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INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2 Project (Project), located in the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville, California (Figure 1 Project Vicinity, Figure 2 Project Location, Figure 3 Project Features and Appendix A). The Phase 2 Project is 0.99 miles and begins on the north side of Cripple Creek and ends at Whyte Avenue. The Project is located within both the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville. The project lies within the following: Township (T) 10North and Range (R) 6East, Section 23 of the Citrus Heights United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7 ½ Minute Quadrangles. The City of Citrus Heights (City) proposes to makes improvements to Auburn Boulevard in order to upgrade the corridor’s image and improve its function as a transportation facility serving adjacent land uses. The project would include widening Auburn Boulevard to accommodate bike lanes, construction of new curbs, gutters and sidewalks. The City of Citrus Heights is the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead for this project.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

In February of 2005, the City of Citrus Heights adopted a specific plan to guide the revitalization and enhancement of Auburn Boulevard between Sylvan Corners and Interstate 80. The purpose of the specific plan is to improve the corridor’s image and commercial competitiveness in the region, and improve its function as a transportation facility serving adjacent land uses as well as provide for better connections with the neighborhoods bordering the corridor. The adopted specific plan project area is located within the Auburn Boulevard corridor from Old Auburn Road to the northern City limits of Citrus Heights, and includes approximately 460 acres. As part of that specific plan, the City proposes to make improvements to Auburn Boulevard which will include widening Auburn Boulevard to accommodate bike lanes, construction of new curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Phase I of the project which extended from Sylvan Corners to north of the Cripple Creek Bridge was analyzed and approved under the 2005 Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR (Appendix B). Construction on the Phase I Project was recently completed. The Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2 Project, which extends north of City limits to Whyte Avenue within the City of Roseville, will be examined within this document. For the purposes of this document, the Final Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR (2005), City of Citrus Heights General Plan FEIR (2011), City of Roseville General Plan (2015) and all associated technical studies will be referenced for this particular segment of Auburn Boulevard.
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Project Features
Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2 Project
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CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the Lead Agency to examine the effects of a project on the physical conditions that exist within the area that would be affected by the project. CEQA also requires a discussion of any inconsistency between the project and applicable general plans and regional plans.

An inconsistency between the project and an adopted plan for land use development in a community would not constitute a physical change in the environment. When a project diverges from an adopted plan, however, it may affect planning in the community regarding infrastructure and services, and the new demands generated by the project may result in later physical changes in response to the project.

In the same manner, the fact that a project brings new people or demand for housing to a community does not, by itself, change the physical conditions. An increase in population may, however, generate changes in retail demand or demand for governmental services, and the demand for housing may generate new activity in residential development. Physical environmental impacts that could result from implementing the project are discussed in the appropriate technical sections.

This section of the initial study identifies the applicable land use designations, plans and policies, and permissible densities and intensities of use, and discusses any inconsistencies between these plans and the project. This section also discusses agricultural resources and the effect of the project on these resources.

For the purposes of this document, the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR (2011), City of Roseville General Plan (2015), and the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR (2005) were referenced.

SECTION 1.0 - BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2
2. Lead Agency: City of Citrus Heights
   Planning Division
   7927 Auburn Boulevard
   Citrus Heights, CA 95621
3. Contact Person: Casey Kempenaar, Senior Planner
   City of Citrus Heights
   Planning Division
   7927 Auburn Boulevard
   Citrus Heights, CA 95621
   Phone: (916)727-4740
   E-mail: ckempenaar@citrusheights.net
4. Project Location: The Phase 2 Project is 0.99 mile and begins on the north side of Cripple
Creek and ends at Whyte Avenue. The Project is located within both the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville. The project lies within the following: Township (T) 10North and Range (R) 6East, Section 23 of the Citrus Heights United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7 ½ Minute Quadrangles.

5. Applicant: City of Citrus Heights (City)


7. Zoning: The portion of the project located within the City of Citrus Heights is zoned for Special Planning Area (SPA). The portion of the project located within the City of Roseville is zoned for Neighborhood Commercial, General Commercial and Community Commercial. The project is located within the boundaries of the Boulevard Plan Specific Plan.

8. Description of Project: The Phase 2 Project is 0.99 mile and begins on the north side of Cripple Creek and ends at Whyte Avenue. The Project is located within both the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville. Project components include widening of Auburn Boulevard to accommodate bike lanes, construction of new curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Minor relocation of utilities and right of way acquisition will be required. Project components within the City of Roseville will consist of approximately 230 feet of roadway improvements along Auburn Boulevard, south of the intersection of Whyte Avenue and Auburn Boulevard (see Figures 2 and 3).

Project components within both the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville would include undergrounding of existing overhead utilities (electrical and communications, etc.) and roadway improvements, also referred to as complete streets, including:

- Pedestrian safety improvements
- Bus pull-outs
- ADA improvements
- Installation of approximately 9,600 lineal feet of bike lanes and sidewalks
- Planting of street trees and landscaping buffer where feasible
- Installation of energy-efficient street lights
- Installation of Landscaped Medians
- Traffic Signal installation and modification

Need

The City of Citrus Heights identified a need to address land use, community design and circulation issues along the existing Auburn Boulevard Corridor.

Land Use:
- The City of Citrus Heights, City of Roseville and Auburn Boulevard now lie at the center of the growing Sacramento Region. The specific plan area is surrounded by major employment centers and
major shopping areas, yet fragmented development patterns, poor site design and access problems limit the area's economic potential.

- Within the specific plan area there is a rough interface between commercial and residential uses. Parking lots, service areas, trash containers, and utilitarian structures occupy the interface between commercial and residential areas. There are land use conflicts due to hours of operation, outdoor storage, shipping and receiving activities and privacy concerns. In some cases, buildings and parcels originally designed for retail uses have been adapted for other uses that involve activities that are incompatible with adjacent or nearby residential areas, such as outdoor storage of materials and vehicles or frequent deliveries.

- A buildings condition survey conducted by the City as part of the Citrus Heights Redevelopment Plan found that along the northern section of Auburn Boulevard numerous structures require moderate or extensive rehabilitation, are dilapidated and require almost total rehabilitation or are suffering from deferred maintenance. A survey of parcel conditions showed that a substantial portion of parcels in the specific plan area are subdivided lots of irregular form and shape, have inadequate size for development, and are in multiple ownership (City of Citrus Heights 2003).

Community Design:

- Overhead transmission lines, light poles, and other utilities along the corridor limit opportunities for adding street trees and landscaping.

- Storm water runoff from parking lots sheet flow to the creek, dumpsters are pushed against the open space, and commercial buildings have been designed on the sites without regard to these important community resources.

- Signage along the corridor is distracting and fragments the visual experience.

Circulation:

- 2015 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes on Auburn Boulevard range from 27,000 to 29,100 vehicles. The corridor is considered a four-lane, low-access-control arterial that currently operates at Level of Service (LOS) “E” conditions on a daily basis. According to the City General Plan EIR, year 2035 traffic demands on the corridor are projected to increase to 28,500 to 32,400 vehicles per day and corridor operations are projected to degrade to LOS F conditions under the existing capacity classification, however City policy allows LOS exceptions to this corridor (City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR, Policy 29.1 and 29.2).

- There are several unsignalized (side-street-stop-sign controlled) intersections and driveways along the entire length of the corridor. The left-turn egress/ingress movements from/to these side-streets carry relatively low traffic volume demands, however several of these left-turn movements operate at peak hour LOS “F” conditions.

- There were 51 reported accidents (over a 36-month period extending between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2014) on the segment of Auburn Blvd. extending from approximately 200 feet south of Grand
The majority of accidents involved rear-end and broadside collisions. Unsafe speed and automobile right-of-way violation were the most frequently reported primary collision factors for these accidents.

- The sidewalk system is incomplete and narrow, has many vertical obstructions, is interrupted by numerous curb cuts, and provides little separation from high speed traffic. In some areas there are no sidewalks and very few streets trees to provide shade. These deficiencies make walking a difficult and unpleasant experience for residents.
- Many residential areas rely on connections to Auburn Boulevard. Side streets do not align east and west of Auburn Boulevard, making pedestrian crossings difficult.
- There are no bike lanes along this segment of Auburn Boulevard.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the project is for the improvement of Auburn Boulevard in order to upgrade the corridor's image, improve its function as a transportation facility serving adjacent land uses, improve commercial competitiveness in the region and improve its function as a transportation facility serving adjacent land uses and provide for better connections with the neighborhoods bordering the corridor.

**Construction Access, Staging and Methods:**

**Project Access and Staging Areas**

To allow equipment to access the project site, access would be through I-80 located to the north of the project area, and Antelope Road located 450 feet south of the project area. Construction and equipment staging will be at one of several commercial business parking lots located along Auburn Boulevard for the duration of the project.

Pavement construction for new roadway and shoulder widening will require excavations of 28 inches in depth. Additional excavation of 6’ in depth, or more, will be required in isolated locations for placement of drainage facilities and underground utility lines. Traffic signs and striping will be installed during and after construction.

**Anticipated Construction Equipment**

Typical construction equipment would include the following:

- Crane
- Backhoe
- Excavator
- Concrete saw (removal of existing road)
- Cement truck
- Paver
- Rollers
- Motor grader
- Dump truck
- Light tools (i.e., saws, jackhammer)

Most construction-related noise would occur during the road improvements. This operation would likely include noise from concrete hammers and jackhammers. All construction work for the project will comply with the City of Citrus Heights and City of Roseville Standard Construction Specifications (or Best Management Practices).

Utilities

There are existing overhead utility lines located along the east side of Auburn Boulevard. The utilities involved include electric (SMUD), telephone (Surewest), and cable television (Comcast). The project proposes to underground these lines along the east side of the roadway either below the sidewalk or adjacent to the easterly curb line. Trenching depths of six (6) feet or more will be required in some locations for underground utilities. Private easements may be required for additional utility company facilities.

Permits

The permits, reviews, and approvals listed below would be required for project construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Permit/Approval</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity</td>
<td>Will be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Roseville – Public Works Engineering Division</td>
<td>Encroachment Permit</td>
<td>Will be obtained prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination Efforts:

The project area exceeds 1 acre, therefore a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System 402 General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with construction activity will be obtained prior to construction. A City of Roseville Encroachment Permit will also be obtained prior to construction. No further permits are required for this project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Auburn Boulevard is classified as an arterial street and is adjacent to local streets, residences, and businesses.
SECTION 2.0 – ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AFFECTED

The Initial Study is also intended to assess whether any environmental effects of the project are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or by other means [15152(b)(2)] of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. If such revisions, conditions, or other means are identified, they will be identified as mitigation measures.

This Initial Study relies on State CEQA Guidelines 15064 and 15604.4 in its determination of the significance of environmental effects. According to 15064, the findings as to whether a project may have one or more significant effects shall be based on substantial evidence in the record, and that controversy alone, without substantial evidence of a significant effect, does not trigger the need for an EIR.

This Mitigated Negative Declaration is a subsequent environmental document that tiers off the General Plan Program EIRs and the Auburn Boulevard Plan EIR, therefore impacts that were adequately addressed in the General Plan EIRs and the Auburn Boulevard Plan EIR do not need to be repeated in this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The following listed topics were addressed in the Program EIR for the Citrus Heights General Plan, City of Roseville General Plan, and the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR and require no further discussion:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

The Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets Phase 2 Project Mitigated Negative Declaration is a subsequent environmental document to the General Plan EIR and the Auburn Boulevard Plan EIR. As such, this MND incorporates all applicable mitigation measures adopted with the Final EIR for the General Plan and the Auburn Boulevard Plan EIR. The following is a summary of additional mitigation measures that were not included in the General Plan FEIR or the Auburn Boulevard Plan FEIR. These measures, along with applicable measures from the Auburn Boulevard Plan FEIR and General Plan FEIR that are listed in Section 4.0, will be adopted in a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan for the Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets Phase 2 Project Mitigated Negative Declaration.

ADDITIONAL MITIGATION MEASURES INCORPORATED WITHIN THE PROJECT

The following are additional mitigation measures applicable to the project that were not included within the City of Citrus Heights General Plan FEIR, City of Roseville General Plan, or the Auburn Boulevard Plan FEIR:
Air Quality

AQ-2: Route and schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible, to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.

Biological Resources

B-4: If construction is planned to occur during the raptor nesting season (February – August) a preconstruction raptor nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, 10 feet or taller and containing a dbh of 2 inches or greater. Within 2 weeks of the nesting raptor survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor.

A minimum 500 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active raptor nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.

B-5: If ground disturbance or vegetation removal is to take place during the breeding season (February – August), a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, bushes, tall grasses and emergent vegetation. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor.

A minimum 100 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.

Hazards and Hazardous Material

HM-4: Any leaking transformers observed during the course of the project should be considered a potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hazard. Should leaks from electrical transformers (that will either remain within the construction limits or will require removal and/or relocation) be encountered during construction, the transformer fluid should be sampled and analyzed by qualified personnel for detectable levels of PCB’s. Should PCBs be detected, the transformer should be removed and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB’s should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency.

HM-5: Based on preliminary plans, right-of-way acquisition may be required at the Towne Mart gas station at Sandalwood Drive and the abandoned gas station at Oak Grove Avenue. Should final plans indicate that a portion of this parcel will be acquired for new right-of-way, a preliminary environmental screening (limited subsurface sampling and laboratory analysis) should be performed during the PS&E for potentially elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and MTBE contamination within the limits of construction, and/or right-of-way acquisition, adjacent to the existing gas stations. Should the preliminary screening encounter elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and/or MTBE a limited Phase II Initial Site Assessment should be performed. The Phase II Initial Site Assessment should consist of subsurface sampling and laboratory analysis and be of sufficient quantity to define
the extent and concentration of contamination within the areal extent and depths of planned
collection activities adjacent to the existing gas stations. The Phase II Initial Site Assessment
should also provide both a Health and Safety Plan for worker safety and a Work Plan for handling
and disposing contaminated soil during construction.

**HM-6:** The potential exists for hazardous contamination from historic chemical spills at Paradise Cleaners,
which is located near the intersection of Auburn Boulevard and Baird Way. At the time of the Initial
Site Assessment, there were no documented reports of soil/groundwater contamination related to
chemical discharge from Paradise Cleaners. If a potential hazardous contamination is detected, soil
samples should be gathered and tested to determine the chemical levels within the soil.

**HM-7:** To avoid impacts from pavement striping during construction it is recommended that removal
requirements for yellow striping and pavement marking materials be performed in accordance with
Caltrans Standard Special Provision 14-11.07 REMOVE YELLOW TRAFFIC STRIPE AND
PAVEMENT MARKING WITH HAZARDOUS WASTE RESIDUE.

**HM-8:** As is the case for any project that proposes excavation, the potential exists for unknown hazardous
contamination to be revealed during project construction (such as previously undetected petroleum
hydrocarbon contamination from nearby gas stations). Should any previously unknown hazardous
waste/material be encountered during construction, the procedures outlined in Caltrans Hazards
Procedures for Construction shall be followed.

**HM-9:** If the project area is anticipated to change (due to a change in the project or staging area), further
investigation for potential hazardous waste generators would be required to determine their impact to
the revised project limits.

**Hydrology/Water Quality**

**H-3:** The Project would require a NPDES General Construction Permit for Discharges of storm water
associated with construction activities (Construction General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ). A SWPPP
would also be developed and implemented as part of the Construction General Permit.

**H-4:** The construction contractor shall adhere to the SWRCB Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ NPDES Permit
pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA. This permit authorizes storm water and authorized non-storm
water discharges from construction activities. As part of this Permit requirement, a SWPPP shall be
prepared prior to construction consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. This SWPPP shall
incorporate all applicable BMPs to ensure that adequate measures are taken during construction to
minimize impacts to water quality.

**Noise**

**N-4:** The Contractor shall follow City of Citrus Heights and City of Roseville noise ordinances for
construction activities:

- Do not exceed 65 dBA at 50 feet from the job site activities from 8 p.m. to 7 a.m.
- Use an alternative waiting method instead of a sound signal unless required by safety laws.
- Equip an internal combustion engine with the manufacturer-recommended muffler.
- Do not operate an internal combustion engine on the job site without the appropriate muffler.
SECTION 3.0 - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Agriculture Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Air Quality
- Geology / Soils
- Land Use / Planning
- Population / Housing
- Transportation / Traffic

The City has prepared an Initial Study for this project, and following public review, has determined that for resource areas not checked above, the project would not result in any significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level or are not sufficiently addressed by the 2005 ABSP EIR, City of Citrus Heights General Plan FEIR or the City of Roseville General Plan FEIR. This Initial Study has concluded that the project would incrementally contribute to, but not exceed, certain significant cumulative impacts previously identified in the 2005 ABSP EIR, and that for such impacts, no new mitigation measures, other than those previously identified in the 2005 ABSP EIR, are required. The project could result in new potentially significant Air Quality, Biological Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, and/or Noise impacts that were not sufficiently addressed and mitigated by the 2005 ABSP EIR, therefore a Tiered Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate.

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The project MAY incrementally contribute to, but not exceed, certain significant cumulative impacts previously identified in the 2005 ABSP EIR, and that for such impacts, no new mitigation measures, other than those previously identified in the 2005 ABSP EIR, are required. In addition, the project MAY result in potentially significant impacts not previously identified in the 2005 ABSP EIR, but project specific mitigation measures would reduce the effect of such impacts to a point that clearly no significant impacts would occur. On the basis of the Tiered Initial Study and implementation of all project specific mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project as mitigated may have a significant effect on the environment. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Name
### SECTION 4.0 - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within state scenic highway?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a. No Impact. The project would not cause adverse effects on a scenic vista (ABSP 2005).

b. No Impact. There are no state or locally designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the project. Auburn Boulevard is not a designated or eligible scenic highway. Therefore, no impact would occur (ABSP 2005).

c. Less-than-Significant with mitigation incorporated. See the ABSP EIR Mitigation Measure A-1.

d. Less-than-Significant with mitigation incorporated. See the ABSP EIR Mitigation Measure A-2.

**Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project**

None.

**Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated**

**A-1:** Implementation of the City of Citrus Heights General Plan Policy 37.1 and compliance with the Tree Preservation Ordinance will encourage the retention of native oaks in the landscape of the specific plan area and will mitigate for the visual impacts resulting from the removal of native oak trees.

See Mitigation Measures for biological resources, B-1, B-2A and B-2B and B-2C which address impacts to the oak woodland and riparian habitat adjacent to Cripple Creek.

**A-2:** Implementation of the Boulevard Plan’s Principles and Design Guidelines and enforcement of the City’s Zoning Code Landscaping and Lighting standards will avoid impacts associated with light and glare.
Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures

None required.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**Discussion**

a. No Impact. The project site would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use (ABSP 2005).

b. No Impact. The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract (ABSP 2005).

c. No Impact. The project does not occur within areas zoned for agriculture or forest lands; therefore, the project would not cause conflicts within existing zoning, or require rezoning of forest land or timberland (ABSP 2005).

d. No Impact. The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (ABSP 2005).

e. No Impact. The project would not involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (ABSP 2005).

*Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project*

None.

*Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated*

None.

*Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures*

None required.
Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 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)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting

For the purposes of this document, the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR (2011), City of Roseville General Plan (2015), and the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR (2005) were referenced for this section.

The project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), in the region administered by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), which administers air quality in the City of Citrus Heights, and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) which administers air quality in the City of Roseville. The SVAB has a Mediterranean climate, characterized by hot, dry summers and mild, rainy winters. During the year, the temperature may range from 20 to 115 degrees Fahrenheit with summer highs usually in the 90s and winter lows occasionally below freezing. Average annual rainfall is about 20 inches with snowfall being very rare. Summer high temperatures as measured at the Sacramento
Executive Airport Federal Aviation Administration - Flight Service Station (the nearest climatic monitoring station to the Auburn Blvd Complete Phase 2 Project) average in the low 90s °F and summer low temperatures average in the upper 50s °F. Winter conditions are characterized by occasional rainstorms and/or occasional snow, interspersed with stagnant and sometimes foggy weather. Wintertime high temperatures average in the mid-upper 50s °F and winter low temperatures average in the high 30s °F (Western Regional Climate Center 2015).

**Standards of Significance**

For purposes of this Initial Study, air quality impacts may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the City of Citrus Heights General Plan General Plan EIR or the City of Roseville General Plan:

- Construction emissions of NO\(_x\) above 85 pounds per day for City of Citrus Heights, and 82 pounds per day for City of Roseville;
- Operational emissions of NO\(_x\) or ROG above 65 pounds per day for City of Citrus Heights and 82 pounds per day for City of Roseville;
- Violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- PM\(_{10}\) concentrations equal to or greater than five percent of the State ambient air quality standard (i.e., 50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) in areas where there is evidence of existing or projected violations of this standard. However, if project emissions of NO\(_x\) and ROG are below the emission thresholds given above, then the project would not result in violations of the PM\(_{10}\) ambient air quality standards;
- CO concentrations that exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard (i.e., 20.0 ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard (i.e., 9.0 ppm); or
- Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Ambient air quality standards have not been established for toxic air contaminants (TAC). TAC exposure is deemed to be significant if:

- TAC exposures create a risk of 10 in 1 million for stationary sources, or substantially increase the risk of exposure to TACs from mobile sources.

**Summary of Analysis under the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR, and the City of Roseville General Plan**

**City of Citrus Heights**

The General Plan EIR addressed the potential effects of the General Plan on ambient air quality and the potential for exposure of people, especially sensitive receptors such as children or the elderly, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. See General Plan EIR, Chapter 4.3.

Policies in the General Plan in Environmental Resources were identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the General Plan, including calling for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to meet state and federal air quality standards. The Master EIR identified exposure to sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) as a potential effect. Policies in the General Plan would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. The policies include requiring consideration of current guidance provided by the Air Resources Board and SMAQMD; requiring development adjacent to stationary or mobile TAC sources to be designed with consideration of such exposure in design, landscaping and filters.
City of Roseville
Policies in the General Plan in Environmental Resources were also identified as mitigating potential effects of development that could occur under the General Plan, including calling for the City to work with the California Air Resources Board and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) to meet state and federal air quality standards. The General Plan EIR identified exposure to sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) as a potential effect. Policies in the general Plan would reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. The policies include requiring consideration of current guidance provided by the Air Resources Board and PCAPCD; requiring development adjacent to stationary or mobile TAC sources to be designed with consideration of such exposure in design, landscaping and filters.

Discussion

a. No Impact. Implementation of the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SMAQMD or PCAPCD Air Quality Plans (SMAQMD 2015a)(PCAPCD 2009).

b. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. SMAQMD and PCAPCD has established screen-level criteria for the assessment of significant impacts from construction-related emissions of fugitive dust. These criteria are based on a projects maximum actively disturbed area. Construction activities that would disturb less than 15.0 acres per day would be required to implement the appropriate level of mitigation, identified as “Basic Construction Emission Control Practices,” for all projects to further minimize construction-related impacts regardless of the CEQA significance determination. Because the project would disturb an area less than 15 acres, BMPs have been included from the “Basic Construction Emission Control Practices” to reduce construction-related emissions of fugitive dust. See City Code: 15.40.050 and 15.44.170; SMAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and their Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices, and PCAPCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust).

PM_{10} emissions are assumed to be below the thresholds because Construction NO_x emissions are temporary. There are no construction ROG thresholds, and both NO_x and ROG operational thresholds are not expected to be exceeded. Therefore, the project would not result in an additional significant impact that was not addressed in the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR or City of Roseville General Plan.

c. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The project would have short-term impacts resulting from the following construction-related sources: 1) construction and demolition equipment emissions; 2) dust from construction operations; and 3) emissions from construction vehicles.

As shown in Table 2, the project is located in an area in nonattainment for 1-hour Ozone for State standards, nonattainment for 8-hour Ozone for both Federal and State standards, and nonattainment for Particulate Matter under 2.5 micrometers for Federal standards and State standards.
Table 2. Attainment at the Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃ – 1-hour</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nonattainment - Serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃ – 8-hour</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Roseville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Serious Non-attainment</td>
<td>Non-attainment/Serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment*</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
<td>Non-attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2015, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, 2009.
*The Sacramento Valley Air Basin portion of Placer County, which includes Roseville, is designated as an attainment area for CO.

Temporary/Construction Impacts

During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions (airborne dust) generated by excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities related to construction. Emissions from construction equipment also are anticipated and would include carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), directly-emitted particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅), and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust particulate matter. Ozone is a regional pollutant that is derived from NOₓ and VOCs in the presence of sunlight and heat.

Heavy trucks and construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines would generate CO, SO₂, NOₓ, VOCs and some soot particulate (PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅) in exhaust emissions. If construction activities were to increase traffic congestion in the detour area, CO and other emissions from traffic would increase slightly while those vehicles are delayed. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site and detour area. Dust generated will result in a temporary, local impact, limited to areas of construction. Dust control practices will be incorporated into the project to mitigate this potential impact. The dust control practices will comply with the current Caltrans’ Standard Specifications.

Permanent Impacts

The project is exempt from all project-level conformity requirements because it falls under exempt projects (widening narrow pavements [no additional travel lanes]) listed in 40 CFR 93.126.
Because construction and operational emissions are temporary and expected to be below the thresholds, the project is not expected to violate any air quality standards. The project would not increase the capacity of the roadway, no additional trips or delays are expected to result from the project. The project is exempt from all project-level conformity requirements because it falls under exempt projects (widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges [no additional travel lanes]) listed in 40 CFR 93.126.

Therefore the project would not result in additional significant impact that was not addressed in the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR or the City of Roseville General Plan. See Mitigation Measures A-1 through A-3.

d. Less than significant. Although the nearest sensitive receptors are residences located directly adjacent to Auburn Boulevard, construction activities, which involve the use of diesel-powered equipment, are short-term and emissions are expected to be well below the thresholds. Operational emissions are not expected to increase, as discussed for Question B. Despite a low-impact expectation for this project, measures for construction activities are still recommended to further reduce impacts on sensitive receptors.

SMAQMD and PCAPCD defines sensitive receptors as facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants or may experience adverse effects from unhealthful concentrations of air pollutants. Hospitals, clinics, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site are residences directly adjacent to the project site.

Construction activities are anticipated to involve the operation of diesel-powered equipment. In 1998, the CARB identified diesel exhaust as a TAC. Cancer health risks associated with exposures to diesel exhaust typically are associated with chronic exposure, in which a 70-year exposure period often is assumed. Although elevated cancer rates can result from exposure periods of less than 70 years, acute exposure (i.e., exposure periods of 2 to 3 years) to diesel exhaust typically are not anticipated to result in an increased health risk because acute exposure typically does not result in exposure concentrations that would represent a health risk. Health impacts associated with exposure to diesel exhaust from project construction are not anticipated to be significant because construction activities are expected to occur well below the 70-year exposure period used in health risk assessments. Therefore, construction of the project is not anticipated to result in an elevated cancer risk to exposed persons. No mitigation is required. Therefore, the project would not result in an additional significant impact that was not addressed in the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR or the City of Roseville General Plan.

e. No Impact. The project would not include industrial or intensive agriculture uses; therefore, the project would not create odors or toxic air contaminants. No odors would be generated by potential uses. Potential effects related to air quality and odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

None.

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

AQ-1A: Inhalable Particulate Matter: The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the project to minimize the generation of PM10 dust during construction.
- enclose, cover, or water twice daily all soil piles;
- water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil;
- water all haul roads twice daily; and
- cover loads of all haul/dump trucks securely.

**AQ-1B:** The demolition or renovation of asbestos-containing building material is subject to the limitations of the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations as listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (40CFR Part 61, Subpart M) requiring notification and inspection. Most demolitions and many renovations are subject to a CAL-OSHA Certified asbestos inspection prior to the start of activity. SMAQMD Rule 902, which requires District consultation and permit, applies to demolition, renovation or removal of asbestos-containing material. Compliance with these regulations is considered to reduce this impact to a less than- significant level.

**Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures**

**AQ-2:** Route and schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible, to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.

**Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures**

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. BIOLOGICAL - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. BIOLOGICAL - Would the project:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regulatory Setting**

The following city, State, and federal statutes pertain to the project:

- National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4321 et seq.)
- Federal Endangered Species Act (16 USC 1531-1543)
- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251-1376)
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC 661-6660)
- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands (May 24, 1977)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (USC 703-711)
- California Environmental Quality Act (PRC 21000 et seq.)
- California Endangered Species Act (CDFW Code 2050 et seq.)
- Native Plant Protection Act (CDFW Code 1900-1913)
- City of Citrus Heights Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance (Code 106.39)
- City of Roseville Tree Preservation Ordinance (Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 19.66)
Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act defines ‘take’ (Section 9) and prohibits ‘taking’ of a listed endangered or threatened species (16 USC 1532, 50 CFR 17.30). If a federally listed species could be harmed by a project, Section 7 or 7 consultations must be initiated, and an Incidental Take Permit must be obtained (16 USC 1539, 50 CFR 13).

Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Migratory birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USC 703-711). The MBTA makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR Part 10 including feathers or other parts, nests, eggs, or products, except as allowed by implementing regulations (50 CFR 21). All migratory bird species are protected by the MBTA. Any removal of active nests during the breeding season or any disturbance that results in the abandonment of nestlings is considered a ‘take’ of the species under federal law.

Setting

For the purposes of this document, the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR (2005), the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR, and all associated technical studies were referenced for this section. The Auburn Boulevard corridor is dominated by urban uses. Few remnant natural habitats are present in the area immediately adjacent to the roadway. These habitats have been highly disturbed through urbanization and various degrees of landform alteration. Small stands of native oaks trees are found within the Project area. Landscaped areas or areas of ruderal vegetation are most common along the corridor (see Figure 3).

The project occurs within the Sacramento Valley floristic region and USFS ecological subsection 262Ag (Hardpan Terraces), which is a geologically characterized by low hills and alluvial plains.

PAR Environmental Services conducted a biological survey of the project area on August 24, 2004 to characterize the environmental setting on and adjacent to the project within the City of Citrus Heights, and Dokken Engineering conducted a preliminary database search on June 24, 2015. The database search was performed to confirm special status species with the potential to occur within the previously surveyed project area within the City of Citrus Heights, and the additional project area within the City of Roseville.

A literature research was conducted through the USFWS Planning Species List, CDFW, CNDDDB and the CNPS Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants to identify habitats and special status species with the potential to occur within the project area for Citrus Heights USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle (see Figure 2 Project Location and Figure 3 Project Features).

These database searches identified special status species within the USFWS jurisdiction that may be affected by the project. In addition, a query of the USFWS’s Critical Habitat Portal was conducted to identify potential critical habitat designations within the vicinity of the project. A query of the CNDDDB database provided a list of known occurrences for special status species. The CNPS database search purpose was to identify special status plant species with the potential to occur within the Citrus Heights, California USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle (Appendix C).

Sensitive Habitats

Sensitive habitats include sensitive natural plan communities and other habitats designated and/or regulated by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), wetlands and other waters of the U.S. are subject to the jurisdiction of USACE. Aquatic habitats may also receive protection
under California statutes including Section 1602 of the California Fish and Wildlife Code and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

**Special Status Species**

Special status species are plants and animals in the following categories:

- Species that are listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and/or California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as rare, threatened, or endangered;
- Species considered as candidates and for state or federal listing as threatened or endangered;
- Wildlife designated by CDFW as species of special concern; and
- Plants ranked by CDFW as “rare, threatened, or endangered” in California.

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), maintained by the CDFW, is considered as the most current and reliable tool for tracking occurrences of special status species in California.

**Special Status Species Evaluation**

The special status species evaluation considers those species identified as having relative scarcity and/or declining populations by the USFWS or CDFW. Special status species include those formally listed as threatened or endangered, those for formal listing, candidates for federal listing, and those classified as Species of Concern by USFWS or Species of Special Concern by CDFW. Species considered to be “special animals” or “fully protected” by the CDFW or rare, threatened, or endangered in California by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) were also included in the evaluation.

**Setting and Methods**

Queries of the USFWS Planning Species list, CNDDB Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, and CNPS database queries, conducted on June 25, 2015 identified several special status species with the potential to be impacted by the project. Field surveys were also previously conducted in August 2004 to document existing biological resources, detect potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and State, and search for suitable habitat and presence of Federal and State protected species. Potential impacts to resources were analyzed based on the project design and ecological resources identified in the field surveys. Table 3 provides a summary of all species identified in the search results, a description of the habitat requirements for each species, and conclusions regarding the potential for each species to occur within the project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An annual herb inhabiting vernal pools and mesic valley and foothill grassland communities. Flowers March-May (3-1,460 feet).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop</td>
<td>Gratiola heterosepala</td>
<td>Fed: --</td>
<td>CA: E 1B.</td>
<td>CNPS: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An annual herb inhabiting clay soils and shallow waters of marshes and swamps, lake margins, and vernal pools. Flowers April-August (33-7792 feet).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Special Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Fed:</th>
<th>CA:</th>
<th>CNPS:</th>
<th>Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 4 miles north of the project area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legenere</td>
<td><em>Legenere limosa</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1B. 1</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The creek within proximity to the project area is likely too regularly maintained for species occurrence. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 4 miles from project location; species presumed absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahart's dwarf rush</td>
<td><em>Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1B. 2</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The project area lacks the requisite vernal pools and mesic grassland community; habitat unsuitable for Ahart's dwarf rush. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 12 miles south of the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Orcutt grass</td>
<td><em>Orcuttia viscosa</em></td>
<td>E E</td>
<td>1B. 1</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The project area lacks the requisite vernal pools and site elevation is outside the species range; habitat unsuitable for Sacramento Orcutt grass. Nearest occurrence is 12 miles south east of the project area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford's arrowhead</td>
<td><em>Sagittaria sanfordii</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1B. 2</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The project area is highly disturbed and urbanized, and lacks the requisite habitat for Sanford's arrowhead. Nearest occurrence is 11 miles southeast of the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big-scale balsamroot</td>
<td><em>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1B. 2</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The project area is highly disturbed and urbanized, and lacks the requisite habitat for Big-scale balsamroot. Nearest occurrence is 6 miles north of the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bluff dwarf rush</td>
<td><em>Juncus leiospermus var. leiospermus</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1B. 1</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The project area is highly disturbed and urbanized, and lacks the requisite habitat for Red Bluff dwarf rush. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 6.5 miles north of the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pincushion navarretia</td>
<td><em>Navarretia myersii ssp. Myerisi</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1B. 1</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The project area lacks the requisite vernal pools and grassland community; habitat unsuitable for pincushion navarretia. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 11 miles southeast of the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispid salty bird’s-beak</td>
<td><em>Chloropyron molle ssp. Hispidum</em></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1B. 1</td>
<td><strong>Presumed Absent:</strong> The project area lacks the requisite meadows, seeps, playas, valley and foothill grassland habitat. Project area is considered unsuitable for Hispid...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Special Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>salty bird’s beak. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 7 miles northeast of the project area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tricolored blackbird</td>
<td><em>Agelaius tricolor</em></td>
<td>Fed: CA:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DFG: --</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers freshwater marsh, swamp and wetland communities, but utilize agricultural or upland habitats that can support large colonies often in the Central Valley area. Requires protected dense nesting habitat protected from predators, be within 3-5 miles to a suitable foraging area with insect prey and within 0.3 miles of open water. Suitable foraging includes wetland, pastureland, rangeland, at dairy farms, and in some irrigated croplands (silage, alfalfa, etc.). Nests mid-march - early August, but may extend until October/November in the Sacramento Valley region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inhabits grasslands, deserts, savannas, and early successional stages of forest and shrub habitats. Requires open terrain for hunting, often utilizing rolling foothills and mountain terrain, wide arid plateaus deeply cut by streams and canyons, open mountain slopes, and cliffs and rock outcrops. Home range dependent on prey availability and habitat openness; estimated at 48 mi² in northern California. Species nests on cliffs and large trees in open areas; breeds January-August (0-11,000 feet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Species inhabits arid, open areas with sparse vegetation cover such as deserts, abandoned agricultural areas, grasslands, and disturbed open habitats. Requires friable soils for burrow construction (Below 5,300 feet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson's hawk</td>
<td><em>Buteo swainsoni</em></td>
<td>Fed: CA:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DFG: T</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inhabits grasslands with scattered trees, juniper-sage flats, riparian areas, savannas, and agricultural or ranch lands with groves or lines of trees. Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands, alfalfa or grain fields that support a stable rodent prey base. Breeds March to late August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-tailed kite</td>
<td><em>Elanus leucus</em></td>
<td>Fed: CA:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DFG: --</td>
<td>FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inhabits rolling foothills and valley margins with scattered oaks and river bottomlands or marshes next to deciduous woodland. Prefers open grasslands, meadows or marshes for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presumed Absent: Project site is highly disturbed, developed and too frequently managed for species occurrence; habitat unsuitable for burrowing owl. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 9 miles north west of the project area.

Presumed Absent: The project area lacks open grassland habitat needed for the species. The project area is highly disturbed and urbanized with unsuitable habitat for golden eagle. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 12 miles south of the project area.

Presumed Absent: The project area does not contain open grassland habitat needed for the species. The project area is urbanized with unsuitable foraging habitat for Tricolored blackbird. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 5 miles northeast of the project area.

Presumed Absent: The project area does not contain the dense emergent wetland or an adequate source of open water needed throughout the breeding season. The project area is urbanized with unsuitable foraging habitat for Tricolored blackbird. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 7 miles northeast of the project area.

Presumed Absent: The project area lacks open grassy field suitable for the species foraging. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 5 mile from...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Special Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Vicinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasshopper sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank swallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American badger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mammal Species</th>
<th><strong>Fed:</strong></th>
<th><strong>CA:</strong></th>
<th><strong>DFG:</strong></th>
<th><strong>SSC</strong></th>
<th><strong>Common Name</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American badger</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; The project area lacks the shrub and herbaceous habitat necessary for breeding. The project area is highly disturbed and lacks the necessary habitat for American badger. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 12 miles south of the project area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefers treeless, dry, open stages of most shrub and herbaceous habitats with friable soils and a supply of rodent prey. Species also inhabits forest glades and meadows, marshes, brushy areas, hot deserts, and mountain meadows. Species maintains burrows within home ranges estimated between 338-1,700 acres, dependent on seasonal activity. Burrows are frequently reused, but new burrows may be created nightly. Young are born in March and April within burrows dug in relatively dry, often sandy, soil, usually in areas with sparse overstory cover. Species is somewhat tolerant of human activity, but is sensitive to...
### Table 3: Special Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>automobile mortality, trapping, and persistent poisons (up to 12,000 feet).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallid bat</td>
<td>Antrozous pallidus</td>
<td>Fed: CA: DFG:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Inhabits deserts, grasslands, shrub lands, woodlands and forests. Most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting.</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; The project area lacks the shrub land and forest habitat necessary for roosting. The project area is highly disturbed and lacks the necessary habitat for American badger. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 10 miles north of project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptile Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western pond turtle</td>
<td>Emys marmorata</td>
<td>Fed: CA: DFG:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>A fully aquatic turtle of ponds, marshes, rivers, streams and irrigation ditches with aquatic vegetation. Requires basking sites and suitable (sandy banks or grassy open field) upland habitat for reproduction (Sea level-4,690 feet).</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; The project area does not contain open grassy fields necessary for reproduction. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is approximately 6 miles from project location; no occurrences are documented within the Cripple Creek drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant garter snake</td>
<td>Thamnophis gigas</td>
<td>Fed: CA: DFG:</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Inhabits marsh, swamp, wetland (including agricultural wetlands), sloughs, ponds, rice fields, low gradient streams and irrigation/drainage canals adjacent to uplands. Ideal habitat contains both shallow and deep water with variations in topography. Species requires adequate water during the active season (April-November), emergent, herbaceous wetland vegetation, such as cattails and bulrushes, for escape cover and foraging habitat and mammal burrows estivation. Requires grassy banks and openings in waterside vegetation for basking and higher elevation uplands for cover and refuge from flood waters during winter dormant season. Species is extremely shy and sensitive to disturbance.</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; Cripple Creek does not contain adequate water during the species active season; habitat unsuitable for giant garter snake. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is greater than 10 miles from the project location. No occurrences are documented within Cripple Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibian Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger salamander</td>
<td>Ambystoma californiense</td>
<td>Fed: CA: DFG:</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Inhabits annual grasslands and the grassy understory of valley-foothill hardwood communities. Requires underground refuges, especially ground squirrel burrows and vernal pools or other seasonal water sources for breeding.</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; The project area lacks the annual grasslands and vernal pools required for breeding. The project area is highly disturbed and lacks the required habitat for California tiger salamander. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is greater than 10 miles from the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California red-legged frog</td>
<td>Rana draytonii</td>
<td>Fed: CA:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Inhabits lowlands and foothills in or near permanent sources of deep</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; Cripple Creek in proximity to the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Special Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Fed:</th>
<th>CA:</th>
<th>DFG:</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western spadefoot</td>
<td>Spea hammondii</td>
<td>DFG:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Water with dense, shrubby or emergent riparian vegetation. Requires 11-20 weeks of permanent water for larval development and must have access to estivation habitat. Occurs from elevations near sea level to 5,200 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invertebrate Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endemic to the grasslands of the Central Valley, Central Coast mountains and South Coast Mountains, in astatic rain-filled pools. Inhabits small, clear-water sandstone-depression pools and grassed swale, earth slump, or basalt-flow depression pools. Species is dependent on seasonal fluctuations.</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; Cripple Creek in proximity to the project area does not contain preferred valley foothill hardwood woodland communities necessary for western spadefoot. Nearest CNDDB occurrence is 3.5 miles north west of the project area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal pool fairy shrimp</td>
<td>Branchinecta lynchi</td>
<td>Fed:</td>
<td>CA:</td>
<td>DFG:</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal pool tadpole shrimp</td>
<td>Lepidurus packardi</td>
<td>Fed:</td>
<td>CA:</td>
<td>DFG:</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley elderberry longhorn beetle</td>
<td>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</td>
<td>Fed:</td>
<td>CA:</td>
<td>DFG:</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spawning occurs in small tributaries on coarse gravel beds in riffle areas. Central Valley steelhead are found in the Sacramento River system; the principal remaining wild populations spawn annually in Deer and Mill Creeks in Tehama County, in the lower Yuba River, a small</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; Cripple Creek in proximity to the project area does not provide adequate water, substrates, or connectivity to known river populations; habitat unsuitable for Central Valley steelhead. CNDDB records show the nearest species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley steelhead</td>
<td>Oncorhynchus mykiss</td>
<td>Fed:</td>
<td>CA:</td>
<td>DFG:</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Special Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta smelt</td>
<td><em>Hypomesus transpacificus</em></td>
<td>Fed: T</td>
<td>E: E</td>
<td>Occurs within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and seasonally within the Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait and San Pablo Bay. Most often occurs in partially saline waters.</td>
<td>Presumed Absent; Cripple Creek in proximity to the project area is outside the range of the species; habitat unsuitable for delta smelt. The nearest CNDDB occurrence is 5 miles from the project area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Federal Designations (Fed):
- (FESA, USFWS)
- C: Federal candidate
- D: Federally delisted
- E: Federally listed, endangered
- T: Federally listed, threatened

#### State Designations (CA):
- (CESA, CDFG)
- E: State-listed, endangered
- T: State-listed, threatened
- FP: CDFG Fully Protected

#### Other Designations
- DFG_SSC: DFG Species of Special Concern
- DFG_FP: DFG Fully Protected

#### California Native Plant Society Designations:
- A: Plants presumed extinct in California.
- B: Plants rare and endangered in California and throughout their range.
- 1: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere in their range.
- 2: Plants about which need more information; a review list.
- 4: Plants of limited distribution; a watch list.

#### Plants 1B, 2, and 4 extension meanings:
- _1: Seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)
- _2: Fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened)
- _3: Not very endangered in California (<20% of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)

#### Potential for Occurrence Criteria:
- Present: Species was observed on site during a site visit or focused survey.
- High: Habitat (including soils and elevation factors) for the species occurs on site and a known occurrence has been recorded within 5 miles of the site.
- Low-Moderate: Either low quality habitat (including soils and elevation factors) for the species occurs on site and a known occurrence exists within 5 miles of the site, or suitable habitat strongly associated with the species occurs on site, but no records were found within the database search.
- Presumed Absent: Focused surveys were conducted and the species was not found, or species was found within the database search but habitat (including soils and elevation factors) do not exist on site, or the known geographic range of the species does not include the survey area.

#### Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, an impact on biological resources is considered significant if implementation of the General Plan and GGRP would:

- 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 DFG or USFWS;
- 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 DFG or USFWS;
- 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;
- 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 nursery sites by native wildlife;
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- With the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan (HCP), natural community conservation plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state HCP.

The City of Citrus Heights and City of Roseville General Plan established local policies protecting biological resources. There would be no conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Compliance with local tree preservation ordinances will be required prior to the start of construction and will be discussed further as a potentially significant impact. No adopted or planned HCP or NCCP covers the planning area. For this reason, there would be no conflicts between the project and any HCP or NCCP. This significance criterion is not discussed further in the EIR.

**Summary of Analysis under the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR, and the City of Roseville General Plan**

**City of Citrus Heights**
Chapter 4.6.1 of the General Plan EIR evaluated the effects of the General Plan on biological resources within the general plan policy area. The General Plan EIR identified potential impacts in terms of degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special status birds, through the loss of both nesting and foraging habitat.

Policies in the General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the General Plan. Policy ER 34.3 requires the City to consider the potential impact on sensitive plants for each project and to require pre-construction surveys when appropriate.

The General Plan EIR concluded that the cumulative effects of development that could occur under the General Plan would be less than significant as they related to effects on special status plant species, reduction of habitat for special status invertebrates, loss of habitat for special status birds, loss of habitat for special status amphibians and reptiles, loss of habitat for special status mammals, special status fish and, in general, loss of riparian habitat, wetlands and sensitive natural communities.

**City of Roseville**
Chapter 5 of the Open Space and Conservation Element evaluated effects of the General Plan on biological resources within the City of Roseville area. The General Plan identified potential impacts in terms of degradation of the quality of the environment or reduction of habitat or population below self-sustaining levels of special status birds, through the loss of both nesting and foraging habitat.

Policies in the General Plan were identified as mitigating the effects of development that could occur under the provisions of the General Plan. Policies 1 through 13 require the City to consider the potential impact on existing habitats and sensitive species.

The General Plan concluded that the cumulative effects of development that could occur under would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated as they related to effects on special status plant species, reduction of habitat for special status invertebrates, loss of habitat for special status birds, loss of habitat for special status amphibians and reptiles, loss of habitat for special status mammals, special status fish and, in general, loss of riparian habitat, wetlands and sensitive natural communities.

**Discussion**
a. No impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, all special status species are presumed absent within the project area. Considering the amount of development and hardscape in the project area, the current frequency and volume of human activity, the amount of affected foraging habitat within the project limits, anticipated absence of species nesting, and the implementation of minimization and avoidance measures incorporated into the project design, the project would not impact the viability of the overall population and further consultation under CESA is not anticipated. To minimize and avoid potential impacts to potential special status species occurrences and vegetation clearing, the project would comply with mitigation measures B-2 through B-5 (ABSP 2005).

b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, Riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities were not observed within the project construction limits. The project construction will take place within landscaped and developed areas (ABSP 2005).

c. No impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, Cripple Creek is the closest waterway to the project area and is located 180 feet southwest of the project area. Cripple Creek is a major tributary of Arcade Creek, which is a tributary to the Sacramento River, and is considered Waters of the U.S. However, no impacts to Cripple Creek or direct runoff would occur due to the project. No vernal pools or wetland habitat occurs within the proximity to the project site. The project would result in no permanent or temporary impacts to Waters of the U.S. or State (ABSP 2005).

d. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. No interference would take place due to the project with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Project construction will take place on landscaped and hardscape area. However, trees will be removed due to project construction. Therefore, to protect migratory birds B-2 through B-5 will be implemented to ensure protection of migratory nesting birds.

e. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project is subject to the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville Tree Ordinance. At this time, approximately 57 trees will be impacted by the project (Arborist Report & Tree Inventory Summary, 2015). The trees will be removed prior to construction and replanted after construction along the widened road and within existing medians. According to the City of Citrus Heights and City of Roseville Tree Preservation and Protection Regulations, native oak trees 6 inches or more in diameter, and mature trees 19 inches or more in diameter are protected and require a permit for removal. Some removals may require the replanting of trees or the payment of a mitigation fee and a report from a certified arborist. An arborist survey will be conducted by Acorn Arboricultural Services, Inc. to determine species found within the project area, and, if necessary, a tree removal permit will be obtained from both Cities prior to construction. Mitigation measure B-2 through B-5 will also be implemented to further reduce impacts to vegetation within the project area (ABSP 2005).

f. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project will not conflict with any locally adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, etc. Within the project area, there are no resource based plans that address special status species (ABSP 2005).

Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure B-3 and City of Roseville General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 have been incorporated within Mitigation Measures B-4 and B-5 of this section.

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated
B-1: To ensure consistency with the City of Citrus Heights’ Policy 37.1, which requires incorporation of existing trees into development projects, building envelopes for future development projects should be configured to minimize impacts to trees to the extent feasible. The following measures shall be implemented:

1. Building envelopes should be established on plans and specifications for the future development projects to designate the area needed for construction of roads, driveways, and building pads.
2. These building envelopes should be large enough to include not only the improvements, but also work areas for heavy equipment, staging areas, and equipment and material lay down areas.
3. To protect trees elsewhere on construction sites, no construction activities or use of heavy equipment should occur outside of the building envelopes.
4. Oaks that fall within the building envelope but which are not slated for removal should be protected by the following measures, which should be implemented during all construction phases of the project:
   a. Plans and specifications should clearly state protection procedures for oaks to be preserved on the project site. The specifications should also require contractors to stay within designated work areas and should include a provision for penalties if oak trees are damaged;
   b. No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile offices, or materials should be parked or located within the driplines of oaks and other trees that are to be preserved;
   c. Soil surface removal should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be preserved. No cuts or trenching should occur within the dripline. If this area cannot be avoided, then the tree should be added to the list of oaks to be replaced through an on-site planting;
   d. Earthen fill deep should not be placed within the driplines of oak trees to be retained, and no fill should be placed within five feet of their trunks;
   e. Paving should not be placed within the dripline of oaks to be retained;
   f. Underground utility line trenching should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be retained. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the driplines of oak trees, the trench should either be bored or drilled but not within five feet of the trunk and a certified arborist should be retained to monitor this construction and repair or wrap any damaged roots;
   g. Living Among the Oaks: A Management Guide for Landowners (UC Cooperative Extension, Berkeley) in Appendix H should be used by the City as a guide in reviewing landscape plans. The information should be distributed to landowners and developers to provide information and guidelines for preparing landscape plans and for protecting oaks after construction is complete.

B-1B: Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Woodland Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within oak woodland and/or riparian habitats (as opposed to isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Oak trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted.
2. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies.
a. The goals of the Oak Plan should be to replace trees lost by the project to create healthy, self-sustaining habitats that are not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period. The functions and values of the created habitat should approximate those of the affected habitats, i.e., the functions and values of oak woodland rather than an ornamental landscape planting.

b. At a minimum, the Oak Plan should include clear success criteria, monitoring and reporting requirements, and a contingency plan should the responsible parties fail to meet the success criteria that ensure that mitigation goals and ratios are met. The Oak Plan should also include details for the species, size of plants and quantities, planting techniques, techniques for protecting the trees from herbivory, and irrigation, weed control and maintenance plan, and monitoring requirements.

B-1C: Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Maintenance Plan (Landscape Tree Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within landscape settings (i.e. isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Oaks trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted.

   a. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Maintenance Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies. The goals of the Oak Plan, at a minimum, should be to replace trees lost by the project in an appropriate landscape setting that will allow trees to thrive and be self-sustaining and not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period. Replacement within the specific plan area’s planned landscape areas as street trees, trees for public space landscape or roadway medians, should be emphasized when identifying replanting sites. Replacement in a natural habitat setting as described in Measure B-2B would also accomplish these oak tree replacement goals.

B-1D: Preconstruction Tree Survey: Prior to construction, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, condition and species of trees that would be removed by the roadway improvement project. An Oak Tree Replacement and Management Plan shall be prepared in accordance with Mitigation Measures B-2A, B-2B and B-2C described above.

B-2: Avoid Impacts to Nesting Birds
1. If tree removal for construction will occur during the nesting season (February through July), a minimum of two preconstruction surveys should be conducted in construction areas for nesting birds. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist.
2. Surveys should be conducted no more that 14 days prior to the initiation of tree-removal activities during the early part of the breeding season (February through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through July).
3. If the surveyor deems that an active bird nest is close enough to the construction area to be disturbed, he or she should (in consultation with CDFG) determine the extent of the construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest.
4. Trees should be removed outside the nesting season (February through July), or after a qualified wildlife biologist verifies that the nest is empty and the nest tree is no longer used by the adults and young birds.
B-3: Avoid Introduction and Spread of New Noxious Weeds. In the vicinity of Cripple Creek, during construction only certified weed-free straw will be used and all disturbed soils will be thoroughly covered with straw (or mulch or chips created on-site during tree removal) upon completion of grading. No seed mixes should be used unless consisting of locally native grasses and forbs.

Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures

B-4: Pursuant to the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure B-3 and the City of Roseville Mitigation Measure 4.9-3, if construction is planned to occur during the raptor nesting season (February – August) a preconstruction raptor nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, 10 feet or taller and containing a dbh of 2 inches or greater. Within 2 weeks of the nesting raptor survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor.

A minimum 500 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active raptor nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.

B-5: Pursuant to the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure B-3 and the City of Roseville Mitigation Measure 4.9-3, if ground disturbance or vegetation removal is to take place during the breeding season (February – August), a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, bushes, tall grasses and emergent vegetation. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor.

A minimum 100 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

a. No Impact. Per the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR, there are no known historical resources within the project area. There are no significant cultural resources located within proximity of the project area. The existing site was previously graded and developed (ABSP 2005). On June 23, 2015, Dokken Engineering Archaeologist, Namat Hosseinion, P.I., conducted a pedestrian field survey of the additional project area located within the City of Roseville. No potential cultural resources or historical resources were observed within the project area.

b. No impact. Per the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR, there are no known archaeological resources within proximity of the project area in the City of Citrus Heights (ABSP 2005). During the June 23, 2015 pedestrian survey, no additional potential archaeological resources were observed within the City of Roseville portion of the project.

c. The project is not anticipated to impact paleontological resources. The project area has been disturbed previously by construction of the surrounding development and industrial uses. As documented in the City of Citrus Heights General Plan FEIR, the City of Roseville General Plan, and Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR, the general City of Citrus Heights and project area is not considered sensitive for paleontological resources (ABSP 2005).

d. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. No human remains or cemeteries were identified within proximity of the project area. See CR-1 and CR-2 of the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR.

e. No Impact. Effective July 1, 2015, CEQA was revised to include early consultation with California Native American tribes and consideration of tribal cultural resources (TCRs). These changes were enacted through Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52). By including TCRs early in the CEQA process, AB 52 intends to ensure that local and Tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents would have information available, early in the project planning process, to identify and address potential
adverse impacts to TCRs. CEQA now establishes that a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC § 21084.2).

To help determine whether a project may have such an adverse effect, the PRC requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a project. That consultation must take place prior to the determination of whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project (PRC § 21080.3.1). Consultation must consist of the lead agency providing formal notification, in writing, to the tribes that have requested notification or projects within their traditionally and culturally affiliated area. AB 52 stipulates that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall assist the lead agency in identifying the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated within the project area. If the tribe wishes to engage in consultation on the project, the tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification. Once the lead agency receives the tribe’s request to consult, the lead agency must then begin the consultation process within 30 days. If a lead agency determines that a project may cause a substantial adverse change to TCRs, the lead agency must consider measures to mitigate that impact. Consultation concludes when either: 1) the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a TCR, or 2) a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached (PRC § 21080.3.2). Under existing law, environmental documents must not include information about the locations of an archaeological site or sacred lands or any other information that is exempt from public disclosure pursuant to the Public Records act. TCRs are also exempt from disclosure.

For purposes of this study, the term “tribal cultural resource” refers to either of the following:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
   a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources
   b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020.1
2. A resource determined by a California lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the PRC Section 5024.1.

In July, 2015, the City of Citrus Heights obtained a list of California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area from the NAHC. The City then sent initial letters inviting the tribes detailed on the NAHC list to consult under AB 52 for the project. This initial letter provided a brief project description, project location, lead agency contact information, and a notification that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation. No TCRs were identified within the project area.

**Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project**

None.

**Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated**
CR-1: Handling of Discovered Artifacts or Remains: Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during any development activities, work shall be suspended according to (A) below.

It is recommended under CEQA and Policy 41.1 of the Citrus Heights General Plan that:

1. In the event that any prehistoric, historic, or paleontological resources are discovered during construction-related earth moving activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and the developer shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist, then representatives from the City of Citrus Heights and the qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist would meet to determine the appropriate course of action.

2. Pursuant to Section 5097.97 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. And that under Policy 42.3 of the Citrus Heights General Plan that planners establish thresholds by which future projects can be judged when considering historic impacts. These standards should include height and massing considerations for projects that are located in close proximity to historic resources (individual structures and districts) and define locations for potential prehistoric resources.

CR-2: Evaluation of Historic Resources Older than 45 Years. Prior to approval of projects or issuance of construction or grading permits, cultural resources that appear to be 45 years old or older on a project site need to be recorded for the purposes of inclusion in the State Office of Historic Preservation’s filing system. “The 45 year criterion recognizes that there is commonly a five year lag between resource identification and the date that planning decisions are made” (California, State of 1995). Should the five year period lapse between the completion of the initial cultural resources documentation and the start date of the project, the cultural resource studies would need to be updated to include any additional properties/sites that would, by that time, meet the 45 year criteria.

Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures

None required.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic 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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

a.i-iv. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial or adverse effects (ABSP 2005).

i. California Department of Conservation (CDC) California Geological Survey does not list Sacramento County or Placer County as affected by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. According to the Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas, no active faults are located within the project area.

ii. The project would not expose people or structures to seismic ground shaking due to the lack of active faults within the City and the nature of the project activities.

iii. The project would not create ground failure or liquefaction. Given the soil types and depth to bedrock, the ground at this site is not prone to liquefaction. In addition, the project does not involve the construction of structures which would regularly be occupied by people.

iv. The CDC does not list Sacramento County or Placer County as an area at risk for Landslides as identified in the California Department of Transportation’s (Caltrans) Highway Corridor Mapping project (CDC 2007). Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial risk of landslides.

b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, project construction would not generate soil erosion concerns or the loss of topsoil. Standard BMPs will be implemented during construction as mentioned in the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR. The project would comply with Sacramento and Placer County NPDES for discharges of urban runoff from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s). The project would comply with the Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan (SQIP), which will adequately control all erosion. Therefore, no impacts from soil erosion are anticipated.

c. No Impact. The project is not located on a geologic 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.

d. No Impact. The project is not located on expansive soil. Special design considerations are not required for expansive soils, as they are not located within the project area.

e. No Impact. The project would not use a septic tank system. In addition, sewage is not required for the project; therefore, the project will have no impacts related to septic systems.

Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

None.

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

None.

Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures

None required.
Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting

As part of its action in approving the City of Citrus Heights General Plan, and the City of Roseville General Plan, the City Councils certified the Master EIR that evaluated the environmental effects of development that is reasonably anticipated under the new General Plan. The General Plan EIR includes extensive discussion of the potential effects of greenhouse gas emissions. The General Plan EIR discussions regarding climate change are incorporated here by reference. See, for example:

Final EIR: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan
This document is available at [http://www.citrusheights.net/203/Greenhouse-Gas-Reduction-Plan](http://www.citrusheights.net/203/Greenhouse-Gas-Reduction-Plan) and at the offices of City of Citrus Heights at 6237 Fountain Square Drive, Citrus Heights, California.

Final Report: City of Roseville Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan Analysis
This document is available at [https://www.roseville.ca.us/lp/supersize/ClimateActionPlan.pdf](https://www.roseville.ca.us/lp/supersize/ClimateActionPlan.pdf) and at the offices of City of Roseville at 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, California.

The project is consistent with the land use designations for the project site. The project would result in the generation of greenhouse gases during construction and operation, as discussed below.

Environmental Consequences

Short-Term Construction Emissions

During construction of the project, temporary GHG emissions would be emitted from the operation of construction equipment and from worker supply vendor vehicles. Emissions from construction equipment are not expected to exceed the threshold of significance.
Long-Term Construction Emissions

Because the project consists of road improvements, and does not increase capacity of the roadway, there are no long-term operational activities associated with the project. The project would not lead to changes in vehicular operations and associated emissions. While there may be maintenance visits to the project site, these visits are expected to be infrequent, and occur for emergency repair or for repaving, which occurs after the lifetime of the installed pavement has been reached. Long term operational emissions are thus expected to be negligible.

Ongoing Activities

City of Citrus Heights
The General Plan includes a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan for the City. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan provided additional guidance, strategies and measures for the City’s ongoing efforts to reduce GHG emissions.

To prevent the continued escalation of GHG emissions, the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan establishes a 2020 target (10 to 15 percent below 2005 levels) to reduce annual emissions levels consistent with state laws and guidelines. According to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, the actions that could be quantified along with those that could not outline a path to meet the City’s 2020 reduction target, consistent with state laws and guidelines. When combined with quantified state and federal legislative reductions, primary actions contained in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan offer a potential reduction of about 145,677 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) annually. This level of reduction will meet the City’s 2020 target of 10 to 15 percent and is consistent with state laws.

City of Roseville
The General Plan includes a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan Analysis for the City through 2015. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan provided additional guidance, strategies and measures for the City’s ongoing efforts to reduce GHG emissions.

To prevent the continued escalation of GHG emissions, the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan established a 2015 target (20 percent below 2000 levels) to reduce annual emissions levels consistent with state laws and guidelines. According to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, the actions that could be quantified along with those that could not outline a path to meet the City’s 2015 reduction target, consistent with state laws and guidelines. When combined with quantified state and federal legislative reductions, primary actions contained in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan offered a potential reduction of up to 16,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) annually. Currently, this level of reduction has met the City’s 2015 target of 20 percent and is consistent with state laws.

State and Federal Levels
In addition to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, GHG-reduction strategies continue at the state and federal level to combat climate change. In December 2009, the EPA listed GHG as harmful emissions under the Clean Air Act. This action could eventually result in regulations with a purpose of reducing such emissions.

The General Plan EIR concluded that GHG emissions that could be emitted by development that is consistent with the General Plan would be less than significant. The General Plan EIR includes a full analysis of GHG emissions and climate change, and adequately addresses these issues. As indicated in the General Plan EIR, future development within the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville will be required to comply with Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2035 Metropolitan transportation Plan (MTP). The 2035 MTP is anticipated to meet the AB 32 goal of reaching 1990 transportation emissions by 2020. The City is not anticipating an increase in GHG emission with the incorporation of reduction measures.
The project must comply with the General Plan policies and measures for the reduction of GHGs to comply with the 2035 MTP and AB 32. Because the traffic from the project was assumed in the 2035 MTP, and the 2035 MTP is anticipated to meet the goals of AB 32, the project would comply with the 2035 MTP. AB 32 requires an approximate 29 percent reduction from existing emissions on a statewide level in order to achieve the goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

The General Plan EIR for the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville General Plan allows for periodic maintenance on established arterial streets, such as Auburn Boulevard, therefore the GHG emissions increase that would occur with implementation of the project has been accounted for in the General Plan. The project would not impede the City’s efforts to comply with AB 32 requirements. Therefore, the project’s cumulative impacts related to construction and operation of the project conflicting with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions would be less than significant. The project would not have any significant additional environmental effects relating to GHG emissions or climate change.

Discussion

a. Less-than-Significant Impact. Short-term, negligible GHG emissions would result from the construction equipment and worker vehicles. Worker vehicles would be limited to minimum necessary causing a less-than-significant impact to generation of GHG emissions in the region (ABSP 2005).

b. Less than Significant. The project would not conflict with the City of Roseville Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan or the City of Citrus Heights Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

None.

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

None.

Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures

None required.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setting**

Federal regulations and regulations adopted by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Management District (SMAQMD) and the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) apply to the identification and treatment of hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities. Failure to comply with these regulations respecting asbestos may result in a Notice of Violation being issued by the AQMD and APCD and civil penalties under state and/or federal law, in addition to possible action by U.S. EPA under federal law.

Federal law covers a number of different activities involving asbestos, including demolition and renovation of structures (40 CFR § 61.145).

**SMAQMD Rule 902 and Commercial Structures, and PCAPCD Asbestos Demolition Requirements:**

The work practices and administrative requirements of Rule 902 apply to all commercial renovations and demolitions where the amount of Regulated Asbestos-Containing Material (RACM) is greater than:

- 260 lineal feet of RACM on pipes, or
- 160 square feet of RACM on other facility components, or
- 35 cubic feet of RACM that could not be measured otherwise.

The administrative requirements of Rule 902 apply to any demolition of commercial structures, regardless of the amount of RACM.

**Asbestos Surveys**

To determine the amount of RACM in a structure, Rule 902 and PCAPCD requirements state that a survey be conducted prior to demolition or renovation unless:

- the structure is otherwise exempt from the rule, or
- any material that has a propensity to contain asbestos (so-called "suspect material") is treated as if it is RACM.

Surveys must be done by a licensed asbestos consultant and require laboratory analysis. Asbestos consultants are listed in the phone book under "Asbestos Consultants." Large industrial facilities may use non-licensed employees if those employees are trained by the U.S. EPA. Questions regarding the use of non-licensed employees should be directed to the AQMD and PCAPCD.
**Removal Practices, Removal Plans/Notification and Disposal**

If the survey shows that there are asbestos-containing materials present, the SMAQMD and PCAPCD recommends leaving it in place.

If it is necessary to disturb the asbestos as part of a renovation, remodel, repair or demolition, Cal OSHA and the Contractors State License Board require a licensed asbestos abatement contractor be used to remove the asbestos-containing material.

There are specific disposal requirements for friable asbestos-containing material, including disposal at a licensed landfill. If the material is non-friable asbestos, any landfill willing to accept asbestos-containing material may be used to dispose of the material.

**Summary of Analysis under the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR, and the City of Roseville General Plan**

**City of Citrus Heights**

This section is derived from information contained in the General Plan EIR for the City of Citrus Heights General Plan and the Initial Site Assessment for the Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2, Citrus Heights, California (Dokken Engineering, June 2015). Record searches conducted for the Initial Site Assessment (ISA) identified twenty-two (22) sites within one mile of the project alignment for which hazardous materials issues may be present. These sites are identified based on records that show historic soil and/or groundwater contamination; or they are existing or historic land uses commonly associated with hazardous waste contamination problems. The General Plan EIR evaluated effects of development on hazardous materials, emergency response and aircraft crash hazards. See Chapter 4.6. Implementation of the Project may result in the exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction activities. Impacts identified within the EIR and ISA related to construction activities and operations were found to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Policies included in the General Plan were effective in reducing the identified impacts.

**City of Roseville**

State and federal legislation, which address concerns regarding hazardous materials, provide much of the framework within which Roseville works to manage safety issues relating to hazardous materials. A variety of laws are now in effect that regulate hazardous materials clean-up, storage, testing procedures and financial assistance for hazardous waste reduction. Policies included in the City of Roseville General Plan were effective in reducing potential impacts relating to hazardous materials. See Chapter 8, Policies 1 through 4.

**Discussion**

a-b. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Initial Site Assessment conducted by Dokken Engineering (2015) for the project identified existing and historic land uses that were associated with contamination. The most common type of sites are existing or historic service stations with possible leaks from underground storage tanks. Based on the site reconnaissance, potential REC’s on properties adjacent to the project boundaries include the following:

- Potential for PCB’s with existing pole-mounted electrical transformers,
- Potential for underground fuel storage tank leaks from the four gas stations (Chevron, Shell, Towne Mart, and an abandoned gas station) in the project area located along Auburn Boulevard, and
- Potential chemical spills from Paradise Cleaners near the intersection of Auburn Boulevard and Baird Way.
The ISA recommended additional actions to verify the presence/extent of RECs and to evaluate the potential for remediation during the Plans, Specifications & Estimate (PS&E) phase of the Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets – Phase 2 Project: Impacts related to emissions of hazardous materials are significant but can be mitigated to a less than significant level by following the precautions required for construction and demolition activities in areas where contamination may be present.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) can occur in serpentine rock. The most common forms of NOA minerals are chrysotile, actinolite, and tremolite. A review of the “General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California – Areas likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos” (CGS Open-file Report 2000-19) indicated that NOA was not mapped on, or in the near vicinity of the project site. The nearest ultramafic rock formation which may be associated with naturally occurring asbestos is approximately 10 miles east of the project area, along the eastern banks of Folsom Lake (USGS, 2015).

The roadway improvements in the vicinity of residences adjacent to Auburn Boulevard may involve removal of yellow thermoplastic traffic striping from the existing roadway surface. Yellow traffic stripes may contain heavy metals such as lead and chromium at concentrations in excess of hazardous waste thresholds established by the CCR and may produce toxic fumes when heated. Disposal of stripes is required at a Class 1 disposal facility. See Mitigation Measure HM-1 through HM-7.

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school The closest public school to the project area is located approximately 0.5 mile south at Mesa Verde High School. In addition, mitigation measures HM-1 will be implemented (ABSP 2005).

d. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project is located within an area of existing and historic land uses that were associated with contamination on the Cortese List of hazardous materials sites from EnviroStor. The ISA recommended additional actions to verify the presence/extent of RECs and to evaluate the potential for remediation during the Plans, Specifications & Estimate (PS&E) phase of the Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets – Phase 2 Project: Impacts related to emissions of hazardous materials are significant but can be mitigated to a less than significant level by following the precautions required for construction and demolition activities in areas where contamination may be present. See HM-1 through HM-7.

e-f. No Impact. The project is not located near an airport or airstrip. Since the project site is not located within two miles of an airport or an area for which an Airport Land Use Plan has been prepared, and no public or private airfields are within two miles of the project area, users of the project would not be exposed to hazards due to over flight aircraft. Thus, no significant impact would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary (ABSP 2005).

g. No Impact. The project is not expected to impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan for the City of Citrus Heights or the City of Roseville. The project would not result in an increased concentration of large numbers of persons in any at-risk location, and the project would not have a significant impact on any emergency plans. Thus, no significant impact would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary (ABSP 2005).

h. No Impact. The project does not present conditions that are subject to wildland fires. There is no potential to 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. Therefore, no impacts are potential or expected (ABSP 2005).
Mitigation Measures from the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

HM-1: Pursuant to City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.15-3a, no projects shall be approved where there is substantial evidence of existing contamination on a Cortese-listed site that would pose an unacceptable risk to the health of construction workers.

HM-2: Pursuant to City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.15-3b, establish a process that identifies the steps to be taken prior to commencement of any site preparation activities on Cortese-listed sites. This may contain but not be limited to the following:

1. Retain a licensed professional to investigate the environmental status of the soils and/or groundwater contamination. Prepare a site plan that identifies and implements any remediation activities that are required to remove health risks to persons exposed to the site during construction activities.
2. Remove all contaminated soil, dispose of contaminated soil by a licensed contractor to a properly licensed facility, and replace contaminated soil with clean fill dirt.
3. Consult with appropriate regulatory agencies such as Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Sacramento Department of Environmental Health to determine what actions are required by these agencies to be implemented (e.g., de-watering, groundwater monitoring, etc.).

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

HM-3: Mitigation Measure HM-1A Handling of Asbestos Material: Control devices and fugitive emissions monitoring are required during demolition activities which will disturb, or have the possibility of disturbing, the asbestos-containing materials. All asbestos containing building material within the buildings planned for demolition should be removed prior to any demolition activity that could break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb these materials. This removal must be done using appropriate engineering controls, in compliance with all regulations, and be a contractor certified by the Contractor’s State License Board and registered by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Northwest Envirocon, Incorporated 1997).

HM-3B: Disposal Of The Yellow Thermoplastic Traffic Stripes: Disposal of the yellow thermoplastic traffic stripes will be at a Class 1 disposal facility. All aspects of the project associated with removal, storage, transportation, and disposal of the yellow thermoplastic traffic striping, should be in strict accordance with the appropriate regulations.

Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures

HM-4: Any leaking transformers observed during the course of the project should be considered a potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hazard. Should leaks from electrical transformers (that will either remain within the construction limits or will require removal and/or relocation) be encountered during construction, the transformer fluid should be sampled and analyzed by qualified personnel for detectable levels of PCB’s. Should PCBs be detected, the transformer should be removed and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB’s should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency.

HM-5: Based on preliminary plans, right-of-way acquisition may be required at the Towne Mart gas station at Sandalwood Drive and the abandoned gas station at Oak Grove Avenue. Should final plans indicate that a portion of this parcel will be acquired for new right-of-way, a preliminary environmental
screening (limited subsurface sampling and laboratory analysis) should be performed during the PS&E for potentially elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and MTBE contamination within the limits of proposed construction, and/or right-of-way acquisition, adjacent to the existing gas stations. Should the preliminary screening encounter elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and/or MTBE a limited Phase II ISA should be performed. The Phase II ISA should consist of subsurface sampling and laboratory analysis and be of sufficient quantity to define the extent and concentration of contamination within the areal extent and depths of planned construction activities adjacent to the existing gas stations. The Phase II ISA should also provide both a Health and Safety Plan for worker safety and a Work Plan for handling and disposing contaminated soil during construction.

HM-6: The potential exists for hazardous contamination from historic chemical spills at Paradise Cleaners, which is located near the intersection of Auburn Boulevard and Baird Way. At the time of this ISA, there were no documented reports of soil/groundwater contamination related to chemical discharge from Paradise Cleaners. If a potential hazardous contamination is detected, soil samples should be gathered and tested to determine the chemical levels within the soil.

HM-7: To avoid impacts from pavement striping during construction it is recommended that removal requirements for yellow striping and pavement marking materials be performed in accordance with Caltrans Standard Special Provision 14-11.07 REMOVE YELLOW TRAFFIC STRIPE AND PAVEMENT MARKING WITH HAZARDOUS WASTE RESIDUE.

HM-8: As is the case for any project that proposes excavation, the potential exists for unknown hazardous contamination to be revealed during project construction (such as previously undetected petroleum hydrocarbon contamination from nearby gas stations). Should any previously unknown hazardous waste/material be encountered during construction, the procedures outlined in Caltrans Hazards Procedures for Construction shall be followed.

HM-9: If the project area changes (due to a change in the project design or staging area), further investigation for potential hazardous waste generators would be required to determine their impact to the revised project limits.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

For the purposes of this document, the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR (2005) was referenced for this section.

The project area is located within the American River watershed hydrologic unit which feeds into Sacramento County’s River Flood Control System. There are no streams or waters within the project area. The closest stream is Cripple Creek which is located 180 feet south of the project area, and flows in a westerly direction to Arcade Creek, which in turn drains to the Natomas Main Drainage Canal and ultimately into the Sacramento River (City of Citrus Heights, 2000). Drainage facilities are located at several locations along Auburn Boulevard.

Cripple Creek maintains a perennial flow south of the project area, though a significant source of this flow is urban runoff. The project is not located within one of California’s four sole source aquifers. The project is located in Sacramento County, and extends into Placer County, which does not have a sole source aquifer.

Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts to hydrology and water quality may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan EIR:

- Substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants generated by construction and/or development of the Specific Plan, or
- Substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.
Summary of Analysis under the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR, and the City of Roseville General Plan

City of Citrus Heights
Chapter 4.5 of the General Plan EIR evaluates the potential effects of the General Plan as they relate to surface water, groundwater, flooding, stormwater and water quality. Potential effects include water quality degradation due to construction activities and exposure of people to flood risks (Impacts 4.5-2 through 4.5-6). Policies included in the General Plan, including a directive for regional cooperation, comprehensive flood management, and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development (Policies 34.2-49.8) were identified that reduced all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

City of Roseville
Chapters 5 and 8 of the General Plan evaluate potential effects as they relate to surface water, groundwater, flooding, stormwater and water quality. Potential effects include water quality degradation due to construction activities and exposure of people to flood risks. Policies included in the General Plan, including a directive for regional cooperation, comprehensive flood management, and construction of adequate drainage facilities with new development (Chapter 5, Implementation Measure 10, and Chapter 8, Implementation Measures 1 through 13). The City of Roseville regulates its floodplain areas through land use, zoning, and other development restrictions. This includes policies requiring the dedication of and a prohibition on development within—the City’s Regulatory Floodplain. Certain exceptions to this policy exist primarily within the infill area and for the construction of essential services. Where encroachments may be permitted, improvements are required to be designed to minimize cumulative upstream and downstream effects.

Discussion

a. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Construction would consist of activities on landscaped and hardscape environments. Construction activities would not substantially degrade water quality and would not violate any water quality objectives by the State Water Resources Control Board. Drainage facilities are located at several locations along Auburn Boulevard BMPs will be put in place to prevent sediment and other contaminants generated by construction from impacting the drainages. Mitigation measures H-1 through H-4 will be incorporated to further reduce the risk of violating any water quality or waste discharge standards.

b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, no groundwater wells would be drilled as part of the project. The project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level.

c-d. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not 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

e. Less-than-Significant. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, there will be an increase in impervious surface due to the project. This will result in more runoff water, however the project is including drainage improvements. The existing drainage facilities within the project have adequate capacity for additional runoff.

f. No impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
g.-h. Less than significant. Cripple Creek has a relatively small hydrologic capacity and can be quickly overwhelmed during severe storm runoff events. In these events, stream channel banks can overflow and result in temporary inundation of adjoining low lying areas. Within the project area, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) shows the area immediately adjacent to Cripple Creek as being within the 100-year floodplain, Zone AE which represents areas with a 1% annual chance of flooding. The project includes construction of a raised median on Auburn Boulevard starting approximately 300 feet south of Cripple Creek Drive. The raised median encroaches approximately 50 feet on to the existing floodplain Zone AE for Cripple Creek. The rest of the project area is within Zone X, which represents areas of 0.2% annual chance flood; areas of 1% annual change flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 1% annual chance flood (Appendix D). A Summary Floodplain Encroachment Report was submitted by Dokken Engineering per Caltrans requirements on June 25, 2015 to examine if the project would increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood. While the proposed median would encroach 50 feet on to the existing floodplain Zone AE, the project does not include new housing or development within the floodplain and would only make improvements to the existing road which is consistent with the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville General Plan. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

i. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of levee or dam.

j. Less than significant. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, while the median would encroach 50 feet on to the existing floodplain Zone AE, the project does not include new housing or development within the floodplain and would only make improvements to the existing road which is consistent with the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville General Plan. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or property to flooding risks or inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflows.

**Mitigation Measures from the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project**

None.

**Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated**

**H-1:** Incorporate Development Standards for Improving Water Quality: The City shall incorporate water quality protection measures into the specific plan Development Standards: The standards may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Install and maintain landscaping that requires minimal application of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides;
2. Emphasize xeriscape landscaping that reduces the need for irrigation by minimizing the use of turf in decorative landscaping, using plant materials adapted to local conditions and efficient irrigation;
3. Minimize irrigation overspray - do not permit use of sprinkler and spray irrigation in areas less than 8 feet wide;
4. Use of drip irrigation systems where feasible;
5. Incorporate features such as filtration strips or bioswales in site design to prevent urban pollutants from entering into Cripple Creek via storm drains from parking lots and paved surfaces.
H-2: Implement Best Management Practices (BMPs). The City shall require implementation of best management practices for public and private development. Such practices may include, but are not limited to:

1. Regular inspection, maintenance and cleaning out of stormwater retention or detention structures;
2. Regular inspection, maintenance and cleaning out of oil and water separators;
3. Encourage property owners to regularly remove trash, dead vegetation and leaf litter;
4. Encourage use of landscaping and horticultural practices that minimize the need for chemical fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides.

Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures

H-3: The Project would require a NPDES General Construction Permit for Discharges of storm water associated with construction activities (Construction General Permit 2012-0006-DWQ). A SWPPP would also be developed and implemented as part of the Construction General Permit.

H-4: The construction contractor shall adhere to the SWRCB Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ NPDES Permit pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA. This permit authorizes storm water and authorized non-storm water discharges from construction activities. As part of this Permit requirement, a SWPPP shall be prepared prior to construction consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. This SWPPP will incorporate all applicable BMPs to ensure that adequate measures are taken during construction to minimize impacts to water quality.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

a. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project will take place on and adjacent to an existing facility. The project would not physically divide an established community (ABSP 2005).

b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project will not affect the roadway designation. The project would not change the zoning ordinance within the project area (ABSP 2005).

c. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project will not conflict with any existing habitat conservation plan or natural community’s conservation plan. No such plans currently exist within the project area (ABSP 2005).

Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

None.

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

None.

Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures

None required.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Not applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a-b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project site has not been identified as containing mineral resources that would be considered a significant resource. No active mining operations are present in or near the project area (ABSP 2005).

**Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project**

None.

**Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated**

None.

**Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures**

Not applicable.
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:

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?  
   Potentially Significant Impact  Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document  Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  Less Than Significant Impact  No Impact
   - X

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?  
   Potentially Significant Impact  Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document  Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  Less Than Significant Impact  No Impact
   - X

c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  
   Potentially Significant Impact  Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document  Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  Less Than Significant Impact  No Impact
   - X

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above level existing without the project?  
   Potentially Significant Impact  Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document  Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  Less Than Significant Impact  No Impact
   - X

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project to excessive noise levels?  
   Potentially Significant Impact  Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document  Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  Less Than Significant Impact  No Impact
   - X

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  
   Potentially Significant Impact  Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document  Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated  Less Than Significant Impact  No Impact
   - X

Setting

In accordance with the Caltrans Environmental Handbook guidelines, noise is defined as unwanted sound. Sound levels usually are measured and expressed in decibels (dB), with 0 dB being the threshold of hearing. Decibel levels range from 0 to 140; 50 dB for light traffic is considered a low decibel level, whereas 120 dB for a jet takeoff at 200 feet is considered a high decibel level.

Under the Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (CaTNAP) 2011, projects that are not Type 1 only require an evaluation of predicted construction noise. The project is not a Type 1 project as defined in 23 CFR 772.5:

1. The construction of a highway on new location; or,
2. The physical alteration of an existing highway where there is either:
(i) Substantial Horizontal Alteration. A project that halves the distance between the traffic noise source and the closest receptor between the existing condition to the future build condition; or,
(ii) Substantial Vertical Alteration. A project that removes shielding therefore exposing the line-of-sight between the receptor and the traffic noise source. This is done by either altering the vertical alignment of the highway or by altering the topography between the highway traffic noise source and the receptor; or,

(3) The addition of a through-traffic lane(s). This includes the addition of a through-traffic lane that functions as a HOV lane, High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane, bus lane, or truck climbing lane; or,
(4) The addition of an auxiliary lane, except for when the auxiliary lane is a turn lane; or,
(5) The addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps added to a quadrant to complete an existing partial interchange; or,
(6) Restriping existing pavement for the purpose of adding a through-traffic lane or an auxiliary lane; or,
(7) The addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot or toll plaza.
(8) If a project is determined to be a Type I project under this definition then the entire project area as defined in the environmental document is a Type I project.

The project is a reconstruction project of an existing road and is not a new highway. The project would not significantly change the horizontal or vertical alignment of the road, would not add through-traffic lanes or an auxiliary lane, would not add or relocate interchange lanes, would not restripe existing pavement for the purpose of adding through-traffic lanes, and would not add or alter a weigh station/rest stop/ride-share lot/toll plaza. Therefore, the project is not a Type I project and only construction noise impacts are discussed.

The project is within the City of Citrus Heights’s Boulevard Plan Planning Area and the City of Roseville’s Planning Area. The project area within the City of Citrus Heights is located in areas designated for General Commercial, Low Density Residential, and Medium Density Residential land uses in the Boulevard Plan (City of Citrus Heights 2005a). The area is zoned for Auburn Boulevard Commercial (ABC) Zoning District and Commercial and Village Centers (City of Citrus Heights 2005b). The project site located within the City of Roseville is located in areas designated for Community Commercial land uses and is zoned for Neighborhood Commercial, General Commercial and Community Commercial (City of Roseville, 2009).

Noise sources that contribute to ambient noise levels in and adjacent to the project site include traffic from local streets. As a way to characterize noise levels, Table 4 summarizes typical ambient noise levels based on population density.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>dBA, Ldn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Suburban</td>
<td>40–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet suburban residential or small town</td>
<td>45–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal suburban residential urban</td>
<td>50–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal urban residential</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy urban residential</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very noisy urban residential</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown, major metropolis</td>
<td>75–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under flight path at major airport, 0.5 to 1 mile from runway</td>
<td>78–85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining freeway or near a major airport</td>
<td>80–90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Cowan 1984, Hoover and Keith 1996
The vicinity of the project area is most similar to that of “noisy urban residential,” and “normal urban residential.” Noisy Urban Residential areas have a typical noise level of 65 dBA while Normal Urban Residential has a typical noise level of 60 dBA. The Technical Noise Supplement (Caltrans, 2009) defines a noise receiver or receptor as “any natural or artificial sensor that can perceive, register or be affected by sound, such as a human ear, or a microphone.”

In general, noise sensitive land-uses include residences, schools, hospitals, churches, and parks. The project would take place near General Commercial, Low Density Residential, and Medium Density Residential land uses (City of Citrus Heights 2005a). Open Space, which includes a community park, is south of the project footprint; however, no impacts to this noise sensitive land-use is anticipate. Additionally, no industrial development is in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Located along the project alignment are residences along with a variety of businesses, including a bowling alley, auto shops, small restaurants, retailers and convenience stores.

Standards of Significance

For purposes of this Initial Study, impacts due to noise may be considered significant if construction and/or implementation of the Project would result in the following impacts that remain significant after implementation of General Plan policies or mitigation from the General Plan EIR:

- Result in exterior noise levels in the project area that are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses due to the project’s noise level increases;
- Result in residential interior noise levels of 45 dBA $L_{dn}$ or greater caused by noise level increases due to the project;
- Result in construction noise levels that exceed the standards in the City of Citrus Heights or the City of Roseville's Noise Ordinance;
- Permit existing and/or planned residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;
- Permit adjacent residential and commercial areas to be exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; or
- Permit historic buildings and archaeological sites to be exposed to vibration-peak-particle velocities greater than 0.2 inches per second due to project construction and highway traffic.

Summary of Analysis under the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan

City of Citrus Heights

The General Plan EIR evaluated the potential for development under the General Plan to increase noise levels in the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, railways, and stationary sources. The general plan policies establish exterior and interior noise standards (Policy 51.1). A variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policy 52.2 through 52.5, which requires new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and Policy 52.4, which calls for the City to limit hours of operations for parks and active recreation areas to minimize disturbance to nearby residences. Notwithstanding application of the general plan policies, noise impacts for exterior and interior noise levels, and vibration impacts, were found to be significant and unavoidable.

City of Roseville

The General Plan evaluated potential for development to increase noise levels within the community. New noise sources include vehicular traffic, vehicular traffic on highways, railways, and stationary sources. The general plan policies establish exterior and interior noise standards (Table IX-1 through Table IX-3). A
variety of policies provide standards for the types of development envisioned in the general plan. See Policies 1 through 10, which require new mixed-use, commercial and industrial development to mitigate the effects of noise from operations on adjoining sensitive land use, and call for the City to limit hours of operations for parks and active recreation areas to minimize disturbance to nearby residences.

Discussion

a. Less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated. During construction of the project, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction. Construction noise is regulated by Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 14-8.02, “Noise Control,” which states that noise levels generated during construction shall comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, and that all equipment shall be fitted with adequate mufflers according to the manufacturers’ specifications.

Generally, noise levels at construction sites can vary from 55 dBA to a maximum of nearly 96 dBA when heavy equipment is used. Construction noise of this project would be intermittent, and noise levels would vary depending on the type of construction activity. For this project, lowest construction equipment-related noise levels would be 55 dBA at a distance of 50 ft for sound from a pick-up truck. Highest noise levels would be up to 90 dBA (at a distance of 50 ft) for a concrete saw for pavement removal. A jackhammer, which would be up to 89 dBA at a distance of 50 ft, would also be utilized during the project. Rock crushing, during construction of the project, may also be necessary.

No adverse noise impacts from construction are anticipated because construction would be conducted in accordance with Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 14-8.02 and applicable local noise standards. Construction noise would be short-term and intermittent. Construction is expected to take approximately 180 days. Further, implementing the measures below would minimize the temporary noise impacts from construction.

The project is exempt from City of Citrus Heights code pertaining to noise regulation due to the Section 34-88 which states that activities involving “Noise sources associated with construction, repair, remodeling, demolition, paving or grading of any real property, provided the activities do not take place between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. on weekdays and Friday commencing at 8:00 p.m. through and including 7:00 a.m. on Saturday, Saturdays commencing at 8:00 p.m. through and including 7:00 a.m. on the next following Sunday, and on each Sunday after the hour of 8:00 p.m. However, when an unforeseen or unavoidable condition occurs during a construction project and the nature of the project necessitates that work in process be continued until a specific phase is completed, the contractor or owner shall be allowed to continue work after 8:00 p.m. and to operate machinery and equipment necessary until completion of the specific work in progress can be brought to conclusion under conditions which will not jeopardize inspection acceptance or create undue financial hardships for the contractor or owner” are exempt from the provisions of the city code. In addition, the City of Roseville’s Municipal Code specifically prohibits the overnight operation of certain noisy, construction-related equipment (i.e. between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.). These specified equipment items include any pneumatic or air hammer, pile driver, steam shovel, derrick, steam or electric hoist, parking lot cleaning equipment or other appliance that creates a “loud or unusual” noise. Noise Element Policy P4 under Objective N-1.2 constrains all construction in the vicinity of noise sensitive land uses (such as residences, hospitals, or convalescent homes) to daylight hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Further, this Policy lays out ‘best practices’ strategies for reducing noise from construction equipment and operations.

The project would have a less than significant impact on noise based on: 1) the project is not anticipated to change traffic; 2) Proposed construction duration is temporary; and 3) construction of the project would use proposed minimization methods. No adverse noise impacts from construction
are anticipated because construction would be conducted in accordance with Caltrans’ standard specifications and would be short term and intermittent. Mitigation measures N-1 through N-4 will be implemented to further reduce any noise specific impacts.

b. Less than significant. The project site is level, and does not include buildings or structures that would require unusual construction techniques that would cause substantial vibration. The project would not result in additional significant environmental effects. Substantial levels of vibration are not anticipated because traffic volumes will be similar to the existing situation.

The project would generate some vibration due to construction activities, but it would not include construction activities that could generate significant ground vibration, such as pile driving. There are no historic structures within the project area that would be affected by construction-related vibration, therefore this impact would not exceed the impact disclosed in the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR or the City of Roseville General Plan.

c. Less than significant. The project activities would not cause permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. During construction activities, there would be a temporary noise increase from use of power tools, equipment, and other non-powered hand-tools. The City would require the contractor to comply with all applicable noise and occupational safety standards as defined in the construction specifications, and to protect workers and other persons from health effects of increased noise levels from the use of construction equipment. Compliance with construction specifications would reduce potential noise-related concerns at the construction site, and therefore cause a less-than-significant impact. Mitigation measures N-1 through N-4 are presented in response a. and would reduce the noise impacts to less-than-significant.

e-f. No Impact. The project site is not located near an existing airport and is not within an area covered by an existing airport land use plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures from the City of Citrus Heights and the City of Roseville General Plan EIR that apply to the Project

N-1: Pursuant to City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-1:

1. Limit hours of construction to account for more sensitive weekend hours.
2. Limit hours of construction where noise is audible at sensitive land uses beyond the boundaries of the construction site.

N-2: Pursuant to City of Roseville General Plan, Chapter 9, Mitigation Measure 8:

The City shall use the Noise Level Performance Standards contained in Table IX-3 for reviewing new development of noise-sensitive uses exposed to fixed noise sources. These standards are also to be used for evaluating potential impacts of proposed new fixed noise sources upon nearby noise-sensitive uses. Where a noise-sensitive land use is proposed near a fixed noise source, such as an industrial facility, noise measurements will be performed to determine whether existing and/or future noise levels due to that source will exceed the standards of Table IX-3 within the property line of the proposed use. Similarly, where a fixed noise-producing use such as an industrial facility is proposed near an existing or future noise-sensitive use, a noise analysis will be prepared to ensure that the noise produced by that use will not exceed the standards of Table IX-3 within the property line of the noise-sensitive use. (Policies 6, 7 and 8).
Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

N-3: On-site Noise Control: To ensure mitigation of noise due to project-related loading docks and on-site traffic, development proposals should be reviewed to identify potential noise conflicts with existing or proposed noise sensitive uses. Implementation of the noise standards contained in the Noise Element of the Citrus Heights General Plan will mitigate project-related noise to an insignificant level. For development requiring installation of large groundmounted HVAC systems, development review should include an assessment of noise impacts on nearby residential areas.

Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures

N-4: The Contractor shall follow City of Citrus Heights and City of Roseville noise ordinances for construction activities:

- Do not exceed 65 dBA at 50 feet from the job site activities from 8 p.m. to 7 a.m.
- Use an alternative waiting method instead of a sound signal unless required by safety laws.
- Equip an internal combustion engine with the manufacturer-recommended muffler.
- Do not operate an internal combustion engine on the job site without the appropriate muffler.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

a-c. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project will not affect population and housing. The project is not capacity enhancing; therefore, is not growth inducing. Also, the project would not displace housing or necessitate construction of replacement housing (ABSP 2005).

Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

None.

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

PH-1: Prior to approving a development project that would result in conversion of trailer parks to other uses; the City shall comply with Government Code Section 65863.7, a copy of which is included in Appendix J of the ABSP EIR.

PH 1-B: Relocation Assistance for Housing Displacement:

1. The City shall provide standard relocation assistance to both tenants and owner occupants in compliance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Replacement housing must be decent, safe, and sanitary (DS&S), which means it must meet all of the minimum requirements established by Federal regulations and conforms to applicable housing and occupancy codes.
2. All real property transactions shall comply with the property acquisition and relocation standards of the State of California, the Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.
PH-1C: Business Relocation. The following mitigation measures shall be required to compensate for right-of-way acquisition:

1. Property owners shall be compensated in accordance with fair market values based on appraisals. Business owners shall be compensated based on an assessment of the value of the business and any loss of good will.
2. All efforts shall be made to identify relocation opportunities for affected businesses that would reduce the loss of goodwill and historic patronage. Wherever feasible, assistance shall be made available in identifying suitable relocation sites within the service area of existing businesses.

PH-1D: Property Compensation:

1. All real property transactions shall comply with the property acquisition and relocation standards of the State of California, the Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.
2. Property owners shall be compensated in accordance with fair market values based on appraisals. Business owners shall be compensated based on an assessment of the value of the business and any loss of good will.
3. All efforts shall be made to identify relocation opportunities for affected businesses that would reduce the loss of goodwill and historic patronage. Wherever feasible, assistance shall be made available in identifying suitable relocation sites within the service area of existing businesses.

Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures

None required.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project will not adversely affect public services in the area. The project would not contribute to any change in population, traffic circulation, or other land use modifications that would impact local fire or police protection. There will be no road closures during construction. The project improvements will not have an effect on parks or other services. As a result of the project utility coordination has taken place and will continue throughout construction with the following utility companies: Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), City of Citrus Heights Water District, City of Roseville, Sacramento Area Sewer District, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), Consolidated Communications, and Comcast. No mitigation will be required (ABSP 2005).

**Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project**

None.

**Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated**

None.

**Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures**

Not applicable.
XIV. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a-b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not affect recreation or recreation facilities in the area. As the project consists solely of roadway improvements, the project does not propose new residential or commercial developments creating a need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was anticipated in the City of Citrus Heights and City of Roseville General Plans therefore, the project would not result in additional significant impacts on recreation that were not addressed or considered in the City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR or City of Roseville General Plan (ABSP 2005).

**Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project**

None.

**Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated**

None.

**Additional Project-Level Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures**

Not applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a-b. Less-than-Significant Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, while construction of the project would generate short-term impacts through Auburn Boulevard, construction activities would be temporary, intermittent, and have a minimal impact on surrounding traffic flows, therefore short-term construction impacts are considered less than significant. Auburn Boulevard provides direct access to I-80, however the project would not adversely affect the operations of any freeway facility and will remain open during construction to maintain access to local businesses. Prior to construction signage and other construction related information for continuing traffic operations will be established through the project site (ABSP 2005).
c. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project does not require any changes to existing regional air traffic activity, and the project site is not located near an airport. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the design features associated with the project will not increase hazards. All project features will meet safety standards (ABSP 2005).

e. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Per the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan EIR, construction activities would result in temporary disruption to businesses and residents in the area as well as to some public services such as public transit and emergency vehicles (i.e. fire and police). Detours and traffic delays may occur; however interruptions to access would be minimized for all properties. These impacts would be temporary. Mitigation Measure T-1 from the ABSP EIR would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (ABSP 2005).

f. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The project would require acquisition of frontage properties on Auburn Boulevard to provide for widening and construction of improvements. Property acquisition would impact parking areas within several businesses along Auburn Boulevard. Property owners must be compensated for the loss of the underlying property. Additional mitigation measures would be needed if the parking loss affects the viability of the business operations. Mitigation measure T-2 from the ABSP EIR would additional reduce this impact to a less than significant level (ABSP 2005).

g. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, there are no conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (ABSP 2005).

Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project

None.

Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated

T-1: Ensure Adequate Parking Supply. In order to ensure that adequate parking supply is maintained in the specific plan area, the city shall establish a special permit process to allow flexibility in the number of required parking spaces when deemed appropriate.

T-1B: Compensate for Parking Impacts:

1. The determination of project-caused parking impacts shall be made in accordance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Project proponents shall compensate for acquisition of underlying property in compliance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

2. In the event that it is determined that the project will result in a reduction of parking spaces below the number required by zoning, but would not preclude continued use of the parcel that is allowed by zoning as determined by the appropriate land use authority (City of Citrus Heights), the project proponent(s) shall:

(a) Investigate feasibility of and compensate for cost of reconfiguring parking area or relocating parking on the same parcel to provide additional spaces; or
(b) Investigate feasibility of and compensate for the cost of providing off-site parking; and/or
(c) The appropriate land use authority (City of Citrus Heights) shall grant a special parking permit to allow the continued use with reduced parking.

3. If it is determined during the right-of-way appraisal and acquisition process that the project would result in a reduction of parking spaces that would preclude continued use of the parcel in accordance with the existing zoning, and none of the measures under No. 2 above are feasible, the project proponent(s) shall provide compensation in accordance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

T-6: Construction Period Traffic Management Plan. A traffic handling plan will be prepared prior to construction of any roadway improvements. The plan will address traffic management during construction periods, including but not limited to road and lane closures; detours; pedestrian and bicycle routes; and public notification. The traffic handling plan should be prepared in consultation with regional transit in order to minimize disruptions to public transit service along the corridor. Additionally, prior to commencement of construction, a Traffic Management Plan as described in A Traffic Management Plan Guide (See Appendix A of the Final EIR) will be prepared and provided to Caltrans for review in order to address strategies needed to minimize disruption of traffic at the Interstate 80/Auburn Boulevard Interchange.

Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures

None required.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not involve wastewater treatment requirements (ABSP 2005).

b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities (ABSP 2005).

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The facility for this area has enough capacity to contain any additional runoff associated with the project during construction.

d. No Impact. The project would not increase water supply demand (ABSP 2005).

e. No Impact. The project would not affect wastewater treatment (ABSP 2005).
f. No Impact. The project would not increase solid waste disposal needs (ABSP 2005).

g. No Impact. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (ABSP 2005).

*Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project*

None.

*Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated*

**U-1:** Construction Management for Utilities: The construction project management team shall coordinate with utility providers during design stages of roadway projects. The construction project management team shall undertake periodic assessments of upcoming utility and service disruptions during construction. These assessments and an identification of the service area involved shall be coordinated with utility providers and the public outreach program. The public outreach program shall ensure that advance notice of any utility or service shutdowns is extended to affected businesses and residents. Through construction management and project scheduling, all available measures shall be taken to minimize the duration of utility or service shutdowns.

**Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures**

None required.

*Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures*

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Project Impact Adequately Addressed in Previous Document</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in this study, the project could result in impacts on biological resources. However, there is no potential for Federal or State threatened or endangered species to occur within the project area and no designated Critical Habitat occurs within the project vicinity. Construction of the project would also result in temporary construction noise impacts. Mitigation measures included in this study would reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels.

b. No Impact. As addressed within the 2005 ABSP FEIR, the project does not directly or indirectly contribute to cumulative impacts associated with increased urban development because the impacts of public parking, and traffic, have previously been evaluated by the City and considered in development of the City’s General Plan (ABSP 2005).

c. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in this study, the project could result in impacts on human beings indirectly due to noise impacts. Mitigation measures included in this study would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

**Mitigation Measures from City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR and the City of Roseville General Plan that apply to the Project**

None.

**Applicable ABSP EIR Mitigation Measures Incorporated**

None applicable.
Additional Project Level Mitigation Measures

None required.

Significance Determination with Mitigation Measures

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
SECTION 5.0 - COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

This section summarizes the City of Citrus Heights’ efforts to identify, address and resolve Project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

Scoping Process

The approved Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report document (2005) provided basis for determining potential environmental constraints within the Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2 project area.

Consultation and Coordination with Public Agencies

Coordination with the following agencies was initiated for the Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2 Project:

- City of Roseville,
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and
- Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

Public Participation

The public comment period for the Project provides the opportunity for public comment and participation. The comment period for the project occurred October 9th, 2015, through November 8th, 2015. All public comments received are included within Appendix F of this document. Table 5 displays coordination that has occurred with developers and property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Attendees</th>
<th>Title/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regina Cave</td>
<td>Management Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                   | City of Citrus Heights | • Whyte Ave. has a proposal for a ped/bike overcrossing over 80.  
|                   |                     | • There is a high incident of accidents near Whyte. 
|                   |                     | • There is interconnect past the freeway overcrossing. The new bus intermodal site plans will have the location. Roseville is providing these docs. 
| Kevin Becker      | Principal Engineer  |
|                   | City of Citrus Heights | • The bus project design project will be completed in the next 2 months. 
|                   |                     | • Roseville would support medians & a sidewalk in their jurisdiction. 
|                   |                     | • Not sure of the R/W where the AC path is on the private property. Roseville hopes the R/W has already been dedicated for the sidewalk area. 
| Jason Shykowski   | Principal CE, Engineering |
|                   | City of Roseville    | • The Keep Clear area for the bus seems to be working. This should be retained for buses accessing Whyte to the east. 
| Mike Dour         | Bike Planner         |
|                   | City of Roseville    | • Include Placer County residents in the outreach and environmental. The residential area uses Auburn. 
| Jana Cervantes    | Senior Engineer/Traffic |
|                   | Engineer             |                        |
|                   | City of Roseville    |                        |
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APPENDIX A: Representative Site Photos
Photograph 1: Representative existing Auburn Boulevard, facing south.

Photograph 2: Representative existing narrow sidewalks and road shoulder; looking north.
Photograph 3: Representative commercial and residential land use; looking west at the proposed road improvements area south of I-80.

Photograph 4: Representative highly disturbed ruderal vegetation; west of Auburn Boulevard.
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CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for The Boulevard Plan (Specific Plan) and the Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project (SCH# 2003-062165) was submitted to the State Clearinghouse and released for public review for a 45-day review and comment period on October 12, 2004. The public review and comment period closed on November 29, 2004. This document provides a record of comments received on the Draft EIR and the City’s responses to those comments and comprises the Final EIR for the project. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15090, the City of Citrus Heights City Council as the Lead Agency decision-making body must review and consider the information contained in the Final EIR before it approves or rejects the project.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines (Section 15132), this final EIR consists of the following:

1. Revisions to the Draft EIR;
2. Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary;
3. A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
4. The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process;
5. Other information added by the Lead Agency.

In addition to considering the Final EIR, the Lead Agency is required to make findings of fact regarding the significant environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR and the alternatives to the project that were considered. If the project would result in significant environmental impacts which could not be mitigated, then the Lead Agency, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines (Section 15093), is required to make a statement of overriding considerations which explains in writing the specific reasons to support the Lead Agency’s action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record.

The findings of fact and any statement of overriding consideration are made after the Lead Agency considers the Final EIR and are part of the public record.

Additionally, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines (Section 15097) a mitigation monitoring or reporting program (MMRP) must be adopted by the Lead Agency in order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the Final EIR are implemented.

Both the findings of fact, statement of overriding considerations along with the MMRP are separate documents adopted after the Lead Agency has considered the Final EIR.
1.2 Organization Of This Document

The Final EIR is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 2.0 is an Executive Summary providing a brief project description and summary table of the project’s environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Chapter 3.0, Written Comments Received, provides a list of commenting agencies, organizations and individuals and copies of the written comments (coded for reference). Chapter 4.0, Responses to Written Comments, provides the Lead Agency responses to the comments in Chapter 3.0 and briefly notes any revisions to the Draft EIR that are needed in order to respond to the comments. Chapter 5.0, Oral Comments and Responses, presents the oral comments made at the Planning Commission Hearings of October 28, 2004 and November 18, 2004 and responds to those comments related to environmental issues. Chapter 6.0, Revisions to the Draft Specific Plan, presents revisions made to the draft specific plan as a result of public and Planning Commission input at the previously noted hearings. Any changes to the Draft EIR required due to these revisions are summarized. Chapter 7.0 Minor Changes to the Auburn Boulevard Plan Line presents minor revisions that were made to the Plan Line Study. Chapter 8.0, Minor Changes and Errata to the Draft EIR, includes corrections and additions to the Draft EIR text as a result of comments made on the Draft EIR or changes made to the Draft Specific Plan. Changes to the Draft EIR are indicated by underline for additions and strikeout for deletions to the text.

1.3 Recirculation Of The Draft EIR Not Required

Comments received on the Draft EIR do not indicate that new significant impacts and/or significant new information have been identified, nor have changes in the project been made that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines (Section 15088.5).
CHAPTER 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Introduction

Project Location

Auburn Boulevard is located in the City of Citrus Heights in Sacramento County. The City is located near the center of the Sacramento Metropolitan Area in northeastern Sacramento County, on the south side of the Interstate 80 (I-80) corridor. The City of Roseville is located to the north and immediately across the Placer County line.

The Boulevard Plan (the Specific Plan) is comprised of the Auburn Boulevard corridor between the City of Citrus Heights city limits on the north and the Sylvan Road/Auburn Boulevard/Old Auburn Road intersection (Sylvan Corners) on the south, and extending approximately 1000 feet east and west of Auburn Boulevard, an area which totals approximately 460 acres. The Specific Plan focuses primarily on the parcels and commercial and residential uses (encompassing 112 acres) that front on Auburn Boulevard.

The Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project (Roadway Design Project), is located within the boundaries of the Boulevard Plan, and begins in the vicinity of Cripple Creek Road (a private road) on the north and ends at Sylvan Corners on the south.

Project Description

Summary of the Boulevard Plan

The Boulevard Plan is a Specific Plan in accordance with State Planning Law. It provides for the systematic implementation of the City’s general plan for a defined area of the community. The Boulevard Plan includes the following:

- Concepts, Goals and Principles\(^1\) to establish formal policies regarding land use, circulation and community design and presents, in diagrammatic form, key concepts of the plan;
- Development Standards that present specific guidance for public and private development along the Boulevard;

\(^1\) Concepts, Goals and Principles
- Concept: A concept is an organizational idea. The concepts derive from the objectives established by the community and stakeholders in workshops and meetings. They inform the standards and guidelines.
- Goal: A goal is a general direction-setter. It is an ideal future end related to public health, safety, or general welfare. A goal is a general expression of community values and, may be abstract in nature.
- Principle: A principle is an assumption, fundamental rule, or doctrine guiding-tenet.
• Guidelines to provide guidance for making design changes along the corridor in each of four districts; and
• An Implementation Section that describes how the Plan’s policies and guidelines are to be put into place.

Boulevard Plan Districts

The Boulevard Plan divides the Auburn Boulevard corridor into the following four districts:

1. Gateway District;
2. Rusch Park District;
3. Lincoln 40 District; and
4. Sylvan Corners Village Square District.

Land Use, Circulation and Community Design Concepts

The Plan contains Goals and Principles to support the Land Use, Circulation and Community Design Concepts for the Districts. These Goals and Principles are listed in Section 2 of The Boulevard Plan, which is incorporated by reference.

Land Use Designations

The Boulevard Plan uses six residential, commercial, open space, and public land use designations to depict the proposed land uses within The Boulevard Plan planning area. Each land use designation is defined in terms of allowable uses and density and intensity standards. The Boulevard Plan focuses primarily on the parcels and commercial uses that front Auburn Boulevard. Most of these parcels along the corridor are designated as General Commercial, which allows for a variety of land uses including mixed-use, multi-family residential, and service and retail commercial uses. The General Commercial designation is implemented through a new zoning district, the Auburn Boulevard Commercial District (ABC District).

Transportation and Circulation

The Plan seeks to improve pedestrian/motorist safety by limiting left-turn movements, consolidating and reducing the number of driveways, and creating a better balance among transportation modes (i.e., automobiles, transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians), while allowing for future growth in the area.

The Specific Plan also proposes to amend the General Plan Circulation Element to change Rollingwood Boulevard from a local street to a collector street.
General Plan Amendments

As part of Implementation of The Boulevard Plan, four amendments to the City of Citrus Heights General Plan Land Use Element are proposed. Each General Plan Amendment is described below.

A. General Plan Amendment from General Commercial (GC) to Medium Density Residential affecting 3.63 acres located between the west end of Auburn Oaks Court and Interstate 80.
B. General Plan Amendment from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to General Commercial (GC) affecting 3.61 acres located at the intersection of Auburn Boulevard and Auburn Oaks Court.
C. General Plan Amendment from Business Professional (BP) to General Commercial (GC) affecting 1.72 acres located west of Auburn Boulevard between Rusch Park and Antelope Road.
D. General Plan Amendment from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to General Commercial (GC) affecting 1.99 acres located on the south side of Antelope Road, west of Auburn Boulevard.

The Auburn Boulevard Plan Line

The Plan Line for Auburn Boulevard will cover the limits as described earlier for the Boulevard Plan, from Sylvan Corners on the south to the northerly City limits. The Plan Line will be adopted by the City Council as a document identifying the ultimate alignment of Auburn Boulevard and the required right of way acquisitions to implement the Specific Plan. The plan line will use the cross sections identified within the specific plan to develop the right of way requirements.

Utility Undergrounding

There are existing overhead utility lines located along the east side of Auburn Boulevard. The utilities involved include electric (SMUD), telephone (Surewest), cable television (Comcast), and fiber optic lines (Sprint). The project proposes to underground these lines along the east side of the roadway either below the sidewalk or adjacent to the easterly curb line. Trenching depths will be up to six (6) feet. Private easements may be required for additional utility company facilities.

Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project (Sylvan Corners to Cripple Creek Road)

The Draft EIR also addressed the project specific impacts that would result from the proposed Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project (Roadway Design Project), located within the boundaries of The Boulevard Plan, beginning in the vicinity of Cripple Creek Road (a private road) on the north and ending at Sylvan Corners on the south. The Roadway Design Project located in the portion of Auburn Boulevard that is within the Lincoln 40 District and the very southern edge of the Rusch Park District.
2.2 Environmental Process And Issues

In accordance with Section 15082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Citrus Heights circulated a Notice of Preparation for the EIR on June 24, 2003 for a thirty day review period. The Notice of Preparation is provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The notice was circulated through the State Clearinghouse to state agencies; the City of Citrus Heights circulated the notice to local and federal agencies and other interested parties in order to solicit comments on significant effects that could potentially occur due to the project. Concerns raised in response to the Notice of Preparation were taken into consideration when preparing the Draft EIR. Comments received on the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix B of the Draft EIR.

An Environmental Checklist Form was attached to the Notice of Preparation, which identified environmental issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR. The following issues were found to be of concern due to the project’s potential to have significant effects on the environment.

- Aesthetics (visual resources)
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources (archaeology/historic architecture)
- Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities

An Environmental Scoping Meeting was held in accordance with CEQA Section 21083.9 on July 24, 2003 at the City Council Hearing Room at 6237 Fountain Square Drive in Citrus Heights. The Scoping meeting was convened at 4 p.m., and at 7 p.m as part of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting. Notice of the meeting was provided in the Notice of Preparation and was provided in the City’s advertisement of the City Council meeting.

The City of Citrus Heights held formal hearings before the City Planning Commission during the Draft EIR review period on October 28 and November 18, 2004. The majority of comments made at those hearings addressed concerns regarding the Specific Plan. Comments made at the hearings requiring a formal response are included in Chapter 5.0 of this Final EIR.
2.3 Alternatives To The Proposed Project

The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6, state that “An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible.”

The following alternatives were addressed in the Draft EIR.

No Project Alternative

As required by the CEQA Guidelines the Draft EIR considered the No Project Alternative in order to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1)]. With the No Project Alternative there would be no adoption of a specific plan that would guide the implementation of comprehensive land use, circulation and community design concepts within the plan area. The roadway design improvements would not be constructed. Land uses would continue to be governed by the City of Citrus Heights General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and any proposed changes would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Existing General Plan and Zoning designations would be retained.

Plan Alternatives

No other plans or development alternatives were addressed in the Draft EIR. Through a lengthy process of plan development, which included significant community and stakeholder involvement, the City developed a plan that addresses the needs and major problems related to land use and circulation in the specific plan area. The land use concepts, design guidelines and development standards were tailored to address specific problems within the specific plan area related to land use conflicts; under-utilization of the commercial corridor; the appearance of the commercial corridor; and transportation deficiencies – both automobile and non-motorized. No other approaches appeared to offer substantial environmental advantages over the proposed specific plan in addressing these issues. A description of the process used to develop The Boulevard Plan and plan scenarios evaluated are in Chapter 6.0 of the Draft EIR.

2.4 Summary of Environmental Impacts And Mitigation Measures

Table 2-1 provides a summary of impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of The Boulevard Plan, the General Plan Amendments, the Plan Line for Auburn Boulevard, future roadway improvements on Auburn Boulevard and construction of the Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project from Sylvan Corners to Cripple Creek Road.
### Table 2-1 Summary Of Impacts And Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-1 Impacts to scenic resources, visual character and/or quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Specific Plan Impacts:</strong> The potential exists for significant visual changes to take place as a result of tree removal for development on private properties along Cripple Creek in the vicinity of Rusch Park.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Implementation of the GP Policy 37.1, and compliance with the Tree Preservation Ordinance will encourage the retention of native oaks in the landscape of the specific plan area and will mitigate for the visual impacts resulting from the removal of native oak trees. See Mitigation Measures for biological resources, B-1, B-2A and B-2B and B-2C which address impacts to the oak woodland and riparian habitat adjacent to Cripple Creek.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Design Improvement Projects:</strong> Adoption of the Plan Line for Auburn Boulevard would assure that new development improvements such as landscaping are located outside of the future road right of way. Future roadway improvement projects constructed in accordance with The Boulevard Plan’s Design Guidelines, for the most part would be beneficial, however increased right of way and widening would require removal of any existing trees and landscape improvements on properties that have not been redeveloped.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>See A-1 above</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-1 Summary Of Impacts And Mitigation Measures *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **C. General Plan Amendments:**  
Site D (s/w quadrant of Auburn Blvd. and Antelope Rd.)  
Proposed commercial development constructed in conformance with proposed design guidelines would have positive visual impacts; however, two large oak trees on the site may be lost. | S | See A-1 above | LTS |
| **D. Near-term Roadway Design Improvement Project**  
Roadway improvements will require removal of some existing trees and landscaping, most notably, ten native oak trees with trunk diameters larger than six inches. One blue oak with 27-inch trunk diameters, and one valley oak with a 40-inch trunk diameter are included in this count. Construction of the on-street bicycle lane and a wider sidewalk at the southeast corner of Rusch Park will require installation of a retaining wall to avoid encroachment into the Creek. The construction will temporarily encroach into the Creek and removal of some trees may be necessary. | S | Refer to Mitigation Measures B-1C, B-2A, B-2B and B-2C in the Biological Resources section. These measures require restoration of riparian vegetation and minimizing impacts to existing oaks and require replacement of removed oaks. | LTS |
Table 2-1 Summary Of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact A-2: Creation of a new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Improvement Projects, General Plan Amendments and Near-term Roadway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Improvement Project</strong>. Spill over of lighting from the commercial corridor may impact adjacent residential neighborhoods, especially the rural neighborhoods on the east side of Auburn Boulevard.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>Implementation of The Boulevard Plan’s Principles and Design Guidelines and enforcement of the City’s Zoning Code Landscaping and Lighting standards will avoid impacts associated with light and glare.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AQ-1 - Construction-Related Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Construction-Related Impacts of the Specific Plan, Future Road Improvements, General Plan Amendments and Zone Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activity associated with implementation of the proposed specific plan (including general plan amendments and zone change) would result in the temporary generation of ROG, NOx and PM_{10} emissions. These emissions would result from construction equipment exhaust, and fugitive dust from land clearing, earthmoving, and wind erosion of exposed soil. It is possible some individual project components would be large enough to result in construction-related emissions greater than the significance thresholds.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure AQ-1A Inhalable Particulate Matter: The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the project to minimize the generation of PM_{10} dust during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• enclose, cover, or water twice daily all soil piles;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• water all haul roads twice daily; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cover loads of all haul/dump trucks securely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure AQ-1B Asbestos Mitigation Measures: The demolition or renovation of asbestos-containing building material is subject to the limitations of the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations as listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (40CFR Part 61, Subpart M) requiring notification and inspection. Most demolitions and many renovations are subject to a CAL-OSHA Certified asbestos inspection prior to the start of activity. SMAQMD Rule 902, which requires District consultation and permit, applies to demolition, renovation or removal of asbestos-containing material. Compliance with these regulations is considered to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the specific plan would result in the demolition of structures. Structures to be demolished may include building materials containing asbestos. Asbestos present in building materials may become airborne during demolition activities</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Construction Impacts of the Roadway Design Improvement Project (Sylvan Corners to Cripple Creek Road)</td>
<td>Construction activity associated with implementation of the proposed roadway design improvement project from Sylvan Corners to Cripple Creek Road would result in the temporary generation of ROG, NO\textsubscript{x}, and PM\textsubscript{10} emissions. These emissions would result from construction equipment exhaust, and fugitive dust from land clearing, earthmoving, and wind erosion of exposed soil. These increases in emissions were determined to be less than the SMAQMD thresholds.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AQ-2 Operational Ozone Precursor, Inhalable Particulate Matter and Carbon Monoxide Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, and Zone Change Operational Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No mitigation measures required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ozone Precursor Impacts</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational motor vehicle activity associated with implementation of the proposed specific plan (including general plan amendments and zone change) would result in the long-term generation of ROG, NOx, and PM10 emissions. The motor vehicle activity would result from trips generated by specific plan land uses. Implementation of the Specific plan would result in vehicle trips associated with existing land use designations being replaced with vehicle trips associated with proposed land use designations. The increases in emissions are less than the SMAQMD thresholds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Carbon Monoxide Impacts</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational motor vehicle activity associated with implementation of the proposed specific plan would result in the long-term generation of CO emissions. The motor vehicle activity would result from trips generated by specific plan land uses. Implementation of the specific plan would result in vehicle trips associated with existing land use designations being replaced with vehicle trips associated with proposed land use designations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designations. The resulting change in vehicle trips would contribute to traffic volumes and vehicle congestion at the intersection of Antelope Road and Auburn Boulevard. Estimates were made of CO concentrations in the vicinity of this intersection under future year Cumulative No Project conditions, and Cumulative Plus Project conditions. Both one-hour average and eight-hour average CO concentrations near to the intersection of Antelope Road and Auburn Boulevard would be below ambient air quality standards for CO under both Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project conditions.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Roadway Design Improvement Project Operational Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed Roadway Design Improvement Project would not change the number of vehicle trips generated in the project vicinity, would not change the capacity of the roadway system, and would not have a substantial effect on traffic operations. Therefore, the Roadway Design Improvement Project is not considered to have a significant operational impact on air quality.
C. Impacts of the Proposed Plan Line Adoption and Future Road Improvements

Adoption of the proposed Plan Line by itself would have no effect on air quality. However, implementation of future road improvements that may result from adoption of the Plan Line would have an impact on air quality.

The nature and magnitude of future road improvements are not known at this time. Therefore, quantification of the air quality impacts of the improvements is not possible. However, it is expected that, in general, the impacts would be similar to the impacts of the Roadway Design Improvement Project. These impacts are presented above.

The impacts of the Roadway Design Improvement Project were found to be less-than-significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Impacts of the Proposed Plan Line Adoption and Future Road Improvements</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact B-1: Impacts to Waters of the United States Including Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Improvement Projects and General Plan Amendments.</strong></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The following measures shall be made conditions of approval for all projects within the specific plan area.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure B-1A Protect Cripple Creek’s Aquatic Life: To protect Cripple Creek’s terrestrial and aquatic wildlife and special status species, and to avoid encroachments within the creek’s floodplain, a Floodplain/Habitat Buffer (Buffer) should be established on both sides of Cripple Creek for projects adjacent to the Creek. Ownership and management of the Buffer should be consistent with implementing plans that fulfill the goals and policies of the City of Citrus Heights General Plan and shall be consistent with the City’s administrative policies and procedures for drainage and development, and objectives of the Arcade Creek Watershed Plan, so that individual property owners are not free to undertake vegetation clearing, bank protection, soil disturbance, or creation of fences or structures within the Buffer. The width of the buffer shall be the 100-year floodplain boundary, as defined by best available data (County hydraulic studies, FIRM and other flood data).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure B-1B Protect Cripple Creek’s Water Quality: To prevent urban pollutants from entering into Cripple Creek from The specific plan area parking lots and paved surfaces, site design shall incorporate features that will intercept runoff before it can enter the storm drain system or directly enter Cripple Creek. Use of features such as filtration strips or bioswales is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Impacts of the Near-term Roadway Design Improvement Project</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Refer to Mitigation Measures B-1A and B-1B. The full text of the following measures are presented in Chapter 4.0 of the Draft EIR and in the mitigation monitoring programs. Mitigation Measure B-1C Minimize Impacts to Riparian Habitat and Waters of the United States: Establish Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) to limit work areas near Cripple Creek riparian habitat and stream channel to the minimum possible area. Mitigation Measure B-1D Prepare and Implement Riparian and Wetland Restoration Plan: To restore disturbed habitat at the site retaining wall site, a riparian/wetland restoration plan should be prepared by a qualified restoration ecologist prior to construction. Mitigation Measure B-1E Implement Water Quality Protection Measures: Potential instream impacts to Cripple Creek and the Arcade Creek Watershed aquatic resources and fisheries shall be minimized by adherence to State Standard Specifications for avoidance of water pollution (Section 7-1.01G) and by implementing Best Management Practices. Mitigation Measure B-1F Obtain Clean Water Act Permit and Streambed Alteration Agreement: Prior completion of project final design, consult with the USACOE to determine permitting requirements under the Clean Water Act Section 404. Obtain Streambed Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact B-2: Impacts to Native Oaks, Oak Woodland and Associated Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Improvement Projects and General Plan Amendments. Future development and redevelopment activities within The specific plan area have the potential to directly and indirectly impact native oak trees and remaining oak woodlands, including the area adjacent Cripple Creek.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure B-2A Minimize Impacts to Oaks: To ensure consistency with the City of Citrus Heights’ Policy 37.1, which requires incorporation of existing trees into development projects, building envelopes for future development projects should be configured to minimize impacts to trees to the extent feasible. The following measures shall be implemented:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Building envelopes should be established on plans and specifications for the future development projects to designate the area needed for construction of roads, driveways, and building pads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. These building envelopes should be large enough to include not only the proposed improvements, but also work areas for heavy equipment, staging areas, and equipment and material lay down areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To protect trees elsewhere on construction sites, no construction activities or use of heavy equipment should occur outside of the building envelopes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Oaks that fall within the building envelope but which are not slated for removal should be protected by the following measures, which should be implemented during all construction phases of the project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Plans and specifications should clearly state protection procedures for oaks to be preserved on the project site. The specifications should also require contractors to stay within designated work areas and should include a provision for penalties if oak trees are damaged;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile offices, or materials should be parked or located within the driplines of oaks and other trees that are to be preserved;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Soil surface removal should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be preserved. No cuts or trenching should occur within the dripline. If this area cannot be avoided, then the tree should be added to the list of oaks to be replaced through an on-site planting;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Earthen fill deep should not be placed within the driplines of oak trees to be retained, and no fill should be placed within five feet of their trunks, except</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Paving should not be placed within the dripline of oaks to be retained;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Underground utility line trenching should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be retained. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the driplines of oak trees, the trench should either be bored or drilled but not within five feet of the trunk and a certified arborist should be retained to monitor this construction and repair or wrap any damaged roots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Living Among the Oaks: A Management Guide for Landowners (UC Cooperative Extension, Berkeley) in Appendix H should be used by the City as a guide in reviewing landscape plans. The information should be distributed to landowners and developers to provide information and guidelines for preparing landscape plans and for protecting oaks after construction is complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Mitigation Measure B-2B Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Woodland Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within oak woodland and/or riparian habitats (as opposed to isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Oak trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. The goals of the Oak Plan should be to replace trees lost by the project to create healthy, self-sustaining habitats that are not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period. The functions and values of the created habitat should approximate those of the affected habitats, i.e., the functions and values of oak woodland rather than an ornamental landscape planting.

b. At a minimum, the Oak Plan should include clear success criteria, monitoring and reporting requirements, and a contingency plan should the responsible parties fail to meet the success criteria that ensure that mitigation goals and ratios are met. The Oak Plan should also include details for the species, size of plants and quantities, planting techniques, techniques for protecting the trees from herbivory, and irrigation, weed control and maintenance plan, and monitoring requirements.

Mitigation Measure B-2C Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Maintenance Plan (Landscape Tree Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within landscape settings (i.e. isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Oaks trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted.
   a. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Maintenance Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies. The goals of the Oak Plan, at a minimum, should be to replace trees lost by the project in an appropriate landscape setting that will allow trees to thrive and be self-sustaining and not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period. Replacement within the specific plan area’s planned landscape areas as street trees, trees for public space landscape or roadway medians, should be emphasized when identifying replanting sites. Replacement in a natural habitat setting as described in Measure B-2B would also accomplish these oak tree replacement goals.</td>
<td>The following measures shall be made conditions of approval for all projects within The Boulevard Plan Area. <strong>Mitigation Measure B-2D Preconstruction Tree Survey:</strong> Prior to construction, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, condition and species of trees that would be removed by the roadway improvement project. An Oak Tree Replacement and Management Plan shall be prepared in accordance with Mitigation Measures B-2A, B-2B and B-2C described above.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Impacts of the Near-term Roadway Design Improvement Project. The proposed Roadway Design Improvement Project, from Sylvan Corners to Cripple Creek Road would potentially require removal of ten native oak trees larger than six inches in diameter (dbh)
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact B-3: Impacts to Nesting/Migratory Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following measures shall be made conditions of approval for all projects within the specific plan area.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **A. Impacts of, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near-Term Roadway Improvement Projects and General Plan Amendments** | S                                      | Mitigation Measure B-3 Avoid Impacts to Nesting Birds  
1. If tree removal for construction will occur during the nesting season (February through July), a minimum of two pre-construction surveys should be conducted in construction areas for nesting birds. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist.  
2. Surveys should be conducted no more that 14 days prior to the initiation of tree-removal activities during the early part of the breeding season (February through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through July).  
3. If the surveyor deems that an active bird nest is close enough to the construction area to be disturbed, he or she should (in consultation with CDFG) determine the extent of the construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest.  
4. Trees should be removed outside the nesting season (February through July), or after a qualified wildlife biologist verifies that the nest is empty and the nest tree is no longer used by the adults and young birds. | |
## Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact B-4: Introduction of Noxious Weeds-Significant and Avoidable Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near-term Roadway Improvement Projects and General Plan Amendments.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure B-4 Avoid Introduction and Spread of New Noxious Weeds. In the vicinity of Cripple Creek, during construction only certified weed-free straw will be used and all disturbed soils will be thoroughly covered with straw (or mulch or chips created on-site during tree removal) upon completion of grading. No seed mixes should be used unless consisting of locally native grasses and forbs.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Impact CR-1: Potential Impacts To Undiscovered Prehistoric, Archaeologic, And Historic Resources**

A. Impacts of Specific Plan, Plan Line Adoption, and Future Roadway Improvements. All ground disturbing activities associated with implementation of the specific plan, general plan amendments and roadway design improvements have the potential to adversely affect undiscovered prehistoric, archaeological, and historic resources. | S | Mitigation Measure CR-1: Handling of Discovered Artifacts or Remains: Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during any development activities, work shall be suspended according to (A) below. It is recommended under CEQA and Policy 41.1 of the Citrus Heights General Plan that: 1. In the event that any prehistoric, historic, or paleontological resources are discovered during construction-related earth moving activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and the developer shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist, then | LTS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. representatives from the City of Citrus Heights and the qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist would meet to determine the appropriate course of action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pursuant to Section 5097.97 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And that under Policy 42.3 of the Citrus Heights General Plan that planners: Establish thresholds by which future projects can be judged when considering historic impacts. These standards should include height and massing considerations for proposed projects that are located in close proximity to historic resources (individual structures and districts) and define locations for potential prehistoric resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact CR-2: Potential Impacts To Existing Prehistoric, Archaeological, And Historic Resources**

**A. Impacts of Specific Plan, Plan Line Adoption, and Future Roadway Design Improvement Projects.** There are a number of properties within the Specific Plan area that appear to be 45 ears old or older. These buildings could be affected by future redevelopment projects. As an historic...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cemetery, there is the potential for burials to be present outside of the current marked boundaries of Sylvan Cemetery. These unmarked burials could be disturbed by construction activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period lapse between the completion of the initial cultural resources documentation and the start date of the project, the cultural resource studies would need to be updated to include any additional properties/sites that would, by that time, meet the 45 year criteria. See CR-1 for measures related to potential impacts to buried remains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Impacts of the General Plan Amendments. All of the sites that are subject to proposed general plan amendment are currently developed sites. One site is a trailer park located on the southwest portion of the intersection of Antelope Road and Auburn Boulevard. This park is more than 50 years old but lacks significance and integrity necessary to be considered potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or CEQA.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No additional mitigation measures required</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.6 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

**Impact HM-1: Impacts related to hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.**

**A. Impacts of the Specific Plan**

The proposed Specific Plan Area includes two schools, located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Auburn Boulevard/Sylvan Road/Old Auburn Road. Implementation of the specific plan may involve demolition or significant remodeling of existing structures in the vicinity. Redevelopment activities in the vicinity of the intersection could involve structures with asbestos or other hazardous materials.

| S | Mitigation Measure HM-1A Handling of Asbestos Material: Control devices and fugitive emissions monitoring are required during demolition activities which will disturb, or have the possibility of disturbing, the asbestos-containing materials. All asbestos containing building material within the buildings planned for demolition should be removed prior to any demolition activity that could break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb these materials. This removal must be done using appropriate engineering controls, in compliance with all regulations, and be a contractor certified by the Contractor’s State License Board and registered by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Northwest Envirocon, Incorporated 1997). | LTS |
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Impacts Related to Plan Line Adoption and Near-term and Future Roadway Design Improvement Projects.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure HM-1B Disposal Of The Yellow Thermoplastic Traffic Stripes: Disposal of the yellow thermoplastic traffic stripes will be at a Class 1 disposal facility. All aspects of the project associated with removal, storage, transportation, and disposal of the yellow thermoplastic traffic striping, should be in strict accordance with the appropriate regulations.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Implementation of future roadway improvement projects in the vicinity of the schools adjacent to Auburn Boulevard may involve removal of yellow thermoplastic traffic striping from the existing roadway surface. Yellow traffic stripes may contain heavy metals such as lead and chromium at concentrations in excess of hazardous waste thresholds established by the CCR and may produce toxic fumes when heated. Disposal of stripes is required at a Class 1 disposal facility.

#### 4.6.5.2 Impact HM-2: Impacts related to presence of listed hazardous materials sites that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; or impacts related to the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

#### A. Impacts of the Specific Plan and the General Plan Amendments

Implementation of the specific plan may involve demolition or significant remodeling of existing structures. Redevelopment activities could involve structures with asbestos or other hazardous materials, or could disturb soils that have been contaminated by past land uses and result in exposure of workers and the general public to hazardous waste due to soil disturbance of soils or exposure to groundwater.

<p>| S                                      | See HM 1A and 1B above, plus the following measures. HM-2A Service Station Sites: At a minimum, prior to redevelopment activities or acquisition of property for road improvements, additional review of site specific data shall be conducted regarding the status of investigation/remediation and how it might impact the planned improvements prior to right of way acquisition and/or redevelopment activities. HM-2B Additional Investigations: Prior to redevelopment or acquisition of property frontage for roadway improvements, an investigation to further define past site use at 7800 Auburn Boulevard (northeast corner of Auburn Boulevard and Watson Way) shall be conducted. If the site investigation confirms that a service station was present, a preliminary investigation shall be conducted. This investigation shall focus on detecting hydrocarbon contamination in the soil and groundwater within the property boundaries. | LTS                                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Impacts Related to Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Improvement Projects.</strong> Roadway improvement projects will involve right of way acquisition and ground disturbance on properties adjacent to Auburn Boulevard. Record searches conducted for the ISA identified 19 properties bordering Auburn Boulevard for which hazardous materials issues are present. Additional investigations are required to determine whether these sites have existing soils and/or water contamination problems. Future roadway improvement projects may involve removal of yellow thermoplastic traffic striping from the existing roadway surface. Disposal of stripes is required at a Class 1 disposal facility.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Implement Mitigation Measures HM-1A, 1B, 2A and 2B.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project.</strong> There are twelve sites adjacent to Auburn Boulevard in the area of the Roadway Design Improvement Project (between Sylvan Corners and Cripple Creek Road) that may have existing or historic land uses that require further study due to possible soil or ground water contamination. Additional investigations are required to determine whether these sites have existing soils and/or water contamination problems.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Implement Mitigation Measures HM-1A, 1B, 2A and 2B.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact H-1. Impacts to Water Quality due to Substantial Additional Sources of Polluted Runoff.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near Term Roadway Design Improvements.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan's emphasis on landscaping (landscaped street medians, street trees, parking lot landscape borders and public spaces) could lead to increased runoff from irrigation overspray. This is of concern because of the role that irrigation runoff plays in introducing pollutants into streams and the stated need to improve and monitor water quality of Arcade Creek and its tributaries, with special emphasis on pesticide levels and other toxicants contained in runoff.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure H-1: Incorporate Development Standards for Improving Water Quality: The City shall incorporate water quality protection measures into the specific plan Development Standards: The standards may include but are not limited to the following: 1. Install and maintain landscaping that requires minimal application of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides; 2. Emphasize xeriscape landscaping that reduces the need for irrigation by minimizing the use of turf in decorative landscaping, using plant materials adapted to local conditions and efficient irrigation; 3. Minimize irrigation overspray - do not permit use of sprinkler and spray irrigation in areas less than 8 feet wide; 4. Use of drip irrigation systems where feasible; 5. Incorporate features such as filtration strips or bioswales in site design to prevent urban pollutants from entering into Cripple Creek via storm drains from parking lots and paved surfaces.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact H-2: Impacts due to substantial alterations to the existing drainage patterns of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, resulting in erosion or runoff and flooding. Create runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>LTS No mitigation measure required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near Term Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvements. The proposed Specific Plan and its roadway improvement projects would not substantially alter topography or change drainage patterns. Impacts are less than significant since the area is substantially built out with an existing storm drain system, no impacts related to capacity of the system are anticipated, no substantial increase in stormwater runoff is anticipated.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measure required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact H-3: Impacts due to Placement of Housing Within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area Or Placement Within A 100-Year Flood Hazard Area Structures Which Would Impede Or Redirect Flood Flows.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near-term Roadway Design Improvements. Areas adjacent to Cripple Creek are within the 100-year floodplain. While The Boulevard Plan does not specifically address development adjacent to the Creek, the City of Citrus Heights administrative policies and procedures for drainage and development on property affected by the 100-year floodplain.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 LAND USE AND PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact LU-1: Land uses that are incompatible with existing or planned land uses on or surrounding the project site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Impacts of the Proposed Specific Plan and Proposed General Plan Amendments</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there would be little change in the general categories of land uses that already exist in the Commercial Corridor, and no changes to existing residential land uses outside of the Commercial Corridor are proposed. The amount of commercial floor area would be reduced along the Corridor by 22 percent for retail and 20 percent for office. With the implementation of the proposed Urban Design Guidelines and the City of Citrus Heights Zoning Code sections addressing parking lot lighting, and landscaping adjacent to residential areas, conflicts between the commercial and residential uses would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact LU-2: Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption.</strong></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intent of the Boulevard Plan is to improve connectivity within the specific plan area by improving accessibility, mobility and improving the streetscape for pedestrians,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bicyclists and transit users. With the implementation of land use concepts, circulation concepts and design concepts, The Boulevard Plan, including the proposed general plan amendments, Plan Line adoption and future roadway improvements will increase connectivity.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Impacts of the Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project.</strong> Construction activities would result in temporary disruption to connectivity by requiring detours for pedestrians and bicyclists, and traffic congestion.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.9 NOISE

**Impact N-1: Transportation Noise - 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**

| A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Roadway Design Improvement Projects. Traffic associated with the project would reduce traffic noise levels along Auburn Boulevard by about 1 dB as compared to the No Project condition, the result of the project-related reduction in the speed limit. | LTS | No mitigation measures required. | LTS |
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact N-2: Non-Transportation Noise - A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure N-2 On-site Noise Control: To ensure mitigation of noise due to project-related loading docks and on-site traffic, development proposals should be reviewed to identify potential noise conflicts with existing or proposed noise sensitive uses. Implementation of the noise standards contained in the Noise Element of the Citrus Heights General Plan will mitigate project-related noise to an insignificant level. For development requiring installation of large ground-mounted HVAC systems, development review should include an assessment of noise impacts on nearby residential areas.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Impacts of Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments. Commercial HVAC system noise is potentially significant, depending upon the size of the systems and their locations relative to noise sensitive uses. Loading docks are potentially significant noise sources, depending upon their locations and the hours of use. Offices and supporting retail uses would also have the potential to affect neighboring noise sensitive uses, primarily due to noise from on-site traffic and service activities.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Impact N-3: Construction Impacts - A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.** |                                        |                                                                                                                       |                                        |
|                                                                                      | A. Impacts of Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments and Roadway Design Improvement Projects. During the construction phases of the project, noise from construction would dominate the noise environment in the immediate area. Construction noise levels could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby residences. Road construction noise is regulated by Caltrans standard specifications Section 7-1.01I “Sound Control Requirement” and the City noise ordinance applies to the road construction and to other construction activities involved in redevelopment of the commercial corridor. | LTS                                                                                                               | LTS                                    |
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING</strong></td>
<td>Before Mitigation</td>
<td>After Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PH-1: 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).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Design Improvement Projects.</strong> The specific plan area is built out, with the exception of a few vacant properties. Under the proposed Specific Plan, redevelopment activities would result in the addition of approximately 541 residential units that would accommodate a population of approximately 1,352 people. Would result in an overall decrease in the amount of commercial floor space. The increase in population is not considered substantial (1.6 percent of the projected 2007 population). No significant environmental impact is anticipated from the additional housing since it is occurring in an area with existing services, and would be in conjunction with mixed use development and transportation improvements (both automobile and non automobile) serving the area.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement Project (Sylvan Corners to Cripple Creek Road)</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Roadway Design Improvement project would not induce growth or create additional demand for housing. No impact.
Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact PH-2: Impacts from displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing; impacts from displacement of substantial numbers of people, impacts due to acquisition of property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure PH-1A Disclosure Requirements: Prior to approving a development project that would result in conversion of trailer parks to other uses; the City shall comply with Government Code Section 65863.7, a copy of which is included in Appendix J of this EIR.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA Site D is an existing trailer park with approximately 27 mobile home units on 1.99 acres. The trailer park at Pratt Avenue has approximately 16 units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Design Improvement Projects.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>The following mitigation measures shall be implemented in conjunction with the design and environmental review process for future roadway design projects.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future roadway design improvement projects would require removal of approximately 3 residences for the realignment of the Linden Avenue intersection. The realignment of Linden Avenue and Walnut Drive (private) would also require removal of two commercial structures. Installation of raised medians will limit left-turn movements to median breaks. Direct left-turn access to some businesses will be eliminated; however u-turn movements will be possible and access will be maintained to all properties along Auburn Boulevard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure PH-1B: Relocation Assistance for Housing Displacement:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The City shall provide standard relocation assistance to both tenants and owner occupants in compliance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Replacement housing must be decent, safe, and sanitary (DS&amp;S), which means it must meet all of the minimum requirements established by Federal regulations and conforms to applicable housing and occupancy codes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All real property transactions shall comply with the property acquisition and relocation standards of the State of California, the Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **C. Near-term Roadway Design Improvement Project.** The Roadway Design Improvement project would not displace housing or persons but would require acquisition of property frontages for additional right-of-way. Parking may be affected by the widening of the right of way (Parking is discussed in Section 4.11 Transportation). *This is a significant impact which can be mitigated.* | **S** | Mitigation Measure PH-1C Business Relocation:  
The following mitigation measures shall be required to compensate for right-of-way acquisition.  
1. Property owners shall be compensated in accordance with fair market values based on appraisals. Business owners shall be compensated based on an assessment of the value of the business and any loss of good will.  
2. All efforts shall be made to identify relocation opportunities for affected businesses that would reduce the loss of goodwill and historic patronage. Wherever feasible, assistance shall be made available in identifying suitable relocation sites within the service area of existing businesses. | **LTS** |
| Mitigation Measure PH-1D Property Compensation:  
1. All real property transactions shall comply with the property acquisition and relocation standards of the State of California, the Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.  
2. Property owners shall be compensated in accordance with fair market values based on appraisals. Business owners shall be compensated based on an assessment of the value of the business and any loss of good will.  
3. All efforts shall be made to identify relocation opportunities for affected businesses that would reduce the loss of goodwill and historic patronage. Wherever feasible, assistance shall be made available in identifying suitable relocation sites within the service area of existing businesses. | | | |

---

*Note: This table continues on the next page.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.11 Transportation and Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact T-1: Impacts related to increase in traffic which would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the system.</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Specific Plan will be implemented over a period of approximately 20 years; buildout conditions would not occur until the year 2025. The near term and future roadway design improvement projects are not capacity enhancing projects and would not generate additional vehicle trips in the corridor. Therefore, the existing plus project condition was not analyzed for the specific plan or the roadway design improvement projects. Development of roadway improvements identified in the Plan would not be constructed under existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact T-2: Impacts related to exceeding, either individually or cumulative, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways.</strong></td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Design Improvement Projects.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic study conducted for the project indicate that with implementation of project, study roadway segments and intersections would operate at acceptable LOS according to the City of Citrus Heights LOS thresholds contained in the General Plan policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact T-3: Impacts that would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near-term Roadway Improvement Projects. The Plan includes a thorough analysis of existing conflicts due to the design of the roadway and identifies specific locations where bus turnouts and crosswalks should be located. The roadway standards identified in the Plan are intended to develop a corridor that is easy to maneuver, pedestrian-friendly, and safe to use. The Roadway design improvement projects would implement these standards.</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.11.6.4 Impact T-4: Impacts that would result in inadequate emergency parking.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near-term Roadway Improvement Project. The proposed Specific Plan and its components would have no effect on parking for emergency vehicles.</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.11.6.5 Impact T-5: Impacts that would result in inadequate parking capacity.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **A. Impacts of the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments.**  
One objective of the specific plan is to change the relationship between transportation patterns and development standards along the Auburn Boulevard corridor. The parking standards of the City would apply within the specific plan area; however, the parking standards in the specific plan allow flexibility for the provision of parking in some instances. Where businesses are accessible to pedestrians and bicycles, it may be feasible to reduce parking requirements. | S | Mitigation Measure T-5A: Ensure Adequate Parking Supply  
In order to ensure that adequate parking supply is maintained in the specific plan area, the city shall establish a special permit process to allow flexibility in the number of required parking spaces when deemed appropriate. | NA |
| **B. Impacts of the Plan Line Adoption and Future Roadway Design Improvement Projects.**  
Property acquisition for future roadway projects may impact parking areas of existing businesses. By adopting the Plan Line, the City will ensure that impacts to parking facilities for new commercial uses will be avoided since parking areas for new businesses will be located outside of the Plan Line. The determination of parking impacts will need to be made for each roadway design improvement project as it is funded and approved. | LTS | No mitigation measures required. | LTS |
### Table 2-1: Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **C. Impacts of the Near-term Roadway Design Improvement Project.** The near-term roadway design improvement project will require acquisition of frontage properties on Auburn Boulevard to provide for widening and construction of improvements. Property acquisition will impact parking areas at approximately nine existing businesses. Property owners must be compensated for the loss of the underlying real property. Additional mitigation measures would be needed if the parking loss affects the viability of the business operations. | S | Mitigation Measure T-5B: Compensate for Parking Impacts.  
1. The determination of project-caused parking impacts shall be made in accordance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Project proponents shall compensate for acquisition of underlying property in compliance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.  
2. In the event that it is determined that the project will result in a reduction of parking spaces below the number required by zoning, but would not preclude continued use of the parcel that is allowed by zoning as determined by the appropriate land use authority (City of Citrus Heights), the project proponent(s) shall:  
(a) Investigate feasibility of and compensate for cost of reconfiguring parking area or relocating parking on the same parcel to provide additional spaces; or  
(b) Investigate feasibility of and compensate for the cost of providing off-site parking; and/or  
(c) The appropriate land use authority (City of Citrus Heights) shall grant a special parking permit to allow the continued use with reduced parking. | LTS |
Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts And Mitigation Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. If it is determined during the right-of-way appraisal and acquisition process that the project would result in a reduction of parking spaces that would preclude continued use of the parcel in accordance with the existing zoning, and none of the measures under No. 2 above are feasible, the project proponent(s) shall provide compensation in accordance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11.6.6 Impact T-6: Impacts to the circulation network during construction activities

A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near Term Roadway Design Improvement Projects

Construction activities would result in temporary disruption to businesses and residents in the area as well as to some public services such as public transit and emergency vehicles (i.e. fire and police). Detours and traffic delays may occur; however interruptions to access would be minimized for all properties. These impacts would be temporary.

S Mitigation Measure T-6 Construction Period Traffic Management Plan. A traffic handling plan will be prepared prior to construction of any roadway improvements. The plan will address traffic management during construction periods, including but not limited to road and lane closures; detours; pedestrian and bicycle routes; and public notification. The traffic handling plan should be prepared in consultation with regional transit in order to minimize disruptions to public transit service along the corridor. Additionally, prior to commencement of construction, a Traffic Management Plan as described in A Traffic Management Plan Guide (See Appendix A of the Final EIR) will be prepared and provided to Caltrans for review in order to address strategies needed to minimize disruption of traffic at the Interstate 80/Auburn Boulevard Interchange.

LTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.12 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact U-1: Impacts to Water Supply, Water Treatment, Wastewater Treatment and Storm Drain Facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments. The proposed Specific Plan is largely urbanized with existing connections to water supply, water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities. According to the DEIR for the Citrus Heights General Plan, capacity for water supply, water treatment facilities and wastewater treatment facilities are expected to be adequate to serve the projected development buildout of the General Plan. Development proposed by the specific plan is consistent with the Citrus Heights General Plan.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact U-2: Impacts due to disruption of utilities and services during construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impacts of the Roadway Design Improvement Projects Near-term and Future Projects. Public and private utilities are located adjacent to the roadway throughout the project corridor. Temporary impacts to utilities will occur during construction since utilities located in the existing and proposed right-of-way areas must be relocated. Effects may include interruption of services due to accidental damage or during relocation activities. Service interruption can be minimized through preconstruction and construction period coordination efforts between the project proponents and utility providers.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure U-2 Construction Management for Utilities: The construction project management team shall coordinate with utility providers during design stages of roadway projects. The construction project management team shall undertake periodic assessments of upcoming utility and service disruptions during construction. These assessments and an identification of the service area involved shall be coordinated with utility providers and the public outreach program. The public outreach program shall ensure that advance notice of any utility or service shutdowns is extended to affected businesses and residents. Through construction management and project scheduling, all available measures shall be taken to minimize the duration of utility or service shutdowns.</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3.0 WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS

Six comment letters were received on the Draft EIR during the public review period (October 12 through November 29, 2004). One additional letter was received after the public review period ended and is included here. The letters received are listed below. A copy of each letter received is provided in this chapter. Each letter has a reference number which corresponds to the response provided in Chapter 4.0.

List of Written Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Number</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>George Booth</td>
<td>County of Sacramento, Department of Water Resources-Drainage &amp; Hydrology</td>
<td>October 27, 2004 (email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Katherine Eastham</td>
<td>Department of Transportation – District 3</td>
<td>November 22, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mark Morse</td>
<td>City of Roseville</td>
<td>November 23, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Taiwo Jaiyeoba</td>
<td>Regional Transit</td>
<td>November 23, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Peter Christensen</td>
<td>Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>November 29, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Terry Roberts</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>November 30, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wendy Haggard</td>
<td>County Sanitation District – 1</td>
<td>January 14, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruggiero, Janet

From: Booth, George (MSA) [boothg@SacCounty.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2004 12:53 PM
To: Fredrickson, Craig (MSA)
Cc: Becker, Kevin; Ruggiero, Janet; Becker, Kevin
Subject: Auburn Blvd redevelopment

Craig,
The City of Citrus Heights is proposing to redevelop Auburn Blvd, from Sylvan to I-80. Please provide your comments to Kevin.

Janet,
My office has no specific comments.

George H. Booth, PE
Drainage Development and Hydrology Section
Sacramento County Department of Water Resources
(916) 874-6494

This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by other than the County of Sacramento or the intended recipient is strictly prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments thereto.
November 22, 2004

04SAC0148
03- SAC-80 P.M. 17.910
The Boulevard Plan/Auburn Blvd. Specific Plan
DEIR
SCH#2003062165

Ms. Janet Ruggiero
City of Citrus Heights
6237 Fountain Square Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621

Dear Ms. Ruggiero:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Auburn Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan project. Our comments are as follows:

- Although there may be no direct impacts to Interstate 80 as a result of the implementation of this project, Caltrans should be provided with project specifics regarding the construction period and traffic mitigation strategies (i.e. night operations, lane closures during off-peak traffic periods, etc.) to avert any potential traffic disruption problems or possible ramp queuing congestion at the Interstate 80/Auburn Boulevard Interchange. Please address Caltrans’ interchange traffic concerns when drafting Mitigation Measure T-6 to include Interstate 80/Auburn Boulevard Interchange mitigation, as well as City street and road closures and property access mitigation along the Auburn Boulevard corridor. A Traffic Management Plan Guide is provided for reference. Please provide a copy of the Traffic Management Plan guide for our review.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Ken Champion at (916) 274-0615.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE EASTHAM, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning - Southwest

*Caltrans improves mobility across California*
November 23, 2004

City of Citrus Heights
6237 Fountain Square Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621-5577
Attn: Janet M. Ruggiero, CDD Director

Via: Fax and Regular Mail

Subject: Draft EIR for the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan (ABSP) and Road Design Project

Dear Ms. Ruggiero:

I have reviewed the Draft EIR for the Boulevard Plan (Auburn Boulevard Corridor) and have the following comments.

The EIR should analyze the impacts to the Intersections of Auburn Boulevard/Orlando Avenue and Cirby Way/Riverside Avenue using the City of Roseville Buildout/2020 Travel Demand Forecast Model.

On page 4.11-4, the DEIR refers to Figure 4.11-1 showing traffic volumes along Auburn Boulevard but there is no Figure 4.11-1. Please provide a copy of Figure 4.11-1 for our review.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions regarding this letter please contact Scott Gandler, in the Engineering Department, at 746-1300.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mark Morse
Environmental Coordinator

cc: Rob Jensen, Roseville Public Works Director
November 23, 2004

Janet Ruggiero
Director of Community Development
City of Citrus Heights,
6237 Fountain Square Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621

NAME OF DEVELOPMENT: The Boulevard Plan Project

TYPE OF DOCUMENT: Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Regional Transit (RT) staff has reviewed the DEIR for re-inventing the Auburn Boulevard Corridor (The Boulevard Plan) and would like to provide the following comments/recommendations:

The proposed corridor improvement covers a portion of Auburn Boulevard between Sylvan Comer and I-80. The project will improve an area along the Auburn Boulevard Corridor that totals approximately 460 acres focusing on parcels, commercial and residential uses that front on Auburn Boulevard. The goal is to improve the image of the corridor, and improve its function as a transportation facility serving adjacent land uses and better connectivity with other areas in the region.

RT supports the proposed improvements to the Auburn Boulevard corridor. Improvements to this corridor will provide an enhancement to this major transit corridor within the City of Citrus Heights. RT provides services along Auburn Boulevard with bus routes 91, 93, 95 and 103 traveling at regular frequencies within this portion of the corridor.

In order to further enhance the transit supportiveness of this Plan and to minimize future impacts on transit, regardless of the roadway alternatives considered, the following recommendations are proposed for further analysis in the DEIR:

1. Evaluate the potential impact on transit movements along Auburn Boulevard and develop appropriate mitigation plan for the impacts. The DEIR indicates that "construction activities would result in temporary disruption to connectivity by requiring detours for pedestrians and bicyclists, and traffic congestion" (Page 2-28). RT is concerned about impact of construction activities on existing transit services along this corridor.
A significant impact on transit operations occurs if the project construction would result in lane closure (even temporary) or cause a delay to bus transit services within the affected area.

RT’s goal is to provide dependable and on-time service for our patrons and delays caused by construction will make it difficult to adhere to a timed schedule. Please contact Al Schweim, RT’s Director of Transportation or Dennis Jones, Transportation Superintendent at 321-2800 for further information regarding the short-term disruption of traffic and delays.

2. Although the DEIR did not identify specific “noise barriers” to mitigate the impact of noise on nearby residents, RT would like to recommend against soundwalls as a type of noise barrier should the discussion arise in future. Physical barriers such as soundwalls impede access to transit and may increase the distance pedestrians have to walk in order to access transit services.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have further questions regarding these recommendations, please contact me at (916) 321-2870 or tjayeoba@Sacrt.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Taiwo Jeyioba
Real Estate Administrator/Transit Oriented Development

c: Fred Arnold, Director of Real Estate, RT
   Al Schweim, Director of Transportation, RT
29 November 2004

Janet M. Riggiero  
City of Citrus Heights  
Planning Division  
6237 Fountain Square Dr  
Citrus Heights CA 95621

RE: The Boulevard Plan, Reinventing the Auburn Boulevard Corridor

Dear Ms. Ruggiero:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft Environmental Impact Report for "The Boulevard Plan, Reinventing the Auburn Boulevard Corridor". District staff is encouraged by the focus on creating districts that enhance quality environments for all modes of travel, especially bicycling and walking. By combining better travel options with new opportunities for mixed infill development with a residential component, the City is contributing to the regional effort to accommodate growth in a manner that can help to minimize emissions.

We offer the following specific comment on the draft EIR:

Section 4.3.6.1 (Page 4.3-18) describes impact AQ-1 related to construction impacts of the Specific Plan. Construction of the Specific Plan is identified as a significant impact, although quantified emission impacts are not identified because the "amount and timing of construction activities associated with the Specific Plan are not known." In order to mitigate the significant impact, the SMAQMD standard NOx construction mitigation is included.

SMAQMD recommends construction NOx mitigation only in cases where quantified impacts exceed the adopted threshold of significance (85 lbs/day). Applying the mitigation to smaller construction activities is not intended because of the limited amount of off-road equipment associated with smaller projects. As described in the draft EIR, the Specific Plan provides a framework for redevelopment of the corridor over time. It is likely that most construction activities will be relatively small, such as construction of a parcel or group of parcels on an individual basis. Therefore, we recommend that the construction NOx mitigation be removed as required mitigation. We would recommend that any contractor with off-road equipment working on Specific Plan projects contact SMAQMD to investigate financial incentive opportunities for reducing emissions from construction equipment, but specific emission reduction actions should not
be mandated. The mitigation related to particulate matter and asbestos is appropriate and should be retained.

Thank you for the opportunity to review The Boulevard Plan documents. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at 916.874.4886.

Sincerely,

Peter Christensen
Mobile Source Division

SAC200400283
Comment Letter 6
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

November 30, 2004

Janet M. Ruggiero
City of Citrus Heights
6237 Fountain Square Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621-5577

Subject: Boulevard Plan, A Specific Plan for the Auburn Boulevard Corridor from Sylvan Corners to the City Limits, Citrus Heights
SCH#: 2003062165

Dear Janet M. Ruggiero:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on November 29, 2004, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
Comment Letter 7

January 14, 2005
E225.000

Janet M. Ruggiero
City of Citrus Heights
6237 Fountain Square Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621-5577

Dear Ms. Ruggiero:

Subject: The Boulevard Plan-General Planning Document EIR

Both the County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) reviewed the subject documents and have the following comments.

CSD-1 and SRCSD have made some changes, clarifications and additions to some of our comments since our last response letter concerning the Notice Of Preparation dated July 11, 2003. These changes are reflected below and serve as amendments to comments sent on said date. (A copy is attached for your ready reference). Please refer to that letter regarding the following comments.

The two trunk-line relief projects discussed in paragraph one on page two are no longer included in our current planning for capacity increases, due to cost or design complexity issues. This will not impede the ability of the district to serve the area.

The District is still concerned that installation of new surface infrastructure such as roadway medians and channelizations, streetscape elements, street trees etc. could impact our ability to maintain sub-surface sewer line and related facilities, as discussed in paragraphs three and four on page 2.

The future construction should be carefully co-ordinated with the District to eliminate conflicts with our facilities. City designers are asked to contact the District for our standards including a list of compatible street trees and to follow these in their designs wherever possible. Wherever possible, surface elements should be kept free of our subsurface lines in case of future excavation-maintenance needs.

The District still plans on the installation of the Northwest Interceptor Line along Old Auburn Road and Auburn Road west of Sylvan Corner. This could entail extensive Right-of-Way acquisition needs. Accordingly, for this and other reasons, the District would appreciate co-ordination with the City during the formulation and establishment of the official plan line for Auburn Boulevard, as well as over all design and construction involving right-of-way facets.

The above and our July 11, 2003 letter would cover any comments on the project at this time.
Janet M. Ruggiero  
January 14, 2005  
Page 2

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please call Joyce Ferguson at (916) 876-6098 or myself at (916) 876-6094.

Sincerely,

Wendy Haggard, P.E.  
Department of Water Quality  
Development Services

Attachment

WH/JRO: cc

cc: Maria Cablao
July 11 2003
E225,000

Janet M. Ruggiero
City of Citrus Heights
6237 Fountain Square Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621-5577

Dear Ms. Ruggiero:

Subject: Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report
Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan (ABSP) and Road Design Project

County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) and Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) reviewed the subject document and have the following comments, which should be fully studied and discussed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The project description indicates that “commercial services, housing and mixed use infill, and/or regional commercial” land use would be encouraged. The draft EIR will need to completely describe the land use changes that are proposed and what, if any, increase of development intensity is contemplated.

The master plans of both Districts provide for increased density and development in the project area and do expect that the proposed land use plan proposed by the City would be compatible with District programs. District staff expects that after the review of the EIR that they will be able to support the land use plan.

Unfortunately, many of the needed master plan facilities are not yet in place and the sewer system is currently capacity constrained. Increases in density will aggravate the existing constrained sewer facilities serving the project area. Impacts from infill projects could be significant if they are served prior to completion of facilities that will increase capacity. Current development within the plan area will continue to be served by the existing system.

SRCSD constructs and maintains most sanitary sewer facilities for flows that exceed 10 mgd. Currently, the existing facilities are nearing capacity and additional pipe capacity must be developed. SRCSD is currently underway with construction and design of the Lower Northwest and Upper Northwest Interceptors. All sections of these interceptors are funded and completion is currently scheduled for 2007, although a variety of unforeseeable factors may cause the date to be revised. The completion of Lower and Upper Northwest Interceptors will provide the additional interceptor capacity needed to serve the City of Citrus Heights in general and this project specifically.
CSD-1 is responsible to collect flows from individual customers and collect them for transfer to SRCSD. To this end, CSD-1 maintains a trunk system for flows of over 1 mgd. Two major trunk sewer lines serve the subject project area. The southern trunk is a 27" diameter line draining westerly from Sylvan Road through the Stock Ranch Development. The northern trunk ranges from 24" to 36" in diameter and flows south on Auburn Boulevard for 1000 feet before turning westerly at Watson Way and then later heading in a southerly direction. The southern 27" trunk has been identified as capacity constrained and additional connections cannot be permitted at this time. However, discussions are currently underway to provide additional capacity to this trunk and such capacity would be available to serve new customers in the southern portion of the project area. If this project proceeds as is expected, capacity would be available in late 2004. The northern trunk has not been as carefully examined and it will be necessary to prepare a current study to quantify the extent of any capacity constraints that may exist on the pipe. If the northern trunk is capacity constrained, it will be necessary to develop projects that will create additional capacity prior to permitting additional connections.

CSD-1 and SRCSD believe that all impacts could be mitigated to a less than significant impact. To facilitate insignificant impacts the EIR should establish mitigation measures requiring new development to analyze sewer capacity when significant flows or modifications will affect the sewer system. Mitigation measures should also require interim sewer service facilities when determined necessary by CSD-1.

Reconstruction of Auburn Boulevard could impact existing sewer facilities in the roadway. Many of these lines are older, only 6 inches in diameter and may not be in conformance with current standards. Upgrading portions of the collector system may be warranted and/or required as redevelopment occurs in the area. Upsizing the lines will disturb sections of the newly improved road unless the line sizes are increased prior to or during construction of the subject project. The EIR should address these issues in relation to project road design improvements.

Construction of the subject project proposals may also impact sewer facilities that will remain. Mitigation measures that insure protection of the existing facilities during construction will reduce impacts to less than significant.

Finally, SRCSD plans to construct the Upper Northwest Interceptor 9 (UNWI9) section down Old Auburn Road and Auburn Boulevard through the Intersection with Sylvan Road (at Sylvan Corners). The UNWI9 will be around 36" in diameter and 23 feet deep through the Sylvan Corners intersection. Construction, anticipated in the summer of 2007, may require massive removal of street improvements in the area due to excavation and will affect the near-term portion of the subject project between Sylvan Corners and Watson Way. The EIR should explore mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts to less than significant.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please call Joyce Ferguson at 876-6098 or myself at 876-6094.

Very truly yours,

Jeff Attridge, P.E.
Local Sewer Engineering

JA/JF:ds

cc: Christoph Dobson
    Neal B. Allen
CHAPTER 4.0 RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS

LETTER 1: George Booth, County of Sacramento, Department of Water Resources

Comment states that this office has no comments. No response necessary.

LETTER 2: Katherine Eastham, Department of Transportation – District 3

Comment 2-1: Comment states that Caltrans should be provided with project specifics regarding construction period and traffic mitigation strategies to avert potential traffic disruption problems or possible ramp queuing congestion at the Interstate 80/Auburn Boulevard Interchange. Caltrans notes that these concerns should be addressed in Mitigation Measure T-6 of the Draft EIR. Caltrans further provides a copy of *A Traffic Management Plan Guide* and requests that Caltrans be provided with a copy of the Traffic Management Plan for review.

Response 2-1: Mitigation measure T-6 is intended to ensure that these potential problems are addressed in a “traffic handling plan”. The mitigation measure is revised to clarify that Caltrans should be provided a traffic management plan for review prior to road construction projects. *A Traffic Management Plan Guide* is included in Appendix B of the Final EIR and referenced in the revised mitigation measure. Specific details regarding specific projects’ effects on traffic congestion are not available at this time. Project specific environmental reviews for development and redevelopment projects that may have an effect on traffic on the corridor should address these potential impacts. The mitigation measure is revised in this Final EIR to clarify the need for additional coordination and review with Caltrans.

LETTER 3: Mark Morse, City of Roseville

Comment 3-1: The City of Roseville staff requested that the Draft EIR should analyze the project’s impacts to the intersections of Auburn Boulevard/Orlando Avenue and Cirby Way/Riverside Avenue using the City of Roseville’s Buildout/2020 travel demand forecasting model.

Response 3-1:

The project’s impacts were not analyzed at any City of Roseville intersections because the trip generation of the project showed only a slight increase in traffic compared to “no project” conditions. In fact, it was estimated that the project would result in a decrease in trips (compared to “no project” conditions) on the segment of Auburn Boulevard between the City of Roseville/Citrus Heights border and Antelope Road due to the lower-intensity land uses proposed for this area. Overall, the increase in trips due to the project was estimated to be approximately 4,700 daily trips, 290 AM peak hour trips, and 370 PM peak hour trips over the entire project study segment between the north city limits and Sylvan Road.
The City of Roseville is currently conducting a study to determine if Cirby Way should be widened to six lanes or remain four lanes. Various alternatives, such as providing triple left-turn lanes from northbound Riverside Avenue onto Cirby Way, are being studied with the use and development of a visual simulation model. The Specific Plan project was based on a less sophisticated, yet adequate, analysis and did not employ a visual simulation analysis. The inconsistency of analysis techniques between these two projects and the uncertainty of the improvements at the Cirby Way/Riverside Avenue intersection make the traffic analysis of this intersection for the Specific Plan project impractical. Given the project’s low trip generation numbers, the level of effort required in using the more sophisticated model for the Specific Plan’s traffic impacts at these intersections was not justified.

Comment 3-2: Comment notes that Figure 4.11-1 showing existing conditions traffic volumes along Auburn Boulevard is missing from the Draft EIR.

Response 3-2: The Figure, which shows traffic volumes along Auburn Boulevard under the existing conditions scenario, is provided in Chapter 7.0 of this Final EIR.

LETTER 4: Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Regional Transit

Comment 4-1: Comment notes that RT supports the proposed improvements that will provide an enhancement to the corridor, which is a major transit corridor in Citrus Heights.

Response 4-1: No response is necessary.

Comment 4-2: Comment notes that RT is concerned about impacts to transit services due to construction activities on Auburn Boulevard. The potential impact on transit should be addressed in the DEIR and appropriate mitigation measures developed.

Response 4-2: The EIR notes that construction activities would have an affect on traffic congestion and that a traffic handling plan should be put in place prior to construction. The intent of the measure is to minimize traffic congestion that would affect all forms of transportation along the corridor, including public transit. The impacts discussion and Mitigation Measure T-6 are revised to clarify this point.

Comment 4-3: The comment notes that noise barriers impede access to transit and may increase the distance pedestrians have to walk in order to reach transit services.

Response 4-3: As noted in the comment, neither the Specific Plan nor the roadway design improvement project proposes construction of sound walls at any specific location; soundwalls may be proposed as part of future development/reevelopment projects in the Specific Plan area. Additionally, the Specific Plan promotes use of landscaping, walls and fences to screen commercial parking lots and unsightly uses in commercial areas. One of the main priorities of the Specific Plan it to promote transit use and pedestrian friendly site design. The Specific Plan contains design guidelines that address pedestrian
access to transit, pedestrian safety and comfort and connectivity between commercial areas and adjacent neighborhoods. These guidelines include the following:

- **Gateway District Transit Design Guidelines** – Pedestrian connections to transit facilities shall be easy to navigate, safe, comfortable and friendly.
- **Rusch Park District Connections to the Community** –
  - New projects shall provide connections between existing and new streets
  - Concrete block sound walls are not allowed as a means to separate commercial uses from new residential areas
- **Lincoln 40 District Integrating Transit** –
  - New and renovated commercial projects shall be clearly connected to transit services. Sidewalks shall provide direct access to transit stops. Special considerations shall be taken into account, such as shopping cart storage near bus stops.
  - Transit stops shall be conveniently and centrally located. They shall be easy to find and co-located with commercial services and amenities.
  - Transit stops and connecting pedestrian routes shall be well lit and visible.

Future development and redevelopment projects would be evaluated for compliance with these guidelines on a case by case basis to ensure that plan priorities are being met.

**LETTER 5: Peter Christensen, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District**

Comment 5-1: Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) recommends construction NOx mitigation only in cases where quantified impacts exceed the adopted threshold of significance of 85 lbs/day. It is likely that most construction activities within the Specific Plan will be relatively small; therefore it is recommended that the construction NOx mitigation be removed as required mitigation. Applying mitigation to smaller construction activities is not intended because of the limited amount of off-road equipment associated with smaller projects. The mitigation related to particulate matter and asbestos is appropriate and should be retained.

Response 5-1: The air quality mitigation measure is revised in the Final EIR to reflect this comment.

**LETTER 6: Terry Roberts, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit**

This letter is a transmittal letter with the comment letter from the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) attached. Refer to Letter No. 2 comment and response. No further response is necessary.
LETTER 7: Wendy Haggard, Department of Water Quality Development Services, County Sanitation District -1

Comment 7-1: This comment provides an update on the status of the trunk-line relief projects described in the District’s response to the Notice of Preparation (see CSD-1 letter dated July 11, 2003). CSD-1 notes that these projects are no longer included in their current planning for capacity increases. CSD-1 also notes that this will not impede the ability of the district to serve the Specific Plan area.

Response 7-1: Comment is noted and this information is included in the errata section of this Final EIR.

Comment 7-2: The District is concerned that installation of new surface infrastructure such as medians, streets trees, etc. could impact its ability to maintain sub-surface sewer line and related facilities.

Response 7-2: The Draft EIR notes that temporary impacts to utilities may include interruption of services due to accidental damage or during relocation activities. Mitigation measure U-2 is provided to minimize disruptions through preconstruction and construction period coordination efforts between the project proponents and utility providers.

Comment 7-3: The District asks that future construction be coordinated with the District to eliminate conflicts with their facilities. City designers are asked to contact the District for their standards including a list of compatible street trees.

Response 7-3: Mitigation measure U-2 is modified to clarify the need for design period coordination with the district.

Comment 7-4: CSD-1 notes that the District’s plans for installation of the Northwest Interceptor Line along Old Auburn Road and Auburn Road west of Sylvan Corner are still current. The District would appreciate coordination with the City on the planning for the adoption of the Auburn Boulevard Plan Line.

Response 7-4: The Plan Line proposed as part of The Boulevard Plan, Plan Line Study and Auburn Boulevard Roadway Design Improvement project only affects that portion of Auburn Boulevard north of the Sylvan Corners intersection. The Interceptor Project is located in a different segment of the Auburn Boulevard (the segment to the west of Sylvan Corners).
CHAPTER 5.0 ORAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

At the Planning Commission Hearing of October 28, 2004 the following members of the public spoke.

Olita J. Platt  Resident - Speaker focused her comments on the Specific Plan and did not address the Draft EIR.

Response to Comments of Dave Fisher, Resident of Oak Forest Street – Speaker expressed concerns that adoption of the Specific Plan would exacerbate existing sewer problems in his neighborhood (Oak Forest Street) and concerns about traffic congestion.

Response: Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) has provided an update on their planning for improvements to sewer infrastructure in the area (see Letter #7 and attached response to the Notice of Preparation dated July 11, 2003). SRCSD noted that the sewer interceptor system is currently capacity constrained; however, design and construction activities are underway for the Lower Northwest and Upper Northwest Interceptors. All sections of these interceptors are funded and completion is expected in 2007. The completion of these interceptors will provide the additional interceptor capacity needed to serve the City of Citrus Heights generally, including the Specific Plan project.

According to CSD-1 (personal communication Dobson 12/14/04), the sewer collector lines serving particular neighborhoods sometimes have problems due to the condition of the line, rather than capacity. This is the case with the line serving the neighborhood on Oak Forest Street, which is located in a backyard easement. Any development as a result of the approval of the Auburn Boulevard Specific Plan would most likely connect to a line in Auburn Boulevard and therefore would have no effect on the sewer line serving Oak Forest Street. In the unlikely event that development was allowed to connect to the sewer line serving Oak Forest Street, CSD-1 would require the project proponents to either demonstrate that adequate sewer capacity was available, or construct improvements to the sewer system to ensure necessary capacity.

With respect to traffic congestion, one of the main priorities of the project is to improve traffic safety. The Specific Plan would provide roadway improvements and site design that would increase safety and the capacity of the roadway.

Bob Croom  Resident – Speaker focused his comments on the Specific Plan and did not address the Draft EIR.

At the Planning Commission Hearing of November 18, 2004 the following members of the public spoke.

Donald Patch  Resident  Mr. Patch’s comments addressed the Specific Plan and did not address the Draft EIR.
Van Ford  Resident  Mr. Ford expressed concern regarding traffic issues.

Response: One of the main priorities of the project is to improve traffic safety. The Draft EIR noted that the Specific Plan would provide roadway improvements and site design that would increase safety and the capacity of the roadway.
CHAPTER 6.0 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT SPECIFIC PLAN

6.1 Introduction

This section presents revisions (Addendum and Errata) to the public review draft of The Specific Plan (July 2004) as a result of recommendations in the EIR, or recommendations that resulted from public review and Planning Commission review. It has been determined that the revisions are minor and do not constitute a significant change in the proposed project, do not present additional information that would result in the identification of new significant impacts, or a change in significance of previously identified impacts, nor in the need for additional mitigation measures. Incorporation of the Addendum and Errata into the Specific Plan would not require additional environmental analysis or recirculation of the Draft EIR.

6.2 Addendum and Errata

The following are changes to July 2004 Public Hearing Draft Boulevard Plan. Changes are noted by strikeout for deleted language and underline for new or revised language. The Draft Plan will undergo changes to correct non-substantive typographical errors, revise numbering sequences and figure and page numbering changes in addition to the specific changes noted below.

Section 2 Concepts, Goals, and Principles

Page 2-4.

Insert New Land Use Principle
LUP 5 Gateway District Uses
Approve uses, such as a hotel or, alternatively, mixed use office-residential or commercial-residential development (e.g., grocery store with condominiums) for the K-mart site that promotes the Gateway District as a distinctive, mixed use business address. Restrict uses such as big-box retail as well as other similar retail commercial uses that do not achieve this objective.

LUP 6. Lincoln 40 District: Reinventing Continuing Highway Commercial
Reinforce business opportunities for smaller parcels and related land use.

Insert New Land Use Principle
LUP 8 Grocery Store
Recruit a grocery store for the southwest corner of Auburn Boulevard and Antelope Road in the Lincoln 40 District, on the “main street” of the Rusch Park Village Center, or as part of a mixed-use development at the K-mart site in the Gateway District Commercial Center.
LUP 10. Long-Term Vision
Require new uses to reflect the City’s long-term vision for the Boulevard, while ensuring that existing uses are not displaced in the near term by planning or regulatory activities, including allowing upgrading and minor remodeling of existing non-conforming uses.

Page 2-5.

Insert New Land Use Principle
LUP 15 Mitigation Measures
Implement the environmental mitigation measures identified in Appendix 9.

2.3.1 Circulation Concepts
Figure 2.2 shows the major circulation concepts for the Auburn Boulevard corridor, including the location of permitted turning movements, enhanced transit stops, enhancement and repair of local side streets, existing and future traffic signals for both automobiles and pedestrians, potential roadway realignments, parcels that would likely generate considerable pedestrian activity, and private streets. Figure 2.3 addresses the broader circulation context by showing the connectivity of the Boulevard to Interstate 80, major thoroughfares, and local school sites. The following summarizes the circulation concepts for the four districts.

Page 2-8.

CP 7. Bus Turn Outs Enhanced Transit Stops
Install bus turn outs and/or shelters at every bus stop along Auburn Boulevard with the configuration determined by the General Services Department based on site constraints.

Insert New Circulation Principle
CP 8 Sidestreet Improvements
Enhance existing local side streets through street repairs, connecting sidewalks, grading, and landscaping.

Page 2-13

CDP 9. Undergrounding Utilities
Remove overhead transmission lines, light poles, and other utilities along the entire Boulevard that are unsightly and limit the possibility of adding trees and landscaping.
CDP 11. Signs and Billboards
Remove unsightly commercial signs such as billboards, illegal A-frames and signs in disrepair that contribute to the visual clutter along the Boulevard. Limit A-frame signs to one for each parcel.

Insert New Community Design Principle
CDP 12. Billboards
Develop a process for the removal or relocation of billboards along the Boulevard.

CDP 14. Facade Improvements
Upgrade the facades of aging commercial buildings that are outdated and showing signs of blight.

Insert New Streetscape Principle
SP4 Sound Walls
Plant climbing vines at the base of all existing sound walls and new sound walls to soften their visual impact.
## Section 3 Development Standards

### Table 3.5 Building Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Gateway District</th>
<th>Rusch Park District</th>
<th>Sylvan Corners Village Square District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Boulevard frontage</td>
<td>5' setback for commercial and residential mixed-use (required), 20’ setback for residential uses (required)</td>
<td>5’ setback for commercial and residential mixed-use (required), 20’ setback for residential uses (required)</td>
<td>5’ setback for commercial (required), 5' setback for commercial (required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side street frontage</td>
<td>5’ setback for commercial and residential mixed-use (required), 20’ setback for residential uses (required)</td>
<td>5’ setback for commercial and residential mixed-use (required), 20’ setback for residential uses (required)</td>
<td>5’-15’ setback for commercial (required), 5’ setback for commercial (required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to existing residential</td>
<td>20’ setback minimum for commercial and residential uses</td>
<td>1 story–10’ 2 story–15’ setback minimum for commercial and residential uses 20’ setback minimum (1)</td>
<td>20’ setback minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6 Allowable Heights and FAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Gateway District</th>
<th>Rusch Park District</th>
<th>Outside Gateway Commercial Center</th>
<th>Outside Rusch Park Village Center</th>
<th>Lincoln District</th>
<th>Sylvan Corners Village Square District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Boulevard frontage</td>
<td>4 stories 50’</td>
<td>3 stories 40’</td>
<td>3 stories 40’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side street frontage</td>
<td>3 stories 40’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>3 stories 40’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to existing residential</td>
<td>3 stories 40’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
<td>2 stories 30’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>Commercial 0.60 Residential 0.50</td>
<td>Commercial 0.60 Residential 0.50</td>
<td>Commercial 0.60 Residential 0.50</td>
<td>Commercial 0.60 Residential 0.50</td>
<td>Commercial 0.60 Residential 0.50</td>
<td>Commercial 0.60 Residential 0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Parking
One of the objectives of The Boulevard Plan is to change the relationship between transportation patterns and development standards along the Auburn Boulevard corridor. Requiring high amounts of on-site parking can result in excessive paving, increase housing and development costs, and produce an oversupply of parking spaces that can go unused for much of the year. The parking standards in this Plan allow for greater flexibility in the provision of parking and reduce the negative impacts of excessive parking. Where this Plan is silent, the parking standards in the Citrus Heights Zoning Ordinance shall apply.

- Provide opportunities for shared use parking agreements between adjacent parcels when cross access easements are used and driveways are closed or when office buildings are located adjacent to entertainment-oriented uses (e.g., cinema, restaurants). Allow, with a minor parking permit, for a parking reduction of 25 percent to reflect uses that have complementary demand patterns.
- Provide opportunities for on-street parking on interior commercial streets in the Rusch Park Village Center and Gateway Commercial Center.
- Prohibit on-street parking on Auburn Boulevard.
- Require wheel stops to prevent overhang of parked vehicles that may encroach into the sidewalk or planting strip.
- Require employee parking to the rear of businesses where appropriate to provide adequate parking for patrons and visitors.
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• Require pedestrian walkways within parking lots (down middle of parking block) plus crosswalks for larger commercial lots (e.g., within Rusch Park Village Center or Gateway Commercial Center).
• Encourage parking layouts that facilitate egress onto side streets where appropriate instead of on to Auburn Boulevard.
• Allow a up to a 15 percent reduction in parking standards for uses that provide transit support facilities such as bike lockers, shower facilities, etc.
• Allow on-street guest parking for multi-family residential areas in the Rusch Park Village Center.
• For small lot parcels, allow the following exceptions to the parking standards in the Zoning Ordinance:
  - Allow up to 50 percent of all parking to consist of compact parking stalls (8 foot width and 16 foot length).
  - Utilize angled parking stalls with one-way drive aisles in lieu of 90-degree spaces where appropriate.
  - Encourage cross parcel access easements to minimize driveway openings and increase parking on-site.
  - Reduce the sidewalk width from 5 feet to 4 feet and planter width from 6 feet to 4 feet to increase on-site parking.
  - Require cross parcel access easements, where appropriate, to minimize driveway openings, allowing for increased parking on-site.
  - Require a minimum parking aisle width of 18 feet for turn-around space for small lots.
  - Allow landscape to count for a portion of the required on-site landscaping.
FOLLOWING PAGES: FIGURES ILLUSTRATING BUILDING SETBACKS AND HEIGHT STANDARDS TO BE INSERTED FOLLOWING FIGURES 3.5 AND 3.6 (DRAFT SPECIFIC PLAN PAGES 3-10 AND 3-11).
City of Citrus Heights
9/8/2005

The Boulevard Plan FEIR
Revisions to the Draft Specific Plan
### Signage Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>District Signage</th>
<th>Site Signage</th>
<th>Building Signage</th>
<th>Tenant Signage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gateway District</strong></td>
<td>Signage concepts for a mixed-use storefront district</td>
<td>Citrus Heights gateway sign, streetlight banners (1)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>AREA: 1 SF per 5 LF of building, appear on one side</td>
<td>One window sign 4 SF max, One blade sign 4 SF max, Window signs 2 SF max (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rusch Park District</strong></td>
<td>Signage concepts for multi-tenant commercial buildings</td>
<td>District entry signs, streetlight banners, wayfinding signage (1)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>HEIGHT: –36” for major tenants (3) –18” for minor tenants</td>
<td>Blades signs 6 SF max, Window signs 4 SF max (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln 40 District</strong></td>
<td>Signage concepts for single and multi-tenant commercial buildings</td>
<td>District banners and directional signage (1)</td>
<td>MULTI-TENANT Monument signs allowed (2) (3)</td>
<td>AREA: 1 SF per 1 LF of storefront HEIGHT: –36” for major tenants (3) –18” for minor tenants</td>
<td>MULTI-TENANT Blades signs 6 SF max, Window signs 4 SF max (2) SINGLE TENANT BUILDINGS (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SINGLE TENANT BUILDINGS Monument signs allowed (2) (3)</td>
<td>HEIGHT: –36” max, –24” max. for buildings under 3,500 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

City of Citrus Heights  
9/8/2005  
The Boulevard Plan FEIR  
Revisions to the Draft Specific Plan
### Signage Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>District Signage</th>
<th>Site Signage</th>
<th>Building Signage</th>
<th>Tenant Signage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan Corners Village Square District</td>
<td>Signage concepts that support uniform standard for Village Square identity</td>
<td>Public art monuments, entry drive signs, banners (1)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Pads over 3,000 SF AREA: 30 SF Height: 36&quot; max.</td>
<td>Anchors over 20,000 SF AREA: 48 SF Height: 48&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pads under 3,000 SF AREA: 16 SF Height: 24&quot; max.</td>
<td>Shops over 6,000 SF AREA: 30 SF Height: 36&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shops under 6,000 SF AREA: 30&quot; Height: 24 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shops under 3,000 SF AREA: 24&quot; Height: 16 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Coordinated with City of Citrus Heights
2. Signage counts against cumulative allowable building signage area
3. Reviewed on case by case basis
Section 4  Design Guidelines
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Gateway District Screen Walls and Security Fences
When walls or fences are required, they shall be designed as an extension of architectural and landscape design concepts.

- Screen walls shall be architecturally treated as an extension of the building. They shall be architectural concrete block, use a cement plaster finish, or otherwise reflect the design and materials of the building. Vertical and horizontal reveals, accents, and other details shall be included.
- Screen walls along pedestrian routes or sidewalks shall be set back to allow for landscaping.
- Chain link fencing is not allowed. Razor wire or barbed wire is not allowed.
- Service and loading dock areas shall not be placed in visually prominent locations. They shall be screened from view.
- Planting of climbing vines or ivy on fences and soundwalls is encouraged.
  o Soundwalls and fences shall be limited to 8 feet in height.
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Connections to the Community in the Rusch Park District
New projects shall be developed as an integral part of the surrounding community.

- Gateways and edges of the district shall promote landscape and street improvements as common amenities that link adjacent neighborhoods. No part of the district shall be gated or distinguished as an enclave.
- New projects shall provide connections between existing and new streets.
- New commercial projects and retrofit of existing buildings shall be designed so that service vehicle access maintains the pedestrian friendliness of the street.
- Concrete block sound walls are not allowed as a means to separate commercial uses from new residential uses.
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Rusch Park District Walls and Fences
When walls or fences are needed, they shall be designed as an extension of architectural and landscape design concepts.
Screen walls shall be architecturally treated as an extension of the building. They shall be architectural concrete block, use a cement plaster finish, or otherwise reflect the design and materials of the building. Vertical and horizontal reveals, accents, and other details shall be included.

Screen walls along pedestrian routes or sidewalks shall be set back to allow for landscaping.

Chain link fencing is not allowed. Razor wire or barbed wire is not allowed.

- Planting of climbing vines or ivy on fences and soundwalls is encouraged.
  - Soundwalls and fences shall be limited to 8 feet in height.

Lincoln 40 District Transition to Residential Areas

New and renovated projects shall be designed to enhance adjacent residential neighborhoods. Projects shall be designed to reduce the visual, noise and use impacts on adjacent residential areas. Screen walls are generally regarded as mitigation for poor site planning.

- New and renovated commercial projects shall enhance the connections to Auburn Boulevard. They shall provide streetscape, sidewalks, building setback and storefront design that link residential streets to Auburn Boulevard. Residents should be able to walk a direct route from their homes to commercial center stores without traversing parking lots.
- New and renovated commercial projects shall provide a site plan that supports the design and pedestrian access objectives for contiguous residential streets.
- New projects shall respect the scale and proximity of adjacent residential neighborhoods by reducing building height, increasing setbacks, and providing a more friendly building orientation.
- Placing loading and service areas adjacent to residential areas is discouraged.

Site circulation routes and loading areas shall be screened and set back from residential areas.

Where screening walls are required, they shall:

- be designed as a natural extension of the architectural and landscaping concepts for the project. They shall be architectural concrete block, use a cement plaster finish, or otherwise reflect the design and materials of the surrounding buildings. Vertical and horizontal reveals, accents, and other details shall be included.
- have climbing vines or ivy planted along the wall base;
- be constructed of permanent, durable, and high quality building materials;
- restricted to 8 feet in height;
Section 4 Design Guidelines
Section 5 Implementation
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5.4.1 Development Standards and Project Review

The City of Citrus Heights will use the development standards described in Section 3 of this Plan and the project review process as a primary tool to implement The Boulevard Plan. The development standards and the project review process are designed to ensure that individual projects comply with the directives of the Citrus Heights General Plan and this Plan. This is accomplished through determination of compliance with City standards and guidelines and conditions of approval. The Boulevard Plan will be implemented through development standards that are unique to Auburn Boulevard. In addition, the City will require that the mitigation measures identified in Appendix 9 be made conditions of approval for all projects within The Boulevard Plan Planning Area.

The area within the Auburn Boulevard corridor designated General Commercial in the General Plan Land Use Diagram will be zoned Auburn Boulevard Commercial (ABC). The development standards (allowable uses, heights, and setbacks) for the ABC District are set out in Section 3 of this Specific Plan and are referenced but not repeated in the Citrus Height’s Zoning Ordinance.
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5.4.6 Undergrounding

The City will apply for federal funding and work with local private and public utility companies to pay for a portion or all of the undergrounding costs. If the City cannot obtain all of the necessary funding, the City will establish an undergrounding district. The City will require property owners to sign an undergrounding district agreement where each property owner is required to pay their pro-rata share of the costs. The property owners share will depend on the financial resources provided by utility companies and/or the federal government. To reduce the overall undergrounding costs, the City will attempt to coordinate the undergrounding efforts with those of the roadway construction.
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5.8 Follow-up Studies and Plans

There are several sites along Auburn Boulevard that will require further study to determine their feasibility for future development. The two catalyst sites (Gateway Commercial Center and Rusch Park Village Center) will require a pro forma analysis to assist in developing a financing strategy for the sites. The pro forma shall be carried out during Phase 1. Should there be development interest along Cripple Creek or at southwest corner of Auburn Boulevard and Antelope Road, the City should consider preparing a development feasibility study for both sites. The City will also need to prepare a detailed implementation plan for each district to identify staffing
levels for technical assistance and coordination, implementation priorities, and allocating funds to finance improvements and development projects.

The City shall prepare the following studies/plans:

• Pro Forma Analysis for Catalyst Sites (Gateway Commercial Center and Rusch Park Village Center)
• Development Feasibility Study of Parcels along Cripple Creek
• Development Feasibility Study for Southwest Corner of Auburn Boulevard and Antelope Road
• Implementation plan for each district.

Appendix 9

New Appendix 9

1. Biology – Protection of Cripple Creek Aquatic Habitat.

The following measures shall be made conditions of approval for all projects within The Specific Plan Area.

Mitigation Measure B-1A Protect Cripple Creek’s Aquatic Life: To protect Cripple Creek’s terrestrial and aquatic wildlife and special status species, and to avoid encroachments within the creek’s floodplain, a Floodplain/Habitat Buffer (Buffer) should be established on both sides of Cripple Creek. Ownership and management of the Buffer should be consistent with implementing plans that fulfill the goals and policies of the City of Citrus Heights General Plan. Development in the vicinity of Cripple Creek shall be consistent with the City’s administrative policies and procedures for drainage and development, and objectives of the Arcade Creek Watershed Plan, so that individual property owners are not free to undertake vegetation clearing, bank protection, soil disturbance, or creation of fences or structures within the Buffer. The width of the buffer shall be the 100-year floodplain boundary, as defined by best available data (County hydraulic studies, FIRM and other flood data).

2. Biology – Protection of Native Oak Trees and Consistency with Citrus Heights General Plan.

Mitigation Measure B-2A Minimize Impacts to Oaks:

To ensure consistency with the City of Citrus Heights’ Policy 37.1, which requires incorporation of existing trees into development projects, building envelopes for future development projects should be configured to minimize impacts to trees to the extent feasible. The following measures shall be implemented:

1. Building envelopes should be established on plans and specifications for the future development projects to designate the area needed for construction of roads, driveways, and building pads.
2. These building envelopes should be large enough to include not only the proposed improvements, but also work areas for heavy equipment, staging areas, and equipment and material lay down areas.

3. To protect trees elsewhere on construction sites, no construction activities or use of heavy equipment should occur outside of the building envelopes.

4. Oaks that fall within the building envelope but which are not slated for removal should be protected by the following measures, which should be implemented during all construction phases of the project:

   a) Plans and specifications should clearly state protection procedures for oaks to be preserved on the project site. The specifications should also require contractors to stay within designated work areas and should include a provision for penalties if oak trees are damaged;

   b) No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile offices, or materials should be parked or located within the driplines of oaks and other trees that are to be preserved;

   c) Soil surface removal should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be preserved. No cuts or trenching should occur within the dripline. If this area cannot be avoided, then the tree should be added to the list of oaks to be replaced through an on-site planting;

   d) Earthen fill should not be placed within the driplines of oak trees to be retained, and no fill should be placed within five feet of their trunks, except for those trees marked for mitigation;

   e) Paving should not be placed within the dripline of oaks to be retained;

   f) Underground utility line trenching should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be retained. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the driplines of oak trees, the trench should either be bored or drilled but not within five feet of the trunk and a certified arborist should be retained to monitor this construction and repair or wrap any damaged roots.

   g) Living Among the Oaks: A Management Guide for Landowners (UC Cooperative Extension, Berkeley) should be used by the City as a guide in reviewing landscape plans. The information should be distributed to landowners and developers to provide information and guidelines for preparing landscape plans and for protecting oaks after construction is complete.
Mitigation Measure B-2B Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Woodland Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within oak woodland and/or riparian habitats (as opposed to isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Oak trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted.
2. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies.

   a. The goals of the Oak Plan should be to replace trees lost by the project to create healthy, self-sustaining habitats that are not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period. The functions and values of the created habitat should approximate those of the affected habitats, i.e., the functions and values of oak woodland rather than an ornamental landscape planting.
   b. At a minimum, the Oak Plan should include clear success criteria, monitoring and reporting requirements, and a contingency plan should the responsible parties fail to meet the success criteria that ensure that mitigation goals and ratios are met. The Oak Plan should also include details for the species, size of plants and quantities, planting techniques, techniques for protecting the trees from herbivory, and irrigation, weed control and maintenance plan, and monitoring requirements.

Mitigation Measure B-2C Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Maintenance Plan (Landscape Tree Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within landscape settings (i.e. isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Oaks trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted; or fees may be paid in lieu into the City’s oak tree preservation fund. Payment in lieu of replacement should only be accepted if it is infeasible to replace trees.
2. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Maintenance Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared...
in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies.

a. The goals of the Oak Plan, at a minimum, should be to replace trees lost by the project in an appropriate landscape setting that will allow trees to thrive and be self-sustaining and not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period. Replacement within the specific plan area’s planned landscape areas as street trees, trees for public space landscape or roadway medians, should be emphasized when identifying replanting sites.

b. Replacement in a natural habitat setting as described in Measure B-2B would also accomplish these oak tree replacement goals.

3. Hydrology and Water Quality - These should be included in development standards.

Mitigation Measure H-1: Incorporate Development Standards for Improving Water Quality: The City shall incorporate water quality protection measures into The Boulevard Plan Development Standards: The standards may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Install and maintain landscaping that requires minimal application of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides;
2. Emphasize xeriscape landscaping that reduces the need for irrigation by minimizing the use of turf in decorative landscaping, using plant materials adapted to local conditions and efficient irrigation;
3. Minimize irrigation overspray - do not permit use of sprinkler and spray irrigation in areas less than 8 feet wide;
4. Use of drip irrigation systems where feasible;
5. Incorporate features such as filtration strips or bioswales in site design to prevent urban pollutants from entering into Cripple Creek via storm drains from parking lots and paved surfaces.

4. Noise – this measure should be implemented during site plan review.

Mitigation Measure N-2 On-site Noise Control: To ensure mitigation of noise due to project-related systems, loading docks and on-site traffic, development proposals shall be reviewed to identify potential noise conflicts with existing or proposed noise sensitive uses. Implementation of the noise standards contained in the Noise Element of the Citrus Heights General Plan will mitigate project-related noise to an insignificant level. For developments requiring installation of large, ground-mounted HVAC systems, development review shall include an assessment of noise impacts on nearby residential areas.
Revised Maps

Figure 1.2 Planning Areas and Figure 3.3 Zoning Districts Map have been revised. These maps follow this page.
Figure 1.2 Planning Area
Figure 3.3 Zoning Districts Map

Above: This map identifies the boundary of the new Auburn Boulevard (ABC) district.
CHAPTER 7.0 MINOR CHANGES TO THE AUBURN BOULEVARD PLAN LINE STUDY

Minor changes have been made to the proposed plan line for Auburn Boulevard. The sidewalk width is being increased to six feet and bike lanes are decreased to six feet. These revisions do not change the analysis or conclusions contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The revised Plan Line Study is provided on the following pages.
CHAPTER 8.0 MINOR CHANGES AND ERRATA TO THE DRAFT EIR

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents corrections to the text of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) needed due to minor typographical errors or due to changes that have been identified in the response to comments (Chapter 4.0). These changes are shown with underline for added text and strikethrough for deleted text. None of these changes constitute new significant information or result in any new significant impacts related to the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption, Rezoning or the Roadway Design Improvement Project.

8.2 Changes And Errata To The Draft EIR

Chapter 1.0 Introduction - Page 1-10

- Notice of Determination (CEQA Guidelines 1503915093 [c]), which is filed following the City’s action.

Chapter 4.0, Air Quality - Page 4.3-18

4.3.6.1 Impact AQ-10 Construction Related Impacts

Mitigation Measures - Specific Plan Construction Impacts

Nitrogen Oxide Mitigation Measures. The following two categories of mitigation measures should be incorporated into the project to minimize the generation of NOx emissions:

AQ Mitigation Measure Category 1: Reduce NOx emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment

The project shall provide a plan for approval by the lead agency, in consultation with SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at time of construction; and

The project representative shall submit to the lead agency and SMAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and projected hours of use or fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day
period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.

and:

**AQ Mitigation Measure Category 2: Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment**

The project shall ensure that exhaust emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and the lead agency and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1A: Inhalable Particulate Matter.** The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the project to minimize the generation of PM$_{10}$ dust during construction.

- enclose, cover, or water twice daily all soil piles;
- water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil;
- water all haul roads twice daily; and
- cover loads of all haul/dump trucks securely.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1B: Asbestos.** The demolition or renovation of asbestos-containing building material is subject to the limitations of the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations as listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (40CFR Part 61, Subpart M) requiring notification and inspection. Most demolitions and many renovations are subject to a CAL-OSHA Certified asbestos inspection prior to the start of activity. SMAQMD Rule 902, which requires District consultation and permit, applies to demolition, renovation or removal of asbestos-containing material. Compliance with these regulations is considered to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Chapter 4.0, Biological Resources - Page 4.4-20**

Mitigation Measure B-32D Preconstruction Tree Survey
Mitigation Measure B-2D3 Avoid Impacts to Nesting Birds

Chapter 4.0, Transportation and Circulation

Figure 4.11-1 (on following page) follows reference on page 4.11-4.
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4.11.6.6 Impact T-6: Impacts to the circulation network during construction activities.

A. Impacts of the Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Plan Line Adoption and Future and Near Term Roadway Design Improvement Projects

Construction activities would result in temporary disruption to businesses and residents in the area as well as to some public services such as public transit services and emergency vehicles (i.e. fire and police). Detours and traffic delays may occur; however interruptions to access would be minimized for all properties. These impacts would be temporary and are not considered significant, with the implementation of standard traffic handling for construction periods.

Mitigation Measures

A traffic handling plan will be prepared prior to construction of any roadway improvements. The plan will address traffic management during construction periods, including but not limited to road and lane closures; detours; pedestrian and bicycle routes; and public notification. The traffic handling plan should be prepared in consultation with regional transit in order to minimize disruptions to public transit service along the corridor. Additionally, prior to commencement of construction, a Traffic Management Plan as described in A Traffic Management Plan Guide (See Appendix A of the Final EIR) will be prepared and provided to Caltrans for review in order to address strategies needed to minimize disruption of traffic at the Interstate 80/Auburn Boulevard Interchange.
Chapter 4.0, Utilities and Service Systems

4.12.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.12.4.1 Impact U-1: Impacts to Water Supply, Water Treatment, Wastewater Treatment and Storm Drain Facilities.

A. Impacts of the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments

The proposed Specific Plan is largely urbanized with existing connections to water supply, water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities. According to the DEIR for the Citrus Heights General Plan, capacity for water supply, water treatment facilities and wastewater treatment facilities are expected to be adequate to serve the projected development buildout of the General Plan. Development proposed by the specific plan is consistent with the Citrus Heights General Plan, therefore no impacts are anticipated with respect to water supply, water treatment and wastewater treatment. CSD-1 has commented in their letter of January 14, 2005 that previously planned trunk line relief projects are no longer in their current planning for capacity increases, due to cost or design complexities. This will not impede the ability of the district to service the Specific Plan Area.

Mitigation Measures for the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments

No mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure U-2 Construction Management for Utilities: The construction project management team shall coordinate with utility providers during design stages of roadway projects. The construction project management team shall undertake periodic assessments of upcoming utility and service disruptions during construction. These assessments and an identification of the service area involved shall be coordinated with utility providers and the public outreach program. The public outreach program shall ensure that advance notice of any utility or service shutdowns is extended to affected businesses and residents. Through construction management and project scheduling, all available measures shall be taken to minimize the duration of utility or service shutdowns.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

With the construction of California’s state highway system virtually complete, the California Department of Transportation (Department) major emphasis on transportation projects has largely shifted from new construction to reconstruction, operation, and maintenance of existing facilities. As traffic demand steadily increases, Department work activities can create significant additional traffic delay and safety concerns on already congested highways. Planning work activities and balancing traffic demand with highway capacity becomes more critical.

In order to prevent unreasonable traffic delays resulting from planned work, Transportation Management Plans (TMPs) must be carefully developed and implemented in order to maintain acceptable levels of service and safety during all work activities on the state highway system.

B. WHAT ARE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLANS?

A TMP is a method for minimizing activity-related traffic delay and accidents by the effective application of traditional traffic handling practices and an innovative combination of public and motorist information, demand management, incident management, system management, construction strategies, alternate routes and other strategies.

All TMPs share the common goal of congestion relief during the project period by managing traffic flow and balancing traffic demand with highway capacity through the project area, or by using the entire corridor. Certain low-impact Maintenance and Encroachment Permit activities do not require the development of individual TMPs. "Blanket" TMPs are developed for those activities. A blanket TMP is a generic list of actions that would be taken to keep delay below the delay threshold when performing activities on highways. Each district Maintenance and Encroachment Permit office should have a list of activities to which blanket TMPs apply.

All Capital projects require individual TMPs. Blanket TMPs are suitable for minor projects. Major TMPs are required for high-impact projects. Generally, major TMPs are distinguished by being:

- Multi-jurisdictional in scope, encompassing the Department of California Highway Patrol (CHP), city, county and regional governments, state DOTs, employers, merchants, developers, transit operators, ridesharing agencies, neighborhood and special interest groups, emergency services, and Transportation Management Associations;
- Multi-faceted, comprised of an innovative mix of traffic operations, facility enhancement, demand-management and public relations strategies, as well as more traditional work zone actions, construction methods and contract incentives, customized to meet the unique needs of the impacted corridor;
- In place over a longer period of time, sometimes implemented up to a year or more prior to the start of actual construction, with specific elements often implemented incrementally to coincide with construction phasing.

C. POLICY
The TMP Manager:

- Acts as the single focal point for development and implementation of TMPs.

The Construction Traffic Manager (CTM):

- Serves as a liaison between Construction, the DTM and the TMP Manager.
- Reviews the TMP and traffic contingency plan for constructability issues.
- Act as a resource for the Resident Engineer, DTM and TMP Manager during TMP implementation and reviews the contractor’s contingency plan.

The extent of a TMP is determined by the DTM during the preliminary studies of a capital project. For all TMPs, an itemized estimate of the proposed strategies and their respective costs are included in the Project Study Report (PSR) or Project Study Scoping Report (PSSR) for proper funding consideration. The workload required to develop and implement TMPs is estimated in advance and captured in the district work plan.

For major TMPs, a TMP team may need to be formed and led by the TMP Manager. The itemized strategies and costs are further refined in the project report stage as determined by the TMP team and appropriate functional units using the most current geometric information available. Those elements of the TMP not included as part of the main construction contract should be itemized under State Furnished Material and Expenses using the appropriate Basic Engineers Estimate System (BEES) codes in the plans, specifications and estimates. During construction, TMP activities are to be monitored and evaluated by the TMP team and those elements found not to be cost effective should be modified as deemed appropriate or eliminated. The TMP process is explained in detail in the following sections.

**B. FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING**

When identifying funding for various TMP elements, it is important to distinguish between capital outlay and capital outlay support.

Work done by district staff for the planning and designing of TMP activities for capital projects are a normal part of the project development process and should be captured as capital outlay support. The TMP Manager and each functional manager should work closely with the project manager to ensure that TMP activities are included in all project work plans. TMP support activities to consider include ridesharing programs, Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) contracts, public awareness campaigns, parallel route improvements and the Request for Proposal (RFP) process up to award of the contract. Note that some of these activities may also have a capital component in addition to the support component discussed here. Workload hours for TMP activities must be included in the Capital Outlay Support (COS) project’s work plan in order to be resourced (funded) by COS. These activities should then be charged to each project’s expenditure authorization (EA), using the appropriate Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) code for that stage of the project. TMP-related work should be charged only to the WBS codes reserved for those activities. These codes can be found on the Department’s Division of Project Management’s Intranet web page.

Work done by district staff for implementing TMP elements during construction of capital projects are also a normal part of the project development process. Again, workload (hours) for implementing TMP activities must be included in the COS project’s work plan in order to be resourced (funded) by COS. These activities should then be charged to the appropriate project’s phase three EA, and WBS code 270 (Perform Construction Engineering and Contract Administration).
Some funds necessary to implement TMP elements not done by the Department staff, including consultant contracts, can be sourced from capital outlay funds allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as itemized in the plans, specifications and estimates. Some TMP elements, such as parallel route improvements and highway advisory radios, could be a phase of the construction contract or separate construction contracts while others such as public awareness campaigns and transit subsidies must be separate contracts or cooperative agreements.

The TMP elements that need to be in place prior to start of construction are identified and funded as stage construction or first order of work under a single package presented to the CTC. If approved, the Division of Budgets may assign specific amounts for each TMP activity. All TMP activities may not necessarily be included under the main contract. Service contracts such as those for freeway service patrols, public service or consultant contracts, information campaigns, or establishing telephone hotlines must be arranged separately with consultants and other providers. For most projects, it takes four to six months to get a service contract in place. This means that all consultant contracts have been advertised, the consultant selected, and the contract ready for signature and award immediately following CTC allocation of funds. Other activities such as parallel route improvements are usually included in the main construction contract and as a first order of work under a cooperative agreement.

In some cases, the CTC can be petitioned to fund a portion of the TMP as an initial phase of the main project. This is usually for a high priority project where plans, specifications, and estimates for the main project are not yet finalized, but early funds are needed to initiate TMP activities such as making transit arrangements with local governments. The petition to fund an initial phase comes from the district, explaining why a portion of the project must proceed before funding for the main project is allocated. These early funds reduce the programmed funds for the main project accordingly.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) supports the TMP concept and views major reconstruction projects as an excellent opportunity to initiate continuing traffic management strategies that provide improved traffic operations long beyond the completion of work. Examples include: installation of permanent Changeable Message Sign (CMS), full structural section shoulders, continuing auxiliary lanes, and wider shoulders for incident management during construction if cost-effective in the long term. All cost-effective transportation management activities that address the problem of delay or safety are eligible for 100 percent Federal Aid funding.

TMPs and contingency plans for Encroachment Permit projects are developed by the permittee or by Department staff. Staff time for development, review and implementation of TMPs for Encroachment Permits is charged to the permit. Maintenance normally develops TMPs for its projects; Maintenance and staff from other functional areas that expend time on Maintenance TMP charge to the designated Maintenance EA.

C. TMP IN PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT

The TMP is part of the normal project development process and must be considered in the Project Initiation Document (PID) or planning stage (project X phase). Since projects are generally programmed, budgeted, and given an Expenditure Authorization (EA) upon PID approval, it is important to allow for the proper cost, scope and scheduling of the TMP activities at this early stage of development. TMPs that are retrofitted to projects already programmed must be handled on a case by case basis and may require a contract change order.
Prior to PID approval, the initiating unit sends conceptual geometrics to the district Division of Operations for evaluation. The DTM estimates the extent of the TMP required and determines whether potential traffic delays are anticipated that cannot be mitigated by traditional traffic handling practices or well-planned construction staging. The TMP Manager must sign-off on the TMP DATA SHEET in the PID. A TMP cost estimate should be developed for each alternative being considered. An estimate should not be based only on the project cost. The cost of a TMP could range from a small percentage of project cost to 20 percent or more. Further guidance can be obtained from the following publications "Wilbur Smith & Associates TMP Effectiveness Study" and Frank Wilson & Associates "A Traffic Management Plan Study for State Route 91" located in Headquarters Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations.

**TMP Elements**

A list of potential TMP strategies with their respective elements is categorized in TABLE 1. As many different elements as are feasible should be considered for the proposed project’s preliminary TMP.

When developing a preliminary TMP at this early stage, use the most current layout of the roadway (geometries) information available and consider:

- Contingency Plans
- Lane closure policies and procedures
- TMC coordination
- Multi-jurisdictional communication and buy-in
- CHAP and local law enforcement involvement
- Emergency closures
- Clearance of alternate routes for STAA and oversized
- Special training or workforce development
- Duration of construction (months)
- Length of project (miles)
- Number of major construction phases
- Urbanization (urban, suburban, or rural)
- Traffic volumes

Wilbur Smith Associate’s TMP Effectiveness Study and Frank Wilson & Associate’s A Traffic Management Plan Study for State Route 91 During Construction of HOV Lanes (both available from Headquarters Division of Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations) are excellent sources for guidance on selecting the most cost-effective TMP elements. The district Public Information office is also an experienced source for estimating the effectiveness of public information campaign options, and can help the TMP Manager estimate their cost and effectiveness in reducing traffic demand through the project area.

Public information campaigns serve two main purposes in TMPs. They inform the public about the overall purpose of the project to generate and maintain public support; and they encourage changes in travel behavior during the project to minimize congestion. Because they give travelers the information they need to make their own travel choices, public information campaigns can be the single most effective of all TMP elements.

The FSP is a congestion relief program of roving tow trucks operating in most metropolitan and some rural areas. The FSP program is operated by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) with funding from the Department. The Department also reimburses the CHP for training and supervisory services provided for the FSP. The RTPAs contract with tow companies
for commute time service and some weekend and mid-day service to assist motorists with simple repairs (i.e. flat tire, one gallon of gas) or tow the automobile from the highway.

FSP is available for incident management during construction. However, construction-related FSP service needs to be funded as part of the TMP. A cooperative agreement with the RTPA is required, outlining the services provided and the fund transfer. An interagency agreement with the CHP is required for any support services (field supervision and dispatch operator services). These agreements should be initiated with the RTPA and the CHP as soon as it is determined that FSP should be in the project TMP.

The Department's HQ Traffic Operations is currently working on Master Agreements with the RTPAs for future FSP services. This process will simplify the process for both the Department and the RTPAs by eliminating the need for a cooperative agreement for each project. Only a task order form will be needed for each project. A similar agreement is being created with the CHP. Please contact HQ Traffic Operations, Freeways Operations Branch for more information.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMP STRATEGIES AND THEIR ELEMENTS</th>
<th>A. Public Information</th>
<th>Off peak/Night/Weekend Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and Mailers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Lane/Ramp Closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Releases (including</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Phasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Media Sources)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Traffic Screens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Facility Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Truck Traffic/Permit Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings/Speaker's Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variable Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Hotline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extended Weekend Closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Information (videos, slide shows, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Speed Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cable TV and News</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination with Adjacent Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveler Information Systems (Internet)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Control Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Facility Closure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Motorist Information Strategies</th>
<th>E. Demand Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Message Signs</td>
<td>HOV Lanes/Ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changeable Message Signs</td>
<td>Park-and-Ride Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinguishable Signs</td>
<td>Parking Management/ Pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Mounted Signs</td>
<td>Rideshare Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Traffic Radio</td>
<td>Rideshare Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Advisory Radio (fixed and mobile)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Lane Closure Website</td>
<td>Transit Service Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department's Highway Information Network (CHIN)</td>
<td>Train or Light-Rail Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radar Speed Message Sign</td>
<td>Variable Work Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Incident Management</td>
<td>Telecommute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Boxes</td>
<td>Shuttle Service Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction or Maintenance Zone Enhanced</td>
<td>F. Alternate Route Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Program – COZEEP or MAZEEP</td>
<td>Ramp Closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Surveillance Stations (loop detectors and CCTV) Closures</td>
<td>Reversible Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Cellular Calls</td>
<td>Temporary Lanes or Shoulder Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Centers</td>
<td>G. Other Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control Officers</td>
<td>Application of new technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP Officer in TMC during construction</td>
<td>Innovative products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Traffic Advisor</td>
<td>Improved specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP Helicopter</td>
<td>Staff Training/Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Construction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive/Disincentive Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Metering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Rental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the DTM determines that a major TMP is required, the TMP Manager forms a TMP development team. The team's membership will vary according to the TMP elements proposed and the project's impacts. At a minimum, it should include representatives from Construction, Public Affairs, Project Development, Traffic Operations (including Transportation Permits), the CHP and local agencies. Others to be considered as the plan gets refined are Rideshare, Transportation Planning, Public Transportation, Maintenance, Structures, CHP, local law enforcement, local transit agencies, emergency services, and FHWA. Local Maintenance field staff familiar with conditions in the project area should be team members or should be consulted as needed as the TMP develops.

D. TMP IN PROJECT REPORT

As more information becomes available during the project report phase the preliminary scope and cost of the overall TMP and the individual elements should continue to be refined. The TMP team will coordinate the TMP strategies with the project engineer and appropriate units, with
each team member handling their area of expertise. For major projects, subcommittees or task forces may be formed to handle the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation details of some elements. The TMP Manager will keep the Project Manager and district Construction Coordinator updated and must sign-off on the TMP data sheet of the project report.

It is appropriate at this point to develop a timeline schedule for major TMPs keeping in mind that many elements of the TMP have to begin prior to the start of construction. Many TMP elements listed in Table 1 need to be developed separately but concurrently with the project plans. They may be bid and constructed or initiated separately from the project or be included in the project plans and be installed or implemented as the first order of work.

Some tasks may take a long time depending on the complexity of the major project and the type of transportation management necessary. For example, if building new park-and-ride lots are necessary for the Ridesharing element, the planning phase would have to be extended for several months and a design phase added.

An additional activity involves analyzing the existing traffic volume in the corridor, both on the freeway and surface streets. This will provide a basis for establishing the goal of the TMP, i.e., the number of vehicles that should be removed from the freeway, and in determining the capability of the surrounding surface streets to handle the additional traffic demand. It can also provide a database for evaluating the overall effectiveness of the TMP.

E. TMP IN PS&E

Those TMP elements that are not part of the main contract, but are identified as capital outlay costs tied to the main project, should be itemized as State Furnished Materials and Expenses using the appropriate BEES item cost (see TABLE 2). The Project Engineer should consult with the TMP Manager to ensure that the appropriate "Maintaining Traffic" Standard Special Provisions (SSP) are included in the PS&E. The SSPs should always require the contractor to submit a contingency plan.

The TMP and PS&E should address oversize and overweight vehicles traveling under a transportation permit. Additional construction area signs should be provided that restrict travel to overwidth vehicles whenever the lateral clearance drops to 15 feet or less.

The DTM must concur with the PS&E and with Encroachment Permit and Maintenance TMPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TMP BEES ITEM CODES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066003 State Furnished Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066004 Miscellaneous State Furnished Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066005 Concurrent Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066006 Miscellaneous Concurrent Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066008 Incentive Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066009 Utility Expense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
066010 Work by Others
066060 Additional Traffic Control
066061 CHP Enhanced Enforcement
066062 COZEEP Contract
066063 Traffic management plan – public Information
066064 Specter Radar Unit
066065 Freeway Service Patrol
066066 Public Transit Support
066069 Rideshare Promotion
066070 Maintain Traffic
066072 Maintain Detour
066074 Traffic Control
066076 Temporary Traffic Control
066077 Install Traffic Control Devices
066578 Portable Changeable Message Signs
066825 Temporary Striping
066872 Service Contract
128602 Traffic Control System (One Way)
128650 Portable Changeable Message Signs
129150 Temporary Traffic Screen
861793 Telephone Service (Location 1)
860871 Detector Loop
860925 Traffic Monitoring Station (Count)
860926 Traffic Monitoring Station (Speed)
860927 Traffic Monitoring Station (Incident)
860930 Traffic Monitoring Station
861088 Modify Ramp Metering System
861985 Travelers Information system
869070 Power and Telephone Service
991046 Public Address System
991047 Telephone Facility
994920 Bicycle Parking Rack
F. TMP DURING CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

During construction, those TMP elements that are part of the main contract or Encroachment Permit are implemented under the general direction of district Construction or Encroachment Permits. Those separate contracts/agreements such as for rideshare and transit activities and public awareness campaigns will be under the direction of their respective contract managers.

Special effort should be given to assure that Changeable Message Sign (CMS), Highway Advisory Radio (JHAR) and other media tools provide accurate and timely information to motorists regarding lane closure times and

TMP elements must be carefully monitored for cost effectiveness. The TMP team should determine whether the implemented measures are reaching the predetermined goals for cost effectiveness. If an element's predetermined goal is not immediately reached during implementation, but there is a general trend toward meeting that goal, the element can remain in effect and the FHWA will continue to participate. Elements that show no sign of approaching their predetermined goals as determined by the TMP Manager must be modified as deemed appropriate or dropped.

Contractor compliance with lane closure pickup deadlines can be enforced in two ways. A "maintaining traffic" SSP allows a penalty to be assessed to the contractor for value of traffic delay when the contractor exceeds the lane closure window. The minimum penalty is $1,000 per 10 minutes, but it can greatly exceed the minimum, depending on traffic volumes and the highway facility. The DTM calculates the "delay penalty" during PS&E. The second method is for the state representative to suspend the contract work.

A contractor or the Department forces (such as Maintenance) can be ordered to pick up a lane closure early if traffic impacts become significant either due to a project incident or activities outside the project area. Early pickup should only be ordered when traveler and worker safety will not be compromised. The "maintaining traffic" SSPs for capital projects provide for compensating contractors for early pickup. Encroachment Permit provisions require the permittee to pick up a closure early without compensation.

DTM's are to ensure that lane closures will not be terminated early, or may be extended beyond the lane closure window when the activity needs to be completed for the safety of the public or workers. These activities may include structure inspections and repairs, guardrail repairs, culvert replacement.

In order to avoid significant traffic impacts, it is essential to monitor and respond immediately to delay, pick up closures on time, and have solid traffic and contractor contingency plans.

A Department staff member who can make informed decisions about implementing contingency plans and modifying, terminating or extending approved lane closures should be available to respond to significant delays and other unexpected events whenever lane closures are in place.
The designated employee(s) may be Traffic Operations, Construction, or TMC staff, depending on the district.

At the end of the project a post-TMP evaluation report must be completed by the TMP Manager for all major TMPs and for TMPs where the actual delay exceeded the threshold set by the DTM. Post-TMP meetings with the CHP and other partners can be held to identify what went well and what could have been done differently. Samples of past TMP reports can be obtained from headquarters' Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations and from the DTM.

Contingency Plan

Both traffic and contractor contingency plans are required for all planned work. Both blanket and individual TMPs must include contingency plans. The traffic contingency plan, prepared by the Department or a consultant, addresses specific actions that will be taken to restore or minimize affects on traffic when the congestion or delay exceeds original estimates due to unforeseen events such as work-zone accidents, higher than predicted traffic demand, or delayed lane closures. The contractor contingency plan addresses activities under the contractor’s control in the work zone. After the contractor’s contingency plan is submitted and approved, it becomes part of the TMP contingency plan.

The TMP contingency plan should include, but is not limited to the following:

- Information that clearly defines trigger points which require lane closure termination (i.e., inclement weather, length of traffic queue exceeds threshold);
- Decision tree with clearly defined lines of communication and authority;
- Specific duties of all participants during lane closure operations, such as, coordination with CHP or local police, etc.;
- Names, phone numbers and pager numbers for the DTM or their designee, the Resident Engineer (RE), the Maintenance Superintendent, the Permit Inspector, the on-site traffic advisor, the CHP Division or Area Commander, appropriate local agency representatives, and other applicable personnel;
- Coordination strategy (and special agreements if applicable) between DTM, RE, on-site traffic advisor, Maintenance, CHP and local agencies;
- Contractor’s contingency plan;
- Standby equipment, State personnel, and availability of local agency personnel for callout (normally requires a Cooperative Agreement);
- Development of contingencies based on maintaining minimum service level.

G. RETROFITTING PROGRAMMED PROJECTS

Usually the extent of the TMP is to be determined prior to programming (PID approval). However, it may sometimes be necessary to retrofit a TMP to a project that is already programmed due to project changes, policy changes, emergencies or unforeseen conditions. These projects must be handled on a case by case basis since the course of action will depend on how far along the project development process is and how extensive the TMP needs to be. Retrofitted TMPs may require a TMP team and TMP Manager and involvement from all functional units as discussed earlier in these guidelines. The project manager is responsible for
initiating a TMP investigation since they are most knowledgeable of project status. Some suggestions for funding retrofitted TMP are:

Use of Minor Funds

Minor A and B funds have been used to pay for TMP measures that total less than $1,000,000. The districts will not usually be reimbursed for this even though the FHWA agrees to participate (it is not economically feasible for the Department to process minor funds for reimbursement). There have been exceptions however, and that decision is at the discretion of the Federal Resources Branch in headquarters Budgets Program.

Charge to Other Project Phase 4 (Construction) Funds

Funds from other construction contracts in the district may be used if those projects are in the vicinity of, or will be affected by, the project requiring TMP funds. At the discretion of the Deputy District Director for Construction a list of chargeable project EAs may be submitted to headquarters Accounting for prorated charging. Very few Accounting staff are aware of the process required and headquarters Traffic Operations, Office of System Management Operations should be contacted for assistance.

Project Cost or Scope Changes

The CTC has delegated to the Director of the Department the authority to increase a project’s cost by up to 20 percent without prior commission approval. This authority has been delegated to other Department managers as described in Project Management Directive PMD6. This increase can be used for TMP implementation and will be 100 percent reimbursable by the FHWA. The increased costs must be absorbed by other projects in the district since the total capital outlay allocation remains the same.

H. LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

The TMP Deputy Directive 60 applies to all projects on state facilities, including those not funded by the state. District Directors are responsible for assuring local compliance. Since many measure projects are split funded, the Department and local entities must work cooperatively to develop an effective TMP. The Department is responsible for approving all FSIs and it is at this point that agreements should be reached concerning the costs and scope of TMP measures.

III. CORRIDOR, REGIONAL AND MULTI-FUNCTIONAL AREA TMPS

When multiple or consecutive projects are within the same general corridor, the cumulative impact can result in excessive traffic delays and detour conflicts. These may be multiple capital projects, the involvement of more than one district, or a combination of capital projects and Encroachment Permit and/or Maintenance activities. Corridor or regional coordination will minimize or eliminate these impacts and reduce inconvenience to the motoring public.

When multiple projects are in the same corridor or on corridors within the same traffic area, it may be possible to develop a single corridor or regional TMP. In other cases, individual TMPS are developed and funded from their own sources, and a bare-bones corridor or regional TMP addresses the cumulative impact. Each project covered by corridor and regional TMP contributes resources in proportion to its traffic impact. During TMP implementation, the TMC serves as an information clearinghouse and coordinates operations. The TMC helps identify conflicts and recommends appropriate action. When provided with accurate and up-to-date lane closure information the TMC provides real-time traffic information via electronic media, CMS, and HAR.
The TMP Manager coordinates the development and implementation of corridor and regional TMPs. The TMP Manager forms a TMP team including, as a minimum, representatives from Construction, Maintenance, Public Affairs and Traffic Operations for each of the affected districts. The initial meeting is held several months in advance of the construction season to set milestones, and allow time to gather project information and prepare and distribute information.

The corridor/regional TMP may need elements in addition to those provided by the individual TMP for each project. Those elements may include changeable message signs at key locations outside individual project limits, the establishment of an information hot line and web-sites for all projects involved. The use of the statewide Caltrans Highway Information Network (CHIN) number (1-800-427-ROAD), and particularly the use of TMCs as a central reporting hub. The Northern Valley TMC in District 3 has established reporting procedures specifically for interregional TMPs that are obtainable from headquarters Traffic Operations.

IV. MAJOR LANE CLOSURE APPROVAL PROCESS

This process applies to all major lane closures on the state highway system. Major lane closures are those lane closures that are expected to result in significant traffic impacts despite the implementation of TMPs. A "significant traffic impact" is defined in DD-60 as (a) 30 minutes above normal recurring traffic delay on the facility, or (b) the delay threshold set by the DTM, whichever is less. When a planned lane closure is expected to have a significant traffic impact, Headquarters District Lane Closure Review Committee (DLCRC) review and approval is required. The functional unit directly involved in the work must submit the major lane closure request to the DLCRC for approval as detailed below.

A traveler's trip should not be increased by more than 30 minutes due to planned Department activities. The DTM may set a lower maximum if the economic impact of a delay over 20 minutes would be high. The lesser of these delay limits is the maximum delay threshold allowed for any activity. Only the DLCRC can approve a higher delay threshold for a project.

Additionally, it should be noted that TMP activities are comprehensive, and involve actions in addition to traffic management through the work zone, as detailed in these TMP Guidelines. All lane closure operations and other planned activities should be evaluated at the earliest possible developmental stage for potential impacts and mitigation strategies. Pre-implementation meetings and contingency plans remain important aspects of all lane closure operations to minimize impacts of unforeseen events.

A. THRESHOLD CRITERIA FOR LANE CLOSURES REQUIRING APPROVAL OF THE DLCRC

DLCRC review and approval is required when planned activities are expected to result in a traffic delay that exceeds 30 minutes or the delay threshold set by the DTM, whichever is less.

DLCRC review and approval is not required for emergency closures due to natural events or incidents. However, the DTM must be notified, and every effort must be made to minimize traveler delay and reopen traffic lanes as soon as practical.

Applicability

The DLCRC, comprised of the CHP, District Public Information Officer, and Deputy District Directors of Construction, Design, Maintenance and Operations, approves all requests for major lane closures that meet the above threshold criteria. The criteria are applicable for moving or static lane closure operations. The DLCRC will decide when to submit lane closure requests that
are of an interregional, statewide, environmental, or otherwise sensitive nature to the Headquarters Lane Closure Review Committee (HQLCRC) for their approval.

The DLCRC is responsible for determining when HQLCRC approval is required. The HQLCRC is comprised of the Division Chiefs for Construction, Maintenance, Design and Local Programs, and Traffic Operations along with the Headquarters Public Information Officer, and a representative from the CHP. The HQLCRC may review the closure or leave the decision to the DLCRC. The HQLCRC should be advised of all planned lane closures that exceed the above threshold criteria. All planned lane closures that exceed the above threshold criteria and are of an interregional, statewide, environmental, or otherwise sensitive nature, as determined by the district LCRC, may also require approval of the HQLCRC.

Contents of Major Lane Closure Request Submittal

The functional unit requesting the lane closure and responsible for its performance prepares a proposed lane closure submittal. Sufficient information is provided to ensure complete understanding of the proposal. The submittal is sent through the DTM for review before sending it on to the LCRC. If additional TMP efforts can reduce the expected additional delay to less than 30 minutes, then the closure does not have to go to the LCRC. The DLCRC/HQLCRC may require additional information during its review. At a minimum, the following information is recommended initially:

1. Location and vicinity maps showing the state highway(s), local street network, and other adjacent lane closures or nearby work that may affect traffic during the same period, including special events;

2. Dates, times and locations of the lane closure(s);

3. Brief description of the work being performed during the lane closure(s);

4. Brief description of each lane closure and its anticipated affect on traffic;

5. Amount of expected delay and corresponding queue length for each lane closure;

6. Summary of TMP strategies that will be used to reduce delay and motorist inconvenience during the lane closure(s) (refer to Table 1). A copy of the approved TMP for the project, if available;

7. Contingency plan (see "Contingency Plan" below).

B. EVALUATION

The LCRC is responsible for approving major lane closures and will use the items below for evaluating lane closure operations. In its evaluation of the proposal, the LCRC will give consideration to the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of information provided as well as other reliable sources of information available to the LCRC.

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of effectiveness in the following areas:

- Promoting motorist and worker safety;
- TMP strategies;
- Plans for coordination with adjacent construction, maintenance, encroachment permits, and special events;
• Plans for coordination with TMC and field personnel;

• Plans for coordination with public media;

• Plans for use of existing field elements such as traffic surveillance loops, changeable message signs, highway advisory radio, and Closed Circuit Television cameras;

• Lines of communication and authority (top to bottom);

• Plans for monitoring delay (or corresponding queue length) during lane closure operations;

• Alternatives to proposed closures;

• Visibility of contingency plans;

C. Post-Closure Evaluation Statement

A Post-Closure Evaluation statement will be submitted to headquarters’ Traffic Operations Program, Office of System Management Operations, on all projects that exceed expected delay or run outside of the closure window. No more than one page is suggested. The functional unit performing the lane closure will prepare the statement within five working days of the date the lane closure exceeded the threshold criteria. The statement should explain:

• The cause and impact of delays;

• Either actions taken or to be taken to avoid or mitigate an occurrence or recurrence;

• Why the expected delay was exceeded and/or why it was necessary to exceed the closure window;

• How the situation can be avoided in the future.

Post-closure evaluation statements are only for closures formally approved by the District LCRC under this process (i.e. exceed the lesser of 30 minutes or the DTM limit).
APPENDIX C: CNDDDB, USFWS, and CNPS Special Status Species Database Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element Code</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Accipiter cooperii</em></td>
<td>ABNKC12040</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>WL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper's hawk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agelaius tricolor</em></td>
<td>ABPBXB0020</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tricolored blackbird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alkali Meadow</em></td>
<td>CTT45310CA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkali Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alkali Seep</em></td>
<td>CTT45320CA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkali Seep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ammodramus savannarum</em></td>
<td>ABPBXA0020</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grasshopper sparrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Andrena subapasta</em></td>
<td>IIHYM35210</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G1G2</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an andrenid bee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antrozous pallidus</em></td>
<td>AMACC10010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallid bat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aquila chrysaetos</em></td>
<td>ABNKC22010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golden eagle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ardea alba</em></td>
<td>ABNGA04040</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great egret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ardea herodias</em></td>
<td>ABNGA04010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great blue heron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Athene cunicularia</em></td>
<td>ABNSB10010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burrowing owl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</em></td>
<td>PDAST11061</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big-scale balsamroot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Branchinecta lynchii</em></td>
<td>ICBRA03030</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool fairy shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Branchinecta mesovallisensis</em></td>
<td>ICBRA03150</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midvalley fairy shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buteo regalis</em></td>
<td>ABNKC19120</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td>WL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferruginous hawk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buteo swainsoni</em></td>
<td>ABNKC19070</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson's hawk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chloropyron molle ssp. hispidum</em></td>
<td>PDSCR0J0D1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2T2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hispid salty bird's-beak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Clarkia biloba ssp. brandegeae</em></td>
<td>PDONA05053</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G4G5T4</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandegee's clarkia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</em></td>
<td>IICOL48011</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3T2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valley elderberry longhorn beetle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Downingia pusilla</em></td>
<td>PDCAM060C0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>GU</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>2B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwarf downingia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Element Code</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumontia oregonensis</td>
<td>ICBRA23010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G1G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairy water flea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elanus leucurus</td>
<td>ABNKC06010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td>FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white-tailed kite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emys marmorata</td>
<td>ARAAD02030</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western pond turtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falco columbarius</td>
<td>ABNKD06030</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td>WL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritillaria agrestis</td>
<td>PMLIL0V010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stinkbells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratiola heterosepala</td>
<td>PDSCR0R060</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochara ricksecker</td>
<td>IICOL5V010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2?</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii</td>
<td>PMJUN011L1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2T1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahart's dwarf rush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus leiospermus var. leiospermus</td>
<td>PMJUN011L2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2T2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bluff dwarf rush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasionycteris noctivagans</td>
<td>AMACC02010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver-haired bat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legeneria limosa</td>
<td>PDCAM0C010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legenere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepidurus packardi</td>
<td>ICBRA10010</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool tadpole shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linderiella occidentalis</td>
<td>ICBRA06010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California linderiella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarretia myersii ssp. myersii</td>
<td>PDPLM0C0X1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G1T1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pincushion navarretia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool</td>
<td>CTT44110CA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Volcanic Mud Flow Vernal Pool</td>
<td>CTT44132CA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Volcanic Mud Flow Vernal Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</td>
<td>AFCHA0209K</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5T2Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steelhead - Central Valley DPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuttia viscidula</td>
<td>PMPOA4G070</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Orcutt grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalacrocorax auritus</td>
<td>ABNFD01020</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>WL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double-crested cormorant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progne subis</td>
<td>ABPAU01010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purple martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparia riparia</td>
<td>ABPAU08010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank swallow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Selected Elements by Scientific Name

California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
California Natural Diversity Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element Code</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sagittaria sanfordii</td>
<td>PMALI040Q0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford's arrowhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spea hammondii</td>
<td>AAABF02020</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western spadefoot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxidea taxus</td>
<td>AMAJF04010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American badger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Needlegrass Grassland</td>
<td>CTT42110CA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Needlegrass Grassland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record Count: 45
Plant List

1 matches found.  *Click on scientific name for details*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Lifeform</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sagittaria sanfordii</td>
<td>Sanford's arrowhead</td>
<td>Alismataceae</td>
<td>perennial rhizomatous herb</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Citation

Plant List

4 matches found. Click on scientific name for details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Lifeform</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratiola heterosepala</td>
<td>Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop</td>
<td>Plantaginaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii</td>
<td>Ahart's dwarf rush</td>
<td>Juncaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>G2T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenere limosa</td>
<td>legenere</td>
<td>Campanulaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagittaria sanfordii</td>
<td>Sanford's arrowhead</td>
<td>Alismataceae</td>
<td>perennial rhizomatous herb</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Citation

Plant List

3 matches found. Click on scientific name for details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Lifeform</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downingia pusilla</td>
<td>dwarf downingia</td>
<td>Campanulaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>2B.2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>GU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarretia myersii</td>
<td>pincushion navarretia</td>
<td>Polemoniaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>G1T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuttia viscida</td>
<td>Sacramento Orcutt</td>
<td>Poaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Citation

## Plant List

6 matches found. *Click on scientific name for details*

### Search Criteria

Rare Plant Rank is one of [1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3], Found in Quad 38121G3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Lifeform</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</em></td>
<td>big-scale balsamroot</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chloropyron molle ssp. hispidum</em></td>
<td>hispid bird's-beak</td>
<td>Orobanchaceae</td>
<td>annual herb (hemiparasitic)</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G2T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Downingia pusilla</em></td>
<td>dwarf downingia</td>
<td>Campanulaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>2B.2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>GU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gratiola heterosepala</em></td>
<td>Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop</td>
<td>Plantaginaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Juncus leiospermus var. leiospermus</em></td>
<td>Red Bluff dwarf rush</td>
<td>Juncaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G2T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Legenere limosa</em></td>
<td>legenere</td>
<td>Campanulaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Suggested Citation

Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2015-SLI-0759
Event Code: 08ESMF00-2015-E-02569
Project Name: Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the Service under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Please follow the link below to see if your proposed project has the potential to affect other species or their habitats under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service:

http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/protected_species/species_list/species_lists.html

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2)
of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at:
http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm;
http://www.towerkill.com; and

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

The table below outlines lead FWS field offices by county and land ownership/project type. Please refer to this table when you are ready to coordinate (including requests for section 7 consultation) with the field office corresponding to your project, and send any documentation regarding your project to that corresponding office. Therefore, the lead FWS field office may not be the office listed above in the letterhead. Please visit our office's website (http://www.fws.gov/sacramento) to view a map of office jurisdictions.
## Lead FWS offices by County and Ownership/Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Ownership/Program</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Office Lead*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to Bays</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>Stanislaus National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>El Dorado National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>Mendocino National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>AFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Legal Delta (Excluding ECCHCP)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Antioch Dunes NWR</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to Bays</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Management Unit</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>El Dorado National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Mendocino National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>AFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Mendocino National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>AFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>Modoc National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>KFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>Lassen National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>Toiyabe National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>BLM Surprise and Eagle Lake Resource Areas</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>BLM Alturas Resource Area</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>KFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>Lassen Volcanic National Park</td>
<td>All (includes Eagle Lake trout on all ownerships)</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>All other ownerships</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ownership Description</td>
<td>Wildlife Species</td>
<td>Management Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to Bays</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>Russian River watershed</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>All except Russian River watershed</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>AFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Pablo Bay</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>All other ownerships</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (See map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>All other ownerships</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Legal Delta</td>
<td>Delta Smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Ownership Details</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>Legal Delta excluding San Joaquin HCP</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands/marsh adjacent to San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>Shasta Trinity National Forest except Hat Creek Ranger District (administered by Lassen National Forest)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>YFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>Hat Creek Ranger District</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation (Central Valley Project)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>Whiskeytown National Recreation Area</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>YFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>BLM Alturas Resource Area</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>KFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Natural Resource Damage Assessment, all lands</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>Ahjumawi Lava Springs State Park</td>
<td>Shasta crayfish</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>All other ownerships</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>RFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>All other ownerships</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Suisun Marsh</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands.marsh adjacent to San Pablo Bay</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Tidal wetlands.marsh adjacent to San Pablo Bay</td>
<td>Salt marsh species, delta smelt</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>All ownerships but tidal/estuarine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>Mendocino National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>AFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shasta Trinity National Forest</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>except Hat Creek Ranger District (administered by Lassen National Forest)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>YFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>All other ownerships</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>Yolo Bypass</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>FERC-ESA</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>By jurisdiction (see map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>FERC-ESA</td>
<td>Shasta crayfish</td>
<td>SFWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>FERC-Relicensing (non-ESA)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>BDFWO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Office Leads:

AFWO=Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office

BDFWO=Bay Delta Fish and Wildlife Office

KFWO=Klamath Falls Fish and Wildlife Office

RFWO=Reno Fish and Wildlife Office

YFWO=Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office
Official Species List

Provided by:
Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office
FEDERAL BUILDING
2800 COTTAGE WAY, ROOM W-2605
SACRAMENTO, CA 95825
(916) 414-6600

Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2015-SLI-0759
Event Code: 08ESMF00-2015-E-02569

Project Type: RECREATION CONSTRUCTION / MAINTENANCE

Project Name: Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets, Phase 2
Project Description: The Auburn Blvd Complete Phase 2 Project is located in the City of Citrus Heights, California. In February of 2005, the City of Citrus Heights adopted a specific plan to guide the revitalization and enhancement of Auburn Boulevard between Sylvan Corners and Interstate 80. The purpose of the project is for the improvement of Auburn Boulevard in order to upgrade the corridors image and improve its function as a transportation facility serving adjacent land uses.

Please Note: The FWS office may have modified the Project Name and/or Project Description, so it may be different from what was submitted in your previous request. If the Consultation Code matches, the FWS considers this to be the same project. Contact the office in the 'Provided by' section of your previous Official Species list if you have any questions or concerns.
Project Location Map:

Project Coordinates: MULTIPOLYGON (((-121.290191337452 38.710196708644006, -121.29022990017275 38.710099050471186, -121.29032622289033 38.71005726367628, -121.29042388106316 38.71009582639704, -121.29046566785806 38.71019214911462, -121.29065878690713 38.721811424403064, -121.29062022418638 38.721909082575884, -121.2905239014688 38.72195086937079, -121.29042624329597 38.72191230665003, -121.29038445650107 38.72181598393245, -121.290191337452 38.710196708644006)))

Project Counties: Placer, CA | Sacramento, CA
## Endangered Species Act Species List

There are a total of 8 threatened or endangered species on your species list. Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Critical habitats listed under the **Has Critical Habitat** column may or may not lie within your project area. See the **Critical habitats within your project area** section further below for critical habitat that lies within your project. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amphibians</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Has Critical Habitat</th>
<th>Condition(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California red-legged frog (<em>Rana draytonii</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger Salamander (<em>Ambystoma californiense</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: U.S.A. (Central CA DPS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crustaceans</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Has Critical Habitat</th>
<th>Condition(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vernal Pool fairy shrimp (<em>Branchinecta lynchi</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal Pool tadpole shrimp (<em>Lepidurus packardi</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Has Critical Habitat</th>
<th>Condition(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta smelt (<em>Hypomesus transpacificus</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steelhead (<em>Oncorhynchus =salmo</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

United States Department of Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mykiss</td>
<td>Population: Northern California DPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>Valley Elderberry Longhorn beetle</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Desmocerus californicus dimorphus)</td>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>Giant Garter snake (Thamnophis gigas)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical habitats that lie within your project area

There are no critical habitats within your project area.
APPENDIX D: FEMA Firmette Map
APPENDIX E: Mitigation Monitoring Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Reporting Milestone</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AESTHETICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1:</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the City of Citrus Heights General Plan Policy 37.1 and compliance with the Tree Preservation Ordinance will encourage the retention of native oaks in the landscape of the specific plan area and will mitigate for the visual impacts resulting from the removal of native oak trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Mitigation Measures for biological resources, B-1, B-2A and B-2B and B-2C which address impacts to the oak woodland and riparian habitat adjacent to Cripple Creek.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2:</td>
<td>Prior to and During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-1A:</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalable Particulate Matter: The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the project to minimize the generation of PM10 dust during construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- enclose, cover, or water twice daily all soil piles;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- water all haul roads twice daily; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- cover loads of all haul/dump trucks securely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Reporting Milestone</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AQ-IB:</strong> The demolition or renovation of asbestos-containing building material is subject to the limitations of the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations as listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (40CFR Part 61, Subpart M) requiring notification and inspection. Most demolitions and many renovations are subject to a CAL-OSHA Certified asbestos inspection prior to the start of activity. SMAQMD Rule 902, which requires District consultation and permit, applies to demolition, renovation or removal of asbestos-containing material. Compliance with these regulations is considered to reduce this impact to a less than-significant level.</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AQ-2:</strong> Route and schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-1:</strong> To ensure consistency with the City of Citrus Heights’ Policy 37.1, which requires incorporation of existing trees into development projects, building envelopes for future development projects should be configured to minimize impacts to trees to the extent feasible. The following measures shall be implemented: 1. Building envelopes should be established on plans and specifications for the future development projects to designate the area needed for construction of roads, driveways, and building pads. 2. These building envelopes should be large enough to include not only the improvements, but also work areas for heavy equipment, staging areas, and equipment and material lay down areas. 3. To protect trees elsewhere on construction sites, no construction activities or use of heavy equipment should occur outside of the building envelopes. 4. Oaks that fall within the building envelope but which are not slated for removal should be protected by the following measures, which should be implemented during all</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Measure  | Reporting Milestone | Reporting / Responsible Party | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE
---|---|---|---
Construction phases of the project:

a. Plans and specifications should clearly state protection procedures for oaks to be preserved on the project site. The specifications should also require contractors to stay within designated work areas and should include a provision for penalties if oak trees are damaged;
b. No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile offices, or materials should be parked or located within the driplines of oaks and other trees that are to be preserved;
c. Soil surface removal should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be preserved. No cuts or trenching should occur within the dripline. If this area cannot be avoided, then the tree should be added to the list of oaks to be replaced through an on-site planting;
d. Earthen fill deep should not be placed within the driplines of oak trees to be retained, and no fill should be placed within five feet of their trunks.
e. Paving should not be placed within the dripline of oaks to be retained;
f. Underground utility line trenching should not occur within the driplines of oaks to be retained. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the driplines of oak trees, the trench should either be bored or drilled but not within five feet of the trunk and a certified arborist should be retained to monitor this construction and repair or wrap any damaged roots.
g. Living Among the Oaks: A Management Guide for Landowners (UC Cooperative Extension, Berkeley) in Appendix H should be used by the City as a guide in reviewing landscape plans. The information should be distributed to landowners and developers to provide information and guidelines for preparing landscape plans and for protecting oaks after construction is complete.

B-1B: Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Woodland Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within oak woodland and/or riparian habitats (as opposed to isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Oak trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted.
2. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or

| B-1B | Prior to Construction | City of Citrus Heights and Contractor |
B-1C: Prepare and Implement Oak Replacement and Maintenance Plan (Landscape Tree Replacement): In order to compensate for impacts due to removal of native oak trees found within landscape settings (i.e. isolated landscape or street trees), the following measures shall be implemented:

1. Oaks trees shall be planted on project sites or off-site in numbers and species composition similar to those impacted.

   a. Prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies.

   The goals of the Oak Plan should be to replace trees lost by the project to create healthy, self-sustaining habitats that are not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period.

   The functions and values of the created habitat should approximate those of the affected habitats, i.e., the functions and values of oak woodland rather than an ornamental landscape planting.

   b. At a minimum, the Oak Plan should include clear success criteria, monitoring and reporting requirements, and a contingency plan should the responsible parties fail to meet the success criteria that ensure that mitigation goals and ratios are met. The Oak Plan should also include details for the species, size of plants and quantities, planting techniques, techniques for protecting the trees from herbivory, and irrigation, weed control and maintenance plan, and monitoring requirements.

   The arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, and species of trees that would be removed within each building envelope or area subject to disturbance. Based on the estimate, an Oak Replacement and Management Plan (Oak Plan) should be prepared in accordance with the City of Citrus Heights Tree Ordinance, and consistent with the City of Citrus Heights General Plan biological resource goals and policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Reporting Milestone</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project in an appropriate landscape setting that will allow trees to thrive and be self-sustaining and not dependent on maintenance or irrigation following the minimum maintenance period. Replacement within the specific plan area’s planned landscape areas as street trees, trees for public space landscape or roadway medians, should be emphasized when identifying replanting sites. Replacement in a natural habitat setting as described in Measure B-2B would also accomplish these oak tree replacement goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-1D:</strong> Preconstruction Tree Survey: Prior to construction, a qualified biologist or arborist should make an accurate count of the number, diameter, condition and species of trees that would be removed by the roadway improvement project. An Oak Tree Replacement and Management Plan shall be prepared in accordance with Mitigation Measures B-2A, B-2B and B-2C described above.</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-2:</strong> Avoid Impacts to Nesting Birds</td>
<td>Prior to and During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If tree removal for construction will occur during the nesting season (February through July), a minimum of two preconstruction surveys should be conducted in construction areas for nesting birds. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Surveys should be conducted no more that 14 days prior to the initiation of tree-removal activities during the early part of the breeding season (February through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through July).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If the surveyor deems that an active bird nest is close enough to the construction area to be disturbed, he or she should (in consultation with CDFG) determine the extent of the construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trees should be removed outside the nesting season (February through July), or after a qualified wildlife biologist verifies that the nest is empty and the nest tree is no longer used by the adults and young birds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Reporting Milestone</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-3:</strong> Avoid Introduction and Spread of New Noxious Weeds. In the vicinity of Cripple Creek, during construction only certified weed-free straw will be used and all disturbed soils will be thoroughly covered with straw (or mulch or chips created on-site during tree removal) upon completion of grading. No seed mixes should be used unless consisting of locally native grasses and forbs.</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-4:</strong> If construction is planned to occur during the raptor nesting season (February – August) a preconstruction raptor nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, 10 feet or taller and containing a dbh of 2 inches or greater. Within 2 weeks of the nesting raptor survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor. A minimum 500 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active raptor nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction – Mitigation measures shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-5:</strong> If ground disturbance or vegetation removal is to take place during the breeding season (February – August), a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 7 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation surveyed shall include all trees, bushes, tall grasses and emergent vegetation. Within 2 weeks of the nesting bird survey, all vegetation cleared by the biologist shall be removed by the contractor. A minimum 100 foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established around any active nest to limit the impacts of construction activities. The contractor shall immediately stop work in the nesting area until the appropriate buffer is established and is prohibited from conducting work that could disturb the birds (as determined by the project biologist and in coordination with wildlife agencies) in the buffer area until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction – Mitigation measures shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CULTURAL RESOURCES

**CR-1:** Handling of Discovered Artifacts or Remains: Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during any development activities, work shall be suspended according to (A) below.

It is recommended under CEQA and Policy 41.1 of the Citrus Heights General Plan that:

1. In the event that any prehistoric, historic, or paleontological resources are discovered during construction-related earth moving activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and the developer shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist, then
2. representatives from the City of Citrus Heights and the qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist would meet to determine the appropriate course of action.
3. Pursuant to Section 5097.97 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. And that under Policy 42.3 of the Citrus Heights General Plan that planners establish thresholds by which future projects can be judged when considering historic impacts. These standards should include height and massing considerations for projects that are located in close proximity to historic resources (individual structures and districts) and define locations for potential prehistoric resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Reporting Milestone</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td>Initials Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Reporting Milestone</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-2:</strong> Evaluation of Historic Resources Older than 45 Years. Prior to approval of projects or issuance of construction or grading permits, cultural resources that appear to be 45 years old or older on a project site need to be recorded for the purposes of inclusion in the State Office of Historic Preservation’s filing system. “The 45 year criterion recognizes that there is commonly a five year lag between resource identification and the date that planning decisions are made” (California, State of 1995). Should the five year period lapse between the completion of the initial cultural resources documentation and the start date of the project, the cultural resource studies would need to be updated to include any additional properties/sites that would, by that time, meet the 45 year criteria.</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HM-1:</strong> Pursuant to City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.15-3a, no projects shall be approved where there is substantial evidence of existing contamination on a Cortese-listed site that would pose an unacceptable risk to the health of construction workers.</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HM-2:</strong> Pursuant to City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.15-3b, establish a process that identifies the steps to be taken prior to commencement of any site preparation activities on Cortese-listed sites. This may contain but not be limited to the following:</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Retain a licensed professional to investigate the environmental status of the soils and/or groundwater contamination. Prepare a site plan that identifies and implements any remediation activities that are required to remove health risks to persons exposed to the site during construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Remove all contaminated soil, dispose of contaminated soil by a licensed contractor to a properly licensed facility, and replace contaminated soil with clean fill dirt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consult with appropriate regulatory agencies such as Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Sacramento Department of Environmental Health to determine what actions are required by these agencies to be implemented (e.g., de-watering, groundwater monitoring, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Reporting Milestone</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-3: Mitigation Measure HM-1A Handling of Asbestos Material: Control devices and fugitive emissions monitoring are required during demolition activities which will disturb, or have the possibility of disturbing, the asbestos-containing materials. All asbestos containing building material within the buildings planned for demolition should be removed prior to any demolition activity that could break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb these materials. This removal must be done using appropriate engineering controls, in compliance with all regulations, and be a contractor certified by the Contractor’s State License Board and registered by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Northwest Envirocon, Incorporated 1997).</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-3B: Disposal Of The Yellow Thermoplastic Traffic Stripes: Disposal of the yellow thermoplastic traffic stripes will be at a Class 1 disposal facility. All aspects of the project associated with removal, storage, transportation, and disposal of the yellow thermoplastic traffic striping, should be in strict accordance with the appropriate regulations.</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-4: Any leaking transformers observed during the course of the project should be considered a potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hazard. Should leaks from electrical transformers (that will either remain within the construction limits or will require removal and/or relocation) be encountered during construction, the transformer fluid should be sampled and analyzed by qualified personnel for detectable levels of PCB's. Should PCBs be detected, the transformer should be removed and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency. Any stained soil encountered below electrical transformers with detectable levels of PCB’s should also be handled and disposed of in accordance with Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations and any other appropriate regulatory agency.</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-5: Based on preliminary plans, right-of-way acquisition may be required at the Towne Mart gas station at Sandalwood Drive and the abandoned gas station at Oak Grove Avenue. Should final plans indicate that a portion of this parcel will be acquired for new right-of-way, a preliminary environmental screening (limited subsurface sampling and</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
laboratory analysis) should be performed during the PS&E for potentially elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and MTBE contamination within the limits of construction, and/or right-of-way acquisition, adjacent to the existing gas stations. Should the preliminary screening encounter elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and/or MTBE a limited Phase II ISA should be performed. The Phase II ISA should consist of subsurface sampling and laboratory analysis and be of sufficient quantity to define the extent and concentration of contamination within the areal extent and depths of planned construction activities adjacent to the existing gas stations. The Phase II ISA should also provide both a Health and Safety Plan for worker safety and a Work Plan for handling and disposing contaminated soil during construction.

HM-6: The potential exists for hazardous contamination from historic chemical spills at Paradise Cleaners, which is located near the intersection of Auburn Boulevard and Baird Way. At the time of this ISA, there were no documented reports of soil/groundwater contamination related to chemical discharge from Paradise Cleaners. If a potential hazardous contamination is detected, soil samples should be gathered and tested to determine the chemical levels within the soil.

During Construction
City of Citrus Heights
and Contractor

HM-7: To avoid impacts from pavement striping during construction it is recommended that removal requirements for yellow striping and pavement marking materials be performed in accordance with Caltrans Standard Special Provision 14-11.07 REMOVE YELLOW TRAFFIC STRIPE AND PAVEMENT MARKING WITH HAZARDOUS WASTE RESIDUE.

During Construction
City of Citrus Heights
and Contractor

HM-8: As is the case for any project that proposes excavation, the potential exists for unknown hazardous contamination to be revealed during project construction (such as previously undetected petroleum hydrocarbon contamination from nearby gas stations). Should any previously unknown hazardous waste/material be encountered during construction, the procedures outlined in Caltrans Hazards Procedures for Construction shall be followed.

During Construction
City of Citrus Heights
and Contractor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Reporting Milestone</th>
<th>Responsible / Party</th>
<th>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM-9: If the project area changes (due to a change in the project design or staging area), further investigation for potential hazardous waste generators would be required to determine their impact to the revised project limits.</td>
<td>Prior to and During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

**H-1:** Incorporate Development Standards for Improving Water Quality: The City shall incorporate water quality protection measures into the specific plan Development Standards: The standards may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Install and maintain landscaping that requires minimal application of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides;
2. Emphasize xeriscape landscaping that reduces the need for irrigation by minimizing the use of turf in decorative landscaping, using plant materials adapted to local conditions and efficient irrigation;
3. Minimize irrigation overspray - do not permit use of sprinkler and spray irrigation in areas less than 8 feet wide;
4. Use of drip irrigation systems where feasible;
5. Incorporate features such as filtration strips or bioswales in site design to prevent urban pollutants from entering into Cripple Creek via storm drains from parking lots and paved surfaces.

**H-2:** Implement Best Management Practices (BMPs). The City shall require implementation of best management practices for public and private development. Such practices may include, but are not limited to:

1. Regular inspection, maintenance and cleaning out of stormwater retention or detention structures;
2. Regular inspection, maintenance and cleaning out of oil and water separators;
3. Encourage property owners to regularly remove trash, dead vegetation and leaf litter;
4. Encourage use of landscaping and horticultural practices that minimize the need for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Reporting Milestone</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chemical fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides.

**H-3:** The Project would require a NPDES General Construction Permit for Discharges of storm water associated with construction activities (Construction General Permit 2012-0006-DWQ). A SWPPP would also be developed and implemented as part of the Construction General Permit.

Prior to Construction  
City of Citrus Heights  
and  
Contractor

**H-4:** The construction contractor shall adhere to the SWRCB Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ NPDES Permit pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA. This permit authorizes storm water and authorized non-storm water discharges from construction activities. As part of this Permit requirement, a SWPPP shall be prepared prior to construction consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB. This SWPPP will incorporate all applicable BMPs to ensure that adequate measures are taken during construction to minimize impacts to water quality.

Prior to Construction  
City of Citrus Heights  
and  
Contractor

**NOISE**

**N-1:** Pursuant to City of Citrus Heights General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-1:

1. Limit hours of construction to account for more sensitive weekend hours.
2. Limit hours of construction where noise is audible at sensitive land uses beyond the boundaries of the construction site.

During Construction  
City of Citrus Heights  
and  
Contractor
**N-2:** Pursuant to City of Roseville General Plan, Chapter 9, Mitigation Measure 8:

The City shall use the Noise Level Performance Standards contained in Table IX-3 for reviewing new development of noise-sensitive uses exposed to fixed noise sources. These standards are also to be used for evaluating potential impacts of proposed new fixed noise sources upon nearby noise-sensitive uses. Where a noise-sensitive land use is proposed near a fixed noise source, such as an industrial facility, noise measurements will be performed to determine whether existing and/or future noise levels due to that source will exceed the standards of Table IX-3 within the property line of the proposed use. Similarly, where a fixed noise-producing use such as an industrial facility is proposed near an existing or future noise-sensitive use, a noise analysis will be prepared to ensure that the noise produced by that use will not exceed the standards of Table IX-3 within the property line of the noise-sensitive use. (Policies 6, 7 and 8).

### TABLE IX-3

**PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

**FOR NON-TRANSPORTATION NOISE SOURCES**

**OR PROJECTS AFFECTED BY NON-TRANSPORTATION NOISE SOURCES**

(As Measured at the Property Line of Noise-Sensitive Uses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Level Descriptor</th>
<th>Daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)</th>
<th>Nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hourly $L_{eq}$, dB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum level, dB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. For municipal power plants consisting primarily of broadband, steady state noise sources, the hourly ($L_{eq}$) noise standard may be increased up to 10 dB(A), but not exceed 55 dB(A) Hourly $L_{eq}$ dB.

Each of the noise levels specified above should be lowered by five dB for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises. Such noises are generally considered by residents to be particularly annoying and are a primary source of noise complaints. These noise level standards do not apply to residential units established in conjunction with industrial or commercial uses (e.g., caretaker dwellings).

No standards have been included for interior noise levels. Standard construction practices should, with exterior noise levels identified, result in acceptable interior noise levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Reporting Milestone</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-3:</strong> On-site Noise Control: To ensure mitigation of noise due to project-related loading docks and on-site traffic, development proposals should be reviewed to identify potential noise conflicts with existing or proposed noise sensitive uses. Implementation of the noise standards contained in the Noise Element of the Citrus Heights General Plan will mitigate project-related noise to an insignificant level. For development requiring installation of large groundmounted HVAC systems, development review should include an assessment of noise impacts on nearby residential areas.</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-4:</strong> The Contractor shall follow City of Citrus Heights and City of Roseville noise ordinances for construction activities:</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights and Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not exceed 65 dBA at 50 feet from the job site activities from 8 p.m. to 7 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use an alternative waiting method instead of a sound signal unless required by safety laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equip an internal combustion engine with the manufacturer-recommended muffler.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not operate an internal combustion engine on the job site without the appropriate muffler.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION AND HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PH-1:</strong> Prior to approving a development project that would result in conversion of trailer parks to other uses; the City shall comply with Government Code Section 65863.7, a copy of which is included in Appendix J of the ABSP EIR.</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PH 1-B:</strong> Relocation Assistance for Housing Displacement:</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The City shall provide standard relocation assistance to both tenants and owner occupants in compliance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Replacement housing must be decent, safe, and sanitary (DS&amp;S), which means it must meet all of the minimum requirements established by Federal regulations and conforms to applicable housing and occupancy codes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All real property transactions shall comply with the property acquisition and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Reporting Milestone</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relocated standards of the State of California, the Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PH-1C</strong> Business Relocation. The following mitigation measures shall be required to compensate for right-of-way acquisition:</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Property owners shall be compensated in accordance with fair market values based on appraisals. Business owners shall be compensated based on an assessment of the value of the business and any loss of good will.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All efforts shall be made to identify relocation opportunities for affected businesses that would reduce the loss of goodwill and historic patronage. Wherever feasible, assistance shall be made available in identifying suitable relocation sites within the service area of existing businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PH-1D</strong> Property Compensation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. All real property transactions shall comply with the property acquisition and relocation standards of the State of California, the Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Property owners shall be compensated in accordance with fair market values based on appraisals. Business owners shall be compensated based on an assessment of the value of the business and any loss of good will.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All efforts shall be made to identify relocation opportunities for affected businesses that would reduce the loss of goodwill and historic patronage. Wherever feasible, assistance shall be made available in identifying suitable relocation sites within the service area of existing businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T-1</strong> Ensure Adequate Parking Supply. In order to ensure that adequate parking supply is maintained in the specific plan area, the city shall establish a special permit process to</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
allow flexibility in the number of required parking spaces when deemed appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Reporting Milestone</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T-1B:</strong> Compensate for Parking Impacts:</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The determination of project-caused parking impacts shall be made in accordance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Project proponents shall compensate for acquisition of underlying property in compliance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the event that it is determined that the project will result in a reduction of parking spaces below the number required by zoning, but would not preclude continued use of the parcel that is allowed by zoning as determined by the appropriate land use authority (City of Citrus Heights), the project proponent(s) shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Investigate feasibility of and compensate for cost of reconfiguring parking area or relocating parking on the same parcel to provide additional spaces; or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Investigate feasibility of and compensate for the cost of providing off-site parking; and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The appropriate land use authority (City of Citrus Heights) shall grant a special parking permit to allow the continued use with reduced parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If it is determined during the right-of-way appraisal and acquisition process that the project would result in a reduction of parking spaces that would preclude continued use of the parcel in accordance with the existing zoning, and none of the measures under No. 2 above are feasible, the project proponent(s) shall provide compensation in accordance with Caltrans Relocation Assistance Program and the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T-2:</strong> Construction Period Traffic Management Plan. A traffic handling plan will be prepared prior to construction of any roadway improvements. The plan will address traffic management during construction periods, including but not limited to road and lane closures; detours; pedestrian and bicycle routes; and public notification. The traffic handling plan should be prepared in consultation with regional transit in order to</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>City of Citrus Heights</td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
minimize disruptions to public transit service along the corridor. Additionally, prior to commencement of construction, a Traffic Management Plan as described in A Traffic Management Plan Guide (See Appendix A of the Final EIR) will be prepared and provided to Caltrans for review in order to address strategies needed to minimize disruption of traffic at the Interstate 80/Auburn Boulevard Interchange.

**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

**U-1:** Construction Management for Utilities: The construction project management team shall coordinate with utility providers during design stages of roadway projects. The construction project management team shall undertake periodic assessments of upcoming utility and service disruptions during construction. These assessments and an identification of the service area involved shall be coordinated with utility providers and the public outreach program. The public outreach program shall ensure that advance notice of any utility or service shutdowns is extended to affected businesses and residents. Through construction management and project scheduling, all available measures shall be taken to minimize the duration of utility or service shutdowns.
APPENDIX F: Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment Letters and Responses
November 9, 2015

City of Citrus Heights Planning Division
Mr. Casey Kempenaar
7927 Auburn Boulevard
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Via: Email and Regular Mail

ckempenaar@citrusheights.net

Subject: Initial Study Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration Auburn Boulevard Complete Streets Project, Phase 2 – City of Roseville Comments

Dear Mr. Kempenaar:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the subject project Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). The project is unique in that the north end includes planned improvements within the City of Roseville. The City of Roseville appreciates the early coordination that has occurred to date and looks forward to continuing these efforts through the project’s implementation phase as outlined below.

**Improvement Costs**

As discussed during early coordination, the City of Roseville is not prepared to cost share in the proposed improvements. Also, the cost of any City of Roseville utility relocations required to accommodate improvements will need to be funded by the project.

**Project Outreach**

The commercial businesses located at the north end of the project (including the Shell and Chevron gas stations and Jack in the Box restaurant) are located in the City of Roseville. If turn restrictions to these existing Roseville business are planned, the city of Roseville will need to understand the justification (such as a high accident rate and/or the need due to an increase in volume of u-turns). In this regard, Roseville staff would also like to work with the City of Citrus Heights and project's engineers to consult with these business and address any related concerns if project improvements are proposed this area.

**Fiber and Signal Synchronization**

The City of Roseville supports installation of fiber as part of overall project improvements to facilitate the future potential synchronization of City of Roseville and Citrus Heights traffic signals.

**Whyte Avenue/Auburn Boulevard**

Based on review of IS/MND Figure 3, it appears the project would restrict left turns from Whyte Avenue. Prior to any improvements at this intersection the City of Roseville recommends consideration of the following:
- Conduct outreach to all affected residents and businesses both east and west of the project location (prepare a map of outreach limits);
- Please review left turn restrictions with our Engineering Division of Public Works for design;
- The Auburn Boulevard median should be extended north to Orlando and should be a stamped concrete material; or, a gull-wing design might be used to limit left turns from Whyte Avenue. Please review preliminary designs with our Engineering Division of Public Works; and,
- Please enhance the crosswalk(s) for pedestrian safety at the intersection of Auburn/Riverside and Orlando Dr.

The City of Roseville previously studied this improvement as part of the Louis/Orlando Transfer station project and we would be happy to share our study results.

**Louis/Orlando Transfer Station**

The City recommends the project link connections of bicycles and pedestrians to the approved Louis-Orlando Transfer Point project (LOTP). It appears the bike lane stops at Whyte Avenue and we could find no indication of how cyclists or pedestrians would travel to and from the LOTP to other uses along Auburn using the existing and planned facilities.

Also the IS/MND transportation analysis doesn’t address short term construction impacts to transit operations. Are any transit related travel delays anticipated as a result of project construction? Please contact Mike Wixon, City of Roseville Alternative Transportation Manager for additional information regarding the Whyte Avenue/Auburn Boulevard intersection improvements and/or LOTP connectivity issues ((916) 774 5480).

**Utilities**

Roseville Electric has two existing streetlights located on the west side of Auburn Boulevard south of Whyte Avenue with underground conduit and conductor feeding the lights (see attached). Per IS/MND Figure 3, these lights may need to be moved with the project. There may also be other water and/or sewer utility conflicts to consider at the time of final design.

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Mark Morse
Environmental Coordinator

Attachment 1: Roseville Electric Infrastructure
EXIST. 250W MERC. VAPOR ST. LT. TO BE REMOVED BY CITY DUE TO G.O. 95 INFRACTION WITH SAUV PRIMARY OVERHEAD. DEV. TO REMOVE BASE.

8655 AUBURN BLVD.
JACK-IN-THE-BOX REST.

DEV. TO REPLACE DAMAGED ST. LT. CONDUIT AND REPLACE DAMAGED WIRE W/ 2-#12 CU. THHN (1-WHITE, 1-BLACK)

EXIST. CONDUIT AND CONDUITOE FROM SAUV TRANSFORMER TO SERVICE BOX

EXIST. 250W MERC. VAPOR ST. LT. TO BE REMOVED.

RELOCATE EXIST. ST. LT. TO THIS LOCATION. CONSTRUCT CONCRETE BASE PER SPEC'S FOR COMMERCIAL CONST.

EXIST 250W MERC. VAPOR ST. LT. TO BE RELOCATED.

NEW BUS TURNOUT AUBURN BLVD.