



AGENDA

June 25, 2020

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

6:30 p.m.

311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California
www.roseville.ca.us

Commissioners may teleconference pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20.
Members of the public may view the meeting on Comcast channel 14,
Consolidated Communications channel 73 and AT&T U-verse.
Meetings are also video streamed live and are available on the
City's website and YouTube channel.

Members of the public may offer public comment by the following means:
Dial in Phone Number: 916-774-5353
Email: publiccomment@roseville.ca.us

If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this
meeting, please contact Voice: 916-774-5200 , TDD: 916-774-5220.
Requests must be made as early as possible.

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE WELCOMES YOUR PARTICIPATION

If an agenda item is open to public comment, such public comment shall be addressed to the chair of the meeting.

Public Comment - Speakers have three minutes under Public Comment to speak on issues that are not listed on the agenda and are within the City's jurisdiction. The Brown Act does not permit any action or discussion on items not listed on the agenda.

Consent Calendar - If applicable, the Consent Calendar consists of routine items that may be approved by one motion. Any person can remove an item from the Consent Calendar to be discussed separately.

Agenda Items - Speakers have five minutes to address items that are listed on the agenda.

Americans with Disabilities Act - Notify the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance if special assistance is required to participate in a meeting including the need of auxiliary aids or services.

Audio/Visual Presentations - If making a presentation regarding an agenda item, audio/visual materials must be submitted to the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance.

Roseville City Clerk 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 916-774-5200 TDD 916-774-5220

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**
- 5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

5.1. Minutes of May 28, 2020

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Citywide General Plan Update - 311 Vernon St - File # PL16-0336

REQUEST

Staff requests the Planning Commission consider the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and review and make a recommendation to City Council on the proposed draft General Plan. The purpose of the update to the City's General Plan is to comply with new State planning laws, the 2017 General Plan Guidelines, and updates to the CEQA Guidelines and case law; revise outdated information; improve and clarify policy language; and make the General Plan more readable and user-friendly. The City is not proposing changes to the Land Use Map or Sphere of Influence as a part of this update. The complete description of changes can be found in the Project Description chapter of the DEIR.

Applicant: City of Roseville, Development Services Planning Division

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Division is recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- A. Forward all public comments received on the Draft EIR for inclusion in the Final EIR for City Council review, and
- B. Recommend City Council approve the updated 2035 General Plan.

- 7. BOARD MEMBER / COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT**
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**



PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Minutes of May 28, 2020
Contact: Lupe Nelson, lnelson@roseville.ca.us, 916-774-5281

Meeting Date: 6/25/2020
Item #: 5.1.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Minutes of May 28, 2020



MINUTES

May 28, 2020

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
6:30 p.m.
311 Vernon Street Roseville, California
www.roseville.ca.us

Commissioners teleconferenced pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20. Members of the public viewed the meeting on Comcast channel 14, Consolidated Communications channel 73 and AT&T U-verse. The meeting was video streamed live and was available on the City's website and YouTube channel.

Members of the public were able to offer public comment by phone or email.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Caporusso called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Jensen, Krafka, Librea, Martin, Mendonsa, Brashears, Caporusso

Absent: None

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Caporusso led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Caporusso opened the Public Comment period. Hearing none, Chair Caporusso closed the Public Comment period.

Chair Caporusso re-opened the Public Comment period between Item 6.1. and Item 6.2.

Nick Bryant requested transit service to 2050 Blue Oaks Blvd.

Chair Caporusso closed the Public Comment period.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

Motion by Commissioner Mendonsa, seconded by Commissioner Martin, to approve the Consent Calendar.

The Motion passed.

Roll call votes:

Ayes: Mendonsa, Krafka, Brashears, Jensen, Librea, Martin, Caporusso

Noes: None

5.1. Minutes of May 14, 2020

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. NIPA PCL HP-1 – Innovation Park Building, 8020 Foothills Bl, File #PL20- 0019
REQUEST

The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit to allow the construction of 150,926-square-foot, one-story office building within the Roseville Innovation Park (formerly known as the Hewlett-Packard Campus), with associated parking, lighting, and landscaping.

Applicant: Hans Papke, Brick Architecture + Interiors

Property Owner: Scott Stafford, 8000 Foothills LLC

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Division recommends that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- A. Consider the 5th Addendum to the Hewlett-Packard Master Plan Environmental Impact Report; and
- B. Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to sixty-five (65) conditions of approval.

Associate Planner, Kinarik Shallow, presented the staff report.

Chair Caporusso opened the public hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Applicant, Hans Papke, Brick Architecture + Interiors, presented a PowerPoint presentation and property owner, Scott Stafford, 8000 Foothills LLC, responded to questions. They stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Discussion:

- Proposed materials and colors are different than those typically seen in Roseville buildings.
- Timelessness of design concept?
- Will the design complement the other buildings in the complex?
- Like outdoor space.
- Concerns about sun on south side of building.
- Appreciate project style.

- Placement of structure perfect location.
- Great time to explore different design elements.
- Appreciate risk that was taken with this proposed design.

No public comments received. Chair Caporusso closed the public hearing.

Motion by Commissioner Martin, seconded by Vice-Chair Brashears, to:

- Consider the 5th Addendum to the Hewlett-Packard Master Plan Environmental Impact Report; and,
- Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to sixty-five (65) conditions of approval.

The Motion passed.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Brashears, Martin, Librea, Krafka, Jensen, Mendonsa, Caporusso

Noes: None

6.2. NRSP PCL M-31 – Mourier M31 Apartments, 9000 Woodcreek Oaks Bl, File #PL19-0317

REQUEST

The proposed project is an 80-unit apartment complex consisting of four (4) three-story buildings, a community building, parking, and other related improvements. The project includes a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a multi-family residential use in the Community Commercial zone district, a Design Review Permit to review the building architecture and associated site improvements, and a Tree Permit to allow minor encroachment into the protected zone of a native oak tree.

Applicant: David Cobbs, Baker Williams Engineering Group

Property Owner: Steve Schnable, Mourier Land Investment Corp.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Division recommends that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- Adopt the Mourier M31 Apartments Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Conditional Use Permit subject to seven (7) conditions of approval;
- Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to ninety-three (93) conditions of approval; and
- Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Tree Permit subject to eighteen (18) conditions of approval.

Associate Planner, Kinarik Shallow, presented the staff report.

Chair Caporusso opened the public hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Representative, Chad Roberts, Hefner Law, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Discussion:

- Thank you to staff for addressing concerns in regards to the fencing and parking.

Motion by Commissioner Martin, seconded by Commissioner Krafka to:

- A. Adopt the Mourier M31 Apartments Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- B. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Conditional Use Permit subject to seven (7) conditions of approval;
- C. Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to ninety-four (94) conditions of approval; and
- D. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Tree Permit subject to eighteen (18) conditions of approval.

Motion included the following:

Addition of condition #33 to Design Review Permit

The site shall provide two access points as identified on the approved site plan. The southern access shall be designed per the City's standard for private, gated driveways. The developer shall construct a left turn and a right turn lane to provide full access to the site at the southern driveway. The northern driveway shall be designed as a 25-foot wide, A-7 driveway and shall be restricted to right turn movements and egress only. An 8-foot walk shall be constructed along the entire Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard frontage. (Engineering)

Revised Exhibit B – Site Plan

The Motion passed.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Librea, Brashears, Krafka, Jensen, Mendonsa, Martin, Caporusso

Noes: None

7. BOARD MEMBER / COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT

Staff Reports

- There will not be a June 11, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.
- There will be a June 25, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. The General Plan update and possibly 2 additional development projects are tentatively scheduled to be heard
- Election for the Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair and the Design Committee Chair and Alternate will be take place at the first meeting held in July.
- The City Council approved the entitlements for the Campos Oaks project

recently heard by the Planning Commission.

- The Planning Commission's approval of the entitlements for the Blue Oaks Plaza project has been appealed to the City Council.

Commissioner Report

- Chair Caporusso requested a hard copy of the General Plan Update.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Jensen, seconded by Commissioner Mendonsa, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion Passed unanimously at 7:45 p.m. with a voice vote.



PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Citywide General Plan Update - 311 Vernon St - File # PL16-0336

Contact: Gina McColl, gmccoll@roseville.ca.us, 916-774-5452

Meeting Date: 6/25/2020

Item #: 6.1.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Staff Report

Attachment 1 General Plan Policy Redlines

Attachment 2 NOA

Exhibit A and B

Draft General Plan Public Comments

DEIR Public Comments

ITEM 6.1: Citywide General Plan Update – 311 Vernon Street – File #PL16-0336

REQUEST

Staff requests the Planning Commission consider the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and review and make a recommendation to City Council on the proposed draft General Plan. The purpose of the update to the City's General Plan is to comply with new State planning laws, the 2017 General Plan Guidelines, and updates to the CEQA Guidelines and case law; revise outdated information; improve and clarify policy language; and make the General Plan more readable and user-friendly. The City is not proposing changes to the Land Use Map or Sphere of Influence as a part of this update. The complete description of changes can be found in the Project Description chapter of the DEIR.

Applicant – City of Roseville, DS Planning Division

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Division is recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- A. Forward all public comments received on the Draft EIR for inclusion in the Final EIR for City Council review, and
- B. Recommend City Council approve the updated 2035 General Plan.

SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES

There are no outstanding issues associated with this request.

BACKGROUND

The General Plan is a fundamental and legally required tool to guide the City through change and growth. It addresses the physical development of the City and includes Council-adopted policies, which provide direction for decision-making on City services and resources. It is both a long-range and a strategic planning document, containing long-term goals and policies through the horizon year of 2035. State law requires every county and city have an adopted General Plan, which must be periodically updated for consistency with state law. The City typically updates the General Plan as part of the specific plan process, most recently with adoption of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan in 2016. However, recent legislation and case law have created a need for the City to update the General Plan. At this time there are no new or pending specific plan areas the City could use to implement these updates. Therefore, pursuant to City Council direction, in 2017 Planning staff launched a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan to address significant changes in state legislation and case law.

Legislation and case law addressed within this General Plan update includes:

- Assembly Bill (AB) 1358 (Complete Streets), Senate Bill (SB) 743, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 as they relate to active transportation and travel demand management (vehicle miles traveled, or "VMT"). In particular, SB 743 removed Level of Service as a significance threshold in the CEQA Guidelines, replacing this threshold with a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) standard, to be used for assessing transportation impacts in CEQA analysis by July 2020. The City's current method for determining traffic impacts uses an LOS standard, which is reflected in the Circulation Element of the City's current General Plan. The proposed General Plan retains the LOS standard

for the purpose of facility planning, but this will no longer be used as a CEQA threshold of significance. Consistent with SB 743, the General Plan contains a new VMT policy to use for CEQA analysis.

- The California Supreme Court ruling in November 2015, commonly referred to as the Newhall Ranch decision, concludes that comparing project emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) to statewide targets is not enough; lead agencies must provide substantial evidence showing how the project-level reduction of GHG emissions relates to the achievement of statewide reduction targets. The ruling makes project-level analysis of GHG more complicated and costly, and could require an Environmental Impact Report even for relatively small projects. The proposed General Plan contains analysis and thresholds intended to avoid this outcome.
- Senate Bill (SB) 18 and AB 52 outlined requirements for Native American consultation. New notification and consultation policies and procedures are required for development projects.

The details of these laws are described in the relevant chapters of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), under the regulatory framework. The DEIR provides an environmental impact analysis of the proposed policy changes. Although no land use changes or additional growth are proposed as part of the project, the DEIR includes a detailed analysis of City buildout in order to provide a streamlined CEQA process for all development consistent with the land use assumptions of the General Plan.

The effort to update the General Plan involved extensive coordination with multiple consultants, City departments, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) legal counsel, and outside agencies. Throughout this process, additional direction was also provided by the City Council and Planning Commission. At the April 25, 2019 Planning Commission hearing and June 19, 2019 City Council hearing staff provided informational updates on the proposed approach to addressing the Newhall Ranch decision. Both the Commission and the Council provided support for the approach to prepare a rigorous environmental impact report and revised General Plan policies to address greenhouse gas reduction targets for anticipated development in lieu of preparing a separate Climate Action Plan.

DISCUSSION

The proposed updated General Plan addresses the legislation and case law described above through revised goals and policies and a rigorous DEIR. A complete list of the redlines to the goals and policies is provided in Table 2-1 of the Project Description section of the DEIR, and for ease of reference Table 2-1 is also included as Attachment 1 of this staff report. The DEIR is provided as Exhibit A. The proposed General Plan is provided as Exhibit B. The proposed General Plan also includes updates to remove or revise obsolete information, improve and clarify policy language, and make the document more readable and user-friendly. The entire General Plan document has a new look and feel. These changes are described in the Project Description section of the DEIR, but only the goals and policies are shown in redline, because those are the changes which affect General Plan implementation. A summary of the revisions to the goals and policies and how the revision addresses legislation is provided below.

AB 1358 and SB 743 – VMT

The existing General Plan does not contain any policy language or guidance related to VMT, in absence of which, in order to comply with SB 743, new projects would need to establish and justify a VMT significance threshold. To offer a more streamlined approach, policies CIRC4.3 and 4.4 have been added to the Circulation Element, which provide a VMT significance threshold and mitigation guidance for future projects. Because the regulatory and modeling environment related to VMT is continuing to evolve, the City has elected to avoid a policy which states a static threshold specifying an amount per capita to be achieved, out of concern it would not remain relevant. Instead, the policy refers back to new VMT Impact Standards. The General Plan Implementation Measures direct preparation of the VMT Impact Standards, describe the current threshold (15 percent below baseline) and threshold justification contained within the EIR, and

indicates that the threshold will be updated periodically. Existing policy language is also revised to focus on reducing VMT within the City by encouraging mixed-use development patterns and infill development in low VMT areas, along with increasing use of alternative transportation modes. For consistency, similar modifications are proposed to the Land Use Element (Chapter 2) policies and Air Quality and Climate Change Element (Chapter 4) policies.

Additional changes proposed to the General Plan are intended to improve clarity and provide better direction on the transportation management program (TSM) and transit service, and to incentivize infill development and promote mobility options. Within the Circulation Element a subsection on Pedestrian Access was added with the intent to increase pedestrian trips and recognizing pedestrian travel as an alternative transportation method.

Greenhouse Gasses

A secondary goal of the General Plan Update was to insulate anticipated development and provide streamlined environmental review in response to the Newhall Ranch decision. To do so, a combination of proposed General Plan policy and GHG analysis within the DEIR is provided. Additional policies have been added within the General Plan to address climate change and focus on reducing the City's GHG emissions by reducing single vehicle occupancy trips and supporting regional efforts. These new policies are primarily within the Air Quality and Climate Change Element (Chapter 4) but additional or modified policies can be found in all the other Elements. Examples include those policies that encourage infill and mixed use development, increase the availability of alternative transportation, preserve open space areas, and expand the use of alternative fuel sources as the primary fuel source.

SB 18 and AB 52 (Native American Consultation)

The proposed updates to the General Plan acknowledge the new procedures outlined in SB 18 and AB 52. Policies have been updated within the Open Space and Conservation Element (Chapter 5) to highlight these requirements. Additionally the Planning Division has prepared a separate policy document, Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation (Tribal Consultation Policy), to provide direction on tribal consultation for City projects. Staff utilized a contracted Registered Professional Archaeologist to complete the policy document. Extensive outreach and coordination also occurred with the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC). The Tribal Consultation Policy was presented as an informational item at the August 22, 2019 Planning Commission hearing, and will be brought to City Council for hearing in July or August 2020, prior to or concurrently with the General Plan Update. Acknowledgement of the Tribal Consultation Policy has been added to the General Plan as an Implementation Measure within the Appendix.

Noise

The Noise Element is being updated for clarity and revisions to the City's goals for land use and noise compatibility to reflect current best practices, including changes to the City's exterior noise compatibility standards to reflect our growing urban environment. Other changes include separating the City's standards for exterior noise and interior noise into separate policies and adding policy to address circumstances where projects are proposed in environments which already exceed the City's noise standards. The current and anticipated noise levels at buildout of the City have also been updated.

Other updates

As mentioned, the entire General Plan has been updated with a new look that includes photos and updated tables and figures. The narrative text has been reduced and simplified where possible. The intent was not only to update the content to reflect current practices but to improve the readability of document. The Implementation Measures for the goals and policies have also been moved from within each Element

to the Appendix in order to focus the body of the General Plan on policies, and provide staff the ability to maintain the implementation measures.

Conclusion

Representatives from all City Departments have aided in this update effort. The proposed document reflects a more accurate account of the City's current guiding principles and procedures, and addresses applicable legislation and case law. Additionally, in combination with the DEIR, the approval of the General Plan and certification of the EIR will provide coverage and streamlining for development that is consistent with the City's General Plan.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

In 2017, the public was notified of the City's intent to complete the Climate Action Plan and General Plan Update project and support was gained with the adoption of the General Plan Update Fee. In 2019, Planning staff provided informational updates on the project at publicized Planning Commission and City Council hearings. In-person workshops and meetings are currently not a viable option due to restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. However, staff provided early notification of the Planning Commission hearing to the Northstate Building Industry Association (BIA), Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (RCONA), and the Roseville Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) and solicited feedback. Staff also solicited feedback from the Transportation Commission and Parks & Recreation Commission via email. To date, comments from the UAIC, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and the Native American Heritage Commission have been received. In summary, the comments outlined the requirements of SB 18 and AB 52. The Planning Commission will be provided with copies of these comments, and any additional comments received, prior to the Planning Commission hearing. Barring unforeseen events, staff anticipates bringing the Draft General Plan and EIR to the City Council on August 5th for consideration.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Roseville acting as Lead Agency, prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed updates to the General Plan. The DEIR is available to view online at www.roseville.ca.us/GeneralPlan.

The DEIR determined that significant effects on the environment anticipated as a result of buildout of the City include impacts related to transportation, air quality, noise, cultural and tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and aesthetics, and significant cumulative effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, noise, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and aesthetics.

A Notice of Availability of the DEIR (Attachment 2) was published in the Roseville Press Tribune, distributed to various agencies through the State Clearinghouse, and posted to the Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations website on May 8, 2020. The notice was also mailed or e-mailed to a list of interested people, organizations, and agencies, including, but not limited to, neighboring jurisdictions, the BIA, RCONA, the Chamber. The Notice of Availability provided interested persons the opportunity to comment on the DEIR. All written comments were requested to be received no later than 5:00 pm on June 22, 2020, either in writing to Gina McColl, Planning Division, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 or via e-mail to gmccoll@roseville.ca.us.

The Planning Commission should consider this DEIR prior to recommending City Council action on the proposed project.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Division is recommending that the Planning Commission;

1. Forward all public comments received on the Draft EIR for inclusion in the Final EIR for City Council review; and
2. Recommend City Council approve the updated 2035 General Plan.

Attachments

1. General Plan Policies Redlines
2. Notice of Availability

Exhibits

- A. Draft Environmental Impact Report
- B. Draft 2035 General Plan

2.5.2 PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

This proposed General Plan Update has been updated for consistency and clarity, and to be consistent with current best practices, State laws, and the General Plan Guidelines. The following revisions are proposed as a part of this General Plan Update:

- ▶ Circulation Element: updates to reflect Assembly Bill (AB) 1358 (Complete Streets), and SB 743, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 as they relate to active transportation and travel demand management (vehicle miles traveled, or “VMT”).
- ▶ Air Quality & Climate Change Element: updates to include feasible mitigation to reduce GHG emissions.
- ▶ Open Space & Conservation Element: updates to reflect State law related to Native American consultation.
- ▶ Noise Element: updates for clarity and revisions to the City’s goals for land use and noise compatibility which reflect current best practices, including changes to the City’s exterior noise compatibility standards.

The following Table 2-1 is a summary table of changes to the goals and policies within each Element of the General Plan, with [brackets] to show the existing policy number, deletions in ~~striketrough~~, additions in **bold, underlined text**, and [*brackets with italics*] to indicate text that has been moved to or from elsewhere.

For a complete description of proposed changes to the General Plan, please refer to the draft proposed General Plan Update, under separate cover.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update	
Land Use	
Community Form: General	
Goal LU1 [Goal 1]: a. Distinction from other communities through <u>the</u> quality of development and the high level of services provided its <u>to</u> citizens. b. A commitment to preserving its small-town attributes and cultural heritage, and a dedication to promoting a strong sense of community, while preserving individual neighborhoods and promoting a prosperous business community. c. Continuing to be a family-oriented community <u>that,</u> which offers opportunities to pursue various lifestyles.	
Policy LU1.1 [Policy 1]: Ensure high-quality development in new and existing development areas, as defined through specific plans, the development review process, and <u>the</u> Community Design Guidelines.	
Policy LU1.3 [Policy 3]: Continue to provide a full range of public services and maintain high levels of service <u>for public facilities, services, transportation, open space, and parks and recreation,</u> as specified in other elements of this Plan, including the Public Facilities, Open Space and Conservation, Safety, Circulation and Parks and Recreation Elements.	
Policy LU1.6 [Policy 6]: Through development approvals and City programs (e.g., revitalization, Capital Improvement Program, parks and recreation programs, etc.), assure <u>ensure</u> that all portions of the community are linked and integrated.	
Policy LU1.7 [Community Form – Downtown, Neighborhoods, Policy 2]: Promote land use patterns that result in the dispersion of secondary or satellite services including libraries, schools, parks, public meeting places, and commercial uses throughout the community through the establishment of neighborhood centers. [<i>Moved from referenced existing policy location</i>]	

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Community Form: Development Patterns, Transportation, and Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Goal LU2 [Goal 2]: While recognizing that the automobile is the primary form of transportation, the City of Roseville should make a commitment to shift from the automobile to other modes of transportation. <u>Achieve a community form that supports convenient and safe pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access.</u>
Policy LU2.1 [Policy 1]: Promote land use <u>development</u> patterns that support a variety of transportation modes and accommodate pedestrian mobility.
Policy LU2.2 [Policy 2]: Allow for land use patterns and mixed- use development that integrates residential and non-residential land uses, such that residents may easily walk or bike to shopping, services, employment, and leisure activities.
Policy LU2.3 [Policy 3]: Concentrate higher-intensity uses and appropriate support uses in <u>Pedestrian Districts and</u> within close proximity of transit and bikeway corridors, as identified in the <u>Transit Master Plans and</u> Bicycle Master Plan. In addition, some component of public <u>Public</u> uses, such as parks, plazas, public buildings, community centers, <u>schools,</u> and/or libraries, should be located within Pedestrian Districts and transit and bikeway corridors <u>easily accessible to the public.</u>
Policy LU2.4 [Policy 4]: Promote and encourage the location of employee services, such as child care, restaurants, banking facilities, convenience markets, etc <u>and other daily needs,</u> within major employment centers for the purpose of reducing mid-day service-related vehicle trips.
Policy LU2.5 [Policy 5]: Where feasible, improve existing developed ment areas to create better pedestrian, <u>bicycle,</u> and transit accessibility.
Policy LU2.6 [Policy 6]: Through City land use planning and development approvals, Require <u>proposed</u> that neighborhood-serving uses (e.g. neighborhood commercial uses, day care, parks, schools, and other community facilities <u>and services)</u> to be physically linked with adjacent residential neighborhoods <u>through multi-modal transportation connections.</u>
Community Form: Downtown and Neighborhoods <u>Revitalization</u>
Goal LU3.1 [Goal 3]: In partnership with private interests, the City of Roseville will <u>continue to</u> promote the creation of a <u>vibrant</u> town center offering government services, social and cultural activities, and commercial opportunities in <u>Central Downtown</u> Roseville. Roseville will also encourage the creation of additional social, cultural and commercial satellite opportunities throughout the community.
Goal LU3.2 [Goal 4]: Through the designation of special study areas and revitalization efforts, the City of Roseville will promote the <u>preservation, revitalization, revitalize, and enhancement</u> of its business districts, and existing neighborhoods, <u>and mixed-use corridors.</u>
Policy LU3.1 [Policy 1]: Create and maintain a strong and identifiable downtown <u>Downtown</u> that offers the surrounding community a cluster of municipal offices and services, commercial, <u>retail, and</u> services, office <u>uses, higher education opportunities,</u> and higher-density residential uses, <u>consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan.</u>
[Policy 2]: Promote land use patterns that result in the dispersion of secondary or satellite services including libraries, schools, parks, public meeting places and commercial uses, throughout the community through the establishment of clustered community centers. [Moved to be Policy LU1.7]
Policy LU3.2 [Policy 3]: Consider accommodating a portion of the overall projected <u>Facilitate</u> population and economic growth in areas having the potential for revitalization
Policy LU3.3 [Policy 4]: The City should <u>Direct resources to facilitate revitalization of Downtown, neighborhoods in the Infill Area, and mixed-use corridors.</u> Support the revitalization of areas that are in decline or economically underutilized
Policy LU3.4 [Policy 5]: Encourage infill development and rehabilitation <u>reinvestment</u> that:
• <u>Upgrades the quality and enhances the character of existing areas;</u> • <u>Enhances the mix of land uses in proximity to one another so that more households can access services, recreation, and jobs without the use of a car;</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
• enhances Facilitates pedestrian activity and public transit use, and pedestrian access;
• Efficiently utilizes and does not overburden existing services and infrastructure; and
• Results in land use patterns and densities that provide the opportunity for the construction of a variety of household-housing types that are affordable to all income groups.
Policy LU3.7 [Policy 8]: Identify locations where special study is necessary to develop strategies for preserving, enhancing, and revitalizing these existing developed areas.
Community Form: Relationship of New Development (RND)
Policy LU4.1 [Policy 1]: Require that new development areas and associated community-wide facilities (open space resources, parks, libraries, etc.) to be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community through road networks, public transit systems, open space systems, bikeway and pedestrian systems, and other physical connections.
Policy LU4.2 [Growth Management – General, Policy 3]: The City shall Encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City.
Community Form: Jobs/Housing and Economic Development
Goal LU5.1 [Goal 6]: Roseville will strive to be a balanced complete community with a reasonable mix of land uses, housing types, and job opportunities that meet the diverse needs of its existing and future residents and businesses.
Goal LU5.2 [Goal 7]: Roseville will promote and encourage the availability of a variety of goods and services and will take measures to retain a positive business climate in the City.
Policy LU5.1 [Policy 1]: Implement Strive for a land use mix and pattern of development that provides linkages between residents' jobs and local employment-generating uses, facilitates a match between the number and type of local jobs and the local labor force, will provide an reasonable jobs to /housing balance, and will maintains the fiscal viability of the City.
Policy LU5.2 [Policy 2]: Support Apply density bonuses in for the construction of affordable housing, in accordance with the Density Bonus Ordinance and the Housing Element, to promote affordable housing options in areas particularly in areas where with few such housing opportunities exist and where and significant employment centers exist or are planned.
Policy LU5.3 [Policy 3]: Consider the fiscal impacts to the City from projects proposing a General Plan land use change Establish a standard process to analyze the fiscal impacts of proposed development and require a fiscal impact analysis of all projects proposing a significant General Plan land use change as defined through the Economic Development Study/Plan.
Policy LU5.4 [Policy 5]: The City may approve a project that is identified as having a negative fiscal impact on the City if overriding findings are made that the project benefits outweigh its impacts. Such benefits may relate to the provision of affordable housing, significant open space or recreation facilities, job creation, infill development near transit service, or other public benefits. <i>[Moved from referenced existing policy]</i>
Policy LU5.5 [Policy 4]: Uphold the City's Affordable Housing Goal by requiring an affordable housing target for projects seeking a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, and/or rezoning to a residential designation proposing 25 or more new dwelling units. For these projects, the target is a minimum of 10% of all new development to be affordable to housing units to cost no more than 30% of the total monthly income of very low-, low-income, and moderate-income households (the City also uses the term "middle" in certain Specific Plans to refer to moderate-income households earning no more than 100% of the Area Median Income-AMI). The breakdown of the affordable units will be, at a minimum, 40% for rental to very low- and 40% for rental to low-income households. The remaining 20% may be reserved for middle-income moderate-income purchase (which will be priced to be affordable to households earning 95% of the Area Median Income) or may be distributed equally among the rental obligations, as approved by the City. Variations in affordable housing ratios may be approved through a Development Agreement where the following criteria are met:
• A need has been identified for a specific affordable housing type (very low-, low- or moderate-income) and the project meets this need;
• The project does not rely on or obtain City subsidies; and

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Units proposed within this these criteria would allow for individuals to stay within their units as their future income grows.
[Policy 5]: The City may approve a project that is identified as having a negative fiscal impact on the City if overriding findings are made that the project benefits outweigh its impacts. Such benefits may relate to the provision of affordable housing, significant open space or recreation facilities, job creation, infill development near transit service, or other public benefits. [Moved to be Policy LU5.4]
Policy LU5.6 [Policy 6]: Maintain land use patterns, intensities, and densities that promote ensure an adequate supply of land for office, a positive business climate (e.g. supply of business professional, commercial, and industrial lands), industrial, and other employment-generating development.
Policy LU5.7 [Policy 7]: Support activities that attract employment uses to the City, as identified in the Economic Development Study/Plan Strategy.
Community Form: Community Involvement and Inter-Jurisdictional Cooperation
<u>Goal LU6.2: Provide inclusive community engagement opportunities for individuals and community groups to produce timely and meaningful input leading to proactive, consensus-driven actions by the City and its partners.</u>
[Goal 8]: Maintain a strong commitment to an open governmental process which stresses accessibility of City officials (e.g. staff, committees, commissions, elected officials) and opportunities for citizen participation.
Policy LU6.3 [Policy 3]: Coordinate and take a lead role, where feasible, with local, state, federal, and other jurisdictional agencies on regional issues of importance, including but not limited to air quality, climate change mitigation and resiliency, transportation, water supply, sewage treatment, solid waste disposal and recycling, flood control, hazardous waste management, resource protection, and transit.
Policy LU6.4 [Policy 4]: To the extent feasible, coordinate land use policies planning and public improvements with neighboring jurisdictions.
Policy LU6.5 [Policy 5]: Encourage early consultation with adjacent jurisdictions, and refer development proposals that may have an impact to, adjacent these jurisdictions to the respective agencies for their review and comment. Respond and comment on development proposals that are received in from other jurisdictions that may have an impact on Roseville, to minimize such impacts and ensure consistency and compatibility with existing and planned development in the City.
Community Design
Policy LU7.2 [Policy 2]: Continue to develop and apply design standards that result in efficient site and building designs, pedestrian-friendly projects that stimulate the use of alternative modes of transportation, and the establishment of functional relationships between adjacent developments.
Policy LU7.7 [Policy 8]: Encourage and promote the preservation of historic and/or unique, culturally and architecturally significant buildings, features, and important visual environments resources.
<u>Policy LU7.9: Control artificial lighting to avoid spill-over lighting onto adjacent properties. Use anti-reflective architectural materials and coatings to prevent glare.</u>
Growth Management: General
Goal LU8.1 [Goal 1]: The City shall Proactively manage and plan for growth.
Goal LU8.2 [Goal 2]: The City shall Encourage a pattern of development that promotes the efficient and timely provision of urban infrastructure and services, and that preserves valuable natural and environmental resources.
Goal LU8.4 [Goal 4]: The City shall Continue a comprehensive, logical planning process, rather than an incremental, piecemeal approach.
Goal LU8.5 [Goal 5]: The City shall Encourage public participation in the development and monitoring of growth management policies and programs.
Goal LU8.6 [Goal 6]: The City shall Manage and evaluate growth in a regional context, not in isolation.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Goal LU8.8 [Goal 8]: Growth and development must occur at a rate corresponding to the availability of desired facilities' capacity and the attainment of defined General Plan levels of service for public activities.
Goal LU8.12 [Goal 12]: The City shall Use growth management as a tool to maintain the City's identity, community form, reputation in the region, to maintain high levels of service for residents, and to influence projects outside the City's boundaries that have the potential to affect the quality of life and/or services that are provided to residents.
Policy LU8.1 [Policy 1]: Growth must provide a strong diversified economic base and a reasonable balance between employment and affordable housing.
[Policy 3]: The City shall encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City. [moved to Community Form LU4.2]
Policy LU8.3 [Policy 4]: Growth shall be managed to ensure that adequate public facilities and services, as defined in the Public Facilities Element, are planned and provided, and the public health, safety, and welfare is protected.
Policy LU8.7 [Policy 8]: <u>The City will</u> M manage growth in such a way to ensure that significant open space areas will be preserved.
Policy LU8.9 [Policy 10]: Work aggressively to address traffic generated outside of Roseville by working in collaboration with neighboring jurisdictions, regional, state, and federal entities to ensure <u>that</u> traffic through Roseville is mitigated by regional solutions. Ensure that transportation solutions are supported by land use and design policies <u>The City will encourage changes in land use mix and community design</u> that promote walking, biking, and transit, consistent with the Growth Management Visioning Committee's Vision Statement.
Policy LU8.10 [Growth Management – Public Amenities, Policy 2]: In addition to being consistent with the other goals and policies of the General Plan, S specific P plans shall comply with the following: <i>[Moved from referenced existing policy]</i>
a. Provide a public focal point, community, and/or theme feature. These features shall be specific to each area and be designed to promote and enhance community character. A special feature may include, but is not limited to, a community plaza, central park, or some other type of gathering area; outdoor amphitheater; community garden; regional park with special facilities; sports complex; or cultural facilities.
b. Provide entryways at entrances to the City in accordance with the Community Design Guidelines. Where possible, the entryways shall take advantage of and incorporate existing natural resources into the entry treatment. The S specific P plans shall identify the location and treatment of the entryways, and shall consider the use of open space, oak regeneration areas, signage, and/or special landscaping to create a visual edge or buffer that provides a strong definition to entryways into the City.
c. The S specific P plan areas shall be planned and oriented to be an integral part of the City consistent with the policies of the Community Form component of this Element.
d. Develop design guidelines, specifying screening and a transition between public utilities (e.g. substations, pump stations) and other uses, in conjunction with the public utility departments and agencies. In addition, development along power line and pipeline easements shall incorporate design treatment to ensure compatibility and safety. Design guidelines and treatment may include minimum setbacks, building and landscape design standards, and possible limitations on certain types of uses and activities.
e. Preserve natural resource areas where they exist, and where feasible, along new roadways. Such roadways may create a public boundary between the resource area and other uses. The S specific P plans shall identify locations and standards for the preservation of natural resources along roadways, and shall identify sources of financing for such road segments.
Growth Management – Land Use Allocation
[Policy 1]: 1. The city shall, through its land use planning process, Capital Improvement Plans, and facility and service programs, provide a land use dwelling unit allocation at buildout as shown in Table II-4 and non-residential entitlements as designated on the General Plan Land Use Map.
[Policy 2]: The City shall maintain a pool of 1,000 residential units to be allocated for City sponsored and state mandated programs (e.g. second units, density bonuses for affordable housing, infill revitalization, annexations of island areas to

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
complete corporate boundaries as reflected on Figure II-1) to be utilized in areas where existing development entitlements exist or to further city affordable housing goals.
[Policy 3]: The City shall review, and if necessary, modify, the 1,000-unit pool in conjunction with regular updates of the housing element, and concurrent with any significant modification to the General Plan resulting in the allocation of additional residential units.
Growth Management – New Growth Areas
Goal LU9.13 [Goal 13]: New development shall be consistent with the City’s desire to establish an edge along the western boundary of the City that fosters: a physical separation from County lands through a system of connected open space; a well-defined sense of entry to City from <u>the</u> west; opportunities for habitat preservation and recreation; and view preservation corridors that provide an aesthetic and recreational resource for residents.
Policy LU9.1 [Policy 1]: The City may consider modification to the General Plan land use allocation for new growth where adequate public services and facilities and preservation and conservation of natural resources can be provided in conjunction with the following:
a. <u>Additional</u> land to accommodate demand for housing or employment uses
b. Projects that will provide public community benefits to the City, including, but not limited to the provision of public transit services
c. Ensure that growth provides benefits to the community as a whole and weigh community benefits against public costs
Policy LU9.2 [Policy 2]: Prior to the consideration of any General Plan amendment to modify the land use allocation land use designations or expand the City’s boundaries or <u>S</u> phere of <u>I</u> nfluence, the City shall complete or cause to be completed the following City-wide studies/plans:
a. Long-range transit plan
b. Economic Development Fiscal studies
c. Public facilities and services capacity study
d. Transportation system capacity study
e. <u>Utility capacity and supply (i.e., water, sewer, drainage, and electric)</u>
Policy LU9.4 [Policy 4]: Specific plans will be evaluated based on the following minimum criteria:
a. Government Code requirements for specific plans
b. Demonstrated consistency with General Plan goals and policies
c. Demonstrated consistency with the identified City-wide studies and holding capacity analyses
d. Justification for proposed specific plan boundaries
e. Community benefit <u>(e.g., affordable housing, significant open space or recreation facilities, job creation, infill development near transit service).</u>
f. Ability to <u>substantially</u> mitigate impacts
g. Impact on the City’s growth pattern
Each specific plan proposal shall include, with its initial submittal, a full analysis of how the plan complies with, and relates to the above factors. The specific plans’ consistency with the General Plan, and its relation to other identified criteria, will be a primary factor in determining whether the proposal will or will not be considered by the City.
Policy LU9.5 [Policy 5]: Apply the City’s adopted Guiding Principles for Growth to any new development proposed in and out of City’s corporate boundaries, which that is not already part of an adopted Specific Plan or within the Infill Area:
1. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall, on a stand-alone basis, have an overall net neutral or positive fiscal impact on the City’s General Fund Services.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
2. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall include logical growth/plan boundaries. and an east to west growth pattern.
3. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall not conflict <u>create a direct or indirect conflict</u> with the <u>ongoing operations of the Pleasant Grove and or Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant operations or any future Power Generation Facility City-owned power generation facilities.</u>
4. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall maintain the integrity of existing neighborhoods and create a sense of place in new neighborhoods.
5. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall include a plan to ensure fully funding and maintenance of improvements and services at no cost to existing residents (including increased utility rates). A proposal shall not burden, increase the cost <u>of</u> , or diminish the supply and or reliability of <u>public</u> services.
6. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall aid in regional traffic <u>transportation</u> solutions and in right-of-way preservation.
7. Any <u>new</u> development proposal that does not have a sufficient supply of surface water shall secure additional supplies above what the City currently has available. New dDevelopment proposals shall also provide the funding necessary to incorporate the new source of supply into the City's water supply portfolio (surface water, groundwater and recycled water); and <u>new</u> development proposals shall include measures to reduce water demand by implementing the use of conservation best management practices, recycled water, and other off-sets.
8. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall consider development potential within the entire City/County Memorandum of Understanding Transition Area in the design and sizing of infrastructure improvements.
9. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall aid in resolution of regional storm water retention.
10. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall incorporate mechanisms to ensure new schools, <u>and, if necessary, new schools</u> are available to serve the residents <u>anticipated for new development and that new development does not adversely affect</u> and shall not impact existing schools.
11. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall include a significant interconnected public open space component/conservation plan <u>consistent</u> in coordination with the City of Roseville/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Memorandum of Understanding.
12. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall include a public participation component to keep the public informed and solicit feedback throughout the specific plan process.
13. Any <u>new</u> development proposal shall provide a " <u>public-community</u> benefit" to the City and residents.
Policy LU9.6 [Policy 6]: As new development is proposed in or outside the City's Sphere of Influence, project proponents shall provide a transitional area between City and County lands, through a system of <u>managed</u> interconnecting Open Space land areas <u>open space</u> or other buffers, such as separation by arterial roadways.
Policy LU9.8 [Policy 8]: New development proposals to the <u>north and</u> west of the City limits Fiddymont Road within the County/City Memorandum of Understanding Transition Area shall meet the objectives and terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Roseville and the County of Placer.
Policy LU9.9 [Policy 9]: Development proposed on the western edge of the City shall provide a distinctive open space transition to create a physical and visual buffer between the City and County to that assure <u>ensures</u> that the identity and uniqueness of the City and County will be maintained.
Policy LU9.10 [Policy 10]: Consistent with the County/City Memorandum of Understanding Transition Area , the City shall continue to support and endorse the maintenance of the one-mile buffer zone around landfill operations, as set forth in Policy No. 4.G.11 of the Placer County General Plan, adopted in August 1994. <u>The buffer zone should, consistent with relevant establish performance criteria, be sufficient to maintain the long-term viability of the landfill, while at the same time protecting City residences from nuisances.</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Growth Management—Public Amenities
[Policy 1]: The City may determine, in accordance with the goals and policies of this element, that it is appropriate to amend its General Plan land use allocation and expand. Under such circumstances, a specific plan will be required to comprehensively plan each of the areas.
[Policy 2] In addition to being consistent with the other goals and policies of the General Plan, specific plans shall comply with the following: <i>[Moved to be Policy LU8.10]</i>
a. Provide a public focal point, community, and/or theme feature. These features shall be specific to each area and be designed to promote and enhance community character. A special feature may include, but is not limited to, a community plaza, central park, or some other type of gathering area; outdoor amphitheater; community garden; regional park with special facilities; sports complex; or cultural facilities.
b. Provide entryways at entrances to the City in accordance with the Community Design Guidelines. Where possible, the entryways shall take advantage of and incorporate existing natural resources into the entry treatment. The specific plans shall identify the location and treatment of the entryways, and shall consider the use of open space, oak regeneration areas, signage, and/or special landscaping to create a visual edge or buffer that provides a strong definition to entryways into the City.
c. The specific plan areas shall be planned and oriented to be an integral part of the City consistent with the policies of the Community Form component of this Element.
d. Develop design guidelines, specifying screening and a transition between public utilities (e.g. substations, pump stations) and other uses, in conjunction with the public utility departments and agencies. In addition, development along power line and pipeline easements shall incorporate design treatment to ensure compatibility and safety. Design guidelines and treatment may include minimum setbacks, building and landscape design standards, and possible limitations on certain types of uses and activities.
e. Preserve natural resource areas where they exist, and where feasible, along new roadways. Such roadways may create a public boundary between the resource area and other uses. The specific plans shall identify locations and standards for the preservation of natural resources along roadways, and shall identify sources of financing for such road segments.
f. The specific plans shall include a resource mitigation / banking plan to be developed in accordance with the provisions of the Open Space and Conservation Element.
Growth Management – Annexations and Sphere of Influence
<u>Goal LU10: Evaluate Sphere of Influence amendments and annexations that promote efficient use of land and public service provision and advance General Plan goals.</u>
Policy LU10.1 [Policy 1]: The City may initiate studies to investigate the potential of (1) annexing areas within its Sphere Of of Influence; and (2) expanding its Sphere of Influence sphere of influence boundaries. The studies should be focused on those areas that, both long and short term , may affect General Plan goals and policies and would be logically served and planned by the City. The studies shall include the identification, availability, and funding of public services, as well as the costs and impacts to the City and other service providers. Issues to be analyzed include, but are not limited to, present and planned land uses, water, sewer, electric, library, parks, schools, circulation, and affordable housing. Based on these studies, and resident and property owner input, the City may take steps to annex or expand its Sphere of Influences sphere of influence .
Policy LU10.2 [Policy 2]: The City may consider annexations that:
Are consistent with State state Law law and Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) standards and criteria;
Policy LU10.3 [Policy 3]: The City may consider expanding its Sphere of Influence sphere of influence to incorporate areas that, in the future, should be logically planned and serviced by Roseville. The City shall consider the following factors, as identified by LAFCO, when making determinations involving Sphere of Influence sphere of influence boundaries:

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Circulation
Functional Classification Section
Policy CIRC1.1 [Policy 1]: Establish a The functional classification system to shall guide the planning and design of the City's roadway system.
Policy CIRC1.3 [Policy 3]: Establish Maintain a comprehensive set of design standards for the City's roadway system by functional class.
Policy CIRC1.5: <u>Design intersections and public rights-of-ways in accordance with state and federal accessibility requirements.</u>
Levels of Service
Goal CIRC2: Maintain an adequate appropriate level of transportation service for all of Roseville's residents, and employees, and consumers through a balanced transportation system which that considers automobiles, and transit users , bicyclists, and pedestrians.
Policy CIRC2.1 [Policy 1]: Maintain a level of service (LOS) "C" standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections and roadway segments in the City during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to the LOS "C" standard may be considered for intersections where the City finds that the required improvements are unacceptable based on established criteria identified in the implementation measures required to achieve the standard would adversely affect pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access, or where feasible LOS improvements and travel-demand-reducing strategies have been exhausted. [In addition, Pedestrian Districts may be exempted from the LOS standard. <i>Moved to CIRC2.5</i>]
Policy CIRC2.2 [Policy 2]: Strive to meet the level of service standards through a balanced transportation system that reduces the auto emissions that contribute to climate change by providing alternatives to the automobile and avoiding excessive vehicle congestion through roadway improvements, Intelligent Transportation Systems, <u>pedestrian and bicycle improvements</u> , and transit improvements.
Policy CIRC2.5 [Policy 5]: Enable the City to designate a Pedestrian District over a geographic area for the purpose of implementing measures that promote pedestrian walkability and reduce total vehicle miles traveled and resultant air pollution emissions that contribute to climate change. In these districts, the City recognizes that pedestrian and bicycle travel takes and transit access have a higher priority than automobile travel, which could reduce the vehicular level of service. <u>in the City's Pedestrian Districts, and development projects in these areas are exempt from the City's LOS standard.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC2.6: Prioritize investments in pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access in Pedestrian Districts.</u>
Transit
Goal CIRC3 [Goal 1]: Promote Provide a safe, convenient, and efficient transit system, utilizing both bus and rail modes, to to enhance mobility ; reduce congestion; reduce auto emissions, including emissions that contribute to climate change; improve the environment; and provide viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through Roseville.
Policy CIRC3.1 [Policy 1]: Pursue and support transit services within the community and region and pursue land use, design, and other mechanisms that promote the use of such services. <u>Promote transit service that is convenient, cost-effective, and responsive to the challenges and opportunities of serving Roseville and surrounding communities, and explore opportunities for transit innovation and service improvements.</u>
Policy CIRC3.3 [Policy 3]: Continue to study options for introducing Bus Rapid Transit <u>high quality transit and/or extending other regional transit linkages to Roseville and developing convenient connections to Sacramento Regional Transit</u> light rail service to Roseville.
Policy CIRC3.5 [Policy 5]: Consider the transit <u>access to health care, community services and employment, and the needs of seniors, minorities, low income persons, persons with disabilities, and other persons who may be transit-dependent when making decisions regarding transit service.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC3.6: Identify opportunities to increase the number and/or capacity of park-and-ride lots as needed, to increase transit and carpool/vanpool use.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC3.7: Pursue transit routes that optimize ridership</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
<u>Policy CIRC3.8: Include transit improvements with new roadway or roadway expansion projects.</u>
Travel Demand Management (renamed from “Transportation Systems Management”
Goal CIRC4 [Goal 1]: Reduce travel demand vehicle miles traveled on the City's and regional roadway systems, while expanding mobility options for residents, employees, and visitors.
Goal 2: Reduce total vehicle emissions in the City of Roseville and the South Placer County region.
Policy CIRC4.1 [Policy 1]: Continue to enforce the City's TSM ordinance and monitor its effectiveness. <u>The City will review and condition projects, as appropriate, to reduce travel demand per capita and per employee by promoting increased density near transit, improving the quality of non-vehicular transportation options, providing incentives for non-vehicular travel, encouraging the mixing of complementary land uses in proximity to one another, and using other feasible methods.</u>
Policy CIRC4.2 [Policy 2]: Work with appropriate agencies to develop implementation measures to reduce vehicular travel demand and total vehicle miles traveled and meet air quality goals.
<u>Policy CIRC4.3: Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects not included in a Specific Plan shall be evaluated for consistency with the City’s VMT Impact Standards.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC4.4: If the evaluation required by CIRC4.3 finds a Specific Plan Amendment or land use development project not included in an adopted Specific Plan is inconsistent with thresholds established within the City’s VMT Impact Standards, on-site land use, transportation, and urban design-related VMT-reducing features should be prioritized to demonstrate consistency. If feasible on-site features cannot achieve the VMT threshold, Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects outside Specific Plan Areas may demonstrate equivalent consistency through off-site actions or fair-share fee contributions, or if consistency cannot be achieved, shall implement all feasible measures.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC4.5: Policy CIRC4.3 does not apply to projects that propose residential or office uses in Transit Priority Areas or low-VMT areas. Low-VMT areas are those shown by the General Plan travel demand model or the SCS travel demand model to have per-capita, per-employee, or per-service-population VMT rates that are at least 15 percent less than the baseline citywide or regional rate.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC4.6: Promote and incentivize Infill development, particularly affordable housing development, through assistance in obtaining outside grant funding and reductions or deferrals in impact fees.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC4.7: Continue to educate the public and business community about alternative modes of travel through Safe Routes to School, Transportation Systems Management, and other local and regional programs and events.</u>
Bikeways/Trails
[Goal 3] Establish education, encouragement and enforcement programs that increase bicyclist and motorist awareness of the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists in order to foster a climate of acceptance for bike riding. [Moved to be Policy CIRC5.6]
Goal CIRC5.4 [Goal 4]: Obtain Maintain the Bicycle Friendly Community Designation from the League of American Bicyclists.
Policy CIRC5.1 [Policy 1]: Develop a comprehensive and safe system of recreational and commuter bicycle routes and trails that provides connections between the City's major employment destinations (including employment) and housing areas and between its existing and planned bikeways.
Policy CIRC5.3 [Policy 4]: Enhance bicycle education, encouragement, and enforcement programs targeted at adult and child bicyclists and motorists.
<u>Policy CIRC5.5: Specific Plans shall incorporate an off-street, Class I bicycle system as part of the comprehensive on-street and off-street bikeway plan.</u>
Policy CIRC5.6 [Goal 3]: Establish Educate Education, encourage encouragement, and enforcement programs that increase bicyclist and motorist awareness of the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists in order to foster a climate of acceptance for bike riding. <i>[Moved from the referenced existing policy]</i>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
<u>Policy CIRC5.7: Include on-street and off-street bicycle improvements with new roadway and roadway expansion projects.</u>
Pedestrian Access [new Circulation Element component]
<u>Goal CIRC6.1: Increase the percentage of pedestrian trips in Roseville.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC6.1: Establish and maintain a safe and continuous pedestrian network that provides connections between residential areas and commercial retail and services, employment, public services, parks, and public transit.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC6.2: Promote development patterns that encourage people to walk to destinations.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC6.3: Enhance pedestrian-friendly street environments and design public spaces and destinations in a way that encourages walking.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC6.4: Sidewalks shall be required in all new Specific Plan Areas with new roadway construction and with roadway expansion.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC6.5: In reviewing proposed development projects and implementing public projects, the City will incorporate standards designed to protect the security of pedestrians and minimize the potential for collisions involving pedestrians.</u>
<u>Policy CIRC6.6: In the Infill Area, the City will actively seek funding sources to complete and maintain sidewalk networks.</u>
<u>Air Quality and Climate Change</u>
Goal AQ1.1 [Goal 1]: Improve Roseville's air quality by: a) Achieving and <u>Reduce local air pollutant emissions to assist with meeting and</u> maintaining ambient air quality standards established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board; and, b) and <u>and</u> minimizing public exposure to toxic or hazardous air pollutants and air pollutants that create a public nuisance through irritation to the senses (such as unpleasant odors).
Goal AQ1.3 [Goal 3]: Encourage the coordination <u>Coordinate</u> and integration of all forms of public transport to, while reducing motor vehicle emissions, through a decrease in the average daily vehicular trips and vehicle miles traveled, while encouraging an increase in, and by increasing the commute vehicle occupancy rate by 50% to 1.5 or more persons per vehicle.
Goal AQ1.4 [Goal 4]: Increase the capacity of the <u>pedestrian, bicycle, and transit</u> transportation systems and <u>and</u> Promote and the share of City-owned vehicular transportation that uses less-polluting fuels, such as electricity, including the roadway system and alternate modes of transportation.
Goal AQ1.5 [Goal 5]: Provide adequate pedestrian and bikeway <u>bicycle</u> facilities for present and future transportation needs.
Goal AQ1.6 [Policy 6]: Promote a well-designed and efficient light rail and transit system.
Goal AQ1.7 [Policy 7]: While recognizing that the automobile is the primary form of transportation, the City of Roseville should make a commitment to shift from the automobile to other modes of transportation. <u>Improve transit, biking, bicycle, and pedestrian access to lessen dependence on automobile travel and reduce household transportation costs.</u>
<u>Goal AQ1.8: Reduce City greenhouse gas emissions, consistent with local, regional, and state goals.</u>
<u>Goal AQ1.9: Enhance Roseville's resilience to local impacts of climate change.</u>
Policy AQ1.1 [Policy 1]: Cooperate with other agencies to develop a consistent and an effective approach to <u>reducing</u> air pollution planning .
Policy AQ1.2 [Policy 2]: Work with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District to monitor air pollutants of concern on a continuous basis, <u>and support Air District efforts to minimize emissions from stationary sources.</u>
Policy AQ1.3 [Policy 3]: <u>Projects that could generate substantial air pollutant emissions or expose sensitive uses to substantial air pollutant concentrations should incorporate strategies to reduce operational emissions, applicable emissions control exposure to such emissions using measures recommended by the Placer County Air Pollution</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
<u>Control District, and other relevant applicable, feasible strategies, as needed, to avoid significant air quality impacts</u> Develop consistent and accurate procedures for evaluating the air quality impacts of new projects.
<u>Policy AQ1.5: Coordinate with local and regional non-profits and other agencies to substantially increase Roseville's tree canopy, which serves as a natural air pollutant filtration system that can counter the urban heat island effect. Focus on neighborhoods without a tree canopy and areas prioritized for natural habitat restoration.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.6: Require new development and City projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions sources in the Planning Area to the greatest degree feasible.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.7: The City will participate in and support regional greenhouse gas reduction and adaptation programs that are consistent with the General Plan and have available funding.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.8: Use the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and regional collaborations to guide implementation of adaptation and resilience strategies associated with the anticipated local impacts of climate change.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.9: Preserve and enhance carbon sequestration resources in the City to improve air quality and reduce net greenhouse gas emissions.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.10: Improve overall health and sustainability of the community by reducing emissions of greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.11: Promote local purchase and use of electric vehicles through incentives and strategic expansion of charging infrastructure.</u>
Policy AQ1.12 [Policy 5] Policy 5: Develop transportation systems that minimize vehicle delay and <u>reduce vehicle emissions by improving the desirability of walking, bicycling, and public transportation relative to vehicular travel air pollution.</u>
Policy AQ1.13 [Policy 6] Policy 6: Develop consistent and accurate procedures for mitigating transportation emissions from new and existing projects <u>Identify feasible strategies to reduce and transportation associated with existing development within the Planning Area.</u>
Policy AQ1.14 [Policy 7] Policy 7: Encourage alternative modes of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle, and transit usage use.
<u>Policy AQ1.15: Promote and incentivize low-emissions vehicles and associated charging infrastructure. Pursue funding from state programs and other sources to facilitate local purchase and use of electric vehicles.</u>
Policy AQ1.16 [Policy 9]: Encourage <u>Implement</u> land use policies that maintain and improve air quality <u>and expand opportunities for transit-oriented development, which allows residents to significantly reduce vehicular transportation and associated air pollutant emissions.</u>
Policy AQ1.17 [Policy 10]: Conserve energy and reduce air <u>pollutant</u> emissions by encouraging energy efficient building designs and transportation systems <u>and promoting energy efficiency retrofits of existing structures.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.18: Promote building and transportation energy efficiency in new residential and commercial development through encouraging and incentivizing implementation measures early in the design and development process.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.19: Encourage energy efficiency by identifying potential cost savings, resource, and health benefits.</u>
Policy AQ1.20 [Policy 8]: <i>Separate air pollution-sensitive land uses from sources of harmful air pollution.</i>
Policy AQ1.21 [Policy 11]: Protect City residents from the risks involved in the transport, distribution, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, <u>and coordinate with other agencies and organizations to reduce existing sources of health risk.</u>
<u>Policy AQ1.22: Support improvements to diesel engines, limits on idling, and incorporation of technology and management practices that reduce harmful emissions at the Rail Yard.</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Open Space and Conservation
Open Space System
Goal OS1.1 [Goal 1]: Establish a comprehensive system of public and private open space, including interconnected open space corridors that should include <u>include</u> oak woodlands, riparian areas, grasslands, wetlands, and other open space resources.
Goal OS1.2 [Goal 2]: Utilize the open space system to connect neighborhoods and separate development areas within the City.
Goal OS1.3 [Goal 3]: Provide access to public open space areas through the establishment of a series <u>network</u> of public linkages <u>pedestrian and bicycle trails</u> that will be adequately managed and protected.
[Goal 5]: Consider alternatives to City ownership and management of open space preserve areas. <i>[moved to be Policy OS1.7]</i>
Policy OS1.3 [Policy 3]: Work with adjacent jurisdictions to connect the City with regional open space and trail systems, providing a network of open space and habitat resources, pathways, and, where reasonable <u>feasible</u> , equestrian trails through the City to link nearby communities.
Policy OS1.4 [Policy 4]: Require all new development to provide <u>pedestrian and bicycle</u> linkages to existing and planned open space systems. Where such access cannot be provided through the creation of open space connections, identify alternative linkages.
Policy OS1.6 [Policy 6]: Take into account consideration of natural habitat areas in developing <u>when designating</u> linkages <u>access to</u> , and in preserving open space areas. Identify alternate sites <u>locations and design</u> for linkages <u>access</u> where sensitive habitat areas have the potential to be adversely impacted.
Policy OS1.7 [Goal 5]: Consider alternatives to City ownership and management of open space preserve areas. <i>[Moved from referenced existing policy]</i>
<u>Policy OS1.12: In new development, properties adjoining open space should be oriented toward this open space in order to reduce maintenance, security, and aesthetic concerns. Not more than 50 percent of residential and non-residential properties, as measured by the length of adjoining parcel boundaries, should back up to adjacent open space.</u>
Vegetation and Wildlife
Goal OS2.2 [Goal 2]: Maintain healthy, and well-managed, <u>and connected</u> habitat areas in conjunction with one another, <u>that</u> maximizing the potential for compatible open space <u>habitat preservation and compatible</u> recreation, and visual experiences.
Policy OS2.1 [Policy 1]: Incorporate existing trees into development projects, <u>with an Particular emphasis</u> shall be placed on avoiding the removal of groupings or groves of trees. and w Where preservation is not feasible, continue to require mitigation for the loss of removed trees. Particular emphasis shall be placed on avoiding the removal of groupings or groves of trees.
Policy OS2.2 [Policy 2]: Preserve and rehabilitate <u>restore</u> continuous riparian corridors and adjacent habitat along the City's creeks and waterways.
Policy OS2.6 [Policy 6]: Provide for <u>the</u> protection and enhancement of native fishery resources, including as informed by <u>as informed by</u> continued coordination with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to release water into Linda Creek.
Policy OS2.7 [Policy 7]: Require <u>consistency with the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan for dedication and management of on-site wetland</u> cumulative mitigation plans for wetlands, where feasible, in association with <u>as part of</u> Specific Plans <u>new development</u> .
Policy OS2.8 [Policy 8]: Consider substitute <u>off</u> -site mitigation for federally non-regulated wetlands, provided that such mitigation will provide comparable habitat values.
Policy OS2.9 [Policy 9]: Limit the access of pedestrians and cyclists to vernal pool and wetland areas so that access is compatible with long-term protection of these natural resource areas, <u>consistent with the City's Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan.</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Policy OS2.10 [Policy 10]: Manage public <u>open space preserves</u> lands with <u>that can provide habitat for</u> special-status species to encourage propagation of the species and discourage <u>spread of</u> non-indigenous, invasive species, <u>consistent with the City's Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan</u> .
Policy OS2.12 [Policy 12]: Consider the use of City property for habitat preservation and mitigation requirements resulting from <u>new</u> development proposals when such efforts do not conflict with existing resources, recreational opportunities, or other City goals, policies, or programs.
<u>Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge</u>
Policy OS3.1 [Policy 1]: Utilize cost-effective urban run-off controls, including Best Management Practices, <u>such as low impact development and naturalized stormwater management features</u> , to <u>reduce the rate of stormwater runoff</u> and limit urban pollutants from entering the watercourses.
<u>Historical, and Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources</u>
Goal OS4.1 [Goal 1]: Strengthen Roseville's unique identity through the protection of its archaeological, historic, <u>paleontological</u> , and <u>tribal</u> cultural resources.
<u>Policy OS4.1: Consult with local Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with resources that could be affected by City plans or projects, identify areas that may be of cultural or tribal cultural significance, and determine appropriate treatment for the areas.</u>
Policy OS4.3 [Policy 2]: When feasible, incorporate significant archaeological and <u>tribal cultural resource</u> sites into open space areas.
Policy OS4.4 [Policy 3]: Subject to approval by <u>The City shall coordinate with</u> the appropriate federal, state, local agencies, and Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) Tribes upon discovery of artifacts. <u>The City shall offer the Maidu Museum & Historic Site as a temporary housing location for artifacts</u> that are discovered and subsequently determined to be "removable," should be offered for dedication to the Maidu Interpretive Center Museum & Historic Site.
Policy OS4.6 [Policy 5]: <u>Buildings and other resources that have historical or architectural value should be preserved, wherever feasible, and the City will encourage private property owners to preserve and maintain or renovate significant historic resources, consistent with applicable Department of the Interior historic preservation standards.</u> Establish standards for the designation, improvement and protection of buildings, landmarks, and sites of cultural and historic character.
Policy OS4.7 [Policy 6]: <u>Participate in countywide inventories of historical sites</u> Participate in the completion of a countywide inventory of historical sites.
Policy OS4.9 [Policy 8]: Explore <u>Pursue</u> funding for cultural, archaeological, and historic programs and activities.
Policy OS4.10 [Policy 9]: Provide opportunities to <u>for</u> public awareness and education through coordination with the <u>Roseville</u> Historical Society and local schools.
<u>Policy OS4.11: Provide guidance to construction personnel for recognizing paleontological resources and when items of paleontological significance are discovered within the City, a qualified paleontologist shall be called to evaluate the find and to recommend proper action.</u>
<u>Parks and Recreation</u>
Goal PR1.1 [Goal 1]: Provide adequate park land, recreational facilities, and <u>a wide variety of programs, activities, and educational opportunities</u> programs within the City of Roseville through <u>using</u> public and private resources.
Goal PR1.2 [Goal 2]: <u>Maximize the use of dedicated park lands and open space areas to provide</u> residents with both active/ <u>formal/programmable</u> and <u>passive/informal/non-programmed</u> recreation opportunities by maximizing the use of dedicated park lands and open space areas.
Policy PR1.1 [Policy 1]: The City shall ensure the provision of nine acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, <u>but may waive parkland acreage and fee requirements in targeted reinvestment areas, such as along mixed-use corridors in the Infill Area and the Downtown and Riverside Gateway Specific Plan Areas</u> except in certain instances in the Riverside and Downtown Specific Plan areas.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Policy PR1.2 [Policy 2]: Retain flexibility in applying park lands standards, in terms of size, facilities, and service areas, so that existing and future needs can be met.
Policy PR1.3 [Policy 3]: The City may consider allocating park credits for lands <u>open space lands</u> that provides active and/or passive recreational value <u>to residents as counting toward the parkland standards.</u>
<u>Policy PR1.4: The City will consider payment of in-lieu fees for both development and parkland as an alternative to dedication of land in order to achieve the parkland standard.</u>
<u>Policy PR1.5: The City shall prioritize discretionary and grant funding for areas of the community that are underserved in terms of access to passive and active recreation opportunities.</u>
<u>Policy PR1.6: Identify opportunities to develop additional parks or other public recreation facilities in underserved areas of the community where access to such facilities exceeds a one-half mile walking distance for residents.</u>
<u>Policy PR1.7: Continue to collaborate with the local school district on planning, financing, and development of joint-use park and recreational facilities.</u>
Policy PR1.10 [Policy 6]: Take into consideration energy efficiency and water conservation, including the use of treated wastewater, in park <u>design and development of parks, streetscapes, and paseos and design.</u>
Policy PR1.12 [Policy 8]: Require that p <u>Parks and recreational facilities in new development areas be phased or fully completed so as to should be available as by the time adjacent residential uses are developed occupied.</u>
[Policy 9]: Continue to maintain and upgrade as necessary City parks and open space areas through the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department, to assure safe, clean and orderly facilities. [Moved to Implementation Measures]
[Policy 10]: Continue to provide a wide variety of programs, activities, and educational opportunities for the community. [Moved to be Goal PR1.1]
Policy PR1.13 [Policy 11]: Through parks and recreation facilities and programs, A commodate those with special needs <u>through parks and recreation facilities and programs,</u> including <u>for</u> teenagers, seniors, and the disabled <u>people with disabilities,</u> and meet the requirements of the Americans <u>with</u> Disabilities Act.
Policy PR1.14 [Policy 12]: Ensure that <u>adequate funding is provided for initial development and ongoing maintenance and operation of</u> new public parks, and recreation facilities, open space, paseos, landscape areas and greenways. provide adequate funding for initial development, as well as ongoing maintenance and operation.
Public Facilities
Civic Center, Community Facilities, and Maintenance Facilities
Goal PF1.1 [Goal 1]: Continue to focus City administrative facilities downtown <u>Downtown</u> by providing efficient expansion opportunities to fill future needs, good public service and access, and a quality civic architectural image for the downtown area.
Policy PF1.1 [Policy 1]: <u>The City will plan for and maintain adequate City facilities in the Downtown area.</u> Continue to implement the Civic Center Master Plan
Policy PF1.2 [Policy 2]: Develop clustered community facilities, including libraries, parks, schools, community centers, and public meeting places, to maintain high <u>high</u> -quality services at the neighborhood level.
<u>Policy PF1.3: Explore collaborative or co-location agreements with public and private organizations and businesses where needed facility expansion by the City is not feasible due to limited resources and/or space.</u>
[Policy 3]: Implement the Corporation Yard Master Plan, including consolidation and expansion of existing maintenance services, at the Hilltop site.
<u>Policy PF1.4: Ensure the costs of ongoing maintenance and operations are fully considered when planning and designing new capital facilities.</u>
Public Library System
Goal PF2.3 [Goal 3]: Create environments that encourage opportunities for self-learning, <u>and</u> cultural and civic engagement.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Policy PF2.2 [Policy 2]: Maintain the library in downtown Downtown Roseville as a key public service to revitalizing Downtown Roseville.
Policy PF2.3 [Policy 3]: Provide libraries throughout the City to locally service residents, with a focus on Consideration should be given to accessible, relatively higher-density and infill areas that are along major transit routes that utilize public transportation .
Policy PF2.4 [Policy 4]: Provide branch libraries to service population increments of ≈ approximately 40,000. The City shall give priority to the construction of new libraries in communities that are deficient in library services.
Policy PF2.5 [Policy 5]: Plan for the clustering and connection of community facilities in neighborhood centers that include, including parks, libraries, and community centers, and other complementary uses .
Policy PF2.6 [Policy 6]: Continue to partner with local school districts, businesses, community members, and Placer County in the provision of high high -quality library services.
Policy PF2.7 [Policy 7]: Encourage the transition of libraries as multi-functional facilities, cultural centers, gathering spaces, and as venues for programs, including arts-related events and programs .
Schools
Goal PF3.1 [Goal 1]: The provision of adequate school facilities is a community priority. The school districts and the City will work closely together to obtain adequate funding and site identify locations for new school facilities. If necessary, and where legally feasible, new development may be required to contribute, on the basis of need generated, 100% of the cost for new facilities.
Goal PF3.2 [Goal 2]: The City and the school districts enjoy encourage a mutually-beneficial arrangement in the joint-use of school and public facilities. Joint-use facilities shall be encouraged in all cases unless there are overriding circumstances that make it impossible or detrimental to either the school district or the City's park and recreation facilities/programs.
[Goal 3]: School facilities shall be available for use in a timely manner. <i>[Addressed by Policy FP3.2]</i>
Policy PF3.1 [Policy 1]: The City and the school districts will work cooperatively with the school districts to explore all local and State funding sources in order to secure adequate funding for new school facilities.
[Policy 2 addressed by Policy FP3.2]: Adequate facilities must be shown to be available in a timely manner before approval will be granted to new residential development.
Policy PF3.2 [Policy 3]: Financing for new school facilities will be encouraged to should be identified and secured before new development is approved, where feasible .
Policy PF3.4 [Policy 5]: The City and the school districts will work together to develop criteria for the designation of school sites, and consider the opportunities for reducing the cost of land for school facilities, and work to minimize the impact of school traffic on the adjacent neighborhoods vehicular traffic by ensuring Encourage opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian connections . The City shall encourage the school districts to comply with City standards in the design and landscaping of school facilities.
Policy PF3.5 [Policy 6]: For proposed joint -use facilities, The City and the school districts will prepare a joint use study for each school facility to determine the feasibility of joint-use facilities. If determined to be feasible, a joint-use agreement will be pursued will pursue joint -use agreements to maximize public use of facilities, minimize duplication of services provided, and identify operational and maintenance responsibilities , and facilitate shared financial and operational responsibilities.
Policy PF3.7 [Policy 8]: Schools, where feasible, shall should be located away from hazards or sensitive resource conservation areas, except where the proximity of resources may be of educational value and the protection of the resource is reasonably assured.
<u>Policy PF3.9: Higher educational opportunities are a priority to the City and the region. The City will look for opportunities to support the establishment of universities and colleges in Placer County.</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Electric Utility
Goal PF4.1 [Goal 1]: <u>Reliability: maintain a resilient and highly reliable electric system with sufficient resource capacity and reserves to meet current and future demand.</u> municipal electric utility that provides an efficient, economical, and reliable electric system.
<u>Goal PF4.2: Affordability: fulfill customer electric service needs at just and reasonable rates.</u>
Goal PF4.3 [Goal 2]: <u>Compliance: Comply with applicable local, state, and federal mandates.</u> Provide electric services to all existing and future Roseville development areas through the City's Electric Utility. The provision of services by another provider may be considered where it is determined that such service is beneficial to the City and its utility customers or the provision of City services is not feasible.
[Goal 3]: Maintain adequate sufficient resource reserves capacity consistent with industry standards, sound utility planning, and applicable contracts.
[Goal 4]: Aggressively pursue cost effective and environmentally safe alternative sources of energy and energy conservation measures.
Policy PF4.1 [Policy 1]: Secure new <u>supply-side and demand-side</u> electric resources, and transmission as necessary, to meet projected demand levels <u>forecasted demand and reserve requirements.</u>
Policy PF4.2 [Policy 2]: Provide improvements to the sub-transmission and distribution system, consistent with facility planning studies, to ensure <u>maintain</u> a reliable source of electricity is maintained.
<u>Policy PF4.4: Comply with federal, state, and local greenhouse gas reduction targets, including the renewable portfolio standards and carbon-free electricity requirements.</u>
[Policy 4]: Extend existing resource contracts if found to be in the best interest of the City.
[Policy 5]: Explore the feasibility of the development of and participation in renewable energy resources.
Policy PF4.5 [Policy 6]: Adopt <u>Maintain an Integrated</u> load/ <u>Resource</u> management p <u>Plan</u> , incorporating energy efficiency, <u>demand- and supply-side management, greenhouse gas reduction, renewable portfolio standard compliance,</u> conservation, load management, and reliability strategies, identifying program objectives and implementation and monitoring mechanisms.
Policy PF4.6 [Policy 8]: Pursue reasonable and cost-effective energy efficiency, conservation, and load management programs <u>that provide benefits to the community,</u> pertinent to the electric utility system.
Policy PF4.7 [Policy 7]: Pursue effective measures to enhance reliability of through <u>through</u> interconnection of the <u>the</u> electric utility system to <u>with the</u> region-wide grid.
Policy PF4.9 [Policy 11]: Develop and implement public education programs designed to increase the public's awareness of energy issues, including conservation measures and practices.
[Policy 9]: Continue to pursue emergency electric supplies.
Privately Owned Utilities
Policy PF5.4 [Policy 4]: Work with non-City-owned utility providers to insure <u>ensure</u> that uses and equipment are planned and constructed in a manner consistent with adopted land use policies and design guidelines, to the extent feasible.
Water System
Goal PF6.1 [Goal 1]: Maintain a water system that adequately serves the existing community and planned growth levels <u>through buildout,</u> ensuring the ability to meet projected water demand and to provide needed improvements, repairs, and replacements in a timely manner.
Goal PF6.2 [Goal 2]: Provide water services to all existing and future Roseville water utility customers. The provision of services by another provider may be considered where it is determined that such service is beneficial to the City and its utility customers or the provisions of City services is not feasible.
Goal PF6.3 [Goal 3]: Ensure that safe drinking water standards are met and maintained, in accordance with State <u>the California State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water</u> Department of Health Services and EPA regulations.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Goal PF6.4: [Goal 4] Actively pursue water conservation <u>efficiency</u> measures <u>to ensure compliance with all State of California mandates.</u>
Goal PF6.5 [Goal 5]: Actively pursue supplemental <u>diverse</u> water supplies, <u>including surface, groundwater, and other sources for water supply reliability and system improvements that increase reliability.</u>
<u>Goal PF6.6: Maintain systems that are resilient and reliable for treatment, conveyance, and energy infrastructure.</u>
Policy PF6.1 [Policy 1]: Secure <u>and maintain</u> sufficient <u>and diverse</u> sources of water to meet the needs of the existing community and planned growth.
Policy PF6.2 [Policy 2]: Provide sufficient water treatment capacity and infrastructure to meet projected water demand through City <u>buildout of the General Plan.</u>
Policy PF6.3 [Policy 3]: Initiate, upon 75% <u>percent</u> of treatment plant capacity, expansion studies to determine necessary improvements, <u>if any,</u> to meet projected water demand.
Policy PF6.4 [Policy 4]: Establish a process for monitoring <u>Monitor</u> growth trends to anticipate <u>and plan for future</u> water consumption <u>demand</u> needs.
Policy PF6.5 [Policy 5]: Ensure all development provides for and pays a <u>New development shall pay a</u> fair share of the cost for adequate water <u>supply, treatment and</u> distribution, including <u>extension of</u> water line mains extensions, easements <u>acquisitions,</u> and <u>treatment</u> plant expansions, <u>water storage, groundwater wells, and pumping expansions, and dry year reliability.</u>
Policy PF6.7 [Policy 7]: Provide an emergency back up system to add <u>Develop a portfolio of energy supply and/or generation options to ensure</u> sufficient energy reliability to for the <u>potable water</u> system <u>facilities</u> as determined by the Environmental Utilities Department. The City will continue to operate its surface water, groundwater, and recycled water systems conjunctively. Any additions to or expansions of the City water system shall include compatible facilities, infrastructure, and resource/supply mixes for like conjunctive operations, as determined by Environmental Utilities.
Policy PF6.8 [Policy 8]: Develop and <u>expand</u> pursue alternatives to continue delivery <u>conjunctive use of water</u> with from <u>in collaboration with neighboring public agencies</u> PCWA and SJWD water to Roseville.
Policy PF6.10 [Policy 10]: Develop and implement water conservation efficiency standards and measures as necessary elements of the water system.
Policy PF6.11 [Policy 11]: <u>Continue</u> Implement and <u>the management and expansion of</u> the <u>groundwater and</u> aquifer storage and recovery program <u>to increase resiliency and reliability of water supply during all supply conditions.</u> Any additions to, or expansions of the City's system shall include like facilities, infrastructure, and technologies for aquifer storage and recovery.
Policy PF6.12 [Policy 12]: Establish a process for <u>Continue</u> monitoring <u>and advocacy for legislative and regulatory requirements that would provide local benefits for the City's water</u> advocating for or against new legislative and regulatory requirements affecting/benefitting the manner in which services are provided to the city's utility customers.
Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems
Goal PF7.2 [Goal 2]: Provide wastewater services to all existing and future Roseville development through the City's wastewater utility. The provision of services by another provider may be considered when it is determined that such service is beneficial to the City and its utility customers or the provision of City services is not feasible.
Goal PF7.4 [Goal 4]: Meet State of California and EPA water quality <u>State and federal</u> standards for the discharge of treated wastewater, as well as meet State of California water <u>water</u> quality standards for the production of recycled water.
[Policy 2]: Ensure adequate storm surge capacity at the wastewater treatment plants.
Policy PF7.2 [Policy 3]: Initiate, upon 75 percent utilization of treatment plant capacity, expansion studies to determine necessary <u>demand management and capacity</u> improvements to meet projected wastewater treatment demands.
Policy PF7.3 [Policy 4]: Ensure that wastewater treatment capacity is available for proposed <u>planned development and intensification</u> and that wastewater generation is minimized.
Policy PF7.5 [Policy 6]: Develop <u>and</u> plan, and provide incentives for <u>the</u> use of recycled water by the public and private sectors.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Policy PF7.7 [Policy 8]: <u>Continue monitoring and advocacy for legislative and regulatory requirements that would provide local benefits for the City's wastewater utility customers.</u> Establish a process for monitoring new legislative and regulatory requirements affecting the manner in which services are provided to the City's utility customers.
Solid Waste Collection and Disposal, Source Reduction & Recycling
Policy PF8.2 [Policy 2]: Comply with the source reduction and recycling standards mandated by the State by reducing the projected quantity of solid waste disposed at the regional landfill by 50%, as well as any mandated future reductions.
Policy PF8.3 [Policy 3]: Require a waste characterization profile as part of the initial study, under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for <u>proposed</u> large-scale commercial and industrial development projects.
Policy PF8.5 [Policy 5]: Develop <u>and implement</u> public education and recycling programs.
Water and Energy Efficiency
Goal PF9.1 [Goal 1]: Preserve scarce resources by recognizing the importance of <u>efficiency</u> conservation in water and energy management.
Goal PF9.2 [Goal 2]: Balance conservation <u>efficiency</u> efforts with water and energy supplies for the maximum benefit of Roseville's residents.
Policy PF9.1 [Policy 1]: Develop and implement water conservation <u>efficiency</u> standards.
[Policy 2]: Implement various water conservation plans developed by the Environmental Utilities Department.
Policy PF9.3 [Policy 4]: Protect the quality and quantity of the City's groundwater <u>by actively seeking, throughout the City, areas suitable for groundwater recharge with land areas with suitable soils and geology for ground-water recharge.</u> and consider designating areas as open space where recharge potential is high.
Policy PF9.4 [Policy 5]: Develop and adopt a landscape ordinance that provides <u>implement</u> standards for the use of drought tolerant, and water- conserving <u>efficient</u> landscape practices for both public and private projects.
Policy PF9.5 [Policy 6]: Develop and implement public education programs designed to increase public participation in energy, water conservation <u>efficiency</u> , and recycled water use.
Policy PF9.8 [Policy 9]: Preserve scarce <u>natural</u> resources by undertaking major projects in energy conservation and load management, including increasing efficiency in the City's electrical system.
Policy PF9.9 [Policy 10]: Continue and expand energy efficiency and conservation programs to serve all utility users.
Safety
Seismic and Geologic Hazards
Policy SAFE1.1 [Policy 1]: Continue to monitor seismic activity in the region and take appropriate action if significant seismic hazards, including potentially active faults, are discovered in the planning area <u>Planning Area.</u>
Policy SAFE1.3 [Policy 3]: Minimize soil erosion and sedimentation through by maintaining compatible land uses, suitable building <u>placement, maximum lot coverage standards, context-sensitive</u> designs, and appropriate construction techniques.
Flood Protection
Policy SAFE2.1 [Policy 1]: Continue to regulate, through land use, zoning, and other restrictions, all uses and development in areas subject to potential flooding and require new development to comply with the State Plan of Flood Control <u>requirements.</u>
Policy SAFE2.2 [Policy 2]: Monitor and regularly update City flood studies, modeling, and associated land use, zoning, <u>drainage fees and flood management projects,</u> and other development regulations.
Policy SAFE2.3 [Policy 3]: Continue to pursue a regional approach to flood issues. <u>Participate in efforts to secure adequate flood management funding.</u>
Policy SAFE2.4 [Policy 4]: Provide flood warning and forecasting information to <u>the</u> community residents to reduce impacts to personal <u>private</u> property.

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
Policy SAFE2.6 [Policy 6]: Require new developments to <u>evaluate potential flood hazards, and</u> provide mitigation to insure <u>ensure</u> that the cumulative rate of peak run-off is maintained at pre-development levels.
Policy SAFE2.8 [Policy 8]: Establish <u>and maintain</u> flood control assessment districts or consider other funding mechanisms to mitigate flooding impacts.
Police Services
Policy SAFE3.4 [Policy 4]: Establish programs that respond to community concerns of crime, gangs, drug abuse, <u>homelessness, mental health,</u> and traffic.
[Policy 6]: Continue to enforce, update, and expand the Building Security Ordinance.
Policy SAFE3.7 [Policy 7]: Design parks to facilitate <u>that are conducive to</u> surveillance by adjoining residents, security services, and police.
Policy SAFE3.9 [Policy 9]: Coordinate with park rangers <u>patrol officers</u> in patrolling parks, and open space, <u>and trails</u> areas and continue coordination with other law enforcement agencies.
Fire Protection
Goal SAFE4.1 [Goal 1]: Protect against the loss of life, property, and the environment by the application of appropriate preventive on , educational al , and operational measures.
Policy SAFE4.2 [Policy 2]: <u>Continue to follow service level response times, as listed in the City's Standards of Cover document.</u> Strive to achieve the following service levels: Strive to achieve the following service levels: –8 minute 12 second Total Response Time 11 minute 30 second Effective Response Force 90 Second Call Processing Time 90 Second Turnout Time 5 minute 12 second Travel Time Maintain ISO rating of 3 or better
[Policy 7]: Continue to completion the permanent fire training classroom facility at the Fire Training Center.
[Policy 8]: Provide a comprehensive emergency medical services program to provide Advance Life Support services and ensure reliable ambulance transport services to aid citizens in need of rescue or medical assistance.
Hazardous Materials
Policy SAFE5.1 [Policy 1]: Require the disclosure, of the use, and storage, <u>and disposal</u> of hazardous materials in existing and proposed industrial and commercial activities and siting of hazardous waste disposal facilities in accordance with to comply with Placer County guidelines and state law local, state, and federal safety standards.
Policy SAFE5.3 [Policy 3]: Cooperate fully with both public and private agencies, as defined in the City of Roseville Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan in the event of a hazardous material emergency.
[Policy 4]: Develop a hazardous materials truck route through the City of Roseville and limit pickup and delivery of hazardous materials of hazardous materials during peak traffic hours.
Health Services
Policy SAFE6.1 [Policy 1]: The City shall plan for the public health implications of climate change, including disease and temperature effects Encourage the establishment of a trauma center to service the South Placer area. <u>The City shall plan for the continued growth and establishment of health services, and expand healthcare access to serve the South Placer region.</u>
Noise
Policy N1.1 [Policy 1]: <u>The City's exterior noise compatibility standards for uses affected by transportation noise sources are included as Table IX-1. Exterior noise levels shall be mitigated to the extent feasible using site planning, building orientation, and/or other construction techniques or design features. Noise barriers should only be used</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update <u>after other feasible noise reduction strategies are exhausted, and not where they would interrupt existing or future community visual, pedestrian, or bicycle connectivity.</u> Allow the development of new noise sensitive land uses (which include but are not limited to residential, schools, and hospitals) only in areas exposed to existing or projected levels of noise from transportation noise sources which satisfy the levels specified in Table IX-1. Noise mitigation measures may be required to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas and interior spaces to the levels specified in Table IX-1. Recognizing that in increasingly urban areas it is difficult to maintain suburban noise standards, and in order to facilitate the City's goals to encourage reinvestment and economic development in the Riverside and Downtown Specific Plan areas, the City may elect to allow new noise sensitive land uses on a case by case basis in proximity to transportation sources. Noise mitigation, including an acoustical analysis, would be required to reduce interior space noise levels to the standards specified in Table IX-1. Exterior noise levels would require mitigation to the extent feasible using building orientation, construction and design features; however ultimately, noise levels may exceed the noise standards identified in Table IX-1.
<u>Policy N1.2: The City's interior noise compatibility standards for uses affected by transportation noise sources are 45 dBA L_{dn} for noise-sensitive uses such as residences, lodging, hospitals, assisted living facilities, and other places where people normally sleep. For noise-sensitive uses where people do not sleep, such as offices, schools, and uses with similar noise sensitivity, noise levels should be no greater than 45 dBA L_{eq}. Proposed projects should incorporate noise reduction strategies, if necessary, to achieve these interior noise levels.</u>
<u>Policy N1.3: The City's exterior noise compatibility standards for uses affected by non-transportation-related noise are defined within the City's Noise Ordinance, and should be applied consistent with the Noise Ordinance.</u>
Policy N1.4 [Policy 2]: <u>The City will require new transportation improvement projects to be designed to limit noise impacts consistent with the standards contained in Table IX-1, to the extent feasible, through the use of appropriate attenuation techniques.</u> Require new roadway improvement projects to be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise levels specified in Table IX-1 at outdoor activity areas or interior spaces of existing noise sensitive land uses.
[Policy 3]: Evaluate new transportation projects, such as light and heavy rail, using the standards contained in Table IX-1. However, noise from these projects may be allowed to exceed the standards contained in Table IX-1 if the City Council finds that there are special overriding circumstances.
Policy N1.5 [Policy 4]: <u>If existing noise levels exceed the noise compatibility standards in Table IX-1 or Policy N1.2, then feasible methods of reducing noise to levels consistent with standards should be considered, but are not required. However, if existing noise levels exceed noise compatibility standards and a project results in a significant increase in noise (as defined below), then feasible methods of reducing noise to avoid a significant noise increase should be applied. In no case should a project result in a Clearly Unacceptable noise level according to Table IX-1.</u> • <u>Where existing exterior noise is less than 60 dB, a ≥ 5 dBA increase in noise is significant.</u> • <u>Where existing exterior noise is between 60 and 65 dBA, a ≥ 3 dB increase in noise is significant.</u> • <u>Where existing exterior noise is greater than 65 dB ≥ 1.5 dBA increase in noise is significant.</u> Require an acoustical analysis where: a. _____ Noise sensitive land uses are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected noise levels exceeding the levels specified in Table IX-1; b. _____ Proposed transportation noise source projects are likely to produce noise levels exceeding the levels specified in Table IX-1 at existing or planned noise sensitive uses. An acoustical analysis shall be required as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be considered in the project design.
<u>Policy N1.6: In order to facilitate reinvestment and economic development, if noise mitigation is found to be infeasible or in conflict with other City policies regarding community design, the City may elect to allow noise levels that exceed the noise standards identified in Table IX-1, although in no case should application of this policy result in a Clearly Unacceptable noise level according to Table IX-1.</u>
Policy N1.7 [Policy 5]: <u>The City will</u> work in cooperation with Caltrans and the Union Pacific <u>Railroad</u> to maintain noise level standards for both new and existing projects in compliance with Table IX-1.
<u>Policy N1.8: Public events, such as school sporting events, community festivals, and similar community and temporary events, and noise associated with emergency vehicles, alarms, or signals are exempt from the noise standards outlined in this Element.</u>

Table 2-1. Policy Changes included in the Proposed General Plan Update
[Policy 6]: Allow the development of new noise sensitive uses (which include, but are not limited to, residential, school, and hospitals) only where the noise level due to fixed (non transportation) noise sources satisfies the noise level standards of Table IX-3. Noise mitigation may be required to meet Table IX-3 performance standards. Recognizing that in increasingly urban areas it is difficult to maintain suburban noise standards, and in order to facilitate the City's goals to encourage reinvestment and economic development in the Riverside and Downtown Specific Plan areas, the City may elect to allow new noise-sensitive land uses on a case by case basis in a mixed-use environment. Noise levels would require mitigation to the extent feasible using building orientation, construction and design features; however ultimately, noise levels may exceed noise standards identified in Table IX-1.
[Policy 7]: Require proposed fixed noise sources adjacent to noise sensitive uses to be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level performance standards of Table IX-3.
[Policy 8]: Require an acoustical analysis where: Noise sensitive land uses are proposed in areas where existing or anticipated future fixed noise sources may a. Proposed non residential or other fixed noise sources are likely to produce noise levels exceeding the performance standards of Table IX-3 at existing or planned noise sensitive uses. An acoustical analysis shall be required as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be considered during project design.
[Policy 9]: Where noise mitigation measures are required to achieve the standards of Tables IX-1 and IX-3, the emphasis of such measures should be placed on site planning and project design. These measures may include, but are not limited to, building orientation, setbacks, landscaping, and building construction practices. The use of noise barriers, such as soundwalls, should be considered as a means of achieving the noise standards only after all other practical design-related noise mitigation measures have been integrated into the project.
Policy N1.9 [Policy 10]: <u>Construction-related noise that is consistent with the City's Noise Ordinance is exempt from the noise standards outlined in this Element.</u> Regulate construction-related noise to reduce impacts on adjacent uses consistent with the City's Noise Ordinance.
<u>Policy N1.10: Include all feasible measures necessary, as a part of proposed development and public infrastructure projects to avoid substantial annoyance for adjacent vibration-sensitive uses, consistent with California Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Agency guidance.</u>

2.5.3 UPDATES TO THE FORMAT TO BE MORE USER FRIENDLY

This includes updates for clarity and concision, incorporating images and other graphics, and moving detailed existing conditions information that goes quickly out of date to the General Plan Update EIR, so that the goals and policies become the focus of the body of the General Plan. Whereas the existing General Plan includes lengthy Setting and Outlook sections with text and tables for each topical area in an Element, the proposed General Plan includes a brief description of the topical area and then proceeds immediately to the goals and policies section. Using the Functional Classification section of the Circulation Element as an example, before reaching the goals and policies the existing General Plan includes:

- ▶ A one-page Setting section describing, in detail, the definition of functional classification, how roadways work, the history of the City's roadway system, a description of each roadway classification and its function and relationship to the City, as well as a summary of truck routes.
- ▶ An Outlook section describing the long-range planning for functional classifications.
- ▶ Four pages for maps and tables identifying every roadway in the City and its classification.

In the proposed Update, the Functional Classification section includes:

- ▶ One page describing the purpose of a functional classification system, and what the City’s classification system includes.
- ▶ Two maps, one showing the City’s roadway classifications and the other showing truck routes.

Other descriptive text has either been deleted, because the information is already contained within the City’s Improvement Standards and other documentation, or has been moved to the General Plan Update EIR. These changes do not affect how the General Plan is implemented or understood, they simply remove extraneous background information to create a more focused and accessible document that is focused on achieving the City’s long-term, comprehensive vision.

2.5.4 REVISE OUTDATED INFORMATION

Throughout the General Plan Update, outdated information that is important for understanding the City’s long-term development and conservation goals is updated.

2.5.5 ELEMENTS OF THE GENERAL PLAN

The General Plan contains an introductory chapter and nine elements:

1. Land Use
2. Circulation
3. Air Quality and Climate Change
4. Open Space and Conservation
5. Parks and Recreation
6. Public Facilities
7. Safety
8. Noise
9. Housing

The General Plan also incorporates a glossary and an appendix. The appendix includes a list of references that were used in the preparation of the General Plan, including issue papers prepared by the consultant during scoping, the EIR, and specific plans. All referenced materials are available through the Roseville Development Services Department – Planning Division during normal business hours, or on the City’s webpage at www.roseville.ca.us.

Each Element of the General Plan includes some background information to establish the context for the goals and policies. This background information is followed by goals and policies. Goals are a statement of the desired future condition related to public health, safety, or general welfare of the community. Goals set directions for policies. Policies are statements or conditions that guide decision making in relation to managing land use change, prioritizing public investments, mitigating environmental effects, and other related actions. Policies convey the City’s position on particular topics. Implementation measures are actions necessary to carry forward the City’s policies.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

Notice is hereby given that, as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report for public review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Project Title/File#/SCH#: General Plan Update; PL#16-0336; 2019080418

Project Location: City of Roseville

Project Owner/Applicant: City of Roseville, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678

Project Planner: Gina McColl, Associate Planner, (916) 774-5452, gmccoll@roseville.ca.us

Project Description: The purpose of this update is to comply with new State planning laws, the 2017 General Plan Guidelines, and updates to the CEQA Guidelines and case law; revise outdated information; improve and clarify policy language; and make the General Plan more readable and user-friendly. The City is not proposing changes to the Land Use Map or Sphere of Influence as a part of this update. The complete description of changes is in the Project Description chapter of the EIR (link below). Revisions include:

- ▶ Circulation Element: updates to reflect Assembly Bill (AB) 1358 (Complete Streets), and SB 743, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 as they relate to active transportation and travel demand management (vehicle miles traveled, or “VMT”). This includes new VMT policies.
- ▶ Air Quality & Climate Change Element: updates to include feasible mitigation to reduce GHG emissions, including a new greenhouse gases policy.
- ▶ Open Space & Conservation Element: updates to reflect State law related to Native American consultation.
- ▶ Noise Element: updates for clarity and revisions to the City’s goals for land use and noise compatibility that reflect current best practices, including changes to the City’s exterior noise compatibility standards.

Document Review and Availability: The Draft Environmental Impact Report may be reviewed online at www.roseville.ca.us/GeneralPlan. Significant effects on the environment anticipated as a result of the project include impacts related to transportation, air quality, noise, cultural and tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and aesthetics, and significant cumulative effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, noise, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and aesthetics.

The public review and comment period begins on May 8, 2020 and ends on June 22, 2020. **Written comments on the adequacy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report may be submitted in hard copy to Gina McColl, Planning Division, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678 or via e-mail at gmccoll@roseville.ca.us, and must be received no later than 5:00 pm on June 22, 2020.** A public hearing before the Planning Commission of the City of Roseville is tentatively scheduled for June 25, 2020. A second notice providing the date, time, and place of the public hearing will be published by the City for the proposed project.

Mike Isom
Development Services Director

Dated: April 30, 2020

Publish: May 8, 2020

EXHIBIT A - Draft Environmental Impact Report - The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) is viewable online at www.roseville.ca.us/GeneralPlan

EXHIBIT B - Draft 2035 General Plan - The proposed General Plan is viewable online at www.roseville.ca.us/GeneralPlan

Hard copies of the DEIR and Draft General Plan are available upon request by contacting Gina McColl at gmccoll@roseville.ca.us.

From: [Roy Stearns](#)
To: [McColl, Gina](#)
Subject: Parks and Recreation, Open Space Plans
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2020 3:01:21 PM

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Gina,

I have now read through the attached plans and I find them to be excellent. I very much like how comprehensive the plans are regarding the value of open space and archeological sites. These plans should preserve and protect parks, recreation, open space and historic sites well into our future and that will be appreciated by all future residents. Excellent work and thank you for the opportunity to review all. My vote is "yes" for approval. I will be interested to hear the comments from our residents.

Roy Stearns

Parks and Recreation Commission

City of Roseville, CA

From: [Regina Soucek](#)
To: [McColl, Gina](#)
Cc: [Geller, Jill](#); [Worland, Ellen](#)
Subject: Fwd: General Plan Amendment and DEIR Review Period -Message 1
Date: Monday, June 22, 2020 9:19:28 AM

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Gina-

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed General Plan Amendments. I have reviewed the Parks and Recreation and Open Space and Conservation chapters and do not have any comments.

Have a good week!

-Regina Soucek, Parks and Recreation Commissioner

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Anna Starkey](#)
To: [McColl, Gina](#)
Subject: RE: UAIC Comments on the General Plan Update (PL16-0336): DEIR
Date: Friday, June 19, 2020 4:10:31 PM
Attachments:

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Gina,

My apologies for the delayed response. Both Matthew and Rebecca are not available next week but I would be able to have the call with you. Would it just be the two of us? Otherwise I can see if someone else in my department is available next week.

Can you please provide us with Shapefiles for the open space areas? We are aware of tribal cultural resources (TCRs) in some of these areas and we have specific requests that we would like to see added to the document.

Comments for the Open Space and Conservation Element

A new policy should include site stewardship to known TCRs that are located on city property, open spaces, and conservation areas.

- Legal/physical Access – confirming that Tribal Members/Native American community can legally go to these places;
- Legal Ability to practice traditional culture at these places (this is also an AIRFA/American Indian Religious Freedom Act requirement) – can Native American individuals safely gather/harvest plants (is pesticide used?), practice ceremony, etc.

Land/Site Management – is there a mechanism for:

- Taking care of cultural sites
- Reporting and correcting looting, erosion, vandalism, etc.
- Vegetation management
- Removal of heavy vegetation/fuel load from cultural sites

-Native plants – how are native plants represented in their green space area?

-Animals – what is their program with respect to stewarding animals/fish

-Water & waterways – how are these tended, and do they incorporate any traditional stewardship?

-Educational programs – do they have educational programming about traditional management practices, plants, sites, etc.?

Thank you,
Anna Starkey



Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

18 June 2020

Gina McColl
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, CITY OF ROSEVILLE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT, SCH#2019080418, PLACER COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 8 May 2020 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Draft Environmental Impact Report* for the City of Roseville General Plan Update Project, located in Placer County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental

KARL E. LONGLEY ScD, P.E., CHAIR | PATRICK PULUPA, ESQ., EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_2018_05.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

II. Permitting Requirements

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits¹

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ. For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

¹ Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality/certification/

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/>

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4709 or Greg.Hendricks@waterboards.ca.gov.



Greg Hendricks
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research,
Sacramento



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Gavin Newsom, Governor

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

June 2, 2020

Gina McColl
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

SECRETARY
Merri Lopez-Keifer
Luiseño

PARLIAMENTARIAN
Russell Attebery
Karuk

COMMISSIONER
Marshall McKay
Wintun

COMMISSIONER
William Mungary
Paiute/White Mountain
Apache

COMMISSIONER
Julie Tumamait-Stenslie
Chumash

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Christina Snider
Pomo

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

Re: SCH# 2019080418 City of Roseville General Plan Update, Placer County

Dear Ms. McColl:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or Negative Declaration prepared for the project referenced above. The review may have included the Cultural Resources Section, Archaeological Report, Appendices for Cultural Resources Compliance, as well as other informational materials. We have the following concerns:

- There does not appear to be any evidence of what to do for inadvertent finds of Native American remains in accordance with Health and Safety Code 7050.5.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)¹, specifically Public Resources Code section 21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.² If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall be prepared.³ In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources with the area of project effect (APE).

CEQA was amended in 2014 by Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52).⁴ **AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015.** AB 52 created a separate category for "tribal cultural resources"⁵, that now includes "a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.⁶ Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource.⁷ Your project may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004), Government Code 65352.3, if it also involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space. Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. Additionally, if your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. Â§ 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 19668 may also apply.

¹ Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.

² Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5 (b); CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (b)

³ Pub. Resources Code § 21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064 subd.(a)(1); CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)

Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

Agencies should be aware that AB 52 does not preclude agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and Sacred Lands File searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/>. Additional information regarding AB 52 can be found online at http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf, entitled "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices".

The NAHC recommends lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources.

A brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments is also attached.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Nancy.Gonzalez-Lopez@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nancy Gonzalez-Lopez". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Nancy" being more prominent.

Nancy Gonzalez-Lopez
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment

cc: State Clearinghouse

Pertinent Statutory Information:

Under AB 52:

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a **lead agency** shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice. A **lead agency** shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.⁴ and **prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report**. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code § 65352.4 (SB 18).⁵

The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:

- a. Alternatives to the project.
- b. Recommended mitigation measures.
- c. Significant effects.⁶

1. The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:

- a. Type of environmental review necessary.
- b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
- c. Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.

If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency.⁷

With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process **shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code sections 6254 (r) and 6254.10**. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public.⁸

If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, **the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss** both of the following:

- a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
- b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource.⁹

Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:

- a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
- b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached.¹⁰

Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2 **shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program**, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable.¹¹

If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, **the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation** pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.3 (b).¹²

An environmental impact report **may not be certified**, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:

⁴ Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)

⁵ Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (b)

⁶ Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)

⁷ Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)

⁸ Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (c)(1)

⁹ Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (b)

¹⁰ Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (b)

¹¹ Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (a)

¹² Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (e)

- a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.
- b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
- c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days.¹³

This process should be documented in the Tribal Cultural Resources section of your environmental document.

Under SB 18:

Government Code § 65352.3 (a) (1) requires consultation with Native Americans on general plan proposals for the purposes of "preserving or mitigating impacts to places, features, and objects described § 5097.9 and § 5091.993 of the Public Resources Code that are located within the city or county's jurisdiction. Government Code § 65560 (a), (b), and (c) provides for consultation with Native American tribes on the open-space element of a county or city general plan for the purposes of protecting places, features, and objects described in Sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 of the Public Resources Code.

- SB 18 applies to **local governments** and requires them to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf
- **Tribal Consultation:** If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.**¹⁴
- **There is no Statutory Time Limit on Tribal Consultation under the law.**
- **Confidentiality:** Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research,¹⁵ the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction.¹⁶
- **Conclusion Tribal Consultation:** Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
 - The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
 - Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation.¹⁷

NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments:

- Contact the NAHC for:
 - A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
 - A Native American Tribal Contact List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.
 - The request form can be found at <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/>.
- Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
 - If part or the entire APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - If any known cultural resources have been already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
 - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

¹³ Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (d)

¹⁴ (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (a)(2)).

¹⁵ pursuant to Gov. Code section 65040.2,

¹⁶ (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (b)).

¹⁷ (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

- If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
 - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

Examples of Mitigation Measures That May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:

- Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
 - Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
 - Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
- Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
 - Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
 - Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
- Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
- Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed.¹⁸
- Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated.¹⁹

The lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.

- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources.²⁰ In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, Public Resources Code section 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

¹⁸ (Civ. Code § 815.3 (c)).

¹⁹ (Pub. Resources Code § 5097.991).

²⁰ per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(f)).



June 22, 2020

Gina McColl, Associate Planner
 Planning Division
 City of Roseville
 311 Vernon Street
 Roseville, CA 95678

SENT VIA : gmccoll@roseville.ca.us

SUBJECT: Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Roseville
 General Plan Update

Dear Ms. McColl,

The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (District) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the City of Roseville General Plan Update. The District has the following comments for your consideration grouped by chapters from the DEIR.

Chapter 4.3 - Transportation

- Under Section 4.3.4.2 Threshold of Significance for Roadway System VMT, the DEIR states that the City is planning to adopt a threshold of 12.8 VMT/capita to satisfy the SB 743 requirement as shown in Table 4.3-5. Further along, the DEIR's discussion states that "Quantitative analysis would not be required if it can be demonstrated that a project would generate VMT which is equivalent to or less than what was assumed in this General Plan EIR." (pp. 4.3-29). According to the above statement, the DEIR presumes that future projects will not be required to do a quantitative analysis for VMT if the project's related VMT can be demonstrated being equal or less than what is assumed in this DEIR. However, without a quantitative analysis, how would a project demonstrate that its related VMT is equal or below the DEIR's estimation?

Furthermore, the proposed VMT threshold (12.8 VMT per capita) is 15% below the baseline VMT metric (15.1 VMT per capita) calculated by the home-based population VMT. Accordingly, a project should reduce 15 % of VMT per capita comparing with the baseline condition in order to be assumed to have less than significant VMT impacts. Therefore, any project which would generate VMT equal to or less than the VMT assumed in this General Plan DEIR may not be sufficient to demonstrate that the project would meet the City's

proposed VMT threshold, unless that project conducts a quantitative analysis to demonstrate its related VMT is below the baseline by 15%. The District recommends that the City reconsider this statement because being consistent with the VMT assumed in this DEIR may not be substantial to presume that a project's relative VMT would not have a significant effect.

- The District concerns that the proposed VMT threshold may not be able to be applied for a local commercial project. The General Plan DEIR states that local serving retail and other local-serving development would generally reduce existing trip distance by providing services in closer proximity to residential areas, and therefore reduce VMT. However, new local serving retails will not only provide shorter traveling distance for existing customers but also generate new trips from new customers from elsewhere. Therefore, the project will need to conduct a quantitative analysis to identify if the project will have a net decrease for VMT and therefore the project's related VMT would not have a significant effect.
- On page 4.3-31, the Table number is the same as on page 4.3-29. That means each subsequent table is numbered incorrectly along with the Table numbers discussed in the document section. Please correct the table number to avoid confusion.

Chapter 4.4 - Air Quality

- In Table 4.4-2 (page 4.4-8) under the Federal 1-hour ozone standard, Placer County attained this standard in 2009, as described in footnote "a" of the table. Please correct this information.
- In Table 4.4-2 Placer County is in attainment for the California annual average standard for PM2.5. Please correct this information.
- Under Section 4.4.4.4 Impact Analysis on page 4.4-27 and 4.4-28 in the conclusion, the first paragraph discusses the District's Rule 228 Fugitive Dust. This rule does not have a one acre threshold as *de minimis* level for dust emissions. All projects are required to comply with the standard dust control requirements set by this rule.
- In this same section on page 4.4-28 under Mitigation Measures it states that "No feasible mitigation measures are available." The District disagrees with this statement because feasible mitigation measures are available depending on the types and sizes of a project to mitigate its related construction emissions. The District recommends that the DEIR uses the District's CEQA Handbook Appendix C as a reference to identify feasible

mitigation measures for construction emissions for the future projects within the City jurisdiction.

- Under Impact 4.4-5 *“Result in Other Emissions (such as those leading to odors) Adversely Affecting a Substantial Number of People”* on page 4-4-51 there is a discussion regarding odor complaints from various industrial sources or facilities. The information should be updated.

In the first facilities reviewed, the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL) and the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), information regarding the history of odors discusses complaints from odors in February 2015. Given that the Notice of Preparation for the General Plan Update was released in 2019, it is appropriate to discuss current information on odor and complaints and notifications of odors. Since 2015, there continues to be a steady increase in odor complaints. In addition to make an odor complaint directly to the District, the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA), the public agency who is responsible for the WRSL and MRF operation, also developed an on-line order notification for the public to report odor issues. Notifications received by the WPWMA are directly forwarded to the District and the District works closely with the WPWMA staff to review where they are categorized by odor smells, from trash smelling to other more descriptive words. In 2019 the District received 4 direct complaints and 179 notifications forwarded from the WPWMA for a total of 183. District staff can assist to obtain any additional information for this facility’s odor compliance discussion.

The second facility to be discussed is the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant. There was no discussion of odor complaints. This District receives odor complaints directly and by notifications forwarded from the facility. From June 2019 the District received 3 complaints and 62 forwarded notifications for a total of 65. Information in the document needs to be updated as people have experienced odors. Any additional information can be obtained from the District.

Chapter 4.5 - Greenhouse Gases

- The service population should be the sum of the population and the employment. However, in Table 4.5-3 on page 4.5-18, the Service Population number for each year is incorrect. For example, the service population for 2035 should be 45,521,334 (population) + 21,338,529 (employment) which is equal to 66,859,863, not 65,179,875 as shown in the table. The DEIR should correct the Service Population number in this table and recalculate the Per Service Population Emissions Efficiency Targets for each year since they are also incorrect. As the result, the revised Per Service Population Emission Efficiency

Target for 2035 should be revised as 2.19 MT CO₂e/SP/yr. The DEIR may need to update the related discussion.

- Table 4.5-3 presents how the statewide emission efficiency per capita and per service population is developed for each target year. However, the table title could mislead the readers that the table data is related with the City instead of the state. In addition, the last sentence in the notes for table states that Appendix B has the detailed calculations and data inputs for the proposed City Efficiency Thresholds determinations. However Appendix B provides the analysis of Air Quality and Greenhouse emissions and does not include any detailed information how adjusted statewide land use-related emissions are calculated and how the statewide emission targets for 2035 is interpolated. The District recommends the DEIR should be corrected with the right reference for Table 4.5-3 or have that information in Appendix B.
- In Table 4.5-5 the service population of existing and buildout condition is inconsistent with the service population shown in the Table on page 4.3-31 (this table number is currently incorrect). According to that Table, the baseline condition's service population should be 189,838 along with the buildout of the General plan in 2035 is 312,018. The DEIR should have internal consistence for service population data used throughout each chapter.
- Appendix B only provides two GHG emission summaries: one is for new development as proposed under the General Plan buildout and another one is the existing + new development under the General Plan buildout. However, Table 4.5-5 has a column showing the modeled GHG emissions related to the existing condition. There is no reference in Appendix B to show how the GHG emissions related to the existing condition is calculated. In addition, both Table 4.5-5 and Appendix B have no reference to identify which year is assumed for the existing condition for GHG emissions. Furthermore, Table 4.5-5 indicates that GHG emissions under existing conditions for area sources are not available and none of any reference in Appendix B explains why the emission estimates for area sources under existing conditions are not available. The District recommends the DEIR should be updated to provide the above information.
- On the bottom of page 4.5-19 the DEIR states that "Table 4.5-7 presents the operational GHG emission estimates for existing land use and activities within the Planning Area, proposed new land uses, and total operations under the proposed General Plan Update." Was it a Table 4.5-7 in DEIR before but now is removed or it is typo? It seems that there was a table showing three columns: existing conditions, new development, and total operations under the General Plan buildout.

Thank you for allowing the District this opportunity to review the project proposal. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 530.745.2325 or ychang@placer.ca.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Yushuo Chang". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Yushuo" and the last name "Chang" clearly distinguishable.

Yushuo Chang
Planning and Monitoring Section Supervisor

CC: Ann Hobbs, Associate Planner



**SHINGLE SPRINGS BAND
OF MIWOK INDIANS**

Shingle Springs Rancheria
(Verona Tract), California
5168 Honpie Road
Placerville, CA 95667
Phone: 530-676-8010
shinglespringsrancheria.com

CULTURAL RESOURCES

May 26, 2020

City of Roseville
Gina McColl
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

RE: General Plan Update PL#16-0336

Dear Gina McColl,

Thank you for your letter dated May 8, 2020 in regard to the above mentioned project. Based on the information provided, the Shingle Springs Band Of Miwok Indians is not aware of any known cultural resources on this site. However, SSR would like to have continued consultation through updates, as the project progresses. This will foster a greater communication between the Tribe and your agency.

SSR would also like to request any and all completed record searches and or surveys that were done in or around the project area up to and including environmental, archaeological and cultural reports. If during the progress of the project new information or human remains are found, we would like to be able to go over our process with you to protect such important and sacred artifacts (especially near rivers and streams).

If such finds are made, please contact Kara Perry, Site Protection Manager, at (530) 488-4049 or kperry@ssband.org.

Thank you for providing us with this notice and opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fonseca
Cultural Resource Director
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO)
Most Likely Descendant (MLD)

From: Anna Starkey
 To: McColl, Gina
 Cc: Rebecca Allen; Matthew Moore
 Subject: UAIC Comments on the General Plan Update (PL16-0336): DEIR
 Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 4:31:51 PM
 Attachments: image001.png

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Gina,

On behalf of the United Auburn Indian Community, I am writing to provide comments on the General Plan Update (PL16-0336), Draft Environmental Impact Report. A hard copy letter will not be mailed so please consider this our formal response. Please respond that this email has been received. Additional comments on the Open Space and Conservation Element will be forthcoming in a separate email.

We have extensive comments and concerns in regards to the Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources Chapters (at the link below). The consultant who authored these chapters missed many crucial elements that are fundamental for appropriate identification, evaluation, and treatment of tribal cultural resources (TCRS). Because our comments are so extensive, we are happy to have a conference call with the consultant (AECOM) and the City to discuss these issues. Additionally, we would like to review the revised version because so many changes are needed.

Also, the document titled "Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation" – is this still in draft phase? Has it been finalized?

http://roseville.ca.us/UserFiles/Servers/Server_7964838/File/Government/Departments/Development%20Services/Planning/General%20Plan/GPU%20UPDATE%202020/DRAFT%20EIR%20CHAPTERS/4.9%20Cultural%20Resources.pdf

Comment 1:

Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) must be a separate, independent chapter from Cultural Resources as shown in the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G. Contained within the TCR chapter should be the regulatory background for AB 52 and the definition of a TCR and TCP. Separate chapters for each of these resources if needed because the impact analysis and mitigation measures do not adequately address tribal cultural resources and tribal values. Because they are combined, only archaeological and built resource values are taken into consideration and addressed. Well-throughout analysis of the impacts to TCRs and the consideration of tribal values is completely missed.

Comment 2, page 4.9-18:

Native American Consultation – many of the bulleted points previously provided by UAIC should be mitigation measures in the TCR Chapter to reduce impacts to these resources.

Comment 3, page 4.9-1 through 4.9-5:

The background section for TCR chapter should not contain the same information as the cultural chapter, such as prehistoric and ethnographic because those provide information that applies to the ancestors of the descendant tribal communities. The background section of the TCR chapter should contain current information on the California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area of the EIR. These tribes have expertise concerning their tribal cultural resources (PCR § 21080.3.1.).

There is only one sentence in the ethnographic background that recognizes that there are living descendant communities. There is no information that tribes are stewards of their ancestor's sites or describing who the Nisenan are today. Including this information sets the background that tribes are stewards of their own past. This is where TCRs come in because the tribes are making these determinations, not archaeologists.

Comment 4, page 4.9-28:

All Impact analysis and mitigation measures must be separated from Cultural Resources and included in the TCRs chapter. The impact analysis and mitigation measures must be specific to TCRs and include tribal values. As they are currently combined, they do not adequately address tribal cultural resources and tribal values. The analysis of should include acknowledging active tribal participation in the stewardship of their ancestral sites.

Comment 5, page 4.9-30:

Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a must include consulting with traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes. The Tribes shall provide appropriate evaluation and treatment of TCR. This is only stated through Policy OS4.1 but should also be included as a mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a also appears to be geared towards built environments. A separate mitigation measure must be included in the TCR Chapter that acknowledges that changes or alterations TCRs or TCPs will result in a significant impact.

Comment 6, page 4.9-32 and 33:

Mitigation Measure 4.9-2a only includes archaeological values. In the separate TCR Chapter tribal values must be taken into consideration.

Comment 7: TCRs can also be historic resources as well.

Comment 8, page 4.9-33:

Implementation Measure

a: "Additional consultation with relevant tribal representatives may be appropriate, depending on the relative level of cultural sensitivity" – Because TCRs are a separate and unique resource, it is not up to an archaeologist to determine if it is sensitive for TCRs.

c: An archaeological survey is not adequate to identify TCR. PRC § 21080.3.1. (a) "The Legislature finds and declares that California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area may have expertise concerning their tribal cultural resources."

d: Again, this is not inclusive of TCRs or Tribal values. A California Native American tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated would determine if the area is sensitive to TCRs and a Tribal Monitor must be retained for these locations.

f: California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated shall provide management recommendations as necessary for TCRs.

g: The following revisions are recommended to include in the TCRs Chapter: "When a project will impact a known **tribal cultural resource archaeological site**, and avoidance is not a feasible option, ~~a qualified archaeologist~~ **California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area** shall evaluate the eligibility of the site for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. If the **archaeological site TCR** is found to be a historical resource as per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)(3), **the California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area** ~~qualified archaeologist~~ shall recommend further mitigative treatment which could include preservation in place, or reinterment ~~or data recovery~~."

UAIC's policy is preservation in place and if items must be recovered, the Tribe has protocols that must be followed which includes a burial treatment plan and keeping items in a secured location until it can be reinterred in an appropriate location as close to the original area it was removed from.

h. "If a site to be tested is prehistoric, local tribal representatives ~~should be afforded the opportunity to~~ **shall** monitor the ground-disturbing activities. Appropriate mitigation may include curation of artifacts removed during subsurface testing." UAIC protocols do not allow for curation of artifacts. However, UAIC is open to discussion of the analysis of certain artifacts. UAIC will collaborate on laboratory studies but long term curation of artifacts is not acceptable.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-2b (page 4.9-34)

c. "If avoidance is not feasible, the ~~qualified archaeologist~~ **consulting tribes** shall ~~collaborate and coordinate with the archaeologist~~ **to develop and oversee the execution of a treatment plan. The treatment plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, data recovery procedures based on location and type of archaeological resources discovered and a preparation and submittal of report of findings to the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. Data recovery shall be designed to recover the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain, based on the scientific/historical research questions that are applicable to the resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable resource questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by project proponents' actions. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical."**

IMPACT

4.9-4

Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource – PREHISTORIC: Native Americans persisted into the historic period. This Section needs to be revised. We are happy to work with your consultant to make appropriate revisions to this Section to appropriately address Native Americans in the past and present.

Policy OS4.10: Provide opportunities to for public awareness and education through coordination with the Roseville Historical Society and local schools **AND WITH LOCAL TRIBES**.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We hope that all of our comments and suggested revisions are taken into serious consideration. Again, we are happy to discuss these changes and/or assist AECOM with these revisions as a separate chapter to discuss TCRs is needed. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,
 Anna Starkey



Anna M. Starkey, M.A., RPA
Cultural Regulatory Specialist
Tribal Historic Preservation Department | UAIC
10720 Indian Hill Road
Auburn, CA 95603
Direct line: (916) 251-1565 | Cell: (530) 863-6503
astarkey@auburnrancheria.com | www.auburnrancheria.com

Nothing in this e-mail is intended to constitute an electronic signature for purposes of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (E-Sign Act), 15, U.S.C. §§ 7001 to 7006 or the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act of any state or the federal government unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this e-mail.