DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE

Phillip Road Project

State Clearinghouse No. 2025060240

Prepared for:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE CALIFORNIA

February 2026

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE

Phillip Road Project

State Clearinghouse No. 2025060240

Prepared for:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE CALIFORNIA

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

Contact:

Derek Ogden
Senior Planner

Prepared by:

Ascent
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Contact:

Sarah Henningsen
Project Manager

20240273.01

February 2026

Ascent
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

ascent.inc

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices

Figures

Tables

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

°C	degrees Celsius
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
2020 MTP/SCS	2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
2022 Scoping Plan	2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality
2025 California Energy Code	2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ACC	Advanced Clean Cars
ACC II	Advanced Clean Cars II
ADA	American Disabilities Act
ADT	average daily traffic
adwf	average dry weather flow
AERMOD	American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model
af	acre-feet
AFV	alternative fuel vehicles
afy	acre-feet per year
AP	administratively permitted
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
AQAP	air quality attainment plan
ARSP	Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials'
ATC	Group Services
BACT	best available control technology
BFE	base flood elevation
bgs	below ground surface
BMP	best management practice
Btu	British thermal units
BUG	Backlight/Uplight/Glare
C&D	construction and demolition
CA SDWA	California Safe Drinking Water Act
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAFE	Corporate Average Fuel Economy
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	climate action plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board

CBC	California Building Code
CC	Community Commercial
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCCP	Curry Creek Community Plan
CC-PD	Community Commercial—Planned Development
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFD	Community Facilities District
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CHRIS	California Historic Resources Information System
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
City	City of Roseville
CLOMR-F	Conditional Letter of Map Revision Based on Fill
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
COA	City's Comprehensive Operational Analysis
COC	contaminants of concern
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CUP	conditionally permitted
CVFPB	Central Valley Flood Protection Board
CVFPP	Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
CVSP	Creekview Specific Plan
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWC	California Water Code
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weight decibel
dbh	diameter at breast height
DCWWTP	Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant
Delta	Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta
diesel PM	PM exhaust from diesel engines
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DOF	California Department of Finance
DOT	US Department of Transportation
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
Draft EIR	draft environmental impact report

DS	Development Standards
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EAP	Energy Action Plan
ECA	Essential Connectivity Areas
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMFAC	EMission FACtors
EMS	emergency medical services
EO	executive order
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
EPAct	Energy Policy Act of 1992
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986
ERF	effective response force
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESA	environmental site assessment
ESP	Elverta Specific Plan
EU	Roseville Environmental Utilities
EV	electric vehicle
EVCS	electric vehicle charging station
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHSZ	Fire Hazard Severity Zones
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FRAP	Fire and Resource Assessment Program
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
General Plan	City of Roseville 2035 General Plan
GHG	greenhouse gas
GPA	General Plan Amendment
gpm	gallons per minute
GWP	global warming potential
H_2S	hydrogen sulfide
HAP	hazardous air pollutant
HARP	Hotspot Analysis and Reporting Program
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HDPUV	heavy-duty pickup truck and van
HDR	high-density residential
HP	Hewlett Packard
HRA	health risk assessment
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
Hz	hertz

IEPR	Integrated Energy Policy Report
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
ITP	Incidental Take Permit
ITP	Innovation Tech Park
ITP-PD	Innovation Tech Park—Planned Development
JPA	joint powers authority
kBTU	kilo-British thermal units
KSF	per thousand square feet
kV	kilovolt
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
L_{dn}	day-night level
LDR	Low-Density Residential
L_{eq}	equivalent continuous sound level
LI	Light Industrial
L_{max}	maximum sound level
LOS	level of service
LRA	local responsibility area
m	meters
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Levels
MFP	Middle Fork Project
mg/kg	milligram/kilogram
mgd	million gallons per day
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
mPa	micro-Pascals
mpg	miles per gallon
mph	miles per hour
MRF	Material Recovery Facility
MS4	municipal separate storm sewer systems
$MTCO_2e$	metric tons carbon dioxide-equivalent emissions
MTIP	Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program
MTP/SCS	metropolitan transportation plan/sustainable communities strategy
MVA	megavolt-ampere
MXD+	Mixed-Use Trip Generation Model
MY	model year
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP	natural community conservation plan
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NIH	National Institutes of Health

NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOP	notice of preparation
NO_X	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPPA	California Native Plant Protection Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
OAL	Office of Administrative Law
OCAP	Operations Criteria and Plan
OCP	organochlorine pesticides
OPR	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OS	Open Space
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OSPOMP	City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan
P	principally permitted
P/QP	Public/Quasi-Public
PCAPCD	Placer County Air Pollution Control District
PCFCWCD	Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
PCTPA	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
PCWA	Placer County Water Agency
PD	Planned Development
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PGWWTP	Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant
PM	particulate matter
PM_{10}	respirable particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less
$PM_{2.5}$	fine particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less
Porter-Cologne Act	Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970
ppb	parts per billion
ppd	pounds per day
ppmw	parts per million by weight
PPV	peak particle velocity
PR	Parks and Recreation
PRC	Public Resource Code
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRL	Parks, Recreation & Libraries
PRSP	Placer Ranch Specific Plan
PUE	Public Utility Easement
PV	photovoltaic
PVSP	Placer Vineyards Specific Plan
Qha	Holocene geological units

R3	Multi-Family Housing
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
REC	recognized environmental conditions
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocations
RHNP	Regional Housing Needs Plan
RMS	root-mean-square
ROG	reactive organic gas
RPS	California's Renewables Portfolio Standard
RS/DS	Residential/Development Standards
RUSP	Regional University Specific Plan
RVSP	Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan
RWQCB	regional water quality control board
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SAP	Roseville Communitywide Sustainability Action Plan
SAP	Sunset Area Plan
SB	Senate Bill
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
sf	square feet
SFHA	Special Flood Hazard Area
SFNA	Sacramento Federal Ozone Nonattainment Area
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014
SIP	state implementation plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SPCC	Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure
SPL	sound pressure level
SPRTA	South Placer Regional Transportation Authority
SPSP	Sutter Pointe Specific Plan
SPWA	South Placer Wastewater Authority
SR	State Route
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SRTP	Short-Range Transit Plan
SSBMI	Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
SSJDD	Sacramento San Joaquin Drainage District
STAA	Surface Transportation Assistance Act
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SVSP	Sierra Vista Specific Plan
SWMM	Stormwater Management Manual
SWMP	Stormwater Management Program
SWPPP	stormwater pollution prevention plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SWRCB-DDW	State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water

TAC	toxic air contaminant
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zones
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
THRIS	Tribal Historic Information System
TISG	VMT-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide
TMDL	total maximum daily load
tpy	tons per year
TRT	Total Response Time
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
TWLTL	two-way left-turn lane
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers
USBR	US Bureau of Reclamation
USC	United States Code
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
UST	underground storage tanks
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
UWMPA	Urban Water Management Planning Act
VCP	vibration control plan
VdB	vibration decibel
VEC	vapor encroachment conditions
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WFA	Water Forum Agreement
WPGSA	West Placer Groundwater Sustainability Agency
WPWMA	Western Placer Waste Management Authority
WQO	Water Quality Objectives
WRSP	West Roseville Specific Plan
WSA	water supply assessment
WSCP	Water Shortage Contingency Plan
WTP	Water Treatment Plant
ZEV	zero-emission vehicle

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This summary is provided in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines) Section 15123. As stated in Section 15123(a), "an EIR [environmental impact report] shall contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical." As required by the Guidelines, this chapter includes (1) a summary description of the proposed Phillip Road Project (project), (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (Table ES-1), (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative, and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project.

ES.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

Panattoni Development Company (Panattoni or project applicant) proposes to purchase and develop a property in the City of Roseville with an approximately 176-acre mixed-use development. Proposed uses include residential, retail, medical offices, and innovation center uses, as well as parks, open space, and trails. The residential uses would be separated from the other proposed uses by a new north-south public roadway, which would connect to the north by a bridge across Pleasant Grove Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek Bypass Channel. The project also includes a new electrical substation, utility extensions, and improvements to Blue Oaks Boulevard and Phillip Road.

ES.2.1 Project Location

The project site is located at 6382 Phillip Road and includes approximately 241 acres of undeveloped grazing land in the northwest corner of Roseville, in Placer County. The project site, which is currently owned by the City, is predominantly flat with some sparsely vegetated, low hills. Pleasant Grove Creek traverses the property in an east–west direction, bisecting the site into a north and south parcel. Due to previous farming activities at the project site, the original hydrology/drainage has been modified over 70+ years. The southern portion of the site includes a drainage channel that was constructed to accommodate flows from the adjacent Creekview Specific Plan development to the east of the project site.

The project site's Assessor's Parcel Number is 017-101-008-000. The existing General Plan land use designation for the project site is Public/Quasi-Public, which primarily allows for municipal and governmental facilities. The project site is zoned Planned Development (PD) and allows for agricultural, recreation, and a limited number of other civic and commercial uses.

The project site is within an area of City-owned property known as Reason Farms. The Al Johnson Wildlife Area is located to the northwest of the site and is part of an area planned to accommodate the City's Pleasant Grove Stormwater Retention Basin Facility and potential passive recreation uses. Agricultural uses are located to the west and south. The Creekview Specific Plan (east of the project site), West Roseville Specific Plan (south of the project site), and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (northeast of the project site) areas are in various stages of development and will include a total of approximately 13,630 residential units at buildout. The Roseville Environmental Utilities Operations Center project is currently under consideration for development by the City and is approximately 2 miles west of the site.

ES.2.2 Project Background

The project site is part of the City-owned property known as Reason Farms, which totals approximately 1,700 acres. The City purchased the property in 2003 for a retention basin project using development impact fees collected in the Pleasant Grove/Curry Creek Mitigation Fee program. Since 2004, further studies and refined design alternatives have

identified excess land areas which would be underutilized in achieving the retention basin project's mitigation needs. This allowed for the disposition of approximately 430 acres for other uses, which includes the approximately 241 acres being studied in this EIR, and the dedication of approximately 218 acres as an environmental preserve now known as the Al Johnson Wildlife Preserve. The remaining land for the Pleasant Grove Stormwater Retention Basin Project site totals approximately 1,052 acres.

The Pleasant Grove Stormwater Retention Basin Facility was originally known as the Reason Farms Retention Basin Facility. As the project proponent for the retention facility project, the City certified an EIR in 2003 (State Clearinghouse [SCH] # 2002072084) and is currently preparing a Subsequent EIR to evaluate changes to the retention facility. Final design and permitting for the facility is currently in process.

The project site is located in an area that is no longer needed for the retention basin project, as described above. The City has identified this property for development for over two decades. A feasibility analysis of the site was done in 2006 by the City of Roseville for a potential job center, which assumed 18 buildings totaling 1,080,000 sf.

On March 3, 2021, the City Council determined that the disposition of the property was in the City's best interest and executed an Option and Purchase and Sale Agreement to Panattoni (project applicant).

A previously proposed project, known as the Roseville Industrial Park, was proposed on the same project site and included the proposed development of a range of industrial uses, including light manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution uses. A notice of preparation (NOP) was issued by the City in July 2021, a public scoping meeting was conducted, and comments were received on the scope of the EIR. The City published a Draft EIR (SCH# 2021070186) in January 2023 and comments were received from reviewing agencies and the public. Subsequently, the applicant held a series of public workshops in 2023 and redesigned the project based on City and community feedback. The Roseville Industrial Park Project was formally withdrawn by the applicant in September 2024.

ES.2.3 Project Objectives

The project applicant has developed the following objectives for the project:

- design a comprehensively planned community with a mix of land uses to create a balanced community;
- develop a state-of-the-art employment center designed and operated to achieve the highest and best use of the property and create substantial, permanent employment opportunities for residents of Roseville and surrounding areas;
- provide for alternative transportation through connections via a system of open space, creek crossings, paseos, and Class 1A bikeways;
- support the City of Roseville's desire to create a job-housing balance, and provide high-quality employment generating uses in western Roseville;
- provide housing options in varying densities to respond to a range of market segments, including opportunities for affordable housing consistent with the City's General Plan;
- provide a variety of housing options to help the City meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) obligations;
- utilize, wherever feasible, alternative energy sources, including solar panels when possible;
- locate the project as near as possible to existing utility infrastructure with anticipated capacity;
- locate the project to be accessible from existing roads and minimize the need for construction of major new roadway improvements;
- include a mix of land uses and facilities which, taken together, provide a positive fiscal impact to the City's General Fund;
- plan for long-term growth to be positioned to react to market demand in multiple land use types; and
- minimize environmental impacts to surrounding areas and other sensitive land uses.

ES.2.4 Characteristics of the Project

The Phillip Road Project is envisioned to be a mixed-use development, with a mix of residential, retail, medical offices, and innovation center uses, Specifically, the project would include development of:

- 529 single-family residential units;
- Up to 135 multi-family residential units;
- 30,084 square feet (sf) of retail uses;
- 20,925 sf of medical offices;
- 1,011,032 sf of innovation center uses;
- 4.9 acres of park; and
- 13.9 acres of open space along Pleasant Grove Creek and the Pleasant Grove Creek Bypass Channel.

The southern portion of the project site would include residential, retail, medical offices, innovation center uses, and a park. The northern portion of the project site would include residential uses and a park. The two portions would be connected by a bridge across Pleasant Grove Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek Bypass Channel, which would remain as open space.

Two parks are proposed within the residential area: a 3-acre park in the south and a 1.9-acre park in the north. Each park would include typical City of Roseville amenities such as a picnic pavilion, play equipment, open turf areas, and walking paths with shade trees and landscaping. Landscape setbacks would also be provided along the perimeter of the innovation and commercial areas as buffers from adjacent streets, Pleasant Grove Creek, and residential uses, consisting primarily of low water-use trees, shrubs, and ground cover.

As part of the project, the site would be rezoned and the General Plan would be amended to allow for the proposed land uses. The EIR identifies the permitted uses that would be allowed in the innovation and commercial area. While actual tenants are not known yet, the project would be designed to support a range of uses consistent with the General Plan land use designations and zoning. For the purposes of this EIR analysis, higher intensity uses are assumed in order to evaluate the most conservative range of environmental impacts. "Specialized industrial" uses would either be conditionally permitted or principally permitted. "Specialized industrial" uses could include alternative energy products and related components and services, data center, or pharmaceutical and medicine manufacturing not exceeding biosafety level 2. Biosafety level 3 and 4 uses would not be permitted. Additionally, "wholesale and distribution" uses (both light and heavy), which includes warehousing, would not be permitted.

At buildout, the project would require approximately 49 megavolt-amperes (MVA) of power. Roseville Electric has identified 5 MVA currently available from its existing facilities, which would require extension of two existing 12-kilovolt (kV) underground lines. The remaining demand would be met through construction of a new 225-by-175-foot electrical substation proposed to be constructed on the project site, along with two 60-kV overhead power lines extending along the south side of Blue Oaks Boulevard to the substation.

Primary access to the project site would be provided from Blue Oaks Boulevard via a new north-south public roadway (Street A), separating the residential and commercial/innovation areas. Multiple internal roadways would provide access to each use area, and a surface parking lot would serve the innovation and commercial parcels. The project would include approximately 1,707 total parking stalls, exceeding City requirements.

A bridge across Pleasant Grove Creek and the Pleasant Grove Creek Bypass Channel would connect the northern and southern portions of the site and include two travel lanes, an 8-foot-wide sidewalk on the east side, and a 5-foot-wide sidewalk on the west side. Utility extensions, including potable water and recycled water, would be attached to the bridge, subject to City and agency permitting.

The project would also include new pedestrian and bicycle facilities, such as sidewalks, bike lanes, and Class I trails connecting to existing networks along Pleasant Grove Creek and Blue Oaks Boulevard. Off-site roadway improvements would extend Blue Oaks Boulevard and improve Phillip Road along the project's frontages.

Utility extensions for water, recycled water, wastewater, stormwater, and electricity would also be constructed to serve the project.

These improvements are described in more detail in Chapter 2, "Project Description."

PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

Depending on market demand, the project is anticipated to be developed in multiple phases, and a general phasing plan has been developed based on reasonable assumptions. Backbone infrastructure would be constructed beginning in 2027. Residential development would occur in five phases starting in 2028, with full residential occupancy projected by 2033. The innovation and commercial components would follow in up to four phases beginning as early as 2029. The timing of future phases would depend on market readiness and tenant demand. From a market absorption and practical perspective, it could take decades for the entire innovation and commercial development to come to fruition. For the purposes of the EIR, the full buildout year is conservatively assumed to be 2038.

PROJECT OPERATION

Though actual tenants are not known yet, the project's innovation and commercial uses are expected to generate 910–980 jobs at full buildout. Operational hours would vary based on the actual tenants. Typical operational hours for the innovation center uses would be 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., 5 days per week. Typical operational hours for the commercial uses would be 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., 7 days per week.

The project's residential component would provide housing for 1,550–1,650 residents at buildout.

ES.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts for the proposed Phillip Road Project. The table provides the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after implementation of the mitigation measures.

The proposed Phillip Road Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts; that is, no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project's impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Transportation and Circulation: Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Pedestrian Facilities (project); and Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Transit Facilities (project)
- Air Quality: Construction Emissions (cumulative); Long-term Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors (project and cumulative); Toxic Air Contaminants (cumulative)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change: Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment (project and cumulative)
- Noise and Vibration: Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Excessive Traffic Noise Levels (project)
- Utilities and Service Systems: New or Expanded Utility Infrastructure or Determination of Inadequate Capacity (cumulative)
- Aesthetics: Visual Character and Quality (cumulative); and Light and Glare (cumulative)

ES.4 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following provides brief descriptions of the alternatives evaluated in this Draft EIR.

- **Alternative 1: No Project Alternative** assumes no development occurs on the project site. The project site would remain in its current condition (undeveloped grazing land).
- **Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint and Development Alternative** would eliminate proposed development on the northern portion of the project site, which eliminates the need for the bridge across Pleasant Grove Creek and the Pleasant Grove Creek Bypass Channel. This alternative also results in a reduction of development area, compared to the proposed project.
- **Alternative 3: Residential-only Alternative** would involve development of the project site with residential land uses only, rather than the mix of uses proposed for the project. Specifically, the proposed retail, medical offices, and innovation center uses would not be developed on the project site. Residential land uses would be developed on both the southern and northern portions of the project site and a bridge would be installed (similar to the project), to connect both areas.

Table ES-2 provides a summary comparison of the alternatives and the proposed project at buildout.

Table ES-2 Summary Comparison of the Alternatives and the Proposed Project at Buildout

Land Use/Project Component	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint and Development Alternative	Alternative 3: Residential-only Alternative
Development Type	Mixed Use	No development	Mixed Use	Residential
Retail	30,084 sf	0	30,084 sf	0
Medical offices	20,925 sf	0	20,925 sf	0
Innovation center	1,011,032 sf	0	1,011,032 sf	0
Employees	910–980 employees	0	910–980 employees	0
Residential units	664 units	0	453 units	1,014 units
Residents	1,550–1,650 residents	0	1,078 residents	2,480 residents
Total acreage to be developed	176 acres	0	128 acres	176 acres
Site layout	Northern and southern portions	None	Southern portion only	Northern and southern portions

Notes: sf = square feet.

Source: Data compiled by Ascent in 2026.

Further details on these alternatives, and an evaluation of environmental effects relative to the proposed project, are provided in Chapter 6, "Alternatives."

ES.4.1 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Because the No Project Alternative would avoid all adverse impacts resulting from construction and operation of the Phillip Road Project analyzed in Chapter 3, it is the environmentally superior alternative. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the objectives of the project. When the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[e][2]) require selection of an environmentally superior alternative from among the other action alternatives evaluated.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of Alternative 2 would meet most of the project objectives but would not meet the objective related to designing a comprehensively planned community with a mix of land uses and a range of residential densities to create a balanced community to the same extent as the proposed project, due to the fact that this alternative includes less residential uses compared to the project. Likewise, because this alternative would result in fewer housing units, it would also not meet objectives related to helping the City meet its RHNA obligations to the same extent as the project. This alternative may also not meet the objective related to the highest and best use of the property because it would cut off the 50-acre northern portion of the project site from near-term development.

Similar to Alternative 2, implementing Alternative 3 would also not meet the basic project objective of designing a comprehensively planned community with a mix of land uses to create a balanced community because only residential land uses would be developed. Nor would this alternative meet the project objectives related to developing a state-of-the-art employment center; creating substantial, permanent employment opportunities; supporting the City's desire to create a job-housing balance; providing high-quality employment generating uses; or providing a mix of land uses and facilities which, taken together, would provide a positive fiscal impact to the City's General Fund.

ABILITY TO REDUCE PROJECT IMPACTS

Impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be less than or similar to the proposed project and may reduce (but would not avoid) the project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation (pedestrian and transit facilities), air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and traffic noise. This is, in part, because the project's mitigation measures for transportation and circulation (pedestrian and transit facilities) impacts, while they would be effective if implemented, are not fully enforceable by the City. In addition, while mitigation measures would reduce air quality and GHG impacts, the actual future tenants are unknown, the exact onsite emissions reductions cannot be quantified, and it cannot be guaranteed that air quality and GHG emissions would be reduced to the necessary levels. Finally, like the project, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would reduce traffic noise.

Impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be similar to or greater than the proposed project. Like Alternative 2, Alternative 3 may reduce (but would not avoid) the project's significant and unavoidable impacts because the project site would still be developed and it is unknown if mitigation measures (if available) would sufficiently reduce impacts related to transportation and circulation (pedestrian and transit facilities), air quality, GHG, and traffic noise. Further, while this potential alternative may reduce some of the impacts of the project, it could result in greater impacts related to vehicle miles traveled, operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, and demands on public services. Because it would not substantially reduce the project's significant impacts and may result in greater impacts for some resource areas, Alternative 3 is not the environmentally superior alternative.

Because Alternative 2 would be developed on a smaller project footprint (and would reduce the amount of residential land use) compared to the project, impacts related to air quality, GHGs, biological resources, cultural resources, aesthetics, and Tribal cultural resources would be reduced. However, because Alternative 2 would include the same land uses as the project (innovation and commercial as well as residential), it would generate similar impacts related to land and use and agricultural resources; population, housing, and employment; transportation and circulation; noise and vibration; hazardous materials, wildfire, and other hazards; public services and recreation; utilities and service systems; hydrology and water quality; and energy. Thus, Alternative 2 would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation, air quality, GHG, and traffic noise. Nevertheless, because it would reduce the significant impacts associated with the project, Alternative 2 is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

ES.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092 and California Code of Regulations Section 15082, the City issued a notice of preparation (NOP) for the proposed Phillip Road Project on June 6, 2025, to inform agencies and the general public that an EIR was being prepared and to invite comments on the scope and content of the document. The NOP and responses to the NOP are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. Based on the comments received during the NOP comment period, the major areas of controversy associated with the project include:

- concern about allowable uses within the new Innovation Tech Park (ITP) zone;
- concern about allowing potentially hazardous uses on the project site (e.g., Biosafety level 3);
- potential for soil contamination due to past agricultural use of the project site, and recommendation to test imported soil and fill material for potential contaminants of concern;
- concern about traffic safety (e.g., speed) along Blue Oaks Boulevard given the inconsistent roadway width;
- concern about continued growth in Roseville and roadway safety;
- relationship of the project to the planned widening of Blue Oaks Boulevard;
- relationship of the project to the planned Placer Parkway project;
- suggestion to add a masonry wall separating the existing Creekview neighborhood from project construction to reduce construction noise, dust, and rodents;
- potential impacts to biological resources along the Pleasant Grove Creek corridor, as well as potential degradation of water quality in the creek;
- potential impacts to cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources; and
- water supply source and availability to serve the project.

Areas of controversy that fall within the scope of CEQA are addressed in this Draft EIR. Issues that fall outside the scope of CEQA are not evaluated in this Draft EIR; however, the City will continue to respond to these issues through the project planning process.

All of the substantive environmental issues raised in the NOP comment letters have been addressed or otherwise considered during preparation of this Draft EIR.

ES.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The City will consider whether or not to certify the EIR and approve the proposed Phillip Road Project. Other actions and planning entitlements requested by the project applicant from the City are listed in Section 2.7, "Potential Permits and Approvals Required."

Other federal, state, and local agencies may also need to grant permits or approvals for the project; these are also listed in Section 2.7, "Potential Permits and Approvals Required."

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Land Use and Agricultural Resources			
Impact 3.1-1: Conflict with any Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating an Environmental Effect	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.1-2: Result in the Conversion of Farmland	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Population, Employment, and Housing			
Impact 3.2-1: Potential to Induce Substantial Unplanned Population Growth	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Transportation and Circulation			
Impact 3.3-1: Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.3-2: Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Pedestrian Facilities	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: Construct Sidewalk Adjacent to Project Site	SU
Impact 3.3-3: Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Bicycle Facilities	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.3-4: Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Transit Facilities	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.3-4: Contribute Fair Share Funding to Offset Annual Operating Cost of Fixed-Route Bus Service to West Roseville	SU
Impact 3.3-5: Increased Hazards due to Geometric Design Features, Incompatible Uses, or Inadequate Emergency Access	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Air Quality			
Impact 3.4-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.4-2: Construction Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.4-3: Long-term Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors	S	Mitigation Measure 3.4-3a: Promote Green Consumer Products Mitigation Measure 3.4-3b: Require the Use of Electric Landscaping Equipment Mitigation Measure 3.4-3c: Installation of EV Charging Stations Meeting the Tier 2 Voluntary Requirements of the Most Recent CALGreen Code Mitigation Measure 3.4-3d: Truck Loading Dock Electrification and Idling Control Mitigation Measure 3.4-3e: Implement a Mandatory Commute Reduction Program for Employees Mitigation Measure 3.4-3f: Reduce Ozone Precursors through Off-site Measures	SU

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 3.4-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations	S	Mitigation Measure 3.4-4a: Implement Clean Construction Fleet Mitigation Measure 3.4-4b: Install Tier 4 Generators	LTS
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change			
Impact 3.5-1: Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment	S	Mitigation Measure 3.5-1a: Implement All Feasible On-Site Features to Reduce Operational GHG Emissions Mitigation Measure 3.5-1b: Decarbonize New Nonresidential Buildings Mitigation Measure 3.5-1c: Use Renewable Natural Gas Mitigation Measure 3.5-1d: Off-Site GHG Reduction Measures	SU
Impact 3.5-2: Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of Greenhouse Gases	S	Mitigation Measure 3.5-2a: Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-3c Mitigation Measure 3.5-2b: Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-3e Mitigation Measure 3.5-2c: Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-1c	LTS
Noise and Vibration			
Impact 3.6-1: Construction-Generated Noise	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-2: Construction-Generated Vibration	S	Mitigation Measure 3.6-2: Develop and Implement Vibration Control Plan	LTS
Impact 3.6-3: Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Excessive Traffic Noise Levels	S	No mitigation is available.	SU
Impact 3.6-4: Long-Term Operational Non-Transportation Noise Levels	S	Mitigation Measure 3.6-4a: Reduce Generator Noise Exposure Mitigation Measure 3.6-4b: Reduce Parking Lot Noise Exposure	LTS
Biological Resources			
Impact 3.7-1: Result in Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Plant Species	PS	Mitigation 3.7-1: Conduct Special-Status Plant Surveys and Implement Avoidance Measures and Mitigation	LTS
Impact 3.7-2: Result in Disturbance to or Loss of Special-Status Wildlife Species and Habitat	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.7-2a: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Western Spadefoot, Implement Avoidance Measures, and Relocate Individuals Mitigation Measure 3.7-2b: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Northwestern Pond Turtle, Implement Avoidance Measures, and Relocate Individuals Mitigation Measure 3.7-2c: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Burrowing Owls and Implement Protective Buffers Mitigation Measure 3.7-2d: Conduct Focused Surveys for Special-Status Birds, Nesting Raptors, and Other Native Nesting Birds, and Implement Protective Buffers Mitigation Measure 3.7-2e: Implement Protection Measures for Special-Status Fish	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		Mitigation Measure 3.7-2f: Conduct Pre-construction Vernal Pool Avoidance Surveys, Protocol-Level Branchiopod Surveys, and Compensate for Loss of Vernal Pool Branchiopods Mitigation Measure 3.7-2g: Conduct Focused Surveys for Crotch's Bumble Bee and Implement Avoidance Measures Mitigation Measure 3.7-2h: Conduct surveys for Milkweed Plants, Monarch Eggs, and Monarch Caterpillars, and Implement Avoidance Measures Mitigation Measure 3.7-2i: Conduct Focused Surveys for Ringtail Dens and Implement Avoidance Measures Mitigation Measure 3.7-2j: Conduct Focused Bat Surveys and Implement Avoidance Measures	
Impact 3.7-3: Result in Degradation or Loss of Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Communities	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.7-3: Provide Stream Setbacks, Best Management Practices, and Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Riparian Habitat	LTS
Impact 3.7-4: Result in Degradation or Loss of State or Federally Protected Wetlands	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.7-4a: Implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-2e and 3.7-3 Mitigation Measure 3.7-4b: Identify State or Federally Protected Wetlands, Implement Avoidance Measures, and Obtain Permits for Unavoidable Impacts on Wetlands	LTS
Impact 3.7-5: Interfere with Wildlife Movement Corridors or Impede the Use of Wildlife Nurseries	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.7-5a: Implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-2d, 3.7-2e, and 3.7-3 Mitigation Measure 3.7-5b: Utilize Wildlife-Friendly Building and Fencing Designs	LTS
Impact 3.7-6: Conflict with Local Policies and Ordinances	PS	Mitigation 3.7-6: Remove and Replace Protected Trees Consistent with the Chapter 19.66 of the City of Roseville Municipal Code, "Tree Preservation"	LTS
Cultural Resources			
Impact 3.8-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Unique Archaeological Resources	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.8-1a: Develop and Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program Mitigation Measure 3.8-1b: Halt Ground Disturbance Upon Discovery of Subsurface Archaeological Features	LTS
Impact 3.8-2: Disturb Human Remains	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.8-2: Halt Ground Disturbance Upon Discovery of Human Remains	LTS
Hazardous Materials, Wildfire, and Other Hazards			
Impact 3.9-1: Storage, Use, Disposal, Transport, or Upset of Hazardous Materials	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.9-2: Impair an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.9-2: Provide Adequate Emergency Access in Case of Temporary Lane Closures During Construction	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 3.9-3: Exacerbate Wildfire Risk as a Result of Installation of Infrastructure	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.9-3a: Prepare and Implement a Fire Risk Management Plan Mitigation Measure 3.9-3b: Implement Fire Prevention Measures during Construction	LTS
Public Services and Recreation			
Impact 3.10-1: Result in the Need for New or Expanded Fire Service Facilities	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.10-2: Result in the Need for New or Expanded Police Facilities	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.10-3: Result in the Need for New or Expanded Schools	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.10-4: Result in the Need for New or Expanded Library Facilities	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.10-5: Result in the Need for New or Expanded Parks and/or Recreation Facilities and Potential for Accelerated or Substantial Deterioration of Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities from Increased Use	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Utilities and Service Systems			
Impact 3.11-1: New or Expanded Utility Infrastructure or Determination of Inadequate Capacity	LTS	No mitigation is available.	LTS
Impact 3.11-2: Adequacy of Water Supplies	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.11-3: Landfill Capacity and Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 3.12-1: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Otherwise Degrade Water Quality, or Interfere with Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.12-2: Substantially Decrease Groundwater Supplies, Interfere with Groundwater Recharge, or Interfere with Implementation of a Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.12-3: Substantially Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern of the Site Resulting in Substantial Flooding, Additional Sources of Polluted Runoff, or Exceedance of Existing Stormwater Infrastructure Capacity	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.12-3: Reduce Flood Hazards	LTS
Aesthetics			
Impact 3.13-1: Substantially Degrade the Existing Visual Character or Quality of the Site or its Surroundings	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.13-2: Create a New Source of Substantial Light or Glare That Would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Energy			
Impact 3.14-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy, During Project Construction or Operation	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.14-2: Conflict with or Obstruct a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Tribal Cultural Resources			
Impact 3.15-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.15-1a: Retain a Tribal Monitor for the Initial Ground Disturbance and Any Ground disturbance Near Pleasant Grove Creek Mitigation Measure 3.15-1b: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources	LTS
Cumulative Impacts			
Land Use and Agricultural Resources	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Population, Employment, and Housing	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Transportation and Circulation	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Air Quality	S	There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change	S	There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
Noise and Vibration	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Biological Resources	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Cultural Resources	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Hazardous Materials, Wildfire, and Other Hazards	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Public Services and Recreation	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Utilities and Service Systems	S	There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Aesthetics	S	There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
Energy	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS
Tribal Cultural Resources	LTS	No additional mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable