stand out from surrounding areas, the proposed golf course in the DTSP would add substantially high intensity lighting that could be significant. A mitigation measure (MM 4.5-3) was adopted to address light and glare impacts due to golf course lighting and to reduce impacts from lighting to less than significant.

Proposed Project

The property proposed to be developed as a part of the proposed project was also anticipated in the DTSP to be developed in a manner consistent with the proposed project.

Scenic vistas and visual character and quality: The aesthetic setting has not changed considerably since the 2009 DTSP EIR. The City has a design review process in place that requires all new development projects in the DTSP area to be reviewed for its compliance with the design guidelines established by the DTSP. No new significant impacts on scenic vistas or visual character and quality would result.

Scenic resources: No State Scenic Highways, County Scenic Highways, or other scenic resources are within the DTSP area. There would be no new significant impacts on scenic resources, including those on a State Scenic Highway.

Light or glare: The 2009 DTSP EIR identified that the potential increase of reflective surfaces and nighttime lighting from redevelopment projects would be potentially significant, however, the significant impact would be due to high-intensity lighting from nighttime operation of the proposed golf course in the DTSP. MM 4.5-3 was adopted to reduce the associated impacts to a level of less than significant; however, the currently proposed project does not include development of a golf course and MM 4.5-3 does not apply. The proposed project would not result in any new significant impacts associated with light or glare.

The proposed project would not result in aesthetic impacts beyond what was previously analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur to aesthetics as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project; no new measures are warranted.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

II. Agricultural & Forestry Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None
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))?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None
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?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None

2018 CEQA Checklist Update: No updates were made to Agricultural & Forestry Resources.

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR stated that the Notice of Preparation for the DTSP (dated October 17, 2007) identified that implementation of the DTSP would result in “no-impact” or “less than significant impacts” in the areas of agricultural resources; population and housing; recreation; and mineral resources, and, therefore, these topics were not analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. The 2009 DTSP EIR did not address impacts to agriculture and forestry resources because the DTSP area does not include such resources.

Proposed Project

The proposed project would not result in agricultural and forestry resources impacts beyond what was previously analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR because: (1) it will not result in changes to the development footprint of the DTSP beyond what was previously analyzed; and (2) the proposed project site does not contain agricultural or forestry land. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur to agricultural and forestry resources as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

PC Exhibit A

III. Air Quality

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.10 P. 4.10-27 to 4.10-30, 4.10-33, 4.10-34	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-1 and MM 4.10-2
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.10 P. 4.10-27 to 4.10-30, 4.10-33	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-1 and MM 4.10-2
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)?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.10 P. 4.10-27 to 4.10-30, 4.10-33	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-1 and MM 4.10-2
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.10 P. 4.10-33, 4.10-34	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-3
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.10, P. 4.10-34	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-5
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management <u>district</u> or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Deleted but captured by items a and b				

PC Exhibit A

<p>b) e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant 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)?</p>	<p>2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.10 P. 4.10-27 to 4.10-30, 4.10-33, 4.10-34</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-1 and MM 4.10-2</p>
<p>c) d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<p>See item d above</p>				
<p>d) e) Create objectionable Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<p>2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.10, P. 4.10-34</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-5</p>

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following air quality impacts:

- Impact 4.10-1 – generation of short-term construction related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors (significant and unavoidable);
- Impact 4.10-2 – generation of long-term operation-related (regional) emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (significant and unavoidable);
- Impact 4.10-3 – exposure of sensitive receptors to Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emissions (significant and unavoidable);
- Impact 4.10-4 – generation of long-term operation-related (local) mobile-source emissions of carbon monoxide (less than significant);
- Impact 4.10-5 – exposure of sensitive receptors to odors (less than significant).

Mitigation measures were included to reduce all air quality impacts, however, there would still be significant and unavoidable impacts related to reactive organic gases (ROG) and PM10 from construction and ROG, NOX, and PM10 from long-term operations; significant and unavoidable impacts related to fugitive dust and PM10 from grading and trenching activities and construction emissions; and significant unavoidable impacts related to operational emissions. Measures that apply to the proposed project are included below.

Proposed Project

The proposed project would not conflict with the applicable air quality plan. Construction and operation of the proposed project does not conflict with designated land uses as identified in 2009 DTSP EIR. The 2009 DTSP EIR made a determination that air quality impacts related to both the short-term construction impacts and the long-term operation impacts of development in the DTSP were significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. The proposed project does not change the area assumed for development under the DTSP.

PC Exhibit A

The proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The project is consistent with what was assumed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. The 2009 DTSP EIR modeled emissions of construction-related activity, including site grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coating based on standard construction methods and equipment. Emissions for both construction and operations would be consistent with what was previously disclosed and there would be no new or increased impacts. Further, Placer County Air Pollution Control District's (PCAPCD) preliminary screening table (PCAPCD 2020, Table 2-2) indicates the typical size of a project that would generate NO_x operational emissions equal to PCAPCD's threshold of 55 lbs/day. For residential projects, 868 condominium units or 911 apartment units would generate NO_x that would reach the significance threshold. The proposed project, which includes only 18 units, is minor in comparison.

The 2009 DTSP EIR found that implementation of the DTSP would have the potential to result in exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive TAC concentrations associated with off-site locomotive emissions and was considered a significant and unavoidable impact. 2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.10-3 is applicable to the proposed project; amongst other things, the measure calls for homes equipped with filter systems with high Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) for removal of small particles, disclosure to future residents advising them of the proximity to the J.R. Davis Rail Yard and associated health risk impacts.

To note, the proposed project could have less potential for health risk impact based on the following:

- The proposed project site is located over 1,300 feet from the parcel in which the UPRR J.R. Davis Rail Yard is located, which is 300 feet further than the 1,000-foot siting distance guideline provided by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for conducting a Health Risk Assessment for a rail yard. Due to the distance of the project from the rail yard, a project-specific Health Risk Assessment is not warranted.
- Based on results of the Roseville Rail Yard Study (CARB 2004), the estimated cancer risk on the project site from the UPRR J.R. Davis Rail Yard is between 25 and 50 in one million affected individuals. Although PCAPCD does not have a threshold for existing background health risk, the Bay Area Air Quality Monitoring District establishes a cumulative cancer risk threshold of 100 in one million affected individuals. The project site is well below this risk threshold.
- The Mobile Source Air Toxics Protocol Tool by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (2020) indicates the current cancer risk is approximately 16 in one million affected individuals for the portion of the rail yard within Sacramento County, while this same area is within the 100 in one million isopleth shown in Figure 1 of the Roseville Rail Yard Study (CARB 2004). The current Mobile Source Air Toxics Protocol Tool data suggests that the risks have been substantially reduced since the CARB study was released in 2004. Correspondingly, the cancer risk from the UPRR J.R. Davis Rail Yard is likely currently much less than the 25 and 50 in one million affected individuals estimated in 2004.

Further, the proposed project would result in no new or increased impacts as a result of objectionable odors, or other emissions leading to odors. Odors associated with diesel exhaust and ROG from application of asphalt and architectural coatings would be emitted during project construction. The odor of these emissions is objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the project site and therefore should not

be at a level that would affect a substantial number of people. Further, construction activities would be temporary. As a result, impacts associated with temporary odors during construction are not considered significant.

As a residential development, operation of the project would not result in odors affecting a substantial number of people. Solid waste generated by the project would be collected by a contracted waste hauler, ensuring that any odors resulting from on-site waste would be managed and collected in a manner to prevent the proliferation of odors. Operational odor impacts would be less than significant. The proposed project will not generate new or substantially more severe impacts than those previously evaluated in the 2009 DTSP EIR and thus will not exacerbate any onsite odor impacts.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 4.10-1, 4.10-2, 4.10-3, and 4.10-5 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigate potential impacts to air quality.

MM 4.10-1: [Comply with all applicable rules and regulations in accordance with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District]

MM 4.10-2: [Mitigation measures developed by Placer County Air Pollution Control District]

MM 4.10-3: [Mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs]

MM 4.10-5: [Implement MM 4.10-3 to reduce indoor exposure to TACs would also result in reduction in the intensity of offensive odors]

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

IV. Biological Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.9 P. 4.9-17, 4.9-18, 4.9-19	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.9-1 through 4.9-6
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.9-19	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.9-6
b) 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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.9-19	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.9-6
c) 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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.9 P. 4.9-19, 4.9-20	No	No	No	None
d) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.9 P. 4.9-20	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.9-8

PC Exhibit A

e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	None	No	No	No	None
--	------	----	----	----	------

2018 CEQA Checklist Update:

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on <u>state or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act</u> (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	See b above.	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.9-6
--	--------------	----	----	----	------------------------

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following impacts to biological resources:

- Impact 4.9-1 – biological resources – effects on special-status fish species (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.9-2 – biological resources – effects on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetles (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.9-3 – biological resources – effects on raptors and special-status birds (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.9-4 – biological resources – effects on special-status bats (less than significant);
- Impact 4.9-5 – biological resources – effects on Northwestern Pond Turtles (less than significant);
- Impact 4.9-6 – biological resources – impacts to Jurisdictional Waters and Sensitive Natural Communities (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.9-7 – biological resources – wildlife movement corridors (less than significant);
- Impact 4.9-8 – biological resources – impacts to protected trees (less than significant with mitigation).

Mitigation measures were provided to reduce all biological resources impacts to a less than significant level (2009 DTSP EIR, pp. 4.9-20 to 4.9-24.) Measures that apply to the proposed project are included under “Mitigation Measures,” below. Remaining measures are not included because they apply to biological resources not affected by the proposed project.

Proposed Project

No additional or substantially more severe impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project site was evaluated in July 2020 by HELIX biologist and International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist (WE-12922A), Stephanie McLaughlin, M.S. and the results documented in a Biological Resources Evaluation Letter Report (HELIX 2020a; Attachment B). The evaluation included a review of existing publicly

PC Exhibit A

available records for special status species occurrences in the region, and a biological reconnaissance survey conducted on July 21, 2020. An arborist inventory of the site was also conducted in November 2019 (HELIX 2019; Attachment C).

Refer to the reports in Attachments B and C for the methods and results of both evaluations and refer to Figure 4 in Attachment A for habitat types and protected tree locations. The results are summarized here:

Special Status Plant Species: Based on the results of the database review, and biological reconnaissance survey, there is currently no suitable habitat for special-status plant species on the proposed project site and there have been no reported occurrences of special-status plant species on or adjacent to the site in the California Natural Diversity Database. The site is vegetated with ruderal vegetation and has been disturbed. There are no native or naturalized habitats on the project site. Impacts to special status plant species would be less than significant.

Special Status Animal Species: Based on the results of the desktop review and habitats observed in the proposed project site during the biological reconnaissance survey, the project site provides potentially suitable habitat for pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), a California Department of Fish and Wildlife species of special concern, however, this species has a low potential to occur on the site and would only potentially use the site for night roosting (HELIX 2020a; Attachment B). Impacts to the bat would be less than significant. No other special-status animal species were identified as having the potential to occur on or adjacent to the site. The project site also provides potential habitat for migratory birds and other nesting birds (see below).

Migratory Birds and Raptors: The 2009 DTSP EIR identified suitable nesting habitat in the plan area for common bird species within existing vegetation such as trees, shrubs, and ruderal habitats, which occur on the project site. The project site and immediate vicinity provides nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of native birds common to urbanized areas, such as mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), and California scrub jay (*Aphelocoma californica*). Nests were not observed during surveys; however, a variety of migratory birds have the potential to nest in and adjacent to the site, in trees, shrubs and on the ground in vegetation. Implementation of 2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.9-3 regarding preconstruction surveys would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Aquatic Resources: The project site is in the Linda Creek-Cirby Creek hydrologic unit (HUC12: 180201110104). NWI mapping based on 1984 aerial imagery shows no aquatic features on the property. The nearest mapped aquatic feature is Dry Creek, located 0.3 miles south of the project site. No aquatic features were observed on the project site. The proposed project would not affect aquatic habitat or species, including jurisdictional waters, special-status fish, and the Northwestern pond turtle.

Protected Trees: A total of two protected trees were surveyed within the project footprint (see Figure 4). Both trees identified in the survey area were valley oak trees and are both subject to compliance with the City's tree ordinance. Implementation of 2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.9-3 regarding preconstruction surveys would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 4.9-3 to 4.9-8 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigate potential impacts to biological resources.

MM 4.9-3: Raptors and Special-status Birds

MM 4.9-8: Protected Trees

Conclusion: As described above, with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

V. Cultural, Archeological, or Paleontological Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.7, P. 4.7-9, 4.7-10	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.7 -1
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.7, P. 4.7-10	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.7 -2
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	None	No	No	No	None
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.7, P. 4.7-10, 4.7-11	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.7 -3
2018 CEQA Checklist Update: Section title updated to "Cultural Resources."					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource <u>pursuant to as defined</u> in § 15064.5?	See item a above				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	See Geology and Soils discussion				
c) d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	See item d above				

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following impacts to cultural resources:

- Impact 4.7-1 – cultural resources – disturbance of architectural resources (significant and unavoidable);
- Impact 4.7-2 – cultural resources – disturbance of potential subsurface cultural deposits (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.7-3 – cultural resources – undiscovered/unrecorded human remains (less than significant with mitigation).

Mitigation measures were provided to reduce all cultural resources impacts to a less than significant level except for significant and unavoidable impacts related to the possibility of demolishing a historical resource (Id., p. 4.7-12.). Measures that apply to the proposed project are included below.

Proposed Project

A Cultural Resources Assessment (HELIX 2020b; Attachment D) and Architectural History Evaluation (ECORP 2019; Attachment E) were conducted for the proposed project. As part of the Cultural Resources Assessment, a records search, archaeological intensive pedestrian survey, and Native American outreach was conducted. The updated archival records search, Native American outreach, and field survey determined that two historic-era structures, the Belvedere Hotel at 502 Lincoln Street and the W. Seitz Residence at 430 Lincoln Street, are located within the project's cultural resources Area of Potential Effect (APE; see Attachment A, Figure 5, for the APE). Both of these structures have been evaluated for significance and found to be ineligible for individual inclusion in the CRHR (ECORP 2019; City of Roseville 2009). No other cultural resources, including prehistoric or historic-era artifacts or features, are visible on the ground surface within the APE. Given that the area is highly disturbed and has been intensively used since at least the early 1900s, the likelihood of encountering buried historic-era materials during construction is moderate. The lack of known prehistoric sites in the immediate area and that APE's history of recurring ground disturbances suggest that area has a low sensitivity for buried prehistoric materials.

The record search determined that the Roseville Carnegie Library and Museum (P-31-004242) is located at 557 Lincoln Street, approximately 200 feet northwest of the APE. Built in 1912, the Roseville Carnegie Library and Museum is a Classical Revival style on-story building which was listed on the NRHP in 2009. The townhomes that would be constructed by the proposed project are expected to be largely hidden from the Library's viewshed by trees and the Loyal Order of Moose Lodge at 506 Lincoln Street, and therefore would not significantly impact the library's integrity of setting or feeling (HELIX 2020b; Attachment D).

As documented in the Cultural Resources Assessment and the Architectural History Evaluation for the project (Attachments D and E, respectively), both the Belvedere Hotel and the W. Seitz Residence have been shown to be ineligible for inclusion in the CRHR and are not listed in the City's list of significant buildings shown in Section 19.61.030 of the Roseville Municipal Code. Therefore, neither the Belvedere Hotel nor the W. Seitz Residence require additional study, avoidance, or mitigation to resolve impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project. MM 4.7-1 from the 2009 DTSP EIR does not apply to the proposed project.

As also discussed in the 2009 DTSP EIR, construction activities associated with the project such as grubbing, grading, and trenching have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered, buried archaeological resources or human remains, could result in a potentially significant impact without mitigation. Implementation measures as defined in the DTSP would reduce the impact to less than significant and no new mitigation measures are warranted.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 4.7-2 and 4.7-3 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigate potential impacts to cultural resources.

MM 4.7-2: Disturbance of Potential Subsurface Cultural Deposits

MM 4.7-3: Undiscovered/Unrecorded Human Remains

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

VI. Energy

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
2018 CEQA Checklist Update: Energy is a new issue area, although energy analysis was conducted in the previously certified EIRs.					
a) <u>Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</u>	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 - 20	No	No	No	None
b) <u>Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</u>	None	No	No	No	None
<p>Discussion:</p> <p><u>2009 DTSP EIR</u></p> <p>The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the WRSP project would result in the following impacts to energy, as part of its section on public utilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact 4.2-6 – utilities – increased demand for electrical service (less than significant); • Impact 4.2-7 – utilities – increased demand for natural gas (less than significant). <p>No mitigation measures were required to reduce energy impacts because they were already projected at a less than significant level (2009 DTSP EIR, p. 4.2-20 through 4.2-21.)</p> <p><u>Proposed Project</u></p> <p>The project would not result in additional impacts related to energy beyond what was previously analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. Roseville Electric identified sufficient electric generation capacity to serve increased residential and non-residential land use development in the DTSP area and PG&E indicated that no facility upgrades would be needed to accommodate the estimated increase in natural gas demand. Further, as discussed below in Transportation/Traffic, under proposed project conditions there would be no significant impact on in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which supports a likely reduction in transportation fuel use. In addition, pursuant to a recent update to Title 24, Part 6, Building Energy Efficiency Standards for California, after January 1, 2020, all new homes constructed in the State are required to have solar panels installed, which will further reduce</p>					

the proposed project's consumption of mainstream generated electricity and increase reliance on renewable energy sources. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur to energy resources as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

VII. Geology and Soils

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-7, 4.4-8	No	No	No	None
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.)	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-7, 4.4-8	No	No	No	None
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-7, 4.4-8	No	No	No	None
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-8	No	No	No	None
iv) Landslides?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-8, 4.4-9	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.4-3
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-9	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P.4.4-9, 4.4-10	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-10	No	No	No	None

PC Exhibit A

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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-7	No	No	No	None
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
a) Expose people or structures to <u>Directly or indirectly cause</u> potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.4, P. 4.4-7, 4.4-8, 4.4-9, 4.4-10	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.4-3
f) <u>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</u>	None	No	No	No	None

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following impacts to geology and soils:

- Impact 4.4-1 – geology and soils – risks to people and structures caused by seismic hazards, including surface fault rupture and strong ground shaking (less than significant);
- Impact 4.4-2 – geology and soils – seismically induced risks to people and structures caused by liquefaction (less than significant);
- Impact 4.4-3 – geology and soils – seismically induced risks to people and structures caused by landslides (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.4-4 – geology and soils – construction-related erosion hazards (less than significant);
- Impact 4.4-5 – geology and soils – potential for subsidence or compression of unstable soils (less than significant).

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would have less than significant impacts to geology and soils without mitigation and MM 4.4-3 would reduce impacts caused by potential landslides along Dry Creek to a less than significant level (Id., p. 4.4-10 through 4.4-11).

Proposed Project

The proposed project does not change the development footprint previously analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR and it does not change the conclusions of the geotechnical work already completed. No septic or alternative wastewater systems are proposed. Development of the proposed project site will be required to conform to the City’s ordinances and standards regarding grading, including requirements for stormwater quality and erosion controls during and after construction. Further, the project is not along Dry Creek and, therefore, is not subject to MM 4.4-3 which addresses potential impacts associated with landslides along Dry Creek. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur to geology and soils as a result of the proposed project.

PC Exhibit A

Paleontological resources (question f in the State CEQA Guidelines) was added to the Geology and Soils section during the 2018 CEQA checklist update. The proposed project is located within an infill area in Downtown Roseville and it is surrounded by residential and industrial/transportation land uses. Three of the affected project parcels are developed (W. Seitz Residence, Belvedere Hotel, and parking). Based on the level of disturbance at the site and its surroundings, the likelihood of discovering paleontological resources is considered less than significant and no new mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

VIII. Greenhouse Gases

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	2009 DTSP Ch. 4.10 P. 4.10-13, 4.10-14, 4.10-22, 4.10-23, 4.10-24. Ch 5. P. 5-21, 5-22.	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR 5.4-1 through 5.4-2
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	2009 DTSP Ch. 4.10 P. 4.10-24, Ch 5. P. 5-21, 5-22.	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR 5.4-1 through 5.4-2

2018 CEQA Checklist Update: Section title updated to "Greenhouse Gas Emissions."

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR discussed greenhouse gas emissions and initiatives that were being implemented at the time of the release of the EIR. At the time the 2009 DTSP EIR was certified and approved, no air district or other regulatory agency in California, including PCAPCD, had identified a significance threshold for GHG emissions. The EIR discussed the adoption of SB 37 and AB 32, where AB 32's primary objective was to reduce California's contribution to global warming by reducing California's total annual production of GHG emissions. The EIR concluded that if the DTSP "does not conform with the state mandate to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 and the associated increase in the amount of mass emissions is considered to be substantial, then the impact of the [DTSP] would be cumulatively considerable (significant)" (2009 DTSP EIR p. 4.10-27) and that "Implementation of the [DTSP] would result in increased generation of greenhouse gases (GHGs) which can contribute to global climate change" (2009 DTSP EIR p. 5-14)." The DTSP policies and implementation measures included elements that would reduce GHG emissions and noted that the "purpose of the [DTSP] by its very nature (e.g., promotion of the use of alternative modes of transportation and overall

design that creates a compact development pattern that encourages walking, biking, and public transit use, which in turn reduce vehicle trip number and length) would reduce potential consumption of fossil fuel energy, and thereby reduce potential GHG emissions.

The EIR quantified construction and operational GHG emissions resulting from implementation of the DTSP and concluded that the DTSP would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions and this would be a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact of global climate change that would result in a significant impact.

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP would result in the following project-level and cumulative climate change/greenhouse gas impacts:

- Impact 5.4-1 – increases in greenhouse gas emissions (significant).

(I.d. pp. 5-21 through 5-22)

Mitigation measures that apply to the proposed project are included below.

Proposed Project

As noted in the Transportation/Traffic section of this Addendum, the proposed project would not result in substantial new VMT impacts. Overall, GHG emissions from the proposed project would not exceed emissions associated with the land uses approved in 2009 because the approved project's development footprint, energy use, VMTs, or other emission sources that might produce GHGs have not increased. In fact, emissions should be reduced. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur from GHG emissions as a result of the proposed project.

Refer to the section above on Energy and below on Utilities and Service Systems for information on energy and water conservation and reduction requirements that also would reduce GHG emissions.

The proposed project is consistent with land uses contained in the DTSP; therefore, GHG emissions as a result of the project would not be expected to result in a substantial variation of GHG emissions than the land uses analyzed in the specific plan. Additionally, PCAPCD adopted 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent/year (MT CO₂e/year) as the De Minimis level for land use projects (PCAPCD 2016a). The corresponding size of projects at 1,100 MT CO₂e/year is 105 condominium units or 115 apartment units (PCAPCD 2016b). The proposed project, with only 18 proposed units, falls far below these corresponding project sizes and GHG impacts would therefore be at a De Minimis level.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 5.4-1 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigates potential impacts from GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-2: [(Mitigation measures developed by Placer County Air Pollution Control District)]

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1: [Implement Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy, and Water Conservation and Efficiency, Solid Waste Measures, Land Use Measures, Transportation and Motor Vehicles]

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.8 P. 4.8-5, 4.5-6, 4.8-7	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.8-2
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.8 P. 4.8-5, 4.5-6, 4.8-7	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.8-2
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within on-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	None	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.8 P. 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-5, 4.5-6, 4.8-7	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.8-2
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?	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None
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?	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None

PC Exhibit A

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None
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?	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	See item e above				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Deleted but captured by item e and Noise item d				
f) g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	See item g above				
g) h) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, 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?	See item h above				
<p>Discussion:</p> <p><u>2009 DTSP EIR</u></p> <p>The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following impacts to hazards and hazardous materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact 4.8-1 – hazardous materials – use, storage, or handling of hazardous materials (less than significant); • Impact 4.8-2 – hazardous materials – exposure of construction workers, residents, and others to hazardous materials (less than significant with mitigation). 					

Mitigation measures were provided to reduce all hazards and hazardous materials impacts to a less than significant level (2009 DTSP EIR, pp. 4.8-7 to 4.8-8). Measures that apply to the proposed project are included below.

Proposed Project

The proposed project does not involve new development areas or new uses which had not previously be anticipated. None of the project uses are known to use, store, generate, or transport large amounts or unusual types of hazardous materials, and existing regulations are sufficient to address the common materials – such as cleaners- which will be used in the project area. Based on a review of the EnviroStor website (California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2020) the project site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites. The project site is not within an airport land use plan, is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport and it is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airport is Sacramento McClellan Airport, 3028 Peacekeeper Way, McClellan Park, CA, approximately 7 miles to the southwest. The nearest private air strip is Freedom Field, 9500 Baseline Road, Elverta, CA, approximately 9.7 miles to the west. The downtown area has been taken into account in the City's emergency preparedness planning. As discussed in the DTSP, Fire Station #1 located at 401 Oak Street serves the DTSP area. The project is not located adjacent to any wildlands or wildland fire hazard areas; the project is within a Local Responsibility Area according to the 2007 *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA* map by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (2007).

No schools are within 0.25 mile of the site, however, Woodbridge Elementary School, 515 Niles Avenue, Roseville, is 0.30 mile to the northwest. The mitigation measure from the 2009 DTSP EIR address potential exposure and no additional mitigation is needed.

The project does not introduce any new impacts related to this topic, and impacts will remain less than significant. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur from hazards and hazardous materials as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 4.8-2 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigate for potential impacts as a result of hazards and hazardous materials.

MM 4.8-2: Hazardous Materials – Exposure of Construction Workers, Residents, and Others to Hazardous Materials

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-9, 4.12-10, 4.12-11, 4.12-12	No	No	No	None
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)?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-11	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-9, 4.12-10, 4.12-11, 4.12-12	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-13, 4.12-14, 4.12-15	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-5
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-9, 4.12-10, 4.12-11, 4.12-12	No	No	No	None

PC Exhibit A

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-9, 4.12-10, 4.12-11, 4.12-12	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-13, 4.12-14, 4.12-15	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-6
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-13, 4.12-14, 4.12-15	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-6
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-13, 4.12-14, 4.12-15	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-6
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-15	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-7
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
a) <u>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</u>	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-9, 4.12-10, 4.12-11, 4.12-12	No	No	No	None
b) <u>Substantially deplete decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that <u>the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin</u> 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)?</u>	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.12 P. 4.12-11	No	No	No	None

PC Exhibit A

c) <u>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</u>	See item a above	No	No	No	None
i) <u>result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</u>	See item a above	No	No	No	None
ii) <u>substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</u>	See item g, h, and i above	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-6
iii) <u>create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or</u>	See item a above	No	No	No	None
iv) <u>impede or redirect flood flows?</u>	See item g, h, and i above	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-6
d) <u>In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</u>	See item j above	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.12-7
e) <u>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</u>	See item a above, see also discussion below	No	No	No	None
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?	Deleted but captured in item c				
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 runoff?	Deleted but captured in item c				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Deleted but captured in items a and e				

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?~~

Deleted but captured in item d

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following impacts to hydrology and water quality:

- Impact 4.12-1 – hydrology and water quality – short-term degradation of water quality from project-related construction activities (less than significant);
- Impact 4.12-2 – hydrology and water quality – temporary effects on groundwater quality during construction (less than significant);
- Impact 4.12-3 – hydrology and water quality – change in the quantity of groundwater through withdrawals, interception, or loss of recharge capacity (less than significant);
- Impact 4.12-4 – hydrology and water quality – long-term changes in runoff and water quality (less than significant);
- Impact 4.12-5 – hydrology and water quality – expose people or structures to a significant risk of flooding (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.12-6 – hydrology and water quality – proposed project structures within the 100-year flood zone could impeded or redirect flood flows (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.12-7 – hydrology and water quality – inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (less than significant).

Mitigation measures were provided to reduce all hydrology and water quality impacts to a less than significant level (Id., p. 4.12-16). Measures that apply to the proposed project are included below. Remaining measures apply only to the Dry Creek area of the DTSP (see Attachment A, Figure 6, for the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] map), which is not impacted by the proposed project.

Proposed Project

The proposed project would not result in changes to the development footprint or additional impacts related to hydrology and water quality beyond those that were analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

Regarding the new requirement for a project to not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan, a plan does not exist for the project area at this time. The project site is within jurisdiction of the Western Placer Groundwater Sustainability Agency, which has not yet completed its groundwater sustainability plan, due by January 1, 2022. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur to hydrology and water quality as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: The mitigation measure from prior environmental review that applies to the proposed project is included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 4.12 - 5 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigates potential impacts to hydrology and water quality.

MM 4.12-5: Hydrology and Water Quality – Expose People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Flooding.

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measure, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XI. Land Use and Planning

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Physically divide an established community?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.1, P. 4.1-7	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.1, PP. 4.1-8, 4.9-10	No	No	No	None
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.1, P. 4.1-9	No	No	No	None
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
b) Conflict Cause a significant environmental impact due to a 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?	See b above.	No	No	No	None
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Deleted but captured by item b and Biological Resources item f				

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following land use and planning impacts:

- Impact 4.1-1 – land use – potential for division of an existing community (no impact);
- Impact 4.1-2 – land use – conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations (less than significant);
- Impact 4.1-3 – land use – consistency with Habitat Conservation and Natural Community Conservation Plans (no impact).

Proposed Project

The proposed project will not result in new or substantially more severe impacts to land use and planning beyond what was analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. The project does not alter the development footprint of the DTSP and will not physically divide an established community. The proposed project does not conflict with the designated land use (Central Business District) and zoning (Historic District/Downtown Specific Plan – Old Town Commercial). See Attachment A, Figure 7, for a land use map and Figure 8 for zoning. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur to land use as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XII. Mineral Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None
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?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None

2018 CEQA Checklist Update: No updates were made to Mineral Resources

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR stated that the Notice of Preparation for the DTSP (dated October 17, 2007) indicated that implementation of the DTSP would result in “no-impact” or “less than significant impacts” in the areas of agricultural resources; population and housing; recreation; and mineral resources, and, therefore, these topics were not analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. The 2009 DTSP EIR did not address impacts to mineral resources because the DTSP project area did not include such resources.

Proposed Project

The proposed project would not result in any additional agricultural and forestry resources impacts beyond what was previously analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR because: (1) it will not result in changes to the development footprint of the DTSP beyond what was previously analyzed; and (2) the site for the proposed project does not contain mineral resources. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur to agricultural and forestry resources as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XIII. Noise

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.11 PP. 4.11-22, 4.11-24	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-2, MM 4.11-1, MM 4.11-3, MM 4.11-4, MM 4.11-5, MM 4.11-6
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.11 P. 4.11-24, 4.11-25	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-7
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.11 PP. 4.11-22, 4.11-24	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-2, MM 4.11-1, MM 4.11-3, MM 4.11-4, MM 4.11-5, MM 4.11-6
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.11 P. 4.11-16	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-1
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.11, P. 4.11-16	No	No	No	None
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?	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None

PC Exhibit A

2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
a) Exposure of persons to or g <u>Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</u>	See c above.	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-2, MM 4.11-1, MM 4.11-3, MM 4.11-4, MM 4.11-5, MM 4.11-6
b) Exposure of persons to or g <u>Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</u>	See b above.	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-7
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Deleted but captured by item a				
c) d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Deleted but captured by item a				
d) e) <u>For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?</u>	See e above.	No	No	No	None
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?	Deleted but captured by item d				
<p>Discussion:</p> <p><u>2009 DTSP EIR</u></p> <p>The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following noise impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact 4.11-1 – short-term construction-generated noise levels (less than significant; however, mitigation is included); • Impact 4.11-2 – long-term traffic noise levels at existing noise-sensitive receivers (less than significant); • Impact 4.11-3 – long-term operational stationary source noise levels (less than significant with mitigation); • Impact 4.11-4 – land use compatibility of on-site sensitive receptors with future traffic noise levels (less than significant with mitigation); 					

- Impact 4.11-5 – land use compatibility of on-site sensitive receptors with future railroad noise levels (significant and unavoidable);
- Impact 4.11-6 – future interior noise levels at on-site sensitive receptors (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.11-7 – ground-borne noise and vibration levels at sensitive receptors (less than significant with mitigation).

Mitigation measures were identified to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level except for significant and unavoidable impacts related to land use compatibility of on-site sensitive receptors with future railroad noise levels. Measures that apply to the proposed project are included under “Mitigation Measures,” below. Remaining measures are not included because they apply only to noise-related impacts not associated with the proposed project.

Proposed Project

A project-specific Noise Impact Assessment (ECORP 2020; Attachment F) was prepared in accordance with MM 4.11-4 from the 2009 DTSP EIR.

Construction-Generated Noise Levels: As discussed in the Noise Impact Assessment for the proposed project (ECORP 2020; Attachment F), construction of the proposed project is estimated to result in noise levels ranging from 67.1 to 78.1 dBA¹ at the nearest noise-sensitive receptors which are residences located approximately 70 feet west of the project site. The City of Roseville restricts the time that construction can take place but does not promulgate numeric thresholds pertaining to the noise associated with construction. Specifically, Section 9.24.030 of the City’s Municipal Code states that the noise standards shall not apply to noise sources associated with private construction provided such activities take place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday. Additionally, all construction equipment must be fitted with factory-installed muffling devices and all construction equipment must be maintained in good working order. It is typical to regulate construction noise in this manner since construction noise is temporary, short-term, intermittent in nature, and would cease upon completion of construction. Furthermore, the City of Roseville is a developing urban community and construction noise is generally accepted as a reality within the City. Additionally, construction would occur through the project site and would not be concentrated at one location. Therefore, noise generated during construction activities, as long as construction is conducted within the permitted hours, would be in compliance with City noise standards. However, the 2009 DTSP EIR identifies MM 4.11-1 to address short-term construction generated noise levels during construction of projects in the DTSP. This mitigation would apply to the proposed project so that short-term construction generated noise levels remain less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Stationary Source Noise Levels: Potentially significant impacts associated with long-term operational stationary source noise levels identified in the 2009 DTSP EIR would result from development and operation of industrial and commercial/office land uses. The proposed project consists of a residential development and does not include industrial and commercial/office land uses. The associated operational noise impacts would not occur and the associated mitigation measure (MM 4.11-3) would not apply.

¹ dBA = A-weighted sound level which is the sound pressure level in decibels as measured on a sound level meter which measures the sound in a manner similar to the frequency of the human ear. This measurement correlates well with subjective reactions to noise.

PC Exhibit A

The primary operational noise sources associated with the proposed project would be stationary sources. Potential stationary noise sources related to long-term operation of residences on the project site would include mechanical equipment and other typical sources specific to residential neighborhoods such as barking dogs, internal traffic circulation, radios, and people talking. The 2035 General Plan Update includes Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure Levels (refer to Table 4 of the Noise Impact Assessment; ECORP 2020; Attachment F) which identifies the normally acceptable outdoor noise exposure for residences, as those proposed by the project, as 60 dBA CNEL² and conditionally acceptable outdoor noise exposure as 65 – 69 dBA CNEL. According to field noise measurements conducted by ECORP, mechanical heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment generates noise levels less than 45 dBA at 20 feet, which is less than City's noise threshold for protecting residential uses. Urban residential noise, consisting of barking dogs, internal traffic circulation, radios, and people talking, generally registers at 55 to 60 dBA. Per field measurements conducted by ECORP, the ambient recorded noise level on the project site is 62.5 dBA CNEL. Thus, the project would not be expected to generate noise levels that exceed ambient conditions. As stated in Policy N1.5 of the 2035 General Plan, when existing exterior noise is between 60 and 65 dBA, a greater than 3 dB increase in noise is significant. The project is not anticipated to generate noise levels greater than what is currently experienced in the project area. The proposed project places residential uses adjacent to other residential uses. The most basic planning strategy to minimize adverse impacts on new land uses due to noise is to avoid designating certain land uses at locations within the community that would negatively affect noise sensitive land uses. The project site is located on the outskirts of a predominantly residential area. The project is consistent with the types, intensity, and patterns of land use envisioned for the project area, and as previously described, the project is considered compatible with the existing noise environment. Operation of the project would not result in a significant noise-related impact associated with onsite sources.

Land Use Compatibility with Traffic Noise Levels: The proposed project would generate 94 average trips per day (LSA 2020; Attachment G). The Noise Impact Assessment found that the amount of additional traffic from the proposed project would not result in a doubling of traffic on any of the vicinity roadways (doubling of traffic is considered to result in an increase in noise by 3 dB which is barely perceptible by the human ear), and thus the project's contribution to existing traffic noise would not be perceptible (ECORP 2020). Further, the 2035 General Plan Update states that for projects where the existing exterior noise is between 60 and 65 dBA (as previously stated, the existing exterior noise is 62.5 dBA CNEL), an increase in noise levels of 3 dB or greater is a significant impact. The minimal increase in traffic trips as a result of the project would not result in a 3 dB increase in noise levels. The traffic noise levels would not result in a potentially significant impact. The noise study also found that project-generated traffic would not contribute to a significant increase in future cumulative traffic noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant without additional mitigation.

Land Use Compatibility with UPRR Noise Levels: The proposed project is located within the 60 dB L_{dn}³ noise contour as depicted on Figure IX-3 of the 2035 General Plan Update (City of Roseville 2020). The ambient noise level recorded on the project site is 62.5 dBA CNEL, which is 2.5 dB over what is an acceptable exterior noise level for new residences, but within the conditionally acceptable outdoor noise exposure for residences. According to the 2035 General Plan Update, new construction or development should occur within a conditionally acceptable outdoor noise environment only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are

² CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level which is a 24-hour average of acoustic energy of noise with a 5 dBA "weighting" during the hours of 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. and a 10 dBA weighting added to noise during the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively. A 60 dBA 24-hour L_{Eq} would result in a measurement of 66.7 dBA CNEL.

³ L_{eq} = Equivalent Noise Level which is the average acoustic energy of noise for a stated period of time. The L_{eq} of a time-varying noise and that of a steady noise are the same if they deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear during exposure. This scale does not vary regardless of whether the noise occurs during the day or the night.

included in the design. During the 24-hour noise measurement that was taken from November 19 to 20, 2019, the passing of a freight train occurred on four occasions. The level of use of the UPRR is not anticipated to increase in the future; therefore, significant modifications to the existing noise contours documented in the 2035 General Plan Update are not anticipated (City of Roseville 2020).

MM 4.11-4 and MM 4.11-5 from the 2009 DTSP EIR would apply to the project to minimize the exposure of residents to noise levels exceeding City standards. Consistent with the requirements in the 2035 General Plan Update and 2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-5, in order to reduce noise exposure from the railroad, the proposed project design includes an eight-foot-high masonry wall positioned on the eastern boundary of the project site. The placement of such a wall represents the best available exterior noise level reduction measure and masonry barriers are able to reduce noise levels at an affected receiver by 10 to 20 dBA (FHWA 2011). Eight feet is the maximum allowable height allowed for a masonry wall in the City of Roseville, per Section 19.22.030 of the City's Municipal Code (to achieve the most potent noise-reducing effect, a noise enclosure/barrier must extend length-wise and vertically as far as feasibly possible to be most effective). Neither the masonry wall nor the exterior-to-interior noise attenuations would reduce the ambient noise level of 62.5 dBA CNEL at the rooftop patios; however, the project would be required to adhere to the 2019 California Building Standards which require the project be constructed with building envelopes with a minimum Sound Transmission Class 50. Adherence to the code would limit the transmission of sound within the rooftop patio. Although existing noise levels exceed the preliminary residential standard of 60 dBA CNEL at the project site, the project is providing the best available exterior noise level reduction measure feasible, which is consistent with Policy N1.1 of the 2035 General Plan Update. With implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.11-4, and MM 4.11-5 impacts at the project level would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.11-6 applies to noise-sensitive land uses with direct exposure to roadways, parking area, and railways and exterior noise levels greater than 70 dB L_{dn}.⁴ The project site experiences noise levels of 62.5 dBA CNEL which is below the threshold for the measure, and does not apply to the proposed project. However, the exterior-to-interior reduction of newer residential units, such as that proposed by the project, is generally 30 dBA or more. Therefore, the recorded exterior project site noise level of 62.5 dBA CNEL equates to interior noise levels of 32.5 dBA CNEL within the proposed townhomes, which is below the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise threshold presented in Policy N1.2 of the 2035 General Plan Update.

Vibration: Construction on the project site would have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and the operations involved. Ground vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance. The Noise Impact Assessment for the proposed project addressed vibration, with peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet (inches per second) presented in Table 6 of the assessment (ECORP 2020). For comparison purposes, the Caltrans' (2013a) recommended standard of 0.1 inch per second PPV with respect to the prevention of structural damage for fragile buildings is used as a threshold. This is also the level at which vibrations may begin to annoy people in buildings.

Construction activities would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated at the point closest to the nearest structure. Consistent with Federal Transit Authority (FTA) recommendations for calculating construction vibration, construction vibration was measured from the center of the project site (FTA 2018). It is noted that the project site is irregular-shaped in that the proposed buildings would be

⁴ L_{dn} = Day/Night Noise Level which is a 24-hour average of acoustic energy of noise with 10 dBA weighting added to noise during the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively. A 60 dBA 24-hour Leq would result in a measurement of 66.4 dBA L_{dn}.

constructed to the south and east of the existing Moose Lodge building and the project driveway would wrap around the south, east, and north sides of the Moose Lodge, which is the closest structure to the site. The center point of any of these features is located approximately 25 feet away at the nearest location. Based on the vibration levels presented in Table 6 of the Noise Impact Assessment, ground vibration generated by heavy-duty equipment would not be anticipated to exceed approximately 0.089 inch per second PPV at 25 feet. Thus, structures located at 25 feet, even fragile structures, would not be negatively affected. Based on the vibration levels presented in Table 6, ground vibration generated by heavy-duty equipment would not be anticipated to exceed approximately 0.089 inch per second PPV at 25 feet. Thus, structures located at 25 feet, even fragile structures, would not be negatively affected.

In accordance with MM 4.11-7, groundborne vibration from the UPRR on the project was evaluated. Under the proposed project, a residential building would be 60 feet from the UPRR at the nearest point. The City does not establish a numeric threshold for vibration associated with passing trains; however, the greatest groundborne vibration levels at the nearest residence would be 0.17 PPV which is below the Caltrans recommended standard of 0.2 PPV (ECORP 2020).

Airports: The proposed project site is located approximately nine miles southwest of the Sacramento McClellan Airport and is located outside of the boundaries of the McClellan Airport land use plan. Since the site is outside the land use plan boundaries it is beyond the noise contours generated by airport operations. The proposed project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excess airport noise levels.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 4.11-1, MM 4.11-3, MM 4.11-4, MM 4.11-5, MM 4.11-6, and MM 4.11-7 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigate potential impacts from noise. As described above, MM 4.11-3 and MM 4.11-6 do not apply to the proposed project.

MM 4.11-1: Short-Term Construction-Generated Noise Levels

MM 4.11-4: Land Use Compatibility of On-site Sensitive Receptors with Future Traffic Noise Levels

MM 4.11-5: Land Use Compatibility of On-site Sensitive Receptors with Future Railroad Noise Levels

MM 4.11-7: Ground-Borne Noise and Vibration Levels at Sensitive Receptors

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XIV. Population and Housing

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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)?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 6 P. 6-1, 6-2	No	No	No	None
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None
2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
a) Induce substantial <u>unplanned</u> 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)?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 6 P. 6-1, 6-2	No	No	No	None
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing <u>people or</u> housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No analyzed	No	No	No	None
e) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Deleted but captured by item b				

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts. The DTSP promotes an increase in the density and amount of housing in Downtown Roseville and with respect to population and housing, the DTSP provides additional housing but would not induce the need for additional housing outside of Downtown Roseville because the DTSP encourages development of mixed uses, residential, and commercial/office/retail uses in the same area.

Mitigation measures were not required to reduce population and housing impacts to less than significant.

Proposed Project

The project would increase the number of residential units within the DTSP area by 18 units, which would incrementally increase the population of the DTSP. Existing buildings (the W. Seitz Residence and the Belvedere Hotel) at the proposed project site are unoccupied, therefore, no existing housing or populations will be displaced. The proposed project would replace the existing vacant former Belvedere Hotel and W. Seitz Residence, and because no housing will be removed, no replacement housing will need to be constructed. The 2009 DTSP EIR determined that the DTSP would not induce substantial growth outside of the DTSP area. The Public Services and Utilities sections of this Addendum establish that the City possesses adequate capacity to accommodate the additional units. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur from population or to housing as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XV. Public Services

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
<p>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 the public services:</p>					
a) Fire protection?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.3, P. 4.3-7, 4.3-8	No	No	No	None
b) Police protection?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.3, P. 4.3-8	No	No	No	None
c) Schools?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.3, P. 4.3-8, 4.3-9	No	No	No	2009 DTSP MM 4.3-4
d) Parks?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.3, P. 4.3-10, 4.3-11	No	No	No	None
e) Other public facilities?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.3, P. 4.3-10	No	No	No	None
<p>2018 CEQA Checklist Update: No updates were made to Public Services.</p>					
<p>Discussion:</p> <p><u>2009 DTSP EIR</u></p> <p>The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following public services impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact 4.3-1 – public service – increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical facilities, systems, equipment, and services (less than significant); • Impact 4.3-2 – public services – increased demand for fire flow (less than significant); • Impact 4.3-3 – public services – increased demand for law enforcement facilities, services, and equipment (less than significant); 					

- Impact 4.3-4 – increased demand for public school facilities and services (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.3-5 – public services – increased demand for library services (less than significant).

Mitigation measures were provided to reduce all public services impacts to a less than significant level (Id., pp. 4.3-11). Measures that apply to the proposed project are included below.

Proposed Project

The proposed project would result in a minor increase in the amount of public services required due to the increase of 18 residential units in the DTSP area. This minor increase in population does not change the conclusions of the 2009 DTSP EIR because any potential impacts are readily mitigated through the payment of public facility fees that are calculated based on the number of units being constructed. Accordingly, payment of these fees provides funds for any potentially affected public services, so that they may maintain their current level of service. The proposed project is within the DTSP boundary and is consistent with designated land uses and zoning, therefore, there would be no new or substantially more severe impacts to public services as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures from prior environmental review that apply to the proposed project are included below; no new measures are warranted. MM 4.3-4 in the 2009 DTSP EIR mitigate potential impacts to public services.

MM 4.3-4: Increased Demand for Public School Facilities and Services

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XVI. Recreation

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None
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?	Not analyzed per 2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.0 P. 4-1	No	No	No	None

2018 CEQA Checklist Update: No updates were made to Recreation.

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR indicated that implementation of the DTSP would result in “no-impact” or “less than significant impacts” in the areas of agricultural resources; population and housing; recreation; and mineral resources, and, therefore, these topics were not analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. The DTSP requires an overall park land dedication of 28.7 acres. Royer and Saugstad Parks are located in the DTSP area, with a combined area of 36.3 acres. An additional 1.1 acre of park land will be provided at the Town Square Civic Center, for a total of 36.4 acres of park land in the DTSP area.

Proposed Project

The proposed project would not result in any additional recreational resources impacts beyond what was previously discussed in the 2009 DTSP EIR because: (1) it will not result in changes to the development footprint of the DTSP beyond what was previously analyzed; and (2) development of the site was considered in the 2009 DTSP EIR, and the construction of 18 townhomes would not result in a substantial population increase that would result in an increase in use of parks resulting in their deterioration, nor does the project require or result in the construction of new recreational facilities. Furthermore, park requirements are met through existing parks in the DTSP area and residential development in the DTSP area is waived from park dedication or in-lieu fee requirements (Policy 8.2.1). Therefore, no new significant impacts

or substantially more severe impacts would occur to recreation resources as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XVII. Transportation/Traffic

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.6 PP. 4.6-29, 4.6-30, 4.6-31, 4.6-32	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.6-1, MM 4.6-2, MM 4.6-5
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.6 PP. 4.6-29, 4.6-30	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.6-1, MM 4.6-2, MM 4.6-5
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?	None.	No	No	No	None
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature(s) (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.6 P. 4.6-32	No	No	No	None
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.6 P. 4.6-32	No	No	No	None

PC Exhibit A

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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.6-31, 32	No	No	No	None
2018 CEQA Checklist Update: Section title updated to "Transportation."					
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with an applicable program plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? 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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.6 PP. 4.6-29, 4.6-30, 4.6-31, 4.6-32	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 4.6-1, MM 4.6-2, MM 4.6-5
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (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?	None	No	No	No	None
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?	Deleted but captured by Hazards and Hazardous Materials item e				
c) d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	See item d above				
d) -e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	See item e above				

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Deleted but captured by item a

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following transportation impacts:

- Impact 4.6-1 – Transportation and Circulation—Unacceptable Peak Hour LOS at Signalized Intersections under Existing Plus Project Conditions (less than significant);
- Impact 4.6-2 – Transportation and Circulation—Unacceptable p.m. Peak Hour LOS at Signalized Intersections under cumulative (2020) Plus Project Conditions (significant and unavoidable);
- Impact 4.6-3 – Transportation and Circulation—Transit (less than significant);
- Impact 4.6-4 – Transportation and Circulation—Bicycle and Pedestrian (less than significant);
- Impact 4.6-5 – Transportation and Circulation—Parking (less than significant);
- Impact 4.3-6 – Transportation and Circulation—Design (less than significant);
- Impact 4.3-7 – Transportation and Circulation—Emergency Access (less than significant).

Mitigation measures were provided to reduce transportation impacts to a less than significant level except for the significant and unavoidable impacts indicated above (Id., pp. 4.6-33 to 4.6-34).

Proposed Project

The City’s 2035 General Plan Update (City of Roseville 2020) indicates that future projects consistent with the 2035 General Plan Update will not require further VMT analysis, pursuant to the tiering provisions of CEQA. The proposed project is consistent with 2035 General Plan Update designated land uses and zoning.

The City will be adopting a VMT threshold of 12.8 VMT/capita which aligns with SB 375, the MTP/SCS, and the CARB Scoping Plan (CARB 2017). The VMT threshold could be used for analysis of future land use amendments to the 2035 General Plan Update EIR or other projects not within the scope of the 2035 General Plan Update EIR. It also states that quantitative analysis would not be required if it can be demonstrated that a project would generate VMT which is equivalent to or less than what was assumed in the 2035 General Plan Update EIR. This includes infill projects due to shorter trips and reduced vehicle trips.

Additionally, a traffic memorandum, prepared by LSA and dated August 4, 2020 (Attachment G), analyzed the trip generation of the proposed project and VMT. The proposed project would generate 94 average daily trips (ADT), including eight trips (one inbound and seven outbound) in

the a.m. peak hour and nine trips (six inbound and three outbound) in the p.m. peak hour. Because the proposed project would generate fewer than 50 peak-hour trips, a Traffic Impact Study was not required.

To analyze VMT, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (Technical Advisory; OPR 2018) was consulted. The Technical Advisory recommends VMT screening thresholds for smaller projects. The footnote on page 12 of the OPR Technical Advisory states the following:

"Screening Threshold for Small Projects

Many local agencies have developed screening thresholds to indicate when detailed analysis is needed. Absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or general plan, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact."

The OPR Technical Advisory recommends that a project generating 110 ADT or less be screened out of a VMT analysis due to the presumption of a less than significant impact. As previously described, the proposed project would generate 94 ADT. Because the ADT generation of the proposed project is less than the OPR Technical Advisory screening threshold of 110 ADT, the project is presumed to have a less than significant impact.

This is consistent with the 2035 General Plan Update which states that quantitative analysis would not be required if it can be demonstrated that a project would generate VMT which is equivalent to or less than what was assumed in the 2035 General Plan Update EIR. This includes infill projects due to their shorter trips and reduced vehicle trips.

Policy CIRC2.1 of the 2035 General Plan Update identifies the City's minimum Level of Service (LOS) standard of LOS "C." However, Figure III-3 of the Circulation Element of the 2035 General Plan Update identifies the area in which the proposed project is located as a Pedestrian District. Policy CIRC2.4 exempts City Pedestrian Districts from the LOS standard.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project and no new measures are warranted.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
<p>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:</p>					
<p>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)?</p>	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None
<p>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.</p>	Not analyzed	No	No	No	None
<p>2018 CEQA Checklist Update: No updates were made to Tribal Cultural Resources.</p>					
<p>Discussion: 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. This section, which was part of Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (2014) (discussed below), was added to the CEQA Guidelines after the publication of the prior environmental document to which this Addendum is attached, but cultural resources were addressed in that document.</p>					

2009 DTSP EIR

The requirement to analyze impacts on tribal cultural resources was not added to CEQA until January 2015 with the 2014 passage of AB 52. However, the 2009 DTSP EIR analyzed impacts on cultural resources, which include tribal cultural resources.

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following impacts to cultural resources:

- Impact 4.7-1 – cultural resources – disturbance of architectural resources (significant and unavoidable);
- Impact 4.7-2 – cultural resources – disturbance of potential subsurface cultural deposits (less than significant with mitigation);
- Impact 4.7-3 – cultural resources – undiscovered/unrecorded human remains (less than significant with mitigation).

Mitigation measures were provided to reduce all cultural resources impacts to a less than significant level except for significant and unavoidable impacts related to the possibility of demolishing a historical resource (Id., p. 4.7-12.)

Proposed Project

No AB 52 consultation is required for the proposed project, because it does not trigger the preparation of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or EIR (Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1(b)). The proposed project would result in no additional impacts to cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources, beyond what was previously analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. The proposed project would result in no changes in development footprint beyond what was analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts occur to cultural resources as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures from prior environmental review apply to the proposed project, and no new mitigation measures are required.

Refer to applicable measures in V. Cultural Resources discussed above.

Conclusion: As described above and with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 44.2-16, 4.2-17	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-18, 4.2-19	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-20	No	No	No	None
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-16, 4.2-17	No	No	No	None
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?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-18, 4.2-19	No	No	No	None
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-20	No	No	No	None
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-20	No	No	No	None

PC Exhibit A

2018 CEQA Checklist Update:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Deleted but captured by items a and c				
<u>a b) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or stormwater, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</u>	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-16, 4.2-17, 4.2-18, 4.2-19,4.2-20, 4.2-21	No	No	No	None
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?	Deleted but captured by item a				
<u>b d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</u>	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-16, 4.2-17	No	No	No	None
c 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?	See item e above				
<u>d f) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</u>	2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-20	No	No	No	None

<p>e g) Comply with federal, state, and local <u>management and reduction</u> statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	<p>2009 DTSP EIR Ch. 4.2 P. 4.2-20</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>None</p>
--	--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------

Discussion:

2009 DTSP EIR

The 2009 DTSP EIR concluded that the DTSP project would result in the following impacts to public utilities:

- Impact 4.2-1 – public utilities – potable water supply, treatment, and distribution (less than significant);
- Impact 4.2-2 – public utilities – fire flows (less than significant);
- Impact 4.2-3 – public utilities – wastewater treatment and collection (less than significant);
- Impact 4.2-4 – public utilities – stormwater drainage system (less than significant);
- Impact 4.2-5 – utilities – increased demand for solid waste disposal (less than significant);
- Impact 4.2-6 – utilities – increased demand for electrical service (less than significant);
- Impact 4.2-7 – utilities – increased demand for natural gas service (less than significant).

All impacts to public utilities were determined less than significant (Id., p. 4.2-21).

- Impact 11.14 – contribute to cumulative increases in demands for recycled water (less than significant).

Proposed Project

The proposed project would not modify the land use and zoning designations for project parcels, therefore, there would be no new impact to utilities and services systems and no substantial increase in the severity of impacts as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: Prior environmental review determined no mitigation measures were warranted.

Conclusion: As described above, the proposed project would not result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those analyzed in the 2009 DTSP EIR.

XX. Wildfire

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
2018 CEQA Checklist Update: Wildfire is a new issue area.					
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a) <u>Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</u>	Not Applicable				
b) <u>Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</u>	Not Applicable				
c) <u>Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</u>	Not Applicable				
d) <u>Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</u>	Not Applicable				
<p>Discussion: The project site is not within a State Responsibility Area and receives fire protection from the Roseville Fire Department—not CAL FIRE (2009 DTSP EIR, p. 4.3-1, 4.3-2).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: Not applicable.</p> <p>Conclusion: None required.</p>					

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Implemented or Addressing Impacts.
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, threatened or rare species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	2009 DTSP Ch 5 P. 5-11, 5-12	No	No	No	None
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.)	2009 DTSP Ch 5 P. 5-6, 5-25	No	No	No	2009 DTSP EIR MM 5.4-1
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	None	No	No	No	None

2018 CEQA Checklist Update:	
a) Does the project have the potential to <u>substantially</u> 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, <u>substantially</u> 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?	See item a above
<p>Discussion: The previously certified DTSP EIR and this Addendum disclose all potential environmental impacts, their level of significance, mitigation measures to reduce significance, and the various components of the proposed project. Analyses in Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils (specifically, analysis of paleontological impacts), and Tribal Cultural Resources demonstrate that the proposed project does not result in any new significant impacts or any substantial increases in the severity of previously-identified significant impacts to the environment, habitat or population of a fish or wildlife species, plant, or animal community, rare or endangered plant or animal, or artifacts of history or prehistory. Likewise, analysis in Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems demonstrates that the proposed project does not result in any new significant impacts or any substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant impacts to human beings, either directly or indirectly.</p> <p>Similarly, the proposed project does not result in any new or substantially more severe significant cumulative impacts than those that were addressed in the previously certified EIR. The 2009 DTSP EIR evaluated the potential for cumulative impacts in Section 5.0. The EIR provided the most up-to-date cumulative scenarios at the time of its preparation. As discussed above in the <i>Purpose and Scope of Addendum</i> section, subsection <i>No New Circumstances or New Information</i>, there are no approved or planned projects within the vicinity of the project site beyond those discussed in prior documents that could impact or increase the proposed project’s environmental effects. The proposed project is consistent with the level of development assumed in the 2009 DTSP EIR and, as discussed above, would not result in any new or substantially more severe project-level impacts beyond those previously contemplated. Thereby, the proposed project also would not result in any substantially new or more severe cumulative impacts. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subdivision (a), the City finds that “none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred” relative to the mandatory findings.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: See measures listed under each issue area for those applicable to the proposed project.</p> <p>Conclusion: With implementation of applicable mitigation measures discussed throughout this checklist, the proposed project would not, as compared to the originally proposed and revised projects presented in the 200 DTSP EIR, result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than significant impacts to the areas included in the mandatory findings of significance categories.</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

Based on analysis conducted in this Addendum and in the previously certified EIR, it is determined that implementation of proposed project modifications, as described in this Addendum, would not result in any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, either directly or as a result of new circumstances or information. The City may take the following actions in compliance with CEQA:

- Approve the minor design review permit
- Approve the tentative maps
- Issue the Tree Permit

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 findings of CEQA Section 15162 concerning the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR and the findings of CEQA Section 15164 concerning the decision to prepare an Addendum can be made. As supported by substantial evidence within the Addendum to the DOWNTOWN ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH # 2007102090, certified April 6, 2009), the Lead Agency makes the following findings:

[X] No substantial changes are proposed in the project which would require major revisions of the previous EIR.

[X] No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken.

[X] There is no new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of due diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete.

Addendum Prepared by:

Charity Gold, Associate Planner
City of Roseville, Development Services–Planning Division

REFERENCES

- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Available online: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan>.
2004. Roseville Rail Yard Study. Available online: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/diesel/documents/rrstudy.htm>.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2007. *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA*. Map. Available online: https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6501/fhszs_map31.jpg. Accessed July 29, 2020.
- California Department of Toxic Control. 2020. Envirostor. Available online: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search/>. Accessed July 29, 2020.
- City of Roseville. 2009. *Downtown Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report*. Available at: https://www.roseville.ca.us/government/departments/development_services/planning/specific_plans_planning_areas/downtown_specific_plan. Accessed July 29, 2020.
2020. *2035 General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report*. May 2020. Available at: https://www.roseville.ca.us/government/departments/development_services/planning/general_plan_devlopment_guidelines. Accessed July 29, 2020.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc (ECORP). 2020. *Noise Impact Assessment, The Belvedere Townhomes Project, Roseville, California*. August 2020.
2019. *Architectural History Evaluation, The Belvedere Hotel, 502 Lincoln Street, Roseville, California*. October 2019.
- FHWA. 2011. *Effective Noise Control During Nighttime Construction*. Available online: http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/wz/workshops/accessible/schexnayder_paper.htm.
- HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. 2020a. *Biological Resources Evaluation Letter Report for the Proposed Belvedere Townhomes Project (City of Roseville File # PL20-0050), City of Roseville, Placer County, CA*. July 29, 2020
- 2020b. *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Belvedere Townhomes Project, City of Roseville, Placer County, California*. July 29, 2020.
2019. *Arborist Report for Old Roseville Townhomes Project, City of Roseville, California*. December 6, 2019.
- LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) 2020. *Trip Generation and Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis for the Proposed Belvedere*. August 4, 2020.
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluation Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. Available online: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf. Accessed July 29, 2020.
- Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). 2020a (accessed). *Chapter 2: Thresholds of Significance*. Available online: <https://www.placerair.org/DocumentCenter/View/2047/Chapter-2-Thresholds-of-Significance-PDF>. Accessed July 29, 2020.

PC Exhibit A

Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). 2016a. Placer County APCD Policy, Review of Land Use Projects Under CEQA. Available online: <https://www.placerair.org/DocumentCenter/View/2060/Review-of-Land-Use-Projects-Under-CEQA-Policy-PDF>. Accessed August 3, 2020.

Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). 2016b. Placer County Air Pollution Control District, California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance Justification Report, Appendix D – Corresponding Project Size for Proposed GHG Bright-line Cap Threshold and De Minimis Level. Available online: <https://www.placerair.org/DocumentCenter/View/2059/Appendix-D---Corresponding-Project-Size-for-Proposed-GHG-Bright-line-Cap-Threshold-and-De-Minimis-Level-PDF>. Accessed August 3, 2020.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020. Mobile Sour Air Toxics Protocol Tool. Available online: <http://sacramentorisk.azurewebsites.net/>. Accessed July 29, 2020.