EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to analyze and disclose the effects of the development of approximately 1,612 acres (652 hectares) in western Roseville under the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP). Development under the proposed SVSP, if authorized, would fill approximately 24.81 acres (10.04 hectares) of wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the United States. This discharge of fill material requires approval pursuant to Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act, under which the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) issues or denies Department of the Army (DA) permits for activities involving a discharge of dredged or fill materials into the waters of the United States, including wetlands. The project proponents/applicants are seeking DA permits from the USACE under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC §1344).

The USACE's general regulatory policies and approach are defined in 33 CFR Parts 320-325 and 332. In its regulatory capacity, the USACE is neither a proponent nor an opponent of projects seeking federal approvals; rather, as identified in 33 CFR § 320.1[a][1], USACE conducts a "public interest review" that seeks to balance a proposed action's favorable impacts against its detrimental impacts. Additionally, as identified in 33 CFR §325.2[a][6], the USACE is also required to review actions in accordance with guidelines developed by the USEPA under Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act (33 USC §1344(b)(1)) [hereinafter "404(b)(1) Guidelines"]. The USACE's permit review and decision making triggers a requirement for environmental review under NEPA. The USACE has determined that the DA permit decision for the proposed SVSP constitutes a "major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment," requiring the preparation of an EIS.

The USACE's permit action under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act is the proposed federal action analyzed in this EIS. As SVSP implementation is a reasonably foreseeable outcome of federal permit approval, this EIS analyzes the environmental effects of full buildout of the project site under the SVSP, and for brevity, the SVSP as proposed by the applicants is referred to as the Proposed Action throughout this EIS. The USACE is the federal lead agency under NEPA for the Proposed Action.

PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located northwest of the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road in the western portion of the City of Roseville.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The USACE has determined that the project purpose for the Proposed Action is to implement a large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density master-planned community in western Placer County.

The Proposed Action is proposed as a "mixed-use" community that comprises a range of housing types and residential densities in order to serve the diverse housing needs of the region and includes not only residential but also commercial uses, public and quasi-public uses, parks, and open space. The residential component of the project is proposed to help meet the foreseeable regional housing demand based on

Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG's) projections that the region will add approximately 2 million people by 2050. Commercial uses included in the Proposed Action would provide employment in the project area and ensure that the local jurisdiction will collect sufficient tax revenue from the proposed community to provide necessary public services. Under the Proposed Action, in addition to neighborhood-serving retail (grocery stores, drug stores, etc.) and business professional commercial uses, up to two power centers would be developed. The project is proposed in western Placer County, which is generally defined as the portion of Placer County west of Interstate 80 and Highway 65.

The mix of land uses and the densities and intensities of the SVSP are also consistent with SACOG's "Preferred Blueprint Scenario," which advocates densities and intensities higher than those traditionally seen in the Sacramento region as a means of reducing the severity of long-term environmental impacts. By making a more efficient use of land and facilitating pedestrian travel, bicycle use, and transit use, the combination of mixed uses and more compact development patterns would likely reduce per capita resource consumption (e.g., land, water, electricity, vehicle fuel, energy) and per capita pollution generation (e.g., traditional air pollutants and greenhouse gases).

PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action would implement the SVSP, which is a proposed specific plan project that includes development of the 1,612-acre (652-hectare) site with a mix of land uses. All of the alternatives evaluated in this EIS would also develop a similar large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density, master-planned community either on the project site or on an alternative site (Alternative 4) near the project site.

The master-planned community would include a variety of residential uses, commercial and office uses, public/quasi-public uses (such as schools), parks, open space, and major roadways, paseos, and landscape corridors. **Table ES-1, Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use and Potential Waters of the US Impacts,** presents the key attributes of the Proposed Action and the on- and off-site alternatives and the potential impacts to the waters of the US anticipated to result from the development of the Proposed Action and alternatives.

In addition to on-site development, off-site infrastructure improvements included in the Proposed Action and all on-site alternatives comprise: widening of Baseline Road; extension of Westbrook Boulevard; improvements at the Fiddyment Road/Baseline Road intersection and at the Baseline Road/Watt Avenue intersection; a recycled water storage tank and a recycled water line in Westbrook Boulevard from the Pleasant Grove Boulevard to project's northern boundary; and two water lines conveying potable and recycled water in Westbrook Boulevard from Pleasant Grove Boulevard to the project's northern boundary.

Off-site infrastructure improvements associated with Alternative 4 include water, sewer, and recycled water pipelines. A water main connecting to the City of Roseville water distribution system would be constructed from the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road west along Baseline Road to the alternative site. A sewer force main and a recycled water line would be constructed from the alternative site in a northerly and then an easterly direction to the Pleasant Grove wastewater treatment plant.

Table ES-1
Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use and Potential Waters of the US Impacts

Alternative	Development Footprint	Residential Acreage	Residential Units at Buildout	Other Development Acreage	Open Space Acreage	Potential Impacts to the Waters of the US
Proposed Action	1,370	820	6,650	216 – commercial and office 61 – public/quasi-public 91 – parks 14 – paseos	257	24.81
Alternative 1: Reduced Footprint/ Increased Density	1,027	593	6,655	158 – commercial and office 60 – public/quasi-public 52 – parks 12 – paseos	599	8.66
Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint/Same Density	1,027	600	4,931	159 – commercial and office 60 – public/quasi-public 41 – parks 12.3 – paseos	599	8.66
Alternative 3: Focused Avoidance	1,150	698	5,346	139 – commercial and office 63 – public/quasi-public 81 – parks 13 – paseos	476	14.88
Alternative 4: Southwest Site (2,389 acres)	1,435	875	5,595	138 – commercial and office 75 – public and quasi-public 90 – parks 22 – paseos	954	24[1]
Alternative 5: No Action	771	710	5,040	122 – commercial and office 67 – public and quasi-public 77 – parks 16 – paseos	492	0.0

[1] *This alternative will likely result in additional wetland impacts associated with off-site infrastructure improvements. The exact acreage of off-site impacts cannot be determined at this time.*

Major Conclusions of the Environmental Analysis

Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

The environmental effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives, and mitigation measures to reduce those effects, are summarized in **Table ES-2, Summary of Effects for Major Topics**. This table lists only the significant effects of the Proposed Action or the alternatives. **Chapter 3.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences,** of the EIS includes a discussion of all potential effects, including effects that would be less than significant and would not require mitigation. The basis of the impact conclusions summarized in the table consists of regulatory thresholds for those resource topics for which such thresholds exist, and qualitative thresholds for other resource topics. The significance thresholds are described for each topic in **Chapter 3.0**

Significant Effects That Cannot Be Mitigated

The Proposed Action and alternatives would have several significant effects that cannot be mitigated, as described below.

Aesthetics

The visual resource analysis in this EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed development in terms of loss of scenic views, alterations to the visual character of the area, and the introduction of substantial new sources of light and glare. The project site is characterized by gently rolling topography and large, open annual grassland areas. Views of the project site, the Sierra foothills and the Sierra Nevada are available from the roadways that border the site, including Fiddyment Road to the east and Baseline Road to the south.

With the implementation of the Proposed Action, No Action Alternative, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, the project site would be developed with a variety of urban uses and views of open rangeland and the foothills and Sierra Nevada would no longer be available from Baseline and Fiddyment Roads. In addition to loss of views, the conversion of undeveloped rangeland to urban development under all of these alternatives would alter the visual character of the site and all of the on-site alternatives would add substantial new sources of light and glare on the project site.

Similar effects on scenic vistas, visual character, and light and glare would occur with the implementation of Alternative 4 which is also characterized by flat to rolling topography and comprises rice fields, annual grassland, pasture, and some dispersed rural residences, and is visible primarily from Baseline Road.

No feasible mitigation is available to address these visual effects of the Proposed Action and the alternatives on scenic vistas and visual character of the project area. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate the light and glare effect but not to a less than significant level.

Agricultural Resources

The agricultural resource assessment evaluates the potential for the Proposed Action or the alternatives to directly or indirectly convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Only Alternative 4 would result in

a significant impact related to the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses because the site contains higher quality soils and some portions of the site are currently under rice production. The conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use on the alternative site would be a significant effect. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Air Quality

The air quality assessment addresses the effects of the construction- and operation-related emissions of the Proposed Action and alternatives on the regional and local air quality.

The US EPA and CARB designate air basins or portions of air basins as being in "attainment" or "nonattainment" for each of the criteria pollutants. Nonattainment areas are ranked (marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme) according to the degree of nonattainment. The Placer County portion of Sacramento Valley Air Basin is designated nonattainment for ozone, particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less (PM10), and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or less (PM2.5).

Construction associated with the Proposed Action and all alternatives would result in emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxide (NOx) which are ozone precursors and PM10 emissions. While the maximum emissions of the Proposed Action and Alternative 4 would generally be comparable, emissions associated with the other on-site alternatives would be lower. The construction emissions under the Proposed Action and all alternatives would however exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) significance thresholds. Therefore, the Proposed Action and all alternatives would have a short-term significant effect on air quality in the air basin. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Operational emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10 from buildout of the Proposed Action and all alternatives are also estimated to exceed PCAPCD significance thresholds for these pollutants, and would have a long-term significant effect on air quality in the air basin. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Climate Change

The evaluation of climate change effects in this EIS presents the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Action and all alternatives. Construction emissions of greenhouse gasses (GHGs) associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives would be significant. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Similarly, the operational GHG emissions for the Proposed Action and all alternatives would be significant. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Land Use

The land use assessment addresses the potential for the Proposed Action or an alternative to conflict with adopted local plans. The project site is located in the City of Roseville and the Alternative 4 site is located

in unincorporated Placer County. The applicable plans are the City of Roseville General Plan, Placer County General Plan, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint plan.

Implementation of the Proposed Action and Alternative 2 and 3 would not result in any conflicts with local plans. However, Alternative 1 would result in higher land use densities than those designated for the project site on the City of Roseville General Plan 2025 Land Use Map, and therefore would conflict with the City's General Plan. This conflict is a significant effect. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect. The No Action Alternative would conflict with the SACOG Blueprint plan due to its lower provision of housing units and its non-contiguous pattern of development. This conflict is a significant effect. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect.

Alternative 4 would conflict with both the Placer County General Plan and the SACOG Blueprint plan as the alternative site has not been considered for development under either plan, is not contiguous to existing development, and would require the extension of services. This conflict is a significant effect. No feasible mitigation is available to make the alternative consistent with these plans.

Noise

The noise analysis in this EIS addresses the potential for noise from construction and operational sources such as automobile traffic and area sources to substantially increase ambient noise levels so as to adversely affect noise sensitive receptors. Motor vehicle traffic is a major contributor to the existing noise environment in the vicinity of the project site along Baseline Road and Fiddyment Road. Ambient noise levels range from about 49 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) day-night average noise level (Ldn) to 66 dB(A) Ldn.

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Action and all alternatives would expose on- and off-site residents to elevated noise levels. This effect would be significant. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Similarly, traffic associated with the Proposed Action and the alternatives would expose on- and off-site residents to excessive traffic noise. This effect would be significant. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Transportation and Traffic

Traffic associated with the Proposed Action and all alternatives would result in effects to intersections and roadways in Roseville, Placer County, Sutter County, and Sacramento County. These effects would be significant. Mitigation is available that would require that the Proposed Action and alternatives to pay their fair share of the cost of necessary improvements to the affected intersections and roadway segments by paying traffic impact fees to the applicable jurisdictions. However, the City of Roseville determined that some improvements are not feasible. In addition, USACE does not have jurisdiction over the required improvements to Placer County, Sutter County or Sacramento County roadways. Therefore, these effects would remain significant.

Traffic from the Proposed Action and all alternatives would result in significant effects to certain segments of Interstate 80, State Route 65, and State Route 70/99 which are already deficient facilities. Mitigation is proposed to reduce effects on affected state highway segments. However, the USACE does not have control over the required improvements to state highway facilities and there is no guarantee that improvements would be built within the timeframe of the Proposed Action or alternatives. Therefore, the effects would remain significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

The utilities analysis evaluated whether the Proposed Action or the alternatives would result in a demand for utilities or service systems such that the existing facilities would not have adequate capacity to serve the Proposed Action or an alternatives as well as the projected buildout of the surrounding area, and substantial expansion of the service facilities would be required.

As the analysis shows, implementation of the Proposed Action and all alternatives would result in the need for expanded landfill capacity and the expansion of the regional landfill could result in significant environmental effects. This effect would be significant. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

The following significant cumulative effects are associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives.

Aesthetics

The Proposed Action and all alternatives would have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas and the visual character of the project vicinity by altering views of open rangeland, foothills, and Sierra Nevada, and by converting undeveloped rangeland to urban development as viewed from Fiddyment and Baseline Roads. Development of both the project site and the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area to the south of the project site would permanently alter the visual character of the area, both under daytime conditions and at night. The Proposed Action and Placer Vineyards Specific Plan development would also introduce new sources of light and glare. This would be a significant cumulative aesthetics effect. No feasible mitigation measures are available to fully address the cumulative effect.

Agricultural Resources

Alternative 4 site contains lands that are designated Unique Farmland and are in active agricultural production. The alternative would also implement **Mitigation Measure AG-1** which would reduce its contribution to the cumulative loss of agricultural land. However, because Alternative 4 site contains high quality soils and is in rice production, its contribution to the significant cumulative effect would not be fully mitigated.

Air Quality

The project site and the alternative site are located in an area that is designated non-attainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. Vehicles, commercial operations, and some residential activities would generate ozone

precursors contributing to the ozone problem within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. Area sources, such as residential wood burning stoves and fireplaces, are substantial sources of particulate matter. Operational emissions from buildout of the Proposed Action and all alternatives are estimated to exceed Air District thresholds for ROG, NOx, and PM10.

In order to bring the region into compliance with state and federal air pollutant standards, air districts use General Plans and similar planning documents to determine where and how future growth will occur within the region. When development occurs that is not consistent with the intensity of development presented in a General Plan or if it was not previously accounted for, it is assumed that the emissions associated with that development are unaccounted for in the SIP, which could hinder the region's ability to come into compliance with state and federal air pollutant standards. Although many criteria air pollutants within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin were accounted for in the SIP, current growth forecasts for the Roseville area with approval of the Proposed Action and all alternatives would be higher than what was projected when the existing plans were prepared. Therefore, emissions associated with operation and occupancy of the Proposed Action and all alternatives and buildout of cumulative development would directly adversely affect the region's ability to achieve compliance with air quality standards.

Compliance with the City's Transportation Systems Management Ordinance and implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-2**, which requires implementation of a number of measures to reduce vehicular and area source emissions, would reduce the amount of emissions generated by the Proposed Action and all alternatives. The Proposed Action would also be subject to a variety of policies that would promote the use of alternative forms of transportation and pedestrian access to commercial and office uses within the project site. However, operational air emissions associated with the Proposed Action and all alternatives are not accounted for in regional air quality attainment plans. As a result, even with mitigation, the emissions would be substantial and the Proposed Action and all alternatives would make a substantial contribution to the cumulative effect on regional air quality.

Traffic Noise

Several roadways adjacent to proposed residential areas under the Proposed Action and all on-site alternatives would have noise levels that exceed 60 dB Ldn. Depending on the distance to residences at these locations, the exterior noise levels could exceed City standards under 2025 conditions (future conditions that include traffic from past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future development in the area). **Mitigation Measure NOISE-3** requires new development on the project site to include noise barriers, masonry walls, and setbacks and other feasible measures to reduce noise effects in residential areas of the project site. However, it is unlikely that the significant noise effect would be eliminated at all affected locations. The cumulative effect on on-site receptors near major roadways would remain significant.

Similarly, cumulative traffic under the Proposed Action and all on-site alternatives would increase ambient noise levels along off-site roadways and despite installation of noise barriers where feasible, it is

unlikely that the significant noise effect would be eliminated at all affected off-site locations. The cumulative effect on off-site receptors near major roadways would remain significant.

The contribution of Alternative 4 to cumulative traffic noise effects on off-site receptors would also be significant.

Water Supply

While water demand associated with buildout of the City's General Plan and the Proposed Action (and the on-site alternatives) would be supplied by existing and assured sources of water, and as a matter of policy, the City of Roseville will not approve new specific plans or other projects absent sufficient water for buildout of such plans and projects, any increase in water demand in a region that does not have adequate and assured water supplies for cumulative development has the potential to result in a significant cumulative effect on water resources. No mitigation measure that is within the control of the USACE is available to address the potentially significant cumulative effect. Therefore the effect would be significant and unavoidable.

Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

Areas of Controversy

NEPA regulations (40 CFR Section 1502.12) require that a summary of an EIS identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. During the public comment period for the notice of intent, various comment letters were received regarding the project. **Appendix 1.0** of the Draft EIS includes a scoping report containing a summary of the public scoping process as well as comments received in writing and at the public meetings held on April 16, 2008. In general, areas of potential controversy known to the USACE and the project applicant(s) include project effects on biological resources, circulation (traffic and alternative transportation methods), air quality, land use concerns related to density and smart growth principles, hydrology and water quality, water supply, effects to groundwater supply, provision of public services, provision of infrastructure, alternatives analysis, and growth inducement. These issues were considered in the preparation of this Draft EIS and are addressed in the environmental impact analyses presented in **Chapter 3.0**, **Chapter 4.0, Cumulative Impacts**, and **Chapter 5.0, Other Statutory Requirements**.

Issues to be Resolved

USACE will need to determine whether to grant permits for the Proposed Action pursuant to Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 3144).

Intended Uses of the EIS

The EIS will be used by USACE in exercising its decision-making authority under Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 3144).

Table ES-2
Summary of Effects for Major Topics

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Aesthetics						
Impact AES-1: Effect on Scenic Vistas	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**
Impact AES-2: Effect on Scenic Resources	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact AES-3: Degradation of Visual Character	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**
Impact AES-4: Effects from New Sources of Light and Glare	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Agricultural Resources						
Impact AG-1: Conversion of Agricultural Land	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact AG-2: Compatibility with Adjacent Agricultural Uses	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant after mitigation
Air Quality						
Impact AQ-1: Emissions Associated with Construction	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Emissions Associated with Occupancy/Operation	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact AQ-3: CO Hotspots	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Air Quality (continued)						
Impact AQ-4: Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied
Impact AQ-5: Exposure to Objectionable Odors	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Biological Resources						
Impact BIO-1: Loss of Wetlands through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption or Other Means	Less than significant after mitigation	No effect	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-2: Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Their Habitat	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-3: Effects on Federally Listed Plant Species	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact BIO-4: Effects on Federally Listed Amphibian and Reptile Species	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-5: Effects on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-6: Effects on State Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-7: Effects on Protected Raptor Species and Other Nesting Birds	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-8: Effects on State Special-Status Bats	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact BIO-9: Effects on Wildlife Movement	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Biological Resources (continued)						
Impact BIO-10: Loss of Riparian Habitat	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	No effect
Impact BIO-11: Effects on On-Site Fish Species	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact BIO-12: Effects on Fish Habitat from Water Diversions	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Climate Change						
Impact GHG-1: GHG Emissions due to Construction	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact GHG-2: GHG Emissions due to Operation/Occupancy	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Cultural Resources						
Impact CR-1: Potential to Damage Undiscovered Historic Properties or Human Remains during Construction	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Environmental Justice						
Impact EJ-1: Disproportionate Adverse Environmental Effects on Minority or Low-income Populations	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Geology, Soils, and Minerals						
Impact GEO-1: Hazard associated with Seismic Ground-shaking	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact GEO-2: Hazard associated with Liquefaction	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact GEO-3: Hazard associated with Slope Failure	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Geology, Soils, and Minerals (continued)						
Impact GEO-4: Potential Structural Damage due to Expansive Soils	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact GEO-5: Effect on Mineral Resources	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Impact HAZ-1: Exposure to Soil or Groundwater Contamination from Past Uses	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HAZ-2: Hazards from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials or Wastes	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HAZ-3: Hazard associated with Adjacent Natural Gas Pipeline	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HAZ-4: Risk of Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Transmission Lines	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HAZ-5: Risk related to Use of Recycled Water	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality						
Impact HYDRO-1: Effect related to On- or Off-Site Flood Hazards	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HYDRO-2: Effects from Construction within a Floodplain	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-3: Exposure to Flood Hazards related to Dam or Levee Failure	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-4: Water Quality Effects during Construction	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Hydrology and Water Quality (continued)						
Impact HYDRO-5:Water Quality Effects from Project Occupancy and Operation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HYDRO-6: Effect of Tertiary Treated Effluent on Pleasant Grove Creek	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-7: Effect on Groundwater Recharge	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-8: Effects on Groundwater Basin	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Land Use and Planning						
Impact LU-1: Result in Incompatible Land Uses	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact LU-2: Physically Divide an Established Community	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect
Impact LU-3: Conflict with General Plan and Zoning Code	No effect	No effect	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	No effect	No effect	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**
Impact LU-4: Conflict with SACOG Blueprint	Less than significant, no mitigation	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**
Noise						
Impact NOISE-1: Construction Noise and Vibration	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact NOISE-2: Noise from On-Site Activities	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact NOISE-3: Increase in Traffic Noise at Buildout (Year 2025)	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Noise (continued)						
Impact NOISE-4: Aviation Noise	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Public Services						
Impact PUB-1: Demand for Law Enforcement Services	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact PUB-2: Demand for Fire Protection Services	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact PUB-3: Demand for School Facilities	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact PUB-4: Demand for Library Services	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Transportation and Traffic						
Impact TRA-1: Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-2: Increased Traffic at Placer County Intersections and Roadway Segments	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-3: Increased Traffic at Sacramento County Intersections and Roadway Segments	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact TRA-4: Increased Traffic at Sutter County Intersections and Roadway Segments	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-5: Increased Traffic along City of Rocklin Roadway Segments	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact TRA-6: Increased Traffic at State Highway Intersections and Segments	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**

Resource Topic/Impact	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Transportation and Traffic (continued)						
Impact TRA-7: Increased Demand for Local Transit Service	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact TRA-8: Increased Demand for Local Bicycle Facilities	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Utilities						
Impact UTIL-1: Availability of Water Supplies to Meet Demand	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact UTIL-2: Groundwater Demand Impacts	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact UTIL-3: Capacity of Water Treatment and Supply Facilities	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact UTIL-4: Impacts from Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Facilities	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact UTIL-5: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact UTIL-6: Increased Demand for Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Significant effects that cannot be reduced to less than significant are indicated in ***bold***