

5 OTHER CEQA SECTIONS

5.1 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

5.1.1 CEQA Requirements

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 21100(b)(5) specifies that the growth-inducing impacts of a project must be addressed in an environmental impact report (EIR). Section 15126.2(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides the following guidance for assessing growth-inducing impacts of a project:

Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also, discuss the characteristics of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

A project can induce growth directly, indirectly, or both. Direct growth inducement would result if a project involved construction of new housing. Indirect growth inducement would result, for instance, if implementing a project resulted in any of the following:

- ▶ substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial, or governmental enterprises);
- ▶ substantial short-term employment opportunities (e.g., construction employment) that indirectly stimulates the need for additional housing and services to support the new temporary employment demand; and/or
- ▶ removal of an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as removing a constraint on a required public utility or service (e.g., construction of a major sewer line with excess capacity through an undeveloped area).

Growth inducement itself is not an environmental effect but may foreseeably lead to environmental effects. If substantial growth inducement occurs, it can result in secondary environmental effects, such as increased demand for housing, demand for other community and public services and infrastructure capacity, increased traffic and noise, degradation of air or water quality, degradation or loss of plant or animal habitats, conversion of agricultural and open-space land to urban uses, and other effects.

5.1.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project

AREA NOT PLANNED FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

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 (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 conducted a feasibility analysis of the site in 2006 for a potential job center, which assumed 18 buildings totaling 1,080,000 square feet [sf]; however, this concept was later abandoned and in 2019 the City declared the property as surplus because there are no identified future City needs for the parcel and the property is underutilized. Thus, while the City has identified the Reasons Farms property for development for at least the past 10 years, the City did not envision the mix of uses proposed by the Phillips Road Project.

The proposed project differs substantially from the retention basin project envisioned in the 2003 EIR. Specifically, the Phillip Road Project is envisioned to be a mixed-use development, with 529 single-family residential units, up to 135 multi-family residential units, 30,084 sf of retail uses, 20,925 sf of medical offices, 1,011,032 sf of innovation center uses, parks and open space, utility infrastructure (including an electrical substation), and extensions and improvements to Blue Oaks Boulevard and Phillip Road.

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), which allows for agricultural, recreation, and a limited number of other civic and commercial uses. As part of the project, the site would be rezoned and the General Plan would be amended to allow for the proposed land uses.

In summary, the project is proposed to be developed on land that was not planned for mixed use development and is not consistent with the current General Plan land use designations. Therefore, the project would be growth inducing in this respect because it would result in urban development on land that is currently designated as Public/Quasi-Public in the adopted General Plan.

EXTENSION OF INFRASTRUCTURE

The project would require the extension of existing infrastructure and development of new infrastructure. The project includes the construction of local roadways throughout the project site. Off-site roadway improvements would include the extension of Blue Oaks Boulevard along the southern frontage of the project. Blue Oaks Boulevard would be constructed in phases, as described in Chapter 2, "Project Description." Ultimately, Blue Oaks Boulevard will consist of six travel lanes, with bike lanes on each side, a median, curb and gutter, and detached sidewalk on both sides of the road. Extending and widening Blue Oaks Boulevard was identified as a capital improvement project in the City's 2035 General Plan Update EIR. Improvements would also be made to Phillip Road along the western frontage of the project. Phillip Road would be constructed as a Modified Collector containing two drive lanes with curb and gutter, and a sidewalk along the east side of the road.

The project would include installation of onsite utility infrastructure and connections to the offsite infrastructure. In particular, a new potable water main and recycled water main would be installed within Blue Oaks Boulevard to connect to existing potable and recycled water mains at Westbrook Boulevard. At Phillip Road, a 24-inch stub would be provided to the south to serve future development, and a 16-inch water main would be constructed north along Phillip Road to serve the proposed Roseville Environmental Utilities Operations Center.

A new lift station would be installed south of the Pleasant Grove Creek Bypass Channel to convey wastewater flows from the northern portion of the site. A force main would be constructed from the lift station south along Road A. The line would then run east along Blue Oaks Boulevard and Westbrook Boulevard. The proposed Roseville Environmental Utilities Operations Center would connect to the Phillip Road Site's wastewater infrastructure and the flows from this separate project are accounted for in the sizing of the new sewer mains and sewer lift station that would be installed as part of the proposed project.

Additionally, the project includes the construction of an electrical substation on the project site and the extension of two 60-kilovolt (kV) overhead power lines starting at the southeast corner of Westbrook Boulevard and through the project site on the commercial side to the new substation.

The project applicant would be required to pay its fair share of various utility infrastructure improvements as development proceeds, consistent with project conditions of approval and mitigation measures included in this EIR. The above would represent an extension of utility infrastructure to an area not currently served by such systems. However, the project site is located adjacent to several specific plan areas, including the Creekview Specific Plan area (adopted by the City in 2011), the West Roseville Specific Plan area (adopted by the City in 2004), and the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan area (adopted by the City in 2016). These specific plan areas are in various stages of development and would each include extension of utility infrastructure to serve their respective communities. Thus, the project would not remove obstacles to further growth in the project area.

Utility infrastructure and Blue Oaks Boulevard have already been extended to within 2,000 feet of the City boundary as a result of the development of the Creekview Specific Plan development. Therefore, the project would not remove obstacles to growth by bringing utility infrastructure closer to undeveloped areas. Moreover, the proposed infrastructure improvements would be sized to serve the project's transportation, circulation, and utility requirements, and would also be sized to serve the proposed Roseville Environmental Utilities Operations Center project (which is not yet approved, but is under consideration by the City). The off-site infrastructure improvements would not, however, support other future development. (Note: The proposed Roseville Environmental Utilities Operations Center is considered in the cumulative analysis in Chapter 4, "Cumulative Impacts.") Therefore, the project would not substantially create opportunities for other development in a way that could induce substantial population growth.

CONSTRUCTION-RELATED GROWTH

Project construction would be conducted over multiple phases of development. For any given phase, there would be a range of 75–125 construction workers for a given shift. Because construction workers typically do not change where they live when they are assigned to a new construction site, it is not anticipated that there would be substantial relocation of construction workers to Roseville or Placer County associated with the project. Additionally, Roseville had 4,345 people employed in the construction industry as of 2023 (US Census 2023) and Placer County as a whole had many thousands more. Construction employees would likely include some commuters from other nearby communities outside Roseville, but within the region. Therefore, the project's anticipated construction labor force would be fulfilled by residents currently living in the region and would not result in substantial increased housing demand in the region. Because the existing number of construction workers in the City and surrounding region would likely be sufficient to meet the demand that would be generated by the project, no substantial increase in demand for housing or goods and services would be created by the project and, thus, no growth inducement associated with these workers would occur.

RESIDENTIAL AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

The project involves the development of a mix of land uses that would generate new jobs and housing in Roseville, which could lead to direct population growth. At buildout, the project would result in 664 new housing units, for a population growth of 1,550–1,650 residents. One of the primary objectives of the project is to build a comprehensively planned community with a mix of land uses and a range of residential densities to create a balanced community. Other related objectives include supporting the City of Roseville's desire to create a job-housing balance and providing high-quality employment generating uses in western Roseville; providing 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; and providing a variety of housing options to help the City meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) obligations. Development of the project would help fulfill the City's RHNA, which calls for the construction of 12,066 housing units over the 9-year planning period (2021 through 2029) within the City (SACOG 2020: 4-11). Although the project's single-family units would not meet affordable housing needs, those units could

meet moderate and above-moderate housing needs. (It should be noted that the multi-family units could provide an opportunity for affordable housing; however, these are not proposed as affordable housing units.)

With buildout of the General Plan in 2035, Roseville is estimated to have a total population of approximately 198,000, with approximately 75,200 dwelling units, 60 million square feet of non-residential building square footage, and between 120,000 and 150,000 local jobs (City of Roseville 2020). The project would include 664 new housing units, for a population growth of 1,550–1,650 residents. The project would also include 1,011,032 square feet (sf) of innovation center uses, 20,925 sf of medical offices, and 30,084 sf of retail uses. This would generate 910–980 jobs, including 825–875 innovation jobs, 30–45 medical office jobs, and 50–60 retail jobs (see Table 2-7 in Chapter 2, “Project Description”). The total increase of 664 housing units, 1,550–1,650 residents, and 910–980 jobs would be well within the General Plan projections.

Therefore, the new residents and jobs associated with the project would directly contribute to population growth within Roseville, but the project would not in and of itself cause the growth projections to be exceeded and would represent a small percentage of anticipated future growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial direct growth-inducement.

5.2 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) requires EIRs to include a discussion of the significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented. As documented throughout Chapter 3 (project level impacts) and Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impacts,” of this Draft EIR, after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, most of the impacts associated with the proposed Phillip Road Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, the following impacts are considered significant and unavoidable; that is, no feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project’s impacts to a less-than-significant level. Refer to Chapters 3 and 4 for further information regarding the analysis and impact determinations.

5.2.1 Transportation and Circulation

Impact 3.3-2: Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Pedestrian Facilities

Continuous pedestrian facilities are lacking on Blue Oaks Boulevard adjacent to the project site. This would be inconsistent with General Plan Policies CIRC6.1, CIRC6.3, and CIRC6.5, which call for establishing and maintaining a safe and continuous pedestrian network that encourages walking. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 would result in the construction of a sidewalk in the area specified and would lead to consistency with adopted City policies, plans, or programs regarding pedestrian facilities and, thus, would effectively mitigate the impact. However, this mitigation measure would require the project applicant to work with an adjacent property owner where the missing segment is located to obtain permission and the rights to construct temporary sidewalks in these areas. Further, the City does not have the jurisdiction to monitor or enforce this mitigation measure. Thus, while the mitigation would be effective, the extent to which it can be implemented is conditional based on other property owners and is outside the City’s jurisdiction to implement. Therefore, after mitigation, this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Impact 3.3-4: Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Transit Facilities

The project would add new residents and employees to a site that is not currently served by public transit. The project would construct a bus turnout along its southern frontage (on the north side of Blue Oaks Boulevard) to accommodate future fixed-route bus service. Roseville Transit’s on-demand Arrow bus service operates within the City limits including the project site. However, because transit service is not currently provided along Blue Oaks Boulevard near the project site and there are no assurances that adequate transit service would be available to serve the project, the project would not be consistent with General Plan goals and policies related to transit. Until public transit is provided to the project site, this impact would be potentially significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-4 would result in the project applicant contributing fair share funding to cover a portion of the cost for the City to expand transit service to West Roseville. However, the remaining funding sources are not known and this transit system enhancement is not amongst the higher priority near-term transit system enhancements. Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

5.2.2 Air Quality

Impact 3.4-3: Long-term Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors

Implementation of the project would result in long-term operational emissions from building-related energy and area-wide sources (e.g., landscaping equipment) as well as from mobile sources associated with residences, employee commute, and operational truck travel. Based on modeling conducted, operational emissions would exceed the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) threshold of 55 pounds per day (lb/day) for reactive organic gas (ROG). Therefore, implementation of the project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants and could result in adverse health impacts. This impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-3a would help reduce the amount of ROG emitted due to operational activities by educating occupants about alternative consumer products that have lower ROG/VOC content and Mitigation Measure 3.4-3b would require the use of electric landscaping equipment for maintenance activities within the project site. Mitigation Measure 3.4-3d would require electrification of any proposed truck loading dock as well as idling control. Mitigation Measure 3.4-3e would require the implementation of a mandatory commute reduction program for employees. However, because the actual future tenants are unknown at this time, the level to which each individual on-site mitigation measure can be implemented is unknown; thus, emissions reductions from Mitigation Measures 3.4-3a, 3.4-3b, 3.4-3d, and 3.4-3e were not quantified for this analysis.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3c would provide the necessary electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure to demonstrate compliance with the Tier 2 requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code in effect at the time of project development. This measure is required to demonstrate the project is doing its "fair share" in assisting the state in meeting its long-term greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction and air quality goals. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3c would result in an approximate 2.4 percent reduction in ROG emissions (see Appendix B for detailed calculations). Specifically, after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3c, the remaining ROG emissions to offset would be approximately 45 lb/day. These excess emissions would be offset by the off-site mitigation program (Mitigation Measure 3.4-3f), through which the applicant and future tenants would pay a fee to achieve PCAPCD thresholds of significance for a one-year period. The off-site mitigation program fees are used to fund emissions reductions projects such as the replacement of non-EPA certified woodstoves with EPA-certified appliances, replacement of older high-emissions diesel engines used by transit operators with new low-emission or zero-emission vehicles, and other projects that result in long-term operational emissions reductions. With incorporation of Mitigation Measures 3.4-3a through 3.4-3f, project-generated operational emissions of ozone precursors would be reduced. However, given that the actual future tenants are unknown at this time and the long-term buildout or full occupancy of the project, it cannot be guaranteed at this time that offsets would be available in the amounts needed at the time they are needed to reduce emissions to the levels necessary. Thus, this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

5.2.3 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

The project is estimated to generate maximum annual emissions of 5,164 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) from construction activities and 21,197 MTCO_{2e}/year during full buildout operations in 2038. Annual maximum construction emissions of 5,164 MTCO_{2e} would not exceed the PCAPCD bright-line threshold of 10,000 MTCO_{2e}/year. Operational emissions associated with the residential component of the project (i.e., 3.3 MTCO_{2e}/capita) would not exceed the applicable efficiency threshold of 4.5 MTCO_{2e}/capita and emissions associated

with the non-residential component (i.e., 14.9 MTCO₂e/1,000 sf) would not exceed the applicable efficiency threshold of 26.5 MTCO₂e/1,000 sf. However, the project results in total emissions which exceed the bright-line threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/year and therefore, this impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-3c would reduce GHG emissions (i.e., up to 323 MTCO₂e/year; See Appendix B) by promoting EV use. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-1a would reduce onsite GHG emissions associated with building energy and transportation. Mitigation Measure 3.5-1b would prohibit natural gas use for most nonresidential uses and Mitigation Measure 3.5-1c would require the use of renewable natural gas for the nonresidential land uses that would require natural gas. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce onsite operational GHG emissions. However, given that the actual future tenants are unknown at this time, the exact onsite GHG emissions reductions cannot be quantified, and it cannot be guaranteed at this time that GHG emissions would be reduced to the levels necessary. Mitigation Measure 3.5-1d would offset a single year of operation-related GHG emissions but would not reduce emissions for the life of the project below the applicable threshold. For these reasons, this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

5.2.4 Noise and Vibration

Impact 3.6-3: Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Excessive Traffic Noise Levels

Project operation would result in an increase in traffic volumes along project-affected roadways, resulting in long-term permanent increases in traffic noise. Traffic noise modeling was conducted for the existing and the existing-plus-project conditions. Based on modeling conducted and applicable City of Roseville allowable noise increase standards, a substantial noise increase would occur on the segment of Blue Oaks Boulevard from the project site to Westbrook Boulevard as an increase of 10.7 A-weighted decibels (dBA) would occur with implementation of the project. This impact would be significant.

As described in Chapter 4, "Cumulative Impacts," noise volumes along the segment of Blue Oaks Boulevard from the project site to Westbrook Boulevard were already anticipated to exceed 60 dB in the cumulative condition with or without the project. As demonstrated in the Creekview Specific Plan EIR, roadway noise along Blue Oaks Boulevard west of Westbrook Boulevard were anticipated to reach noise levels of 65.5 dBA L_{dn} in the cumulative condition with buildout of the Creekview Specific Plan (City of Roseville 2011: Table 5-42). All feasible mitigation was applied at the time the Creekview Specific Plan was approved, and the required mitigation has been completed. The existing subdivision north of Blue Oaks Boulevard and west of Westbrook Boulevard is set back 40 feet from the edge of Blue Oaks Boulevard, separated by a landscape buffer, and a 6-foot masonry sound wall was constructed. No additional feasible mitigation is available. Residences along Blue Oaks Boulevard from the project site to Westbrook Boulevard would experience the relative noise impact of existing noise levels being perceived as doubling as a result of the project. Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

5.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

AIR QUALITY (CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS)

Placer County and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) are in nonattainment for ozone (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROG] and oxides of nitrogen [NO_x]) and respirable particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less with respect to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), and in nonattainment for ozone and fine particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM_{2.5}) with respect to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Construction activities in the region would add particulate matter and ozone emissions into the SVAB that may conflict with attainment efforts. Cumulative development identified in Section 4.2.3, "Related Projects," while required to mitigate for adverse air quality impacts, will contribute to regional emissions, resulting in a significant adverse cumulative impact.

Project-related construction emissions of ROG and NO_x would not exceed the applicable mass emission thresholds established by PCAPCD. PCAPCD considers these thresholds to be the criteria for determining whether emissions generated by an individual project would be cumulatively considerable (PCAPCD 2017: 21). Therefore, project construction emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. However, because of the scale and extent of construction activities that would occur cumulatively, as well as the uncertainty of construction activities and timing of different phases, construction activities could overlap, resulting in emissions that exceed PCAPCD's daily construction thresholds. Therefore, the project **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to construction emissions. This cumulative impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

AIR QUALITY (LONG-TERM OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS)

Ozone impacts are the result of cumulative emissions from numerous sources in the region and transport from outside the region. Reasonably foreseeable regional development identified in Section 4.2.3, "Related Projects," will add urban development on undeveloped land in the region. All of this regional development will increase emissions that contribute to ozone impacts. Ozone is formed in chemical reactions involving NO_x, ROG, and sunlight. All but the largest individual sources emit NO_x and ROG in amounts too small to have a measurable effect on ambient ozone concentrations by themselves. However, when all sources throughout the region are combined, they can result in ambient concentrations of ozone that exceed the NAAQS and CAAQS.

PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} have similar regional cumulative impacts when particulates are entrained in the air and build to unhealthy concentrations over time. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} also have the potential to cause significant local problems during periods of dry conditions accompanied by high winds, and during periods of heavy earth disturbing activities. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} may have cumulative local impacts if, for example, several unrelated grading or earth moving activities are underway simultaneously at nearby sites. Cumulative projects include several, large-scale developments in close enough proximity (e.g., Amoruso Ranch, Creekview Specific Plan, West Roseville Specific Plan, Whitney Ranch, and Twelve Bridges Specific Plan) such that localized PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} effects could occur. Operational PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} are less likely to result in local cumulative impacts as operational sources of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} tend to be spread throughout the region (i.e., vehicles traveling on roads), not affecting any one receptor. Therefore, emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from cumulative development are significant in the air basin.

The operational emissions associated with implementation of the project would exceed the applicable thresholds for ROG. Because the PCAPCD thresholds are directly tied to attaining the NAAQS and CAAQS, projects that do exceed these thresholds would contribute to adverse health effects. Therefore, the project's contribution to the nonattainment status of the SVAB with respect to the CAAQS and NAAQS would be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.4-3a, 3.4-3b, 3.4-3d, and 3.4-3e would reduce operational emissions. However, because the actual future tenants are unknown at this time, the level to which each individual on-site mitigation measure can be implemented is unknown; thus, emissions reductions associated with these measures were not quantified. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3c would result in an approximate 2.4 percent reduction in ROG emissions (refer to Appendix B for detailed calculations) and Mitigation Measure 3.4-3f would offset the remaining excess emissions for a one-year period through an off-site mitigation program. Mitigation Measures 3.4-3a through 3.4-3f would reduce project-generated operational emissions. However, given that the actual future tenants are unknown and the long-term buildout and occupancy of the project, it cannot be guaranteed at this time that offsets would be available in the amounts needed at the time they are needed to reduce emissions to the necessary levels. Thus, the project's contribution to the nonattainment status of the SVAB with respect to the CAAQS and NAAQS would be considered cumulatively considerable despite mitigation. Similar to the project, cumulative development would be required to implement mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen emissions of operational air pollutants that would otherwise exceed the thresholds. Therefore, the project **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to conflicts with applicable air quality plans. This cumulative impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

AIR QUALITY (TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS)

Toxic air contaminants (TACs), which are examined under Impact 3.4-4 in Section 3.4, "Air Quality," are also pollutants of localized concern. Diesel particulate matter emissions are the primary TAC of concern regarding the construction and operation of new urban land uses and infrastructure. The health risk-based significance criteria used to evaluate TACs under Impact 3.4-4 are also inherently cumulative. This impact examines whether implementing the project would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions that would result in cancer risk of 10 in 1 million or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1 at any receptor. The project would result in TAC emissions that would exceed the applicable threshold and result in health risk at nearby sensitive receptors before mitigation. The effects of TAC concentrations are typically localized to areas in the near vicinity of a project site and adjacent areas. However, there are several nearby cumulative projects (see Figure 4-1 in Chapter 4, "Cumulative Impacts") adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the incremental effects of the project would combine with the effects of these projects to create potentially significant cumulative TAC impacts since these projects could also affect the same receptors as the project. Mitigation Measures 3.4-4a and 3.4-4b would reduce emissions associated with construction and operational activities, respectively, to below the applicable thresholds. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Nearby projects would also be required to incorporate similar mitigation to reduce significant TAC emissions, which, when considered collectively, would reduce the cumulative health risk to below the applicable threshold. However, it cannot be determined with certainty that future TAC concentrations would not expose any receptors to levels that exceed 10 in 1 million when combined with other projects. Consequently, the project **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to TACs. This cumulative impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The discussion of GHG emissions associated with the project and related infrastructure for Impacts 3.5-1 and 3.5-2 in Section 3.5, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change," is inherently a cumulative impact analysis. GHG emissions from one project cannot, on their own, result in changes in climatic conditions; therefore, the emissions from one project must be considered in the context of their contribution to cumulative global emissions. The analysis of Impact 3.5-1 concluded that the level of construction-related GHG emissions associated with implementation of the project would not exceed PCAPCD's bright line threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/year per year and operation-related GHG emissions would not exceed the applicable efficiency thresholds of significance for residential (i.e., 4.5 MTCO₂e/capita) or non-residential (i.e., 26.5 MTCO₂e/1,000 square feet). However, the analysis of Impact 3.5-1 concluded that total operational GHG emissions (i.e., 21,197 MTCO₂e/year) would exceed the applicable threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/year. Therefore, the project-generated operational GHG emissions would be substantial and cumulatively considerable. The analysis of Impact 3.5-2 concluded that, because the project would not implement the most ambitious voluntary standards related to transportation electrification and building decarbonization as outlined in the 2022 Scoping Plan, it would conflict with the state's ability to meet its statewide GHG targets and, therefore, would be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-1a would reduce onsite GHG emissions associated with building energy and transportation. Mitigation Measure 3.5-1b would prohibit natural gas use for most nonresidential uses and Mitigation Measure 3.5-1c would require the use of renewable natural gas for the nonresidential land uses that would require natural gas. Mitigation Measure 3.5-2a, which would require the project applicant to provide the necessary electric vehicle charging infrastructure (i.e., the most ambitious voluntary standards established in the 2025 California Green Building Standards Code, and Mitigation Measure 3.5-2b, which would require the project to implement a mandatory commute reduction program, would ensure that the project would not conflict with the 2022 Scoping Plan. Therefore, with mitigation, the project would not conflict with State GHG reduction goals at the project level. Nevertheless, given that the actual future tenants are unknown at this time, the exact onsite GHG emissions reductions from mitigation cannot be quantified. Thus, it cannot be guaranteed at this time that GHG emissions would be reduced to the levels necessary. For these reasons, the incremental effects of the project could combine with the effects of cumulative projects to create a significant cumulative impact related to GHG emissions, and the project's contribution to GHG emissions **would be cumulatively considerable**. This cumulative impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS (UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE)

Water supply and wastewater service would be provided by the City of Roseville Environmental Utilities, electrical service would be provided by Roseville Electric, and natural gas service would be provided by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). Future development in Roseville would increase the demand for new and expanded utility infrastructure, the relocation or construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. As described under Impact 3.11-1 in Section 3.11, "Utilities and Service Systems," the project would require the extension of nearby potable water, recycled water, wastewater, stormwater, and electrical infrastructure onto the project site. All of the project-related utility infrastructure extensions and hookups would be installed within the disturbance area of the project site, within existing roadways (e.g., Blue Oaks Boulevard, Phillip Road, and Westbrook Boulevard), and within a public utility easement located in City-designated open space along the south side of Blue Oaks Boulevard. Impacts associated with construction of new or extended utility infrastructure are analyzed throughout this EIR and mitigation measures have been identified, where necessary, that would reduce or avoid most impacts to a less-than-significant level. No additional utility infrastructure beyond what was described and evaluated in this EIR would be required to serve the project.

However, the project would contribute to the need for the City to construct improvements to its existing recycled water infrastructure to serve full buildout of its recycled water customers. Because the specific location, design, timing, and construction methods of these recycled water infrastructure improvements have not yet been determined, the associated environmental impacts cannot be fully evaluated at this time and feasible mitigation measures cannot be identified. Potential environmental impacts of installing these improvements typically include generation of dust and air pollutant emissions from construction equipment and vehicles, construction noise, temporary disruptions to local roadways, ground disturbance (that may lead to erosion, sediment runoff, and soil compaction), clearing or disturbance of vegetation, potential impacts on special-status species and their habitat (including wetlands), potential impacts to archaeological or historical resources (if present), risk of sedimentation and pollutants entering nearby surface waters, potential groundwater contamination if excavation intersects shallow aquifers, increased runoff, and potential for spills of fuels or chemicals. Operational impacts could include generation of air pollutant and GHG emissions from stationary equipment and vehicles, noise from pumps and equipment, increased energy demand, and potential odor issues.

As described above, the project includes utility infrastructure extensions and hookups, the environmental effects of which have been analyzed in this EIR and mitigation measures have been identified, where necessary. Because the project would contribute to the need for the City to construct improvements to its existing recycled water infrastructure to serve full buildout of its recycled water customers, and because these environmental impacts cannot be fully evaluated at this time and feasible mitigation measures cannot be identified, cumulative impacts related to the construction of future recycled water infrastructure improvements would be **significant and unavoidable** and the project's contribution **would be cumulatively considerable**.

AESTHETICS (VISUAL CHARACTER AND QUALITY)

The cumulative projects involve substantial residential, commercial, and other development and would result in similar visual changes as the proposed project. For example, many of the cumulative developments would be adjacent to agricultural/grazing and open space areas and could degrade visual quality by placing urban development adjacent to these areas. The developments and the proposed project would therefore together cause substantial degradation of visual quality, especially where there would be abrupt transitions between open space and agricultural/grazing areas and development. These would be cumulatively significant impacts on visual quality and character. As described for the proposed project, the proposed mixed-use development would be designed to be visually consistent with surrounding specific plan area development and other mixed-use development in Roseville, and proposed landscaping would soften the mixed-use character of the project site. Further, the project would be required to comply with General Plan policies related to community design and the City's Community Design Guidelines, which would ensure that the project would not cause a substantial change in visual character. Similar design requirements would be placed on other developments in Roseville to reduce visual impacts. However, the

project would combine with other projects to develop urban land uses adjacent to agricultural/grazing and open space areas, which would substantially degrade the area's visual quality. Therefore, the project **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to visual character or quality of a site. This impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

AESTHETICS (LIGHT AND GLARE)

The cumulative projects involve substantial residential, commercial, and other development and would result in creation of daytime glare and nighttime light sources similar to the proposed project. For example, many of the cumulative developments have extensive residential development that would together create geographically extensive sources of glare and light pollution in areas that currently have scattered and dispersed sources of daytime glare and nighttime lighting. The developments and the proposed project could cumulatively create a substantial source of daytime glare and nighttime light. These would be cumulatively significant impacts. As described for Impact 3.13-2, the project would be required to adhere to the City's Community Design Guidelines, which require that lighting sources have cut off lenses and are located to avoid light spillage and glare on adjacent properties and in private spaces. Similar design requirements would be placed on other developments in Roseville to reduce light and glare impacts. However, the project would combine with other projects to develop urban land uses in areas that currently have scattered and dispersed sources of daytime glare and nighttime lighting. Therefore, the project **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to light and glare. This impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

5.3 SIGNIFICANT AND IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

The State CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the project. Specifically, the State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(d) states:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible, since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generation to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irrecoverable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

The project would result in the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of energy and material resources during construction and operation, including the following:

- ▶ construction materials, including such resources as soil, rocks, wood, concrete, glass, and steel;
- ▶ land area committed to new project facilities;
- ▶ water supply for project construction and operation; and
- ▶ energy expended in the form of electricity, gasoline, diesel fuel, and oil for equipment and transportation vehicles that would be needed for project construction and operation.

The use of these nonrenewable resources is expected to account for a minimal portion of the region's resources and would not affect the availability of these resources for other needs within the region. Construction activities would not result in inefficient use of energy or natural resources. Construction contractors selected would use best available engineering techniques, construction and design practices, and equipment operating procedures. Long-term project operation would not result in substantial long-term consumption of energy and natural resources.