5.0 CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126 of CEQA Guidelines requires that all aspects of a project must be considered when evaluating its impact on the environment, including planning, acquisition, development, and operation. As part of this analysis, the EIR must also identify:

- Significant environmental effects of the proposed project
- Significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented
- Significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the proposed project
- Growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project
- Mitigation measures proposed to minimize significant effects
- Alternatives to the proposed project.

5.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Chapter 3 of this EIR, *Executive Summary*, and Sections 4.1 through 4.14 of this EIR provide a comprehensive identification of the proposed project's significant environmental effects, including the level of significance both before and after mitigation.

5.3 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. The environmental effects of the Proposed Project on various aspects of the environment are discussed in detail in Chapter 4 of this EIR. Significant impacts that cannot be avoided if the project is approved include:

- Inducement of substantial population growth
- Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways

- Increased traffic on State Highways
- Increased traffic on Placer County roadways
- Increased traffic on Sacramento County roadways
- Increased emissions of fugitive dust and PM_{10} from construction activities
- Increased emissions of ozone precursors during construction (short-term)
- Increased emissions of air pollutants during operation
- Increase in offsite traffic noise
- Alteration of the visual character of the site and vicinity
- New sources of light and glare

Cumulative

- Loss of open space and grassland
- Contribution to the loss of agricultural land
- Increased traffic Increased traffic on City of Roseville roadways
- Increased traffic on State Highways
- Increased traffic on Placer County roadways
- Increased traffic on Sacramento County roadways
- Increased traffic on Sutter County roadways
- Increased emissions of fugitive dust and PM_{10} from grading and trenching activities
- Increased emissions of ozone precursors during construction (short-term)
- Increased emissions of air pollutants during operation
- Contribution to green house gas emissions/global warming
- Increase in offsite traffic noise
- Alteration of the visual character of the site and vicinity
- Potential disturbance or destruction of subsurface archaeological or historical resources
- New sources of light and glare
- Increased demand for water

5.4 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Section 15126.2 (c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental change that would be caused by the Proposed Project. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible changes if:

- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area)
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources

(CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(c).) Development of the proposed project would result in the commitment of the majority of the Project area to eventual urban development, thereby precluding other uses for the lifespan of the project. Restoration of the site to pre-developed conditions would not be feasible given the degree of disturbance, the urbanization of the area, and the level of capital investment.

Resources that will be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include: water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels. Wood products, asphalt, and concrete would be used in construction. With respect to operational activities, compliance with all applicable building codes, as well as mitigation measures, planning policies, and standard conservation features, would ensure that resources are conserved to the maximum extent possible. Green building and sustainable practices are becoming more and more common. It is possible that new technologies will continue to emerge, or will become more cost-effective and user-friendly as the project moves forward. Nonetheless, construction activities related to the proposed project would result in irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, natural gas, and gasoline for automobiles and construction equipment.

The CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by environmental accidents associated with the project. While the project would result in the use, transport, storage, and disposal of minor amounts of hazardous materials during project construction and operation, as described in Section 4.10 (*Hazardous Materials and Public Safety*), all such activities would comply with applicable state and federal laws related to hazardous materials, which significantly reduces the likelihood and severity of accidents that

could result in irreversible environmental damage. Further, no industrial uses that would use or store acutely hazardous materials are proposed in the Project area.

The most notable significant irreversible impacts are a reduction in natural vegetation and wildlife communities, alteration of the visual character of the site, increased generation of pollutants, the use of non-renewable and/or slowly renewable natural and energy resources, such as lumber and other forest products and water resources during construction activities. Operations associated with future uses would also consume natural gas and electrical energy. These irreversible impacts, which are unavoidable consequences of urban growth, are described in detail in the appropriate sections of this EIR (see Chapter 4).

5.5 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

As required by Section 15126.2 (d) CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must discuss ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Also, the EIR must discuss the characteristics of the project that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Growth can be induced in a number of ways, such as through the elimination of obstacles to growth, through the stimulation of economic activity within the region, or through the establishment of policies or precedents that directly or indirectly encourage additional growth.

In general, a project may foster growth in a geographic area if the project removes an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, the provision of new access to an area, a change in zoning or general plan approval); or economic expansion in response to the project (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion). These circumstances are further described below:

Elimination of Obstacles to Growth: This refers to the extent to which a proposed project removes infrastructure limitations or provides infrastructure capacity, or removes regulatory constraints that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval.

Economic Effects: This refers to the extent to which a proposed project could cause increased activity in the local or regional economy. Economic effects can include such effects as the Multiplier Effect. A "Multiplier" is an economic term used to describe inter-relationships among

various sectors of the economy. The multiplier effect provides a quantitative description of the direct employment effect of a project, as well as indirect and induced employment growth. The multiplier effect acknowledges that the onsite employment and population growth of each project is not the complete picture of growth caused by the project.

Elimination of Obstacles to Growth

Removal of Infrastructure Limitations or Provision of Capacity

The elimination of physical obstacles to growth is considered a growth-inducing effect. A number of physical constraints to growth currently exist in the vicinity of the project. In summary, the primary growth obstacles in the area today include:

- Limited capacity of the roadway system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville
- Limited capacity of the potable water system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville
- Limited capacity of the recycled water system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville
- Limited capacity of the wastewater system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville
- Limited capacity of the electric distribution system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville

Solutions to the road capacity limitations are included in the proposed project, including extension of Blue Oaks Boulevard west extension of Westbrook Boulevard north, and extension of Parkway One west. . Extension of water supply lines would make water available to the CSP. The addition of a groundwater well would provide additional supply and storage capacity. Extension of wastewater and recycled water infrastructure from the PGWWTP would provide expanded services to the site. Construction of a new electric substation and transmission lines would provide electrical transmission capacity in the CSP.

The CSP site and some surrounding areas are within the jurisdiction of the County, and thus not fully served by adequate urban infrastructure. The fact that the site is unincorporated is itself an impediment to growth which would be removed through completion of annexation proceedings.

The construction of infrastructure improvements would facilitate the expansions of urban development, into an area where none currently exists. This would eliminate some of the infrastructure constraints that currently are obstacles to growth in the area west of Fiddyment Road west of the current terminus of Blue Oaks Boulevard. The extension of roadways and utility infrastructure would potentially facilitate development to the north (Amoruso Ranch Study Area).

Other Pending Projects

The proposed Placer Parkway, currently being evaluated by PCTPA, would bring a major new transportation corridor into the area, and would connect the area to the regional road system to the west, including State Routes 99/70 and the Sacramento International Airport.

The western growth pattern is further reinforced by other jurisdictions in the region. North and south of Baseline Road, Placer County has approved substantial new development including: Riolo Vineyards, Regional University and Placer Vineyards. Placer Vineyards would extend development almost as far as the Sutter County line. Sutter County also has approved the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan, which could eventually become a new city. In combination with the past and possible future actions, approval of the proposed CSP would further facilitate development in southwestern Placer County, and could stimulate future growth in the region. Southwest of the project site, Placer County has identified the 5,200-acre Curry Creek Community Plan area as a future study area. The Board of Supervisors identified the Curry Creek area as a future community plan area given its location of adjacent development. Although no plan has been prepared for this area, if it built out consistent with densities of adjacent projects, it could accommodate approximately 15,000 units.

Economic Effects

Stimulation of Economic Activity/Multiplier Effects

In addition to the employment anticipated to be generated by the proposed land uses, which would result in 47 new jobs (discussed in Chapter 4.2, *Population, Employment and Housing*), additional local employment can be generated through what is commonly referred to as the "multiplier effect". The multiplier effect tends to be greater in regions with larger diverse economies due to a decrease in the requirement to import goods and services from outside the region.

Estimated employment generated through the multiplier effect is presented in Table 5-1. Two different types of additional employment are tracked through the multiplier effect. *Indirect* employment includes those additional jobs that are generated through the expenditure patterns of direct employment associated with the project. For example, workers in offices in the commercial area of the CSP would spend money in the local economy. The expenditure of the money from employees would result in additional jobs. Indirect jobs tend to be in relative proximity to the places of employment and residences.

TABLE 5-1
EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

Project Component	Direct Employment	Indirect Factor	Indirect Employment	Total Direct and Indirect Employment
Commercial	47	0.07	3	50

In addition to direct and indirect employment, the multiplier effect also takes into effect *induced* employment. Induced employment follows the economic effect of employment beyond the expenditures of the employees within the proposed project area to include jobs created by the stream of goods and services necessary to support businesses within the proposed project. For example, when a manufacturer buys products or sells products, the employment associated with those transactions is considered induced employment.

The multiplier effect also considers the secondary effect of employee expenditures. Thus it includes the economic effect of the dollars spent by the employees who support the employees of the project.

Increased future employment generated by resident and employee spending ultimately results in physical development of space to accommodate those employees. It is the characteristics of this physical space and its specific location that will determine the type and magnitude of environmental impacts of the additional economic activity. Although the economic effect can be predicted, the actual environmental implications of this type of economic growth are too speculative to predict or evaluate, because they can be spread throughout the Sacramento metropolitan region and beyond.

5.6 IMPACTS OF INDUCED GROWTH

The growth induced directly and indirectly by the proposed project would contribute to a number of environmental impacts in the City, as well as the greater Sacramento/Placer County area. The impacts include: traffic congestion, air quality deterioration, contribution to global warming, loss of open space, loss of habitat and wildlife, and impacts on utilities and services; such as fire and police protection, water, recycled water, wastewater, solid waste, energy and natural gas, and increased demand for housing.

Specifically, an increase in population growth in the greater Sacramento region could cause significant environmental effects as new residential development will require governmental services, such as, social services, schools, libraries and parks. The need for these social services may result in environmental effects if additional facilities are constructed or if additional population is required to travel further distances to receive access these services.

Some future employment generated by project residents spending may not ultimately require physical development of additional space, since there is a significant level of vacant space already constructed and available due to the downturn in the economy. Further, the CSP will provide some commercial and office opportunities. Nonetheless some indirect and induced employment and population growth could contribute to the loss of open space because it would encourage conversion to urban uses for housing, services, and infrastructure.

Annexing the Urban Reserve areas would result in substantial pressure to develop in the future, because the property would be within the City's corporate boundaries. Buildout of the Urban Reserve area would include additional traffic, air pollution, loss of open space, and impacts on habitat.

5.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

5.7.1 INTRODUCTION

This EIR provides an analysis of overall cumulative impacts of the proposed project taken together with other past, present, and probable future projects producing related impacts, as required by §15130 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The goal of this analysis is two fold: first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such projects would be cumulatively significant; and second, to determine whether the proposed project itself would cause a "cumulatively considerable" (and thus significant) incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts[1].

In other words, the required analysis first creates a broad context in which to assess the project's incremental contribution to anticipated cumulative impacts, viewed on a geographic scale well beyond the project site itself, and then determines whether the proposed project's incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts from all projects is itself significant (i.e., "cumulatively considerable").

"Cumulative impacts" refers to two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355). The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or many separate projects. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the proposed project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant impacts taking place over time.

Consistent with state CEQA Guidelines §15130(a), the discussion of cumulative impacts in this EIR focuses on significant and potentially significant cumulative impacts. According to §15130(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, in part, "The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as

[1] See CEQA Guidelines §15130 [a]- [b], §153355 [b]((See state CEQA Guidelines §§15130[a]-[b], §15355[b], §15064[h], §15065[c]; *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* [2002] 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 120.)

is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact."

To be adequate, a discussion of the cumulative effects should include:

- A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

- Define the geographic scope of the area affected by the cumulative effect and provide a reasonable explanation for the geographic limitation used.

- A summary of expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information

- A reasonable analysis of the impacts of the relevant project, and feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

5.7.2 DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERED IN THE CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

This cumulative impacts analysis considers the environmental effects of growth in the region, as represented by adopted planning documents and proposals currently under consideration, as well as buildout of the CSP and buildout of the Urban Reserve areas with urban levels of development.

Other aspects considered in the cumulative impacts analysis are development within the City, existing development and build out of the General Plan through 2025, full build out of the West Roseville Specific Plan including specific plan amendments (SPA #3), and infill development associated with the Downtown and Riverside Specific Plans.

The cumulative context for many issue areas extends beyond the City boundaries. Where cumulative impacts extend beyond the City, the cumulative analysis is based on assumptions for growth in Rocklin, Lincoln, unincorporated Placer County, Sacramento County and a portion of Sutter County through the year 2025. Development assumptions for these areas are shown in Table 5-2 and 5-3.

TABLE 5.7-1

CSP PLUS URBAN RESERVE BUILDOUT

TRIP GENERATION RATES

Land Use	Unit Type	2025 Project	Urban Reserve	Daily Trip Ends per Unit	2025 Project Daily Trip Ends	Urban Reserve Daily Trip Ends	Build Out of CSP Daily Trip Ends
Single-Family	DU	1,440	167	9.0	12,960	1476	15,912
Multi-Family	DU	658	238	6.5	4,277	1547	5824
Total Residential	DU	2,098	405		17,237	3023	21,736
Commercial	KSF	179	0	35.0	6,266	0	6,266
Office	KSF	143.2	0	17.7	2,535	0	2,535
School	Students	600		1.0	600		
Park	Acres	15.9	1.1	2.2	35	2.2	37.2
Total Non-Residential					9,436		
Total					**26,673**	**3,025**	**30,574**

TABLE 5.7-2
REGIONAL CUMULATIVE DEVELOPMENT[2]

Project	Existing DU	2025 DU	Existing Retail (msf)	2025 Retail (msf)	Existing Office (msf)	2025 Office (msf)	Existing Industrial (msf)	2025 Industrial (msf)
Cities Current General Plans/ Pending Development								
City Of Roseville								
Roseville General Plan[3]	45,249	66,514	11.2	13.9	8	11	9	12.9
SVSP Urban Reserve	0	2,722	0	.17	0	0	0	0
Brookfield	0	2,785	0	.50	0	0	0	0
City of Rocklin	19,641	28,606	2.1	3.9	.8	3	3.7	4.7
City of Lincoln	9,964	22,218	.4	2	.5	2.5	3.7	4.7
Town of Loomis	2,274	4,087	.3	.9	.9	4	1	1.1
Placer County								
Placer Ranch	0	6,793	0	1	0	5.2	0	4.1
Granite Bay	7,140	7,892	.602	1	.286	.819	.012	.04
Sunset Industrial Area	0	0	0	.357	.166	.762	3.5	6.0
Riolo Vineyard	6	933	0	.08	0	0	0	0
Placer Vineyards	147	14,132	0	1.8	0	.16	.031	0
Regional University	0	3,232	0	.215	0	.75	0	0
Curry Creek	0	16,206	0	2	0	2	0	0
Bickford	9	1,890	.03	.1	0	0	0	0

[2] Placer Parkway Re-circulated Draft EIR January 2009 and
City of Roseville Economic Development Forecast 2009
[3] Includes buildout of the West Roseville Specific Plan and the Sierra Vista Specific Plan

TABLE 5.7-2
REGIONAL CUMULATIVE DEVELOPMENT[4]

CONTINUED

Project	Existing DU	2025 DU	Exist-ing Retail (msf)	2025 Retail (msf)	Existing Office (msf)	2025 Office (msf)	Existing Industrial (msf)	2025 Industrial (msf)
Cities Current General Plans/ Pending Development								
Sutter County								
South Sutter	0	17,500	.12	2	.07	.1	.292	.6
Sacramento County								
Elverta	65	4,950	0	0	0	0	0	0

Proposed and Anticipated Development

Sierra Vista Specific Plan Urban Reserve

The Sierra Vista Specific Plan approved by the City Council in May 2010 included a large Urban Reserve area that did not participate in the specific plan process. It is assumed that development in the future will occur at levels similar to the rest of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan and would include approximately 2,722 dwelling units. Open space, parks and neighborhood serving commercial would also likely be proposed.

West Roseville Specific Plan, Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment No. 3

An amendment to the West Roseville Specific Plan, is proposed in the Fiddyment Ranch area. The proposed Specific Plan Amendment No. 3 (SPA 3) would decrease the land designated for Low Density Residential by 99.4 acres and increase the land designated for Medium and High Density Residential by 55.8 and 18.8 acres respectively, primarily within Phases 2 and 3 of Fiddyment Ranch. The increase in Community Commercial land uses will occur on Parcels F-6D and F-81 (5

[4] Placer Parkway Re-circulated Draft EIR January 2009 and City of Roseville Economic Development Forecast 2009

and 2.3 acres respectively) which are currently designated as Low Density Residential land uses. The Open Space designation will increase by 0.12 acres. Public/quasi-public land uses will increase by 1.9 acres as a result of Parcel F-71 increasing in size from 8.7 acres to 10.6 acres accommodate the elementary school, and lastly, the land dedicated as right of way will increase by 12.4 acres growing from 63.4 acres to 75.8 acres to accommodate two new east/west collector roadways. The SPA 3 project has been submitted to the City for evaluation. A supplement to the WRSP EIR is currently being drafted and is expected to be available in Spring 2011.

Placer Ranch

The Placer Ranch Specific Plan includes 6,796 acres in unincorporated Placer County. The project could include 6,793 residential dwelling units, 527 acres of business park and light industrial uses, 150 acres of office, 99 acres of commercial uses and a 300-acre branch campus for the California State University Sacramento. The university campus could accommodate up to 25,000 students. Originally proposed in the County, a development application was submitted to the City of Roseville in 2007. The project has been on hold since early 2008. While inactive at this time, it is likely that some development will occur in the future, and therefore, it is included in the cumulative analysis.

Placer Vineyards

The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area is located immediately south of the CSP, (south of Baseline Road), and was approved by Placer County in July 2007 and includes development on 5,230 acres. At buildout, Placer Vineyards would include 14,132 dwelling units, 274 acres of commercial development, 1,560 acres of parks, open space, schools, and roadways. Development has not yet commenced due to the need to obtain federal approvals needed for filling wetlands and impacting the habitat of endangered and threatened species.

Regional University

The Regional University Specific Plan is located northwest of the boundary of Creekview, immediately west of the West Roseville Specific Plan area. Access to the site would be through an extension of Watt Avenue, through the CSP area. Regional University and Community Specific Plan is 1,157 acres. It will include a 600-acre private university campus on the western portion of the plan area, and a 557 urban community on the eastern portion of the site. Approximately 3,232

residential units and a private high school for 1,200 students would be included in the development. The Regional University and Community Specific Plan was approved by Placer County in December 2008. Development has not yet commenced due to the need to obtain federal approvals needed for filling wetlands and impacting the habitat of endangered and threatened species.

Riolo Vineyards

The Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan is proposed as a residential community with open-space, recreational, and commercial components and encompasses approximately 525 acres. The development would include a total of 933 residential units consisting of low-, medium- and high-density as well as rural and agricultural residences. A tentative subdivision map with 285 residential lots has been submitted by the project proponent to be processed concurrently with the specific plan application.

Curry Creek

The Curry Creek Community Plan area is located immediately west of the Creekview Specific Plan Area. While the Board of Supervisors gave direction to County Staff to proceed with studying the area for future development in 2003, no formal specific plan is pending at this time. Because development has slowed in recent years, it is likely that development of the Community Plan has slowed. It is unknown what uses could occur, but to be conservative, it is assumed it could include a mix of housing and commercial uses in the future.

Sutter Pointe

Sutter Pointe was approved by Sutter County in June 2009. It consists of approximately 7,500 acres of land located in the southeast corner of Sutter County, adjacent to the Placer County line. It is proposed as a new community with a heavy emphasis on jobs, with approximately 3,600 acres of commercial and industrial uses, 2,900 acres for residential uses, and 1,000 acres of parks, recreation and open space.

Elverta

The Elverta Specific Plan includes 1,744 acres in the north-central portion of Sacramento County, approximately seven miles southwesterly of the project site. Approximately 881 acres would accommodate 4,950 residential units, and 552 acres would include agricultural/rural land use. It also would include 19 acres of commercial and office professional units. The Elverta Specific Plan was approved by Sacramento County in August 2008.

5.7.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis varies depending upon the specific environmental issue area being analyzed. For example, the scope of the cumulative impact analysis for aesthetics include the area that comprises the view shed of and from the project site, whereas the scope of the cumulative impact analysis for air quality would analyze impacts in the air basin, which is a much larger area.

The cumulative analysis assumes the proposed CSP and full build out of the Urban Reserve area.

TABLE 5.7-3

GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Issue Area	Geographic Area
Land Use	Regional development identified in Placer, Sutter and Sacramento Counties. Compatibility limited to project site and immediate vicinity
Population, Housing and Employment	Placer County
Transportation and Circulation	State, Regional and Local facilities in Placer, Sutter and Sacramento Counties
Air Quality	Placer and Sacramento Air Basins
Noise	Immediate project vicinity
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Project site and off-site improvements, Placer County
Vegetation and Wildlife	Southwest Placer County

Issue Area	Geographic Area
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Project site and off-site improvements
Hydrology, Water Quality and Groundwater	Vicinity of project site, and North American River Groundwater Sub-basin
Hazardous Materials and Public Safety	Vicinity of project site
Water Supply	Placer County projects
Wastewater and Recycled Water	Projects identified in Placer County in the WWMP
Solid Waste	Service area of the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill
Agricultural Resources	Central Valley, particularly western Placer County, northern Sacramento County and south Sutter County
Public Services	City of Roseville, and local service providers including the school districts, and PG&E
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Global, regional and local (project site and vicinity)
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Project site and vicinity

Land Use and Agricultural Resources

The cumulative context for agricultural land conversion would be the northern Central Valley, particularly western Placer County, northern Sacramento County and south Sutter County, which contain a wide range of agricultural uses, from grazing and row corps to orchards. The geographic scope is limited based on similar soils that are found in these adjacent areas.

For land use compatibility, the immediate vicinity of the CSP is considered the cumulative context because any incompatibility would occur primarily at the interface of different land uses.

Compatibility with External Land Uses

Once the full project area is developed, it would be adjacent to existing City residential areas to the north and to the east of the CSP. The area to the south includes the planned expansion of Baseline Road to a six-lane facility. Development to the south is expected to be suburban as Placer Vineyards builds out. The land uses proposed in the CSP are similar in nature to the existing uses in the City of Roseville. The uses are also compatible with planned development in Placer Vineyards.

The area to the west of the CSP would be immediately adjacent to the Reason Farms planned regional stormwater retention basin. The City is maintaining dry farming at this time, so it is anticipated that it would continue to include rural/agricultural uses for some time.

Agricultural Land Conversion

Within south Placer County, a majority of agricultural land has been identified as Farmland of Local Importance and Grazing land. The entire Project area is designated as Farmland of Local Importance. The loss of farmland is occurring throughout California, including in south Placer County. Other projects in the cumulative context would also result in the loss of agricultural land. Because farmland is being lost to development throughout south Placer County and the region, the loss of farmland and agricultural productivity would be cumulatively considerable and would result in a **significant and unavoidable impact.** The proposed CSP includes substantial offsite mitigation for grassland to reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk. This mitigation would reduce, but not eliminate, the loss of agricultural land.

Transportation and Circulation

Chapter 4.3 analyzed the project impacts resulting from buildout of the project on a background traffic scenario that included buildout of the City of Roseville and 2025 growth projections from entitled projects within the region. The Cumulative Conditions scenarios expand the list of growth areas to include the Urban Reserve area as well as other reasonably foreseeable projects that have not yet received land use. As a result, the following projects and improvements have been added to the Cumulative scenarios:

- Buildout of the West Roseville Specific Plan and SPA#3 amendments

- Buildout of Amoruso Ranch (formerly Brookfield) Specific Plan
- Buildout of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan and Sierra Vista Urban Reserve Area
- Partial buildout of Placer Ranch (Buildout of Sacramento State University Campus, 50% of residential buildout and 25% of non-residential buildout)
- Partial construction of Placer Parkway (4 lanes from SR 65 to Watt Avenue/ Blue Oaks Boulevard with interchanges at Foothills Boulevard, Fiddyment Road, and Blue Oaks Boulevard/ Watt Avenue)
- Extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard (necessary to provide access to Placer Parkway)
- Extension of Westbrook Boulevard north to Dowd Road (6-lanes from Baseline Road to just south of East Catlett Road and 4-lanes for the remainder)

Table 5-5 shows that the proposed project would increase trip generation by approximately 130,000 daily trip ends without buildout of the Urban Reserve properties and approximately 165,000 daily trip ends with buildout of the Urban Reserve properties with urban levels of development. Daily trip ends include both trips originating in and terminating in the proposed project.

Cumulative Conditions With Partial Placer Parkway

This analysis includes the proposed Project under Cumulative conditions assuming a portion of Placer Parkway from Highway 65 to Watt Avenue has been built. Because Placer Parkway is currently being extensively studied but is not yet funded, information will also be presented without Placer Parkway following this discussion.

Placer Parkway would be a new controlled-access highway that would eventually connect Highway 65 with Highway 70/99. This new facility would decrease traffic volumes on a number of existing and planned roadways in western Placer County, including Baseline Road and numerous roadways in the City of Roseville and unincorporated Placer County.

City of Roseville Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Traffic Impacts

The traffic study shows that a number of intersections (nine during the a.m. peak hour and ten during the p.m. peak hour) actually improve under the Cumulative no project scenario compared to the 2025 CIP project scenario. This is mainly due to the assumed construction of Placer Parkway under the no project scenario. Although a number of additional large land use projects would likely be built on the borders of Roseville, the addition of a four lane Placer Parkway from SR 65 to Blue Oaks Boulevard and a necessary extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard both would divert traffic from the City of Roseville. A number of north-south and east-west roadways in the western portion of the City experience decreases in peak hour and daily volume with the addition of Placer Parkway and the Watt Avenue extension.

Table 5-5 and Table 5-6 provides a comparison of a.m. and p.m. peak hour levels of service at all current and future signalized intersections Citywide under 2025 no project and Cumulative no project conditions. The cumulative conditions include two additional signalized intersections within the Creekview property that were not assumed under 2025 CIP plus project conditions.

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		*AM Peak Hour*			
		2025 CIP Conditions		*Cumulative Conditions*	
ID	*Intersection Name*	*LOS*	*V/C*	*LOS*	*V/C*
Existing Signalized Intersections					
1	Atlantic & Tiger/Center	A	0.43	A	0.43
2	Atlantic & Wills	C	0.72	C	0.73
3	Atlantic St & Yosemite St	A	0.51	A	0.51
4	Baseline Rd & Fiddyment Rd	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.84**
5	Blue Oaks & Crocker Ranch	A	0.52	A	0.54
6	Blue Oaks & Del Webb	A	0.49	A	0.52
7	Blue Oaks & Fiddyment	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.86**

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
8	Blue Oaks & New Meadow	A	0.55	A	0.56
9	Blue Oaks & Orchard View	A	0.51	A	0.54
10	Blue Oaks Bl & Diamond Creek Bl	B	0.68	B	0.70
11	Blue Oaks Bl & Foothills Bl	D	0.88	C	0.72
12	Blue Oaks Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	**C**	**0.73**	**C**	**0.72**
13	Cirby & Sunrise	**D**	**0.90**	**D**	**0.90**
14	Cirby Wy & Foothills Bl	**E**	**1.00**	**E**	**1.00**
15	Cirby Wy & Melody Ln	A	0.58	A	0.57
16	Cirby Wy & Northridge Dr	C	0.78	C	0.78
17	Cirby Wy & Oak Ridge Dr	A	0.54	A	0.54
18	Cirby Wy & Orlando Av	**E**	**0.93**	**E**	**0.93**
19	Cirby Wy & Parkview Dr	A	0.58	A	0.58
20	Cirby Wy & Riverside Av	**F**	**1.04**	**F**	**1.05**
21	Cirby Wy & Rocky Ridge Dr	A	0.43	A	0.43
22	Cirby Wy & San Simeon Dr	B	0.60	B	0.61
23	Cirby Wy & Vernon St	**E**	**0.98**	**E**	**0.99**
24	Douglas & Eureka	A	0.54	A	0.53
25	Douglas & Rocky Ridge	B	0.60	B	0.61
26	Douglas & Santa Clara	A	0.57	A	0.56
27	Douglas & Sierra Gardens	A	0.52	A	0.52
28	Douglas & Sunrise	B	0.68	B	0.69
29	Douglas & Target	A	0.43	A	0.43
30	Douglas Bl & E Roseville Pw	C	0.76	C	0.78
31	Douglas Bl & Folsom Rd	A	0.48	A	0.48
32	Douglas Bl & Harding Bl	B	0.62	B	0.62

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
33	Douglas Bl & Judah St	A	0.29	A	0.29
34	Douglas Bl & Keehner Av	A	0.48	A	0.48
35	Douglas Bl & Park Dr	A	0.35	A	0.35
36	Douglas Bl & Sierra College Bl	C	0.76	C	0.76
37	Eureka & Lead Hill	A	0.48	A	0.48
38	Eureka & N. Sunrise	A	0.58	A	0.58
39	Eureka & Rocky Ridge	A	0.55	A	0.54
40	Eureka Rd & Ashland Dr	A	0.36	A	0.37
41	Eureka Rd & Deer Valley Apts	A	0.39	A	0.39
42	Fairway & Central Park/Lowes	A	0.44	A	0.45
43	Fairway & Cortina Circle	A	0.27	A	0.28
44	Fairway & Five Star	A	0.40	A	0.40
45	Fairway & Home Depot	A	0.52	A	0.52
46	Fairway & Target/Rosehall	A	0.56	A	0.57
47	Fiddyment & Del Webb/Village Green	B	0.66	B	0.67
48	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (North)	B	0.60	B	0.60
49	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (South)	A	0.53	A	0.54
50	Foothills & Baseline/Main	**E**	**0.95**	**E**	**0.93**
51	Foothills & Misty Wood/NEC	A	0.58	A	0.54
52	Foothills Bl & Albertsons Dr	A	0.53	A	0.52
53	Foothills Bl & Atkinson Rd	A	0.54	A	0.54
54	Foothills Bl & Roseville Pkwy/HP (Central)	C	0.75	C	0.75
55	Foothills Bl & HP (South)	B	0.68	B	0.68
56	Foothills Bl & Junction Bl	C	0.72	C	0.72
57	Foothills Bl & McAnally Dr	A	0.52	A	0.53

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
58	Foothills Bl & Pleasant Grove Bl	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.82**
59	Foothills Blvd & Rand/Pilgrims	A	0.51	A	0.51
60	Foothills Bl & Vineyard Rd	B	0.66	B	0.66
61	Galleria & Antelope Creek	A	0.45	A	0.46
62	Galleria & Berry	B	0.65	B	0.66
63	Galleria & Roseville Pkwy	C	0.79	C	0.80
64	Harding & Wills	B	0.67	B	0.67
65	Harding Bl & Estates Dr	A	0.42	A	0.41
66	Harding Bl & Lead Hill Bl	B	0.65	B	0.66
67	Harding Bl & Roseville Square	A	0.33	A	0.33
68	Junction & Stonecrest/Magenta	A	0.56	A	0.56
69	Junction Bl & Americana Dr	A	0.43	A	0.43
70	Junction Bl & Baseline Rd	B	0.64	B	0.65
71	Junction Bl & Country Club Dr	B	0.61	B	0.62
72	Junction Bl & Park Regency Dr	B	0.60	B	0.60
73	Junction Bl & Porter Dr	A	0.48	A	0.48
74	Junction Bl & Revere Dr	A	0.39	A	0.39
75	Junction Bl & Washington Bl	A	0.46	A	0.47
76	Junction Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	A	0.52	A	0.52
77	Lead Hill Bl & N Sunrise Av	A	0.53	A	0.53
78	Lead Hill Bl & Rocky Ridge Dr	A	0.46	A	0.46
79	Lead Hill Bl & Wal-Mart	A	0.27	A	0.27
80	N Sunrise Av & Automall Dr	A	0.36	A	0.36
81	N Sunrise Av & Stone Point Dr	A	0.47	A	0.47
82	N. Sunrise & Sierra Gardens	A	0.48	A	0.47

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
83	Olympus Dr & Europa St	A	0.13	A	0.14
84	PFE & Hilltop	A	0.29	A	0.29
85	Pleasant Grove & Fairway	A	0.55	A	0.55
86	Pleasant Grove & Fiddyment	C	0.74	C	0.78
87	Pleasant Grove & Gold Coast/Hallissy	B	0.68	B	0.68
88	Pleasant Grove & Highland Park	A	0.32	A	0.32
89	Pleasant Grove & Market	A	0.46	A	0.48
90	Pleasant Grove & Michener	A	0.58	A	0.59
91	Pleasant Grove & Monument	A	0.40	A	0.42
92	Pleasant Grove & Rose Creek	A	0.55	A	0.55
93	Pleasant Grove & Roseville Pkwy	**E**	**0.98**	**E**	**0.99**
94	Pleasant Grove & Sun City	A	0.56	A	0.57
95	Pleasant Grove & Wal-Mart/Highland Pointe	A	0.52	A	0.52
96	Pleasant Grove & Washington	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.86**
97	Pleasant Grove Bl & Country Club Dr	B	0.63	B	0.62
98	Pleasant Grove Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	B	0.63	B	0.63
99	Rocky Ridge Dr & Maidu Dr	A	0.54	A	0.54
100	Rocky Ridge Dr & Mclaren Dr	A	0.51	A	0.51
101	Rocky Ridge Dr & Professional Dr	A	0.58	A	0.58
102	Rocky Ridge Dr & Stone Point Dr	A	0.09	A	0.09
103	Roseville Parkway & Chase	A	0.58	A	0.58
104	Roseville Parkway & Creekside Ridge	A	0.53	A	0.54
105	Roseville Parkway & Gibson	**D**	**0.88**	**D**	**0.88**
106	Roseville Parkway & N. Sunrise	C	0.75	C	0.75
107	Roseville Parkway & Reserve	A	0.55	A	0.55

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
108	Roseville Parkway & Secret Ravine	A	0.57	A	0.57
109	Roseville Parkway & Taylor	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.86**
110	Roseville Parkway & West Mall	A	0.46	A	0.47
111	Roseville Pw & Alexandra Dr	A	0.54	A	0.54
112	Roseville Pw & Eureka Rd	A	0.50	A	0.57
113	Roseville Pw & Lead Hill/Orvietto	B	0.61	B	0.61
114	Roseville Pw & N Cirby Wy	A	0.42	A	0.41
115	Roseville Pw & Olympus Dr	A	0.57	A	0.57
116	Roseville Pw & Rocky Ridge Dr	A	0.47	A	0.48
117	Roseville Pw & Sierra College Bl	A	0.50	A	0.51
118	Roseville Pw & Trestle Rd	A	0.51	A	0.53
119	Roseville Pw & Village/Slate Creek	A	0.44	A	0.45
120	Roseville Pw & Washington Bl	A	0.57	B	0.60
121	S Cirby Wy & Champion Oaks Dr	A	0.51	A	0.51
122	S Cirby Wy & Old Auburn Rd	C	0.75	C	0.75
123	Secret Ravine & Scarborough/ Poppy Field	A	0.29	A	0.29
124	Sierra College & Miners Ravine	A	0.51	A	0.51
125	Sierra College & Secret Ravine	A	0.50	A	0.50
126	Sierra College Bl & Eureka Rd	B	0.64	A	0.64
127	Sierra College Bl & Indigo Creek Apts	A	0.45	A	0.45
128	Sierra College Bl & Old Auburn Rd	A	0.57	C	0.57
129	Sierra College Bl & Olympus Dr	B	0.63	A	0.63
130	Stanford Ranch & Fairway	A	0.49	B	0.50
131	Stanford Ranch & Five Star	A	0.39	A	0.39
132	Stanford Ranch & Highland Park	A	0.32	A	0.32

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
133	Sunrise & Coloma	C	0.74	C	0.74
134	Sunrise & Sandringham/Kensington	A	0.59	A	0.59
135	Sunrise & Sun Tree/Kensington	B	0.64	B	0.64
136	Sunrise Av & Frances Dr	B	0.65	B	0.65
137	Sunrise Av & Oak Ridge Dr	A	0.39	A	0.40
138	Washington & Diamond Oaks	B	0.61	B	0.62
139	Washington & Sawtell/Derek	A	0.50	A	0.51
140	Washington Bl & Hallissy Dr	A	0.44	A	0.44
141	Woodcreek Oaks & Baseline	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.85**
142	Woodcreek Oaks & Canevari/Arsenault	A	0.41	A	0.41
143	Woodcreek Oaks & Horncastle	A	0.54	A	0.55
144	Woodcreek Oaks & McAnally	C	0.73	C	0.74
145	Woodcreek Oaks & Trailee	A	0.57	A	0.57
146	SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	A	0.49	A	0.50
147	Washington Blvd & Blue Oaks Blvd	A	0.45	A	0.46
148	I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	C	0.71	C	0.71
149	I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	A	0.44	A	0.44
150	SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	A	0.53	A	0.54
151	SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	A	0.40	A	0.40
152	I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	C	0.71	C	0.71
153	Stanford Ranch & Sr-65 N/B On	A	0.52	A	0.53
154	Stanford Ranch/Galleria & Sr-65 S/B On	A	0.42	A	0.42
155	Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.84**
156	Fairway & Highland Park	A	0.47	A	0.49
157	I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	C	0.76	C	0.76

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
Future Signals in CIP					
158	Roseville Pkwy & Old Auburn	A	0.23	A	0.23
159	Washington Blvd & Industrial	B	0.60	B	0.60
160	Foothills Blvd & HP Far South/ NEC	B	0.69	B	0.69
161	Blue Oaks Blvd & Wood Meadow	B	0.60	B	0.60
162	Gibson Rd & New Convention Center Rd	A	0.48	A	0.48
163	Blue Oaks Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.32	A	0.32
164	Blue Oaks Blvd & Hayden Pkwy	A	0.46	A	0.52
165	Fiddyment Rd & Westhills Dr	B	0.69	C	0.70
166	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.35	B	0.62
167	Fiddyment Rd & Westlake Dr	A	0.48	A	0.49
168	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Northpark Dr	A	0.23	A	0.23
169	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Parkside Wy	A	0.52	A	0.53
170	Industrial Ave & Alantown Dr	C	0.79	C	0.79
171	Roseville Pkwy & Gibson West	**F**	**1.01**	**F**	**1.02**
172	Washington Blvd & All America	A	0.48	A	0.49
173	Cirby & Cottonwood	A	0.53	A	0.53
174	Secret Ravine & Alexandra	A	0.14	A	0.14
175	Fiddyment Rd & Fiddyment Ranch EW Rd	A	0.58	B	0.60
176	Douglas Blvd & I-80 EB On	A	0.48	A	0.48
Signalized Intersections Added with Sierra Vista					
177	Santucci Blvd & Pleasant Grove	A	0.55	A	0.60
178	Santucci Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.49	A	0.52
179	Santucci Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.43	A	0.46
180	Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	A	0.68	C	0.71

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
181	Westbrook Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.42	A	0.44
182	Westbrook Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.44	A	0.45
183	Westbrook Blvd & Baseline Rd	C	0.76	C	0.76
184	Market Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.28	A	0.27
185	Market St & Baseline Rd	B	0.61	B	0.65
186	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Upland Dr	A	0.50	A	0.51
187	Upland Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.29	A	0.28
188	Upland Dr & Baseline Rd	A	0.49	A	0.0.49
189	Baseline Rd CMU3 Entrance	A	0.51	A	0.52
190	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.42	A	0.43
191	Vista Glen Blvd Road 2A	A	0.17	A	0.18
192	Vista Glen Blvd & SV NS Coll 5	A	0.26	A	0.26
193	Santucci Blvd & SV CC5 CC6	A	0.39	A	0.40
194	Santucci Blv & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.50	A	0.53
195	Vista Glen Blvd & Road 1	A	0.07	A	0.07
196	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Glen Dr	A	0.31	A	0.34
197	Baseline Rd & SV CC2	A	0.44	A	0.44
198	Baseline Rd & SV CCBP2	A	0.46	A	0.47
199	Baseline Rd & SV CC4	A	0.44	A	0.45
Intersections in Sierra Vista Urban Reserve Area					
200	Santucci Blvd & Road E	A	0.44	A	0.54
201	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Road 1	A	0.40	A	0.40
202	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Road 1	A	0.22	A	0.24
Creekview Intersections					
203	Westbrook Blvd & Holt Parkway	N/A		B	0.61

TABLE 5.7-4
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 PLUS PROJECT CUMULATIVE
PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
204	Westbrook Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		A	0.49
205	Blue Oaks Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		A	0.27
Intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone					
P1	Riverside Av & Darling Way	C	0.77	C	0.77
P2	Vernon & Douglas/Riverside	A	0.52	A	0.52
P3	Vernon & Grant	A	0.41	A	0.41
P4	Vernon & Judah	A	0.45	A	0.45
P5	Vernon & Lincoln	A	0.53	A	0.53
P6	Washington & Main	A	0.57	A	0.57
P7	Washington & Oak	A	0.53	A	0.53
P8	Grant & Oak	n/a		N/A	

Note: **Shaded** locations indicate a significant impact**.** **Bold** locations operate at LOS D or worse

Source: DKS Associates, 2010

Consistency with 70% Level of Service Policy

Table 5-6 shows the percentage of Roseville intersections projected to operate at better than level of service C during the AM. peak hour under cumulative conditions with and without buildout of the proposed project. Under No Project conditions, 185 of the City's 202 intersections would operate at LOS C or better. This equates to 91.6 percent of the City's signalized intersections functioning at LOS C or better during the AM. peak period which is significantly higher than City requirement that 70 percent of the City's signalized intersections function at LOS C or better during the peak period. The proposed project would add three signalized intersections within the City. Under the Plus Project scenario, 188 of the City's 205 intersections would operate at LOS C or

better. This means that 91.7 percent of the City's intersection would function at LOS C or better during the a.m. peak hour which is significantly higher than the City requirement of 70 percent (which only applies to the p.m. peak period, in any event). Therefore, this impact is considered to be **less than significant.**

TABLE 5.7-5
PERCENTAGE OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS C OR BETTER
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROJECT SCENARIO - AM PEAK HOUR

Level of Service	*AM Peak Hour*			
	Cumulative No Project		*Cumulative Plus Project*	
	Number of Intersections	*Percentage*	*Number of Intersections*	*Percentage*
LOS A-C	185	91.6%	188	91.7%
LOS D	10	5.0%	10	4.9%
LOS E	5	2.5%	5	2.4%
LOS F	2	1.0%	2	1.0%
LOS D-F	**17**	**8.4%**	**17**	**8.3%**
Total	**202**	**100%**	**205**	**100%**
Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone				

DKS 2010

Cumulative traffic would be **significant**. As shown in Table 5-7 the contribution of CSP to the traffic impacts would **significantly** impact the p.m. peak hour under cumulative plus project conditions. Those intersections are:

P.M. Peak:

- Foothills Boulevard and Vineyard Road – (LOS C to LOS D)
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Fiddyment Road – (LOS E to LOS F)
- Sanford Ranch/Galleria and State Route 6/5 southbound onramp – (LOS C to LOS D)
- I-80 E/B Off/Orlando & Riverside Avenue- (LOS D to LOS E)

Foothills Boulevard and Vineyard Road – Under the 2025 Cumulative plus proposed project with partial Placer Parkway scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. This level of service change is based on an increase in p.m. peak hour volume of about 33 vehicles, which represents an approximately 0.7% increase in intersection approach volume. This intersection could be mitigated by adding a dedicated south bound right-turn lane. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS D with a V/C of 0.81 to LOS C with a V/C of 0.80. However, due to the close proximity of homes in the area and the associated right-of-way that would be required, this mitigation is not feasible. Therefore, this impact would be deemed **significant and unavoidable**.

Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Fiddyment Road – Under the 2025 cumulative scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS E to LOS F with the addition of the proposed project. This change is based on a change in overall p.m. peak hour approach volume of about 2.7%. This intersection is already assumed to have extraordinary improvements, such as three westbound left turn lanes. This impact could be mitigated by adding a shared westbound through/left-turn lane, which would also require the signal to be operated in a split-phase mode. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS F with a V/C of 1.01 to LOS E with a V/C of 0.94. This mitigation is feasible and will be added to the City's CIP as a part of this project. Therefore, the impact is considered **less than significant**.

Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard and SR 65 S/B On – Under the 2025 cumulative scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS D with the addition of the proposed project. This change is based on an overall p.m. peak hour approach volume change less than 1%. This impact could be mitigated by adding a fourth northbound through lane. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS D with a V/C of 0.82 to LOS B with a V/C of 0.66. However, due to Caltrans right-of-way and bridge width constraints, this mitigation is not feasible. Because this improvement would not be feasible, the impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp/Orlando Drive and Riverside Avenue – Under the 2025 Cumulative plus proposed project without Placer Parkway scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS D to LOS E. This level of service change is based on an increase in p.m. peak hour volume of about 30 vehicles, which represents a less than 1% increase in intersection approach volume. This intersection could be mitigated by adding a second westbound right-turn lane. This would

improve the intersection operation from LOS E with a V/C of 0.91 to LOS C with a V/C of 0.73. However, due to the close proximity of businesses in the area and the associated right-of-way that would be required, this mitigation is not feasible. Therefore, this impact would be deemed **significant and unavoidable**.

Project mitigation is not sufficient to reduce CSP's cumulative contribution to a less than significant level.

TABLE 5.7-6
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS WITH SIGNIFICANT LEVEL OF SERVICE IMPACTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Intersection		*Cumulative Conditions*			
		No Project		*Plus Project*	
ID	*Intersection Name*	*LOS*	*V/C*	*LOS*	*V/C*
AM Peak Hour					
	No Significant Impacts				
PM Peak Hour					
60	Foothills Blvd & Vineyard Rd	C	0.81	**D**	**0.83**
86	Pleasant Grove & Fiddyment Rd	**E**	**0.96**	**F**	**1.01**
154	Stanford Ranch/Galleria & SR 65 S/B On	C	0.81	**D**	**0.82**
157	I-80 E/B Off/Orlando & Riverside	D	0.90	**E**	**0.91**

Notes: **Shaded** locations indicate significant LOS change **Bold** indicates LOS at less than C

DKS 2010

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
1	Atlantic & Tiger/Center	A	0.44	A	0.44
2	Atlantic & Wills	C	0.75	C	0.75
3	Atlantic St & Yosemite St	B	0.63	B	0.63
4	Baseline Rd & Fiddyment Rd	**E**	**0.95**	**E**	**0.96**
5	Blue Oaks & Crocker Ranch	B	0.64	B	0.67
6	Blue Oaks & Del Webb	A	0.53	A	0.54
7	Blue Oaks & Fiddyment	B	0.69	C	0.75
8	Blue Oaks & New Meadow	A	0.57	A	0.59
9	Blue Oaks & Orchard View	A	0.52	A	0.53
10	Blue Oaks Bl & Diamond Creek Bl	C	0.75	C	0.79
11	Blue Oaks Bl & Foothills Bl	**D**	**0.89**	**D**	**0.90**
12	Blue Oaks Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	B	0.69	C	0.74
13	Cirby & Sunrise	**F**	**1.06**	**F**	**1.07**
14	Cirby Wy & Foothills Bl	**F**	**1.14**	**F**	**1.14**
15	Cirby Wy & Melody Ln	B	0.62	B	0.62
16	Cirby Wy & Northridge Dr	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.92**
17	Cirby Wy & Oak Ridge Dr	C	0.70	C	0.70
18	Cirby Wy & Orlando Av	**D**	**0.89**	**D**	**0.89**
19	Cirby Wy & Parkview Dr	A	0.52	A	0.52
20	Cirby Wy & Riverside Av	**F**	**1.13**	**F**	**1.13**
21	Cirby Wy & Rocky Ridge Dr	B	0.64	B	0.63

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
22	Cirby Wy & San Simeon Dr	B	0.65	B	0.65
23	Cirby Wy & Vernon St	**F**	**1.27**	**F**	**1.27**
24	Douglas & Eureka	B	0.69	B	0.69
25	Douglas & Rocky Ridge	**D**	**0.82**	**D**	**0.82**
26	Douglas & Santa Clara	C	0.70	C	0.70
27	Douglas & Sierra Gardens	B	0.68	B	0.68
28	Douglas & Sunrise	**E**	**0.91**	**D**	**0.90**
29	Douglas & Target	B	0.69	B	0.69
30	Douglas Bl & E Roseville Pw	C	0.73	C	0.74
31	Douglas Bl & Folsom Rd	B	0.61	B	0.61
32	Douglas Bl & Harding Bl	**E**	**0.94**	**E**	**0.94**
33	Douglas Bl & Judah St	A	0.49	A	0.49
34	Douglas Bl & Keehner Av	A	0.47	A	0.47
35	Douglas Bl & Park Dr	A	0.41	A	0.41
36	Douglas Bl & Sierra College Bl	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.88**
37	Eureka & Lead Hill	A	0.54	A	0.54
38	Eureka & N. Sunrise	C	0.76	C	0.76
39	Eureka & Rocky Ridge	C	0.75	C	0.74
40	Eureka Rd & Ashland Dr	A	0.44	A	0.44
41	Eureka Rd & Deer Valley Apts	A	0.43	A	0.42
42	Fairway & Central Park/Lowes	A	0.55	A	0.55

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
43	Fairway & Cortina Circle	A	0.49	A	0.49
44	Fairway & Five Star	A	0.45	A	0.46
45	Fairway & Home Depot	A	0.52	A	0.52
46	Fairway & Target/Rosehall	A	0.48	A	0.48
47	Fiddyment & Del Webb/Village Green	B	0.61	B	0.65
48	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (North)	B	0.60	B	0.61
49	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (South)	A	0.56	A	0.58
50	Foothills & Baseline/Main	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.85**
51	Foothills & Misty Wood/NEC	A	0.53	A	0.53
52	Foothills Bl & Albertsons Dr	B	0.65	B	0.65
53	Foothills Bl & Atkinson Rd	A	0.56	A	0.56
54	Foothills Bl & Roseville Pkwy/HP (Central)	C	0.73	C	0.74
55	Foothills Bl & HP (South)	A	0.51	A	0.51
56	Foothills Bl & Junction Bl	C	0.81	C	0.81
57	Foothills Bl & McAnally Dr	C	0.78	C	0.81
58	Foothills Bl & Pleasant Grove Bl	**E**	**0.91**	**E**	**0.91**
59	Foothills Blvd & Rand/Pilgrims	A	0.59	B	0.61
60	Foothills Bl & Vineyard Rd	C	0.81	**D**	**0.83**
61	Galleria & Antelope Creek	B	0.66	B	0.65
62	Galleria & Berry	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.88**
63	Galleria & Roseville Pkwy	**F**	**1.02**	**F**	**1.02**

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
64	Harding & Wills	C	0.77	C	0.78
65	Harding Bl & Estates Dr	B	0.68	B	0.68
66	Harding Bl & Lead Hill Bl	C	0.77	C	0.77
67	Harding Bl & Roseville Square	B	0.61	B	0.62
68	Junction & Stonecrest/Magenta	A	0.46	A	0.47
69	Junction Bl & Americana Dr	A	0.50	A	0.39
70	Junction Bl & Baseline Rd	C	0.81	C	0.80
71	Junction Bl & Country Club Dr	B	0.60	B	0.61
72	Junction Bl & Park Regency Dr	A	0.52	A	0.54
73	Junction Bl & Porter Dr	B	0.55	A	0.56
74	Junction Bl & Revere Dr	A	0.46	A	0.47
75	Junction Bl & Washington Bl	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.86**
76	Junction Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	A	0.59	A	0.51
77	Lead Hill Bl & N Sunrise Av	C	0.71	C	0.71
78	Lead Hill Bl & Rocky Ridge Dr	B	0.64	B	0.64
79	Lead Hill Bl & Wal-Mart	A	0.43	A	0.43
80	N Sunrise Av & Automall Dr	A	0.53	A	0.53
81	N Sunrise Av & Stone Point Dr	A	0.58	B	0.61
82	N. Sunrise & Sierra Gardens	B	0.63	B	0.62
83	Olympus Dr & Europa St	A	0.20	A	0.19
84	PFE & Hilltop	A	0.43	A	0.43

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
85	Pleasant Grove & Fairway	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.85**
86	Pleasant Grove & Fiddyment	**E**	**0.96**	**F**	**1.01**
87	Pleasant Grove & Gold Coast/Hallissy	C	0.78	C	0.79
88	Pleasant Grove & Highland Park	A	0.50	A	0.50
89	Pleasant Grove & Market	A	0.51	A	0.53
90	Pleasant Grove & Michener	B	0.69	C	0.70
91	Pleasant Grove & Monument	A	0.43	A	0.45
92	Pleasant Grove & Rose Creek	C	0.70	C	0.71
93	Pleasant Grove & Roseville Pkwy	**F**	**1.11**	**F**	**1.13**
94	Pleasant Grove & Sun City	B	0.64	B	0.64
95	Pleasant Grove & Wal-Mart/Highland Pointe	C	0.77	C	0.78
96	Pleasant Grove & Washington	**D**	**0.82**	**D**	**0.83**
97	Pleasant Grove Bl & Country Club Dr	A	0.58	A	0.58
98	Pleasant Grove Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.85**
99	Rocky Ridge Dr & Maidu Dr	A	0.59	B	0.60
100	Rocky Ridge Dr & Mclaren Dr	A	0.49	A	0.49
101	Rocky Ridge Dr & Professional Dr	B	0.67	B	0.67
102	Rocky Ridge Dr & Stone Point Dr	A	0.26	A	0.28
103	Roseville Parkway & Chase	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.85**
104	Roseville Parkway & Creekside Ridge	C	0.78	C	0.80
105	Roseville Parkway & Gibson	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.84**

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
106	Roseville Parkway & N. Sunrise	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.92**
107	Roseville Parkway & Reserve	C	0.79	C	0.79
108	Roseville Parkway & Secret Ravine	C	0.76	C	0.75
109	Roseville Parkway & Taylor	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.84**
110	Roseville Parkway & West Mall	A	0.58	A	0.59
111	Roseville Pw & Alexandra Dr	B	0.61	B	0.62
112	Roseville Pw & Eureka Rd	C	0.71	C	0.75
113	Roseville Pw & Lead Hill/Orvietto	B	0.65	B	0.66
114	Roseville Pw & N Cirby Wy	A	0.50	A	0.51
115	Roseville Pw & Olympus Dr	B	0.63	B	0.63
116	Roseville Pw & Rocky Ridge Dr	B	0.61	B	0.63
117	Roseville Pw & Sierra College Bl	**D**	**0.82**	C	0.81
118	Roseville Pw & Trestle Rd	A	0.59	B	0.61
119	Roseville Pw & Village/Slate Creek	A	0.52	A	0.52
120	Roseville Pw & Washington Bl	C	0.76	B	0.67
121	S Cirby Wy & Champion Oaks Dr	A	0.52	A	0.51
122	S Cirby Wy & Old Auburn Rd	C	0.73	C	0.73
123	Secret Ravine & Scarborough/ Poppy Field	A	0.33	A	0.33
124	Sierra College & Miners Ravine	A	0.44	A	0.45
125	Sierra College & Secret Ravine	A	0.59	B	0.60
126	Sierra College Bl & Eureka Rd	A	0.56	A	0.57

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
127	Sierra College Bl & Indigo Creek Apts	C	0.80	C	0.79
128	Sierra College Bl & Old Auburn Rd	C	0.78	C	0.78
129	Sierra College Bl & Olympus Dr	A	0.55	A	0.55
130	Stanford Ranch & Fairway	B	0.64	B	0.64
131	Stanford Ranch & Five Star	A	0.59	A	0.59
132	Stanford Ranch & Highland Park	A	0.52	A	0.52
133	Sunrise & Coloma	C	0.74	C	0.74
134	Sunrise & Sandringham/Kensington	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.85**
135	Sunrise & Sun Tree/Kensington	C	0.70	C	0.70
136	Sunrise Av & Frances Dr	B	0.62	B	0.62
137	Sunrise Av & Oak Ridge Dr	A	0.45	A	0.45
138	Washington & Diamond Oaks	C	0.70	C	0.71
139	Washington & Sawtell/Derek	C	0.75	C	0.76
140	Washington Bl & Hallissy Dr	A	0.37	A	0.37
141	Woodcreek Oaks & Baseline	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.91**
142	Woodcreek Oaks & Canevari/Arsenault	A	0.55	A	0.56
143	Woodcreek Oaks & Horncastle	A	0.54	A	0.55
144	Woodcreek Oaks & McAnally	B	0.60	B	0.62
145	Woodcreek Oaks & Trailee	A	0.44	A	0.44
146	SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	B	0.61	B	0.61
147	Washington Blvd & Blue Oaks Blvd	B	0.66	B	0.67

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
148	I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	C	0.81	C	0.81
149	I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	A	0.56	A	0.56
150	SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	C	0.71	C	0.71
151	SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	B	0.65	B	0.66
152	I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	B	0.61	B	0.61
153	Stanford Ranch & Sr-65 N/B On	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.83**
154	Stanford Ranch/Galleria & Sr-65 S/B On	C	0.81	**D**	**0.82**
155	Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	**E**	**0.97**	**E**	**0.97**
156	Fairway & Highland Park	C	0.71	C	0.72
157	I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	**D**	**0.90**	**E**	**0.91**
Future Signals in CIP					
158	Roseville Pkwy & Old Auburn	A	0.40	A	0.40
159	Washington Blvd & Industrial	B	0.64	B	0.64
160	Foothills Blvd & HP Far South/ NEC	B	0.66	B	0.66
161	Blue Oaks Blvd & Wood Meadow	A	0.58	A	0.58
162	Gibson Rd & New Convention Center Rd	B	0.67	B	0.68
163	Blue Oaks Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.32	A	0.47
164	Blue Oaks Blvd & Hayden Pkwy	A	0.47	A	0.48
165	Fiddyment Rd & Westhills Dr	B	0.68	C	0.70
166	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.41	B	0.65
167	Fiddyment Rd & Westlake Dr	A	0.41	A	0.41

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
168	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Northpark Dr	A	0.17	A	0.17
169	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Parkside Wy	A	0.58	B	0.60
170	Industrial Ave & Alantown Dr	C	0.74	C	0.75
171	Roseville Pkwy & Gibson West	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.86**
172	Washington Blvd & All America	A	0.58	A	0.58
173	Cirby & Cottonwood	A	0.42	A	0.42
174	Secret Ravine & Alexandra	A	0.21	A	0.21
175	Fiddyment Rd & Fiddyment Ranch EW Rd	C	0.70	C	0.72
176	Douglas Blvd & I-80 EB On	C	0.72	C	0.72
Signalized Intersections Added with Sierra Vista					
177	Santucci Blvd & Pleasant Grove	C	0.74	C	0.77
178	Santucci Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.53	A	0.54
179	Santucci Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.48	A	0.48
180	Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.86**
181	Westbrook Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.48	A	0.51
182	Westbrook Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	B	0.61	B	0.67
183	Westbrook Blvd & Baseline Rd	C	0.79	C	0.80
184	Market Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.26	A	0.28
185	Market St & Baseline Rd	B	0.63	B	0.63
186	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Upland Dr	A	0.49	A	0.51
187	Upland Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.33	A	0.34
188	Upland Dr & Baseline Rd	A	0.57	A	0.57
189	Baseline Rd CMU3 Entrance	A	0.58	A	0.58

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
190	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.55	A	0.57
191	Vista Glen Blvd Road 2A	A	0.17	A	0.19
192	Vista Glen Blvd & SV NS Coll 5	A	0.24	A	0.24
193	Santucci Blvd & SV CC5 CC6	A	0.54	A	0.56
194	Santucci Blv & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.53	A	0.55
195	Vista Glen Blvd & Road 1	A	0.06	A	0.06
196	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Glen Dr	A	0.36	A	0.37
197	Baseline Rd & SV CC2	A	0.63	A	0.63
198	Baseline Rd & SV CCBP2	A	0.57	A	0.57
199	Baseline Rd & SV CC4	C	0.71	C	0.71
Intersections in Sierra Vista Urban Reserve Area					
200	Santucci Blvd & Road E	A	0.54	A	0.56
201	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Road 1	A	0.40	A	0.39
202	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Road 1	A	0.24	A	0.24
Creekview Intersections					
203	Westbrook Blvd & Holt Parkway	N/A		B	0.61
204	Westbrook Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		A	0.59
205	Blue Oaks Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		A	0.38
Intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone					
P1	Riverside Av & Darling Way	B	0.62	B	0.62
P2	Vernon & Douglas/Riverside	B	0.65	B	0.66
P3	Vernon & Grant	A	0.53	A	0.53
P4	Vernon & Judah	A	0.57	A	0.57

TABLE 5.7-7
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
2025 AND CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS
PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS
P.M. PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		2025 CIP Conditions		Cumulative Conditions	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
P5	Vernon & Lincoln	**D**	**0.88**	**D**	**0.88**
P6	Washington & Main	C	0.79	C	0.79
P7	Washington & Oak	C	0.73	C	0.73
P8	Grant & Oak	n/a		N/A	

Note: **Shaded** locations indicate significant impact. **Bold** locations operate at LOS D or worse

Source: DKS Associates, 2010

Consistency with 70% Level of Service Policy

Table 5-9 shows the percentage of Roseville intersections projected to operate at better than level of service C during the p.m. peak hour under cumulative conditions with and without buildout of the proposed project. Under No Project conditions, 168 of the City's 202 intersections would operate at LOS C or better. This equates to 83.2 percent of the City's signalized intersections functioning at LOS C or better during the p.m. peak period which is significantly higher than City requirement that 70 percent of the City's signalized intersections function at LOS C or better during the peak period. The proposed project would add 3 signalized intersections within the City. Under the Plus Project scenario, 170 of the City's 205 intersections would operate at LOS C or better. This means that 82.9 percent of the City's intersection would function at LOS C or better during the a.m. peak hour which is significantly higher than the City requirement of 70 percent (which only applies to the p.m. peak period, in any event). Therefore, this impact is considered to be **less than significant.**

TABLE 5.7-8
PERCENTAGE OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
OPERATING AT LOS C OR BETTER
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROJECT SCENARIO
PM PEAK HOUR

Level of Service	*PM Peak Hour*			
	Cumulative No Project		*Cumulative Plus Project*	
	Number of Intersections	*Percentage*	*Number of Intersections*	*Percentage*
LOS A-C	168	83.2%	170	82.9%
LOS D	19	9.4%	20	9.8%
LOS E	9	4.5%	8	3.9%
LOS F	6	3.0%	7	3.4%
LOS D-F	**34**	**16.3%**	**35**	**17.1%**
Total	202	100%	205	100%
Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone				

DKS 2010

City of Rocklin Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Traffic Impacts

The proposed project would result in traffic volume increases on a number of roadways in the City of Rocklin under Cumulative conditions. 5-10 shows the changes in average daily traffic volumes on a number of Rocklin roadway segments. The table shows that there would not be significant change in level of service under cumulative conditions with the project. This would be **less than significant** cumulative impact.

TABLE 5-9
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROCKLIN ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Roadway Segment	*LOS Standard*	*Lanes*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
			No Project		*Plus Project*	
			ADT	*LOS*	*ADT*	*LOS*
Lonetree Blvd north of Blue Oaks Blvd	D*	4	29,300	D	29,400	D
Blue Oaks Blvd at Roseville City Limit	D*	4	12,100	A	12,100	A
Pleasant Grove Blvd at Roseville City Limit	C	6	26,900	A	26,900	A
Stanford Ranch Rd at Roseville City Limit	C	6	27,100	A	27,200	A
Notes: Bold Locations Do Not Meet Level of service Policy Shaded Locations Indicate Significant Level of service change						

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

City of Lincoln Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Traffic Impacts

The proposed project would result in traffic volume increases on a number of roadways in the City of Lincoln under Cumulative conditions. The table shows that there would not be significant change in level of service under cumulative conditions with the project. This would be **less than significant** cumulative impact.

TABLE 5-10
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT LINCOLN SOI ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Roadway Segment	*LOS Standard*	*Lanes*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
			No Project		*Plus Project*	
			ADT	*LOS*	*ADT*	*LOS*
Dowd Road north of Catlett Road	C	6	27,700	A	28,900	A
Fiddyment Road north of Athens Avenue	C	6	23,400	A	23,500	A
Industrial Avenue north of Athens Avenue	C	4	23,100	B	23,100	B
Athens Avenue east of Dowd Road	C	4	24,800,	B	25,500	C
Athens Avenue east of Fiddyment Road	C	4	26,300	C	26,700	C
Moore Road east of Fiddyment Road	C	4	7,300	A	7,500	A
Notes: Bold Locations Do Not Meet Level of service Policy Shaded Locations Indicate Significant Level of service change						

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

Placer County Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Traffic Impacts

The proposed project would result in traffic volume increases on a number of roadways in Placer County under cumulative conditions. Table 5-11 shows the changes in a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection level of service at a number of Placer County intersections. The table shows that no intersection would be significantly impacted during the p.m. peak hour by the project.

TABLE 5-11
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT PLACER COUNTY INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Intersection	*LOS Standard*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
		No Project		*Plus Project*	
		LOS	*V/C or Delay*	*LOS*	*V/C*
AM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	C	N/A[5]		N/A	
Locust Rd & Baseline Rd	C	A	0.46	A	0.47
Watt Ave & PFE Rd	C	B	0.67	B	0.68
Walerga Rd & PFE Rd	C	**E**	**0.90**	**E**	**0.92**
Fiddyment & Athens	C	**F**	**1.09**	**F**	**1.10**
Industrial & Athens	C	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.92**
PM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	C	N/A		N/A*	
Locust Rd & Baseline Rd	C	C	0.70	C	0.70
Watt Ave & PFE Rd	C	B	0.61	B	0.61
Walerga Rd & PFE Rd	C	**E**	**0.96**	**E**	**0.97**
Fiddyment & Athens	C	**F**	**1.65**	**F**	**1.66**
Industrial & Athens	C	B	0.69	B	0.69

Notes: Bold Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
Shaded Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change
*With Sierra Vista Specific Plan, these Intersections are in Roseville

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

[5] Watt Avenue and Baseline Road is expected to be a Roseville Intersection at buildout.

Table 5-12 shows the changes in daily traffic volume on Placer County roadways under Cumulative and Cumulative plus project conditions. The table shows that there would be volume increases on portions of Baseline Road, Watt Avenue, and Walerga Road. It should be noted that the County has approved a LOS D policy for roadways within and adjacent to Placer Vineyards

TABLE 5-12
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT PLACER COUNTY ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Roadway Segment	*LOS Standard*	*Lanes*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
			No Project		*Plus Project*	
			ADT	*LOS*	*ADT*	*LOS*
Baseline Rd W/O Sierra Vista	D	6	42,600	C	43,100	C
Watt Ave S/O Baseline	D	6	30,500	A	31,300	A
Walerga Rd S/O Baseline	D	4	**38,900**	**F**	**39,300**	**F**
PFE E/O Watt Ave	C	2	8,700	S	9,000	A
Fiddyment Rd S/O Athens	C	4	**35,600**	**E**	**35,300**	**E**
Sunset E/O Foothills	C	6	34,600	B	35,400	B
Foothills Blvd S/O Athens	C	4	26,100	C	25,900	C
Athens Ave E/O Fiddyment Rd	C	4	27,500	C	27,900	C
Industrial Blvd N/O Athens Ave	C	4	23,400	B	23,400	B
Philip Rd W/O Sierra Vista	C	2	400	A	400	A
Brewer Rd S/O W Sunset	C	2	100	A	100	A
W Sunset W/O Fiddyment	C	2	1,700	A	1,700	A
Dowd Rd S/O Athens	C	4	23,900	B	26,400	C

Notes: Bold Locations Do Not Meet Level of service Policy
Shaded Locations Indicate Significant Level of service change

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

Sacramento County Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Traffic Impacts

Table 5-13 shows the changes in a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection level of service at a number of Sacramento County intersections. Table 5-14 shows that no intersections degrade substantially with the project during either the AM or PM peak hours. Cumulative development would be **less than significant**. Therefore, CSP is **less than significant** for its cumulative contribution.

Table 5-14 shows that the segment of Walerga Road south of PFE Road would operate at LOS F with and without the project. This is a **significant** cumulative impact. CSP's contribution is **less than significant**. An increase in ADT of less than 1% on Walerga Road south of PFE Road does not represent a significant impact. Further, the construction of a third northbound and southbound thru lane would improve the operation of this roadway segment to LOS E. Previous studies, including the Placer Vineyards EIR, have identified a need for six lanes on Walerga Road south of the County line.

TABLE 5-13
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SACRAMENTO COUNTY INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Intersection	*LOS Standard*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
		No Project		*Plus Project*	
		LOS	*V/C*	*LOS*	*V/C*
AM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Elverta Rd	E	D	0.89	D	0.90
Walerga Rd & Elverta Rd	E	D	0.88	D	0.89
Watt Ave & Antelope Rd	E	**F**	**1.15**	**F**	**1.15**
Walerga Rd & Antelope Rd	E	B	0.61	B	0.61
Watt Ave & Elkhorn	E	D	0.88	D	0.88
Walerga Rd & Elkhorn	E	B	0.66	B	0.66
PM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Elverta Rd	E	**F**	**1.02**	**F**	**1.01**
Walerga Rd & Elverta Rd	E	**F**	**1.09**	**F**	**1.10**
Watt Ave & Antelope Rd	E	**F**	**1.26**	**F**	**1.26**
Walerga Rd & Antelope Rd	E	D	0.85	D	0.85
Watt Ave & Elkhorn	E	**F**	**1.03**	**F**	**1.03**
Walerga Rd & Elkhorn	E	D	0.88	D	0.89

Notes: **Bold** Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy **Shaded** Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

TABLE 5-14
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SACRAMENTO COUNTY ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Roadway Segment	*LOS Standard*	*Lanes*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
			No Project		*Plus Project*	
			ADT	*LOS*	*ADT*	*LOS*
Watt Ave S/O PFE	E	6	52,500	E	52,700	E
Watt Ave S/O Elverta	E	6	40,500	C	40,400	C
Watt Ave S/O Antelope	E	6	38,800	C	38,900	C
Watt Ave S/O Elkhorn	E	6	47,000	D	47,300	D
Walerga Rd S/O PFE	E	4	**50,900**	**F**	**51,300**	**F**
Walerga Rd S/O Elverta	E	4	33,000	E	33,100	E
Walerga Rd S/O Antelope	E	4	33,000	E	32,900	E
Walerga Rd S/O Elkhorn	E	4	30,600	D	30,600	D

Notes: **Shaded** Locations indicate significant level of service change

Bold Locations operate at less than adopted level of service Standard

Source: DKS Associates, 2010

Sutter County Cumulative Plus Partial Placer Parkway Traffic Impacts

As shown in Table 5-15, Sutter County intersections would function at acceptable level of service with and without the project. Therefore, cumulative impacts and the project's cumulative contribution are considered **less than significant**.

TABLE 5-15

LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SUTTER COUNTY INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Intersection	LOS Standard	Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
		LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
Pleasant Grove N & Riego	D	B	0.67	B	0.67
Pleasant Grove S & Riego	D	B	0.66	B	0.68
SR 70/99 SB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.60	B	0.60
SR 70/99 NB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.11	A	0.11
PM Peak Hour					
Pleasant Grove N & Riego	D	B	0.67	B	0.68
Pleasant Grove S & Riego	D	C	0.79	B	0.79
SR 70/99 SB & Riego Rd	D	C	0.72	B	0.72
SR 70/99 NB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.19	A	0.19

Notes: Bold Locations operate at less than adopted LOS Policy
Shaded Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

DKS 2010

Table 5-16 shows that the addition of the proposed project would not substantially increase daily traffic on Riego Road east of SR 70/99 significantly. Creekview's contribution to the cumulative impact is considered **less than significant.**

TABLE 5-16
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SUTTER COUNTY ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Roadway Segment	*LOS Standard*	*Lanes*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
			No Project		*Plus Project*	
			ADT	*LOS*	*ADT*	*LOS*
Riego Rd E/O SR 70-99	D	4	33,700	F	33,800	F

Notes: **Bold** Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
Shaded Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

State Highway Cumulative Traffic Impacts

The addition of the proposed project to existing conditions would cause changes in traffic volumes at State highway interchanges providing access to the site. It should be noted that the project site is a number of miles from any State highway, so impacts to State highway facilities are minimal. Table 5-19 shows the cumulative plus project levels of service at a number of interchanges providing access to State highways including State Route 65, Interstate 80, and State Route 70/99. The State's Transportation Concept Reports (TCR's) for these three highways stipulate a level of service standard of E or better. The table shows that all intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or better both without and with the proposed project. Therefore, there is **no cumulative impact**. The addition of the proposed project would not cause traffic to back up onto State highway facilities, and therefore Creekview's contribution to this impact is considered **less than significant**.

TABLE 5-17
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SIGNALIZED HIGHWAY RAMP INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Intersection	*LOS Standard*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
		No Project		*Plus Project*	
		LOS	*V/C*	*LOS*	*V/C*
AM Peak Hour					
SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	A	0.49	A	0.50
Washington Blvd & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	A	0.45	A	0.46
I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	E	C	0.71	C	0.71
I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	E	A	0.44	A	0.44
SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	A	0.53	A	0.54
SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	A	0.40	A	0.40
I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	E	C	0.71	C	0.71
SR 65 N/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	A	0.52	A	0.53
SR 65 S/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	A	0.42	A	0.42
I-80 E/B Off & Taylor/Eureka	E	D	0.84	D	0.84
I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	E	C	0.76	C	0.76
PM Peak Hour					
SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	B	0.61	B	0.61
SR 65 SB & Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd	E	B	0.66	B	0.67
I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	E	C	0.81	C	0.81
I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	E	A	0.56	A	0.56
SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	C	0.71	C	0.71
SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	B	0.66	B	0.66
I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	E	B	0.65	B	0.61

TABLE 5-17
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SIGNALIZED HIGHWAY RAMP INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Intersection	*LOS Standard*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
		No Project		*Plus Project*	
		LOS	*V/C*	*LOS*	*V/C*
SR 65 N/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	D	0.83	D	0.82
SR 65 S/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	C	0.81	D	0.83
I-80 E/B Off & Taylor/Eureka	E	E	0.97	E	0.97
I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	E	D	0.90	E	0.91

Notes: **Shaded** Locations indicate significant impact

Bold Locations Indicate LOS operating below LOS Standard

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

Table 5-19 shows the cumulative plus project levels of service on State highway segments. The table shows that I-80 and portions of SR 65 would operate at LOS F with and without the proposed project. This is a **significant** cumulative impact.

TABLE 5-18
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND LOS ON STATE HIGHWAYS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PARTIAL PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT

Facility	Segment	Lanes	Cumulative		Cumulative Plus Project		
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS	% Change
I-80	Sacramento County line to Riverside Ave	8	**215,000**	**F**	**214,800**	**F**	**-0.1%**
	Riverside Avenue to Douglas Blvd	6	**188,400**	**F**	**187,400**	**F**	**-0.1%**
	Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd	6	**187,400**	**F**	**187,000**	**F**	**0.0%**
	Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd	8	**202,300**	**F**	**202,500**	**F**	**+0.1%**
	Taylor Rd to SR 65	8	**191,200**	**F**	**191,300**	**F**	**+0.1%**
SR 65	I-80 to Galleria Blvd	6	**137,300**	**F**	**137,800**	**F**	**+0.4%**
	Galleria Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd	6	**141,800**	**F**	**142,400**	**F**	**+0.4%**
	Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd	6	**130,900**	**F**	**131,600**	**F**	**+0.5%**
	Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd	4	**121,400**	**F**	**121,500**	**F**	**+0.1%**
SR 70/99	Sankey Rd to Riego Rd	4	60,100	C	60,300	C	+0.3%
	Riego Rd to Elverta Rd	4	**88,200**	**F**	**88,500**	**F**	**+0.3%**
	Elverta Rd to Elkhorn Blvd	4	**87,300**	**F**	**87,500**	**F**	**+0.2%**

Notes: Highway segments operating at LOS F are Bold.
Impacts are **Shaded**
Volumes Exclude Carpool Lanes

Because Caltrans considers any increase in volume on an already deficient facility an impact, CSP's contribution represents a **significant** cumulative impact. However, because the City of Roseville does not have control over improvements on State facilities, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

No specific improvements have been identified to mitigate project impacts other than what is described in Section 4.3; however, the City is working with Caltrans & the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) to establish a regional approach to institute a fee program for the purpose of funding improvements on these facilities. If and when Caltrans and the City enter into an enforceable agreement, the Project shall pay impact fees to the City of Roseville in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements, consistent with the Mitigation Fee Act (Gov. Code, § 66000 et seq.).

The City recognizes the magnitude of the projected growth in Placer County, its resulting increase in travel demand, and the need for a cooperative approach to plan, fund and implement transportation improvements to accommodate that growth, including improvements to the State Highway System in Placer County.

The City is working with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) and their member jurisdictions to develop a strategic "Transportation Expenditure Plan" that includes funding for improvements for State highways in Placer County. The Expenditure Plan includes a number of critical transportation projects and programs including construction of the Placer Parkway, improvements to I-80 and SR 65, and construction of SR 65 Lincoln Bypass.

The proposed funding components for the Expenditure Plan are as follows:

- Additional development fees
  - Tier 2 Fee
  - Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee
- Transportation sales tax
- Existing and future State and Federal funds

The Tier 2 fees for Placer Parkway have been adopted in Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln, and Placer County and will be applied to all new growth areas. The CSP will be required to participate in this fee program. In addition, the SVSP will be required to participate in the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority Fee Program (SPRTA) and the Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority to fund improvements along Highway 65. The additional development fees will need to be adopted by each of the jurisdictions in South Placer County. The City supports implementation of the Transportation Expenditure Plan to fund regional improvements in South Placer County. The City will support Caltrans and regional agencies efforts to:

- Secure as much Federal and State funding for improvements to the State Highway System as possible, including funds for the transportation bond measure approved by the voters in 2006.
- Establish impact fees so that development throughout South Placer County pays their fair share of the unfunded cost of regional improvements, including improvements to SR 65

Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway – City of Roseville

Tables 5-20 and 5-21 identify the a.m. and p.m. peak hour level of service respectively at all Roseville intersections with and with out the project under the Cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario.

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
Existing Signalized Intersections					
1	Atlantic & Tiger/Center	A	0.43	A	0.43
2	Atlantic & Wills	C	0.72	C	0.74
3	Atlantic St & Yosemite St	A	0.52	A	0.52
4	Baseline Rd & Fiddyment Rd	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.86**
5	Blue Oaks & Crocker Ranch	A	0.55	A	0.56
6	Blue Oaks & Del Webb	A	0.51	A	0.54
7	Blue Oaks & Fiddyment	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.89**
8	Blue Oaks & New Meadow	A	0.57	A	0.58
9	Blue Oaks & Orchard View	A	0.53	A	0.55
10	Blue Oaks Bl & Diamond Creek Bl	B	0.70	C	0.71
11	Blue Oaks Bl & Foothills Bl	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.93**
12	Blue Oaks Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	C	0.74	C	0.75
13	Cirby & Sunrise	**D**	**0.90**	**E**	**0.91**
14	Cirby Wy & Foothills Bl	**E**	**1.00**	**E**	**1.00**
15	Cirby Wy & Melody Ln	A	0.58	A	0.58
16	Cirby Wy & Northridge Dr	C	0.78	C	0.79
17	Cirby Wy & Oak Ridge Dr	A	0.54	A	0.54
18	Cirby Wy & Orlando Av	**E**	**0.93**	**E**	**0.93**
19	Cirby Wy & Parkview Dr	A	0.58	A	0.58
20	Cirby Wy & Riverside Av	**F**	**1.05**	**F**	**1.05**

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
21	Cirby Wy & Rocky Ridge Dr	A	0.43	A	0.43
22	Cirby Wy & San Simeon Dr	B	0.60	B	0.61
23	Cirby Wy & Vernon St	**E**	**0.99**	**E**	**1.00**
24	Douglas & Eureka	A	0.55	A	0.53
25	Douglas & Rocky Ridge	B	0.60	B	0.61
26	Douglas & Santa Clara	A	0.57	A	0.56
27	Douglas & Sierra Gardens	A	0.52	A	0.52
28	Douglas & Sunrise	B	0.69	B	0.69
29	Douglas & Target	A	0.44	A	0.43
30	Douglas Bl & E Roseville Pw	C	0.75	C	0.76
31	Douglas Bl & Folsom Rd	A	0.49	A	0.49
32	Douglas Bl & Harding Bl	B	0.62	B	0.62
33	Douglas Bl & Judah St	A	0.30	A	0.30
34	Douglas Bl & Keehner Av	A	0.49	A	0.49
35	Douglas Bl & Park Dr	A	0.36	A	0.36
36	Douglas Bl & Sierra College Bl	C	0.75	C	0.77
37	Eureka & Lead Hill	A	0.48	A	0.48
38	Eureka & N. Sunrise	A	0.58	A	0.58
39	Eureka & Rocky Ridge	A	0.55	A	0.54
40	Eureka Rd & Ashland Dr	A	0.37	A	0.36
41	Eureka Rd & Deer Valley Apts	A	0.38	A	0.39
42	Fairway & Central Park/Lowes	A	0.45	A	0.45
43	Fairway & Cortina Circle	A	0.28	A	0.29

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
44	Fairway & Five Star	A	0.40	A	0.40
45	Fairway & Home Depot	A	0.52	A	0.52
46	Fairway & Target/Rosehall	A	0.59	A	0.57
47	Fiddyment & Del Webb/Village Green	B	0.67	C	0.69
48	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (North)	B	0.61	B	0.62
49	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (South)	A	0.55	A	0.55
50	Foothills & Baseline/Main	**E**	**0.96**	**E**	**0.95**
51	Foothills & Misty Wood/NEC	A	0.55	A	0.55
52	Foothills Bl & Albertsons Dr	A	0.53	A	0.53
53	Foothills Bl & Atkinson Rd	A	0.54	A	0.54
54	Foothills Bl & Roseville Pkwy/HP (Central)	C	0.78	C	0.79
55	Foothills Bl & HP (South)	B	0.69	C	0.70
56	Foothills Bl & Junction Bl	C	0.75	C	0.75
57	Foothills Bl & McAnally Dr	A	0.54	A	0.54
58	Foothills Bl & Pleasant Grove Bl	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.84**
59	Foothills Blvd & Rand/Pilgrims	A	0.52	A	0.52
60	Foothills Bl & Vineyard Rd	B	0.66	B	0.67
61	Galleria & Antelope Creek	A	0.45	A	0.45
62	Galleria & Berry	B	0.66	B	0.66
63	Galleria & Roseville Pkwy	C	0.80	C	0.81
64	Harding & Wills	B	0.67	B	0.67
65	Harding Bl & Estates Dr	A	0.42	A	0.42
66	Harding Bl & Lead Hill Bl	B	0.66	B	0.67

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
67	Harding Bl & Roseville Square	A	0.33	A	0.33
68	Junction & Stonecrest/Magenta	A	0.57	B	0.58
69	Junction Bl & Americana Dr	A	0.44	A	0.44
70	Junction Bl & Baseline Rd	B	0.64	B	0.67
71	Junction Bl & Country Club Dr	B	0.63	B	0.63
72	Junction Bl & Park Regency Dr	B	0.61	B	0.62
73	Junction Bl & Porter Dr	A	0.50	A	0.49
74	Junction Bl & Revere Dr	A	0.40	A	0.40
75	Junction Bl & Washington Bl	A	0.48	A	0.48
76	Junction Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	A	0.53	A	0.54
77	Lead Hill Bl & N Sunrise Av	A	0.53	A	0.54
78	Lead Hill Bl & Rocky Ridge Dr	A	0.46	A	0.46
79	Lead Hill Bl & Wal-Mart	A	0.27	A	0.27
80	N Sunrise Av & Automall Dr	A	0.36	A	0.36
81	N Sunrise Av & Stone Point Dr	A	0.44	A	0.46
82	N. Sunrise & Sierra Gardens	A	0.47	A	0.47
83	Olympus Dr & Europa St	A	0.13	A	0.14
84	PFE & Hilltop	A	0.30	A	0.30
85	Pleasant Grove & Fairway	A	0.55	A	0.56
86	Pleasant Grove & Fiddyment	C	0.75	C	0.78
87	Pleasant Grove & Gold Coast/Hallissy	B	0.68	B	0.67
88	Pleasant Grove & Highland Park	A	0.32	A	0.33
89	Pleasant Grove & Market	A	0.48	A	0.49

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
90	Pleasant Grove & Michener	A	0.59	B	0.60
91	Pleasant Grove & Monument	A	0.41	A	0.43
92	Pleasant Grove & Rose Creek	A	0.56	A	0.56
93	Pleasant Grove & Roseville Pkwy	**E**	**0.99**	**E**	**1.00**
94	Pleasant Grove & Sun City	A	0.58	A	0.58
95	Pleasant Grove & Wal-Mart/Highland Pointe	A	0.53	A	0.53
96	Pleasant Grove & Washington	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.86**
97	Pleasant Grove Bl & Country Club Dr	B	0.64	B	0.64
98	Pleasant Grove Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	B	0.62	B	0.64
99	Rocky Ridge Dr & Maidu Dr	A	0.54	A	0.54
100	Rocky Ridge Dr & Mclaren Dr	A	0.51	A	0.51
101	Rocky Ridge Dr & Professional Dr	A	0.59	A	0.58
102	Rocky Ridge Dr & Stone Point Dr	A	0.09	A	0.09
103	Roseville Parkway & Chase	A	0.59	A	0.59
104	Roseville Parkway & Creekside Ridge	A	0.53	A	0.54
105	Roseville Parkway & Gibson	**D**	**0.89**	**D**	**0.88**
106	Roseville Parkway & N. Sunrise	C	0.75	C	0.76
107	Roseville Parkway & Reserve	A	0.56	A	0.56
108	Roseville Parkway & Secret Ravine	A	0.56	A	0.57
109	Roseville Parkway & Taylor	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.86**
110	Roseville Parkway & West Mall	A	0.47	A	0.47
111	Roseville Pw & Alexandra Dr	A	0.53	A	0.54
112	Roseville Pw & Eureka Rd	A	0.53	B	0.61

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
113	Roseville Pw & Lead Hill/Orvietto	B	0.61	B	0.61
114	Roseville Pw & N Cirby Wy	A	0.41	A	0.41
115	Roseville Pw & Olympus Dr	A	0.57	A	0.57
116	Roseville Pw & Rocky Ridge Dr	A	0.48	A	0.48
117	Roseville Pw & Sierra College Bl	A	0.51	A	0.51
118	Roseville Pw & Trestle Rd	A	0.54	A	0.57
119	Roseville Pw & Village/Slate Creek	A	0.45	A	0.45
120	Roseville Pw & Washington Bl	B	0.61	B	0.63
121	S Cirby Wy & Champion Oaks Dr	A	0.51	A	0.51
122	S Cirby Wy & Old Auburn Rd	C	0.75	C	0.75
123	Secret Ravine & Scarborough/ Poppy Field	A	0.29	A	0.29
124	Sierra College & Miners Ravine	A	0.51	A	0.51
125	Sierra College & Secret Ravine	A	0.50	A	0.50
126	Sierra College Bl & Eureka Rd	B	0.63	B	0.62
127	Sierra College Bl & Indigo Creek Apts	A	0.45	A	0.46
128	Sierra College Bl & Old Auburn Rd	A	0.57	A	0.57
129	Sierra College Bl & Olympus Dr	B	0.63	B	0.63
130	Stanford Ranch & Fairway	A	0.50	A	0.51
131	Stanford Ranch & Five Star	A	0.39	A	0.39
132	Stanford Ranch & Highland Park	A	0.33	A	0.33
133	Sunrise & Coloma	C	0.74	C	0.74
134	Sunrise & Sandringham/Kensington	B	0.60	A	0.59
135	Sunrise & Sun Tree/Kensington	B	0.64	B	0.64

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
136	Sunrise Av & Frances Dr	B	0.66	B	0.65
137	Sunrise Av & Oak Ridge Dr	A	0.40	A	0.39
138	Washington & Diamond Oaks	B	0.63	B	0.63
139	Washington & Sawtell/Derek	A	0.51	A	0.51
140	Washington Bl & Hallissy Dr	A	0.45	A	0.45
141	Woodcreek Oaks & Baseline	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.87**
142	Woodcreek Oaks & Canevari/Arsenault	A	0.41	A	0.44
143	Woodcreek Oaks & Horncastle	A	0.55	A	0.57
144	Woodcreek Oaks & McAnally	C	0.74	C	0.76
145	Woodcreek Oaks & Trailee	A	0.57	A	0.59
146	SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	A	0.53	A	0.54
147	Washington Blvd & Blue Oaks Blvd	A	0.47	A	0.48
148	I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	C	0.71	C	0.71
149	I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	A	0.44	A	0.44
150	SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	A	0.54	A	0.54
151	SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	A	0.42	A	0.43
152	I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	C	0.72	C	0.72
153	Stanford Ranch & Sr-65 N/B On	A	0.53	A	0.53
154	Stanford Ranch/Galleria & Sr-65 S/B On	A	0.42	A	0.42
155	Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.84**
156	Fairway & Highland Park	A	0.45	A	0.47
157	I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	C	0.76	C	0.76
Future Signals in CIP					

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
158	Roseville Pkwy & Old Auburn	A	0.23	A	0.23
159	Washington Blvd & Industrial	B	0.64	B	0.65
160	Foothills Blvd & HP Far South/ NEC	C	0.70	C	0.71
161	Blue Oaks Blvd & Wood Meadow	B	0.62	B	0.62
162	Gibson Rd & New Convention Center Rd	A	0.48	A	0.49
163	Blue Oaks Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.35	A	0.50
164	Blue Oaks Blvd & Hayden Pkwy	A	0.48	A	0.54
165	Fiddyment Rd & Westhills Dr	C	0.70	C	0.72
166	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.52	**B**	**0.65**
167	Fiddyment Rd & Westlake Dr	A	0.48	A	0.50
168	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Northpark Dr	A	0.23	A	0.23
169	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Parkside Wy	A	0.55	A	0.56
170	Industrial Ave & Alantown Dr	C	0.80	C	0.80
171	Roseville Pkwy & Gibson West	**F**	**1.01**	**F**	**1.03**
172	Washington Blvd & All America	A	0.49	A	0.49
173	Cirby & Cottonwood	A	0.53	A	0.53
174	Secret Ravine & Alexandra	A	0.14	A	0.14
175	Fiddyment Rd & Fiddyment Ranch EW Rd	B	0.60	B	0.62
176	Douglas Blvd & I-80 EB On	A	0.48	A	0.48
Signalized Intersections Added with Sierra Vista					
177	Santucci Blvd & Pleasant Grove	A	0.36	A	0.41
178	Santucci Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.42	A	0.43

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
179	Santucci Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.32	A	0.34
180	Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	B	0.68	B	0.68
181	Westbrook Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.47	A	0.48
182	Westbrook Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.50	A	0.50
183	Westbrook Blvd & Baseline Rd	C	0.79	C	0.80
184	Market Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.28	A	0.28
185	Market St & Baseline Rd	B	0.60	B	0.62
186	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Upland Dr	A	0.51	A	0.52
187	Upland Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.29	A	0.29
188	Upland Dr & Baseline Rd	A	0.50	A	0.50
189	Baseline Rd CMU3 Entrance	A	0.50	A	0.50
190	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.44	A	0.44
191	Vista Glen Blvd Road 2A	A	0.18	A	0.19
192	Vista Glen Blvd & SV NS Coll 5	A	0.27	A	0.26
193	Santucci Blvd & SV CC5 CC6	A	0.26	A	0.37
194	Santucci Blv & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.43	A	0.44
195	Vista Glen Blvd & Road 1	A	0.08	A	0.08
196	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Glen Dr	A	0.36	A	0.36
197	Baseline Rd & SV CC2	A	0.46	A	0.46
198	Baseline Rd & SV CCBP2	A	0.47	A	0.48
199	Baseline Rd & SV CC4	A	0.46	A	0.46
Intersections in Sierra Vista Urban Reserve Area					
200	Santucci Blvd & Road E	A	0.35	A	0.56
201	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Road 1	A	0.44	A	0.39
202	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Road 1	A	0.22	A	0.24
Creekview Intersections					

TABLE 5-19
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
203	Westbrook Blvd & Holt Parkway One	N/A		C	0.71
204	Westbrook Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		A	0.50
205	Blue Oaks Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		A	0.27
Intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone					
P1	Riverside Av & Darling Way	C	0.77	C	0.77
P2	Vernon & Douglas/Riverside	A	0.52	A	0.52
P3	Vernon & Grant	A	0.41	A	0.41
P4	Vernon & Judah	A	0.45	A	0.46
P5	Vernon & Lincoln	A	0.53	A	0.53
P6	Washington & Main	A	0.59	A	0.59
P7	Washington & Oak	A	0.54	A	0.54
P8	Grant & Oak	n/a		N/A	

Note: Bold locations operate at LOS D or worse
Shaded intersections indicate a significant impact

Source: DKS Associates, 2010

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
Existing Signalized Intersections					
1	Atlantic & Tiger/Center	A	0.46	A	0.47
2	Atlantic & Wills	C	0.76	C	0.77
3	Atlantic St & Yosemite St	B	0.66	B	0.66
4	Baseline Rd & Fiddyment Rd	**E**	**0.98**	**E**	**0.97**
5	Blue Oaks & Crocker Ranch	B	0.69	C	0.72
6	Blue Oaks & Del Webb	A	0.55	A	0.56
7	Blue Oaks & Fiddyment	C	0.73	C	0.76
8	Blue Oaks & New Meadow	B	0.61	B	0.63
9	Blue Oaks & Orchard View	A	0.53	A	0.55
10	Blue Oaks Bl & Diamond Creek Bl	C	0.81	**D**	**0.84**
11	Blue Oaks Bl & Foothills Bl	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.89**
12	Blue Oaks Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	C	0.72	C	0.75
13	Cirby & Sunrise	**F**	**1.07**	**F**	**1.07**
14	Cirby Wy & Foothills Bl	**F**	**1.14**	**F**	**1.15**
15	Cirby Wy & Melody Ln	B	0.62	B	0.63
16	Cirby Wy & Northridge Dr	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.92**
17	Cirby Wy & Oak Ridge Dr	C	0.71	C	0.70
18	Cirby Wy & Orlando Av	**D**	**0.90**	**D**	**0.90**

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
19	Cirby Wy & Parkview Dr	A	0.52	A	0.52
20	Cirby Wy & Riverside Av	**F**	**1.14**	**F**	**1.14**
21	Cirby Wy & Rocky Ridge Dr	B	0.64	B	0.64
22	Cirby Wy & San Simeon Dr	B	0.65	B	0.65
23	Cirby Wy & Vernon St	**F**	**1.28**	**F**	**1.28**
24	Douglas & Eureka	B	0.69	B	0.68
25	Douglas & Rocky Ridge	**D**	**0.82**	**D**	**0.82**
26	Douglas & Santa Clara	C	0.70	C	0.70
27	Douglas & Sierra Gardens	B	0.69	B	0.68
28	Douglas & Sunrise	**E**	**0.91**	**E**	**0.91**
29	Douglas & Target	B	0.69	B	0.69
30	Douglas Bl & E Roseville Pw	C	0.73	C	0.74
31	Douglas Bl & Folsom Rd	B	0.62	B	0.62
32	Douglas Bl & Harding Bl	**E**	**0.95**	**E**	**0.95**
33	Douglas Bl & Judah St	A	0.49	A	0.49
34	Douglas Bl & Keehner Av	A	0.48	A	0.48
35	Douglas Bl & Park Dr	A	0.42	A	0.41
36	Douglas Bl & Sierra College Bl	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.87**
37	Eureka & Lead Hill	A	0.54	A	0.53
38	Eureka & N. Sunrise	C	0.76	C	0.76
39	Eureka & Rocky Ridge	C	0.74	C	0.74
40	Eureka Rd & Ashland Dr	A	0.46	A	0.46

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
41	Eureka Rd & Deer Valley Apts	A	0.42	A	0.42
42	Fairway & Central Park/Lowes	A	0.54	A	0.55
43	Fairway & Cortina Circle	A	0.46	A	0.47
44	Fairway & Five Star	A	0.46	A	0.46
45	Fairway & Home Depot	A	0.52	A	0.53
46	Fairway & Target/Rosehall	A	0.45	A	0.46
47	Fiddyment & Del Webb/Village Green	B	0.66	C	0.69
48	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (North)	B	0.62	B	0.63
49	Fiddyment & Hayden Pkwy (South)	A	0.57	B	0.60
50	Foothills & Baseline/Main	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.86**
51	Foothills & Misty Wood/NEC	A	0.54	A	0.54
52	Foothills Bl & Albertsons Dr	B	0.65	B	0.65
53	Foothills Bl & Atkinson Rd	A	0.57	A	0.57
54	Foothills Bl & Roseville Pkwy/HP (Central)	C	0.79	C	0.80
55	Foothills Bl & HP (South)	A	0.51	A	0.51
56	Foothills Bl & Junction Bl	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	0.83
57	Foothills Bl & McAnally Dr	C	0.80	**D**	**0.82**
58	Foothills Bl & Pleasant Grove Bl	**E**	**0.93**	**E**	**0.93**
59	Foothills Blvd & Rand/Pilgrims	B	0.60	B	0.60
60	Foothills Bl & Vineyard Rd	**D**	0.83	**D**	**0.84**
61	Galleria & Antelope Creek	B	0.66	B	0.66
62	Galleria & Berry	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.87**

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
63	Galleria & Roseville Pkwy	**F**	**1.04**	**F**	**1.04**
64	Harding & Wills	C	0.79	C	0.79
65	Harding Bl & Estates Dr	B	0.69	B	0.69
66	Harding Bl & Lead Hill Bl	C	0.78	C	0.78
67	Harding Bl & Roseville Square	B	0.62	B	0.61
68	Junction & Stonecrest/Magenta	A	0.49	A	0.49
69	Junction Bl & Americana Dr	A	0.49	A	0.49
70	Junction Bl & Baseline Rd	C	0.81	C	0.81
71	Junction Bl & Country Club Dr	B	0.63	B	0.66
72	Junction Bl & Park Regency Dr	A	0.55	A	0.56
73	Junction Bl & Porter Dr	A	0.59	A	0.59
74	Junction Bl & Revere Dr	A	0.50	A	0.50
75	Junction Bl & Washington Bl	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.87**
76	Junction Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	B	0.62	B	0.62
77	Lead Hill Bl & N Sunrise Av	C	0.71	C	0.71
78	Lead Hill Bl & Rocky Ridge Dr	B	0.65	B	0.64
79	Lead Hill Bl & Wal-Mart	A	0.42	A	0.43
80	N Sunrise Av & Automall Dr	A	0.52	A	0.52
81	N Sunrise Av & Stone Point Dr	B	0.61	B	0.60
82	N. Sunrise & Sierra Gardens	B	0.62	B	0.62
83	Olympus Dr & Europa St	A	0.20	A	0.20
84	PFE & Hilltop	A	0.44	A	0.44

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
85	Pleasant Grove & Fairway	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.86**
86	Pleasant Grove & Fiddyment	**F**	**1.01**	**F**	**1.03**
87	Pleasant Grove & Gold Coast/Hallissy	C	0.81	**D**	**0.82**
88	Pleasant Grove & Highland Park	A	0.52	A	0.53
89	Pleasant Grove & Market	A	0.53	A	0.55
90	Pleasant Grove & Michener	A	0.71	C	0.71
91	Pleasant Grove & Monument	A	0.45	A	0.46
92	Pleasant Grove & Rose Creek	C	0.72	C	0.72
93	Pleasant Grove & Roseville Pkwy	**F**	**1.21**	**F**	**1.23**
94	Pleasant Grove & Sun City	B	0.65	B	0.66
95	Pleasant Grove & Wal-Mart/Highland Pointe	C	0.78	**C**	**0.79**
96	Pleasant Grove & Washington	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.86**
97	Pleasant Grove Bl & Country Club Dr	B	0.59	B	0.61
98	Pleasant Grove Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.87**
100	Rocky Ridge Dr & Maidu Dr	A	0.59	A	0.59
100	Rocky Ridge Dr & Mclaren Dr	A	0.49	A	0.49
101	Rocky Ridge Dr & Professional Dr	B	0.67	B	0.67
102	Rocky Ridge Dr & Stone Point Dr	A	0.27	A	0.27
103	Roseville Parkway & Chase	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.86**
104	Roseville Parkway & Creekside Ridge	C	0.79	C	0.79
105	Roseville Parkway & Gibson	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.85**
106	Roseville Parkway & N. Sunrise	**E**	**0.91**	**E**	**0.91**

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
107	Roseville Parkway & Reserve	C	0.80	C	0.80
108	Roseville Parkway & Secret Ravine	C	0.77	C	0.77
109	Roseville Parkway & Taylor	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.86**
110	Roseville Parkway & West Mall	A	0.59	A	0.59
111	Roseville Pw & Alexandra Dr	B	0.63	B	0.63
112	Roseville Pw & Eureka Rd	C	0.70	C	0.71
113	Roseville Pw & Lead Hill/Orvietto	B	0.65	B	0.65
114	Roseville Pw & N Cirby Wy	A	0.51	A	0.50
115	Roseville Pw & Olympus Dr	B	0.63	B	0.64
116	Roseville Pw & Rocky Ridge Dr	B	0.63	B	0.63
117	Roseville Pw & Sierra College Bl	C	0.80	**D**	**0.82**
118	Roseville Pw & Trestle Rd	B	0.66	B	0.69
119	Roseville Pw & Village/Slate Creek	A	0.53	A	0.53
120	Roseville Pw & Washington Bl	B	0.69	C	0.70
121	S Cirby Wy & Champion Oaks Dr	A	0.52	A	0.52
122	S Cirby Wy & Old Auburn Rd	C	0.73	C	0.74
123	Secret Ravine & Scarborough/ Poppy Field	A	0.33	A	0.33
124	Sierra College & Miners Ravine	A	0.45	A	0.45
125	Sierra College & Secret Ravine	B	0.60	B	0.60
126	Sierra College Bl & Eureka Rd	A	0.58	A	0.56
127	Sierra College Bl & Indigo Creek Apts	C	0.79	C	0.78
128	Sierra College Bl & Old Auburn Rd	C	0.78	C	0.78

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
129	Sierra College Bl & Olympus Dr	A	0.55	A	0.55
130	Stanford Ranch & Fairway	B	0.66	B	0.66
131	Stanford Ranch & Five Star	B	0.60	B	0.60
132	Stanford Ranch & Highland Park	A	0.52	A	0.53
133	Sunrise & Coloma	C	0.74	C	0.74
134	Sunrise & Sandringham/Kensington	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.87**
135	Sunrise & Sun Tree/Kensington	C	0.70	C	0.70
136	Sunrise Av & Frances Dr	B	0.62	B	0.62
137	Sunrise Av & Oak Ridge Dr	A	0.45	A	0.46
138	Washington & Diamond Oaks	C	0.73	C	0.73
139	Washington & Sawtell/Derek	C	0.77	C	0.77
140	Washington Bl & Hallissy Dr	A	0.39	A	0.39
141	Woodcreek Oaks & Baseline	**E**	**0.91**	**D**	**0.89**
142	Woodcreek Oaks & Canevari/Arsenault	B	0.56	B	0.60
143	Woodcreek Oaks & Horncastle	B	0.55	A	0.59
144	Woodcreek Oaks & McAnally	B	0.63	B	0.65
145	Woodcreek Oaks & Trailee	A	0.44	A	0.46
146	SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	A	0.59	A	0.59
147	Washington Blvd & Blue Oaks Blvd	C	0.70	C	0.71
148	I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	C	0.80	C	0.80
149	I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	A	0.56	A	0.56
150	SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	C	0.74	C	0.74

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
151	SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	C	0.70	C	0.70
152	I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	B	0.62	B	0.62
153	Stanford Ranch & Sr-65 N/B On	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.83**
154	Stanford Ranch/Galleria & Sr-65 S/B On	C	0.81	**D**	**0.82**
155	Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	**E**	**0.97**	**E**	**0.96**
156	Fairway & Highland Park	B	0.66	B	0.68
157	I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.92**
158	Roseville Pkwy & Old Auburn	A	0.41	A	0.41
159	Washington Blvd & Industrial	B	0.65	B	0.66
160	Foothills Blvd & HP Far South/ NEC	B	0.69	B	0.68
161	Blue Oaks Blvd & Wood Meadow	A	0.59	B	0.60
162	Gibson Rd & New Convention Center Rd	B	0.67	B	0.68
163	Blue Oaks Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.37	A	0.49
164	Blue Oaks Blvd & Hayden Pkwy	A	0.50	A	0.54
165	Fiddyment Rd & Westhills Dr	C	0.72	C	0.74
166	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	A	0.58	B	0.66
167	Fiddyment Rd & Westlake Dr	A	0.42	A	0.41
168	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Northpark Dr	A	0.17	A	0.17
169	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Parkside Wy	B	0.63	A	0.58
170	Industrial Ave & Alantown Dr	C	0.76	C	0.77
171	Roseville Pkwy & Gibson West	**D**	**0.87**	**D**	**0.87**
172	Washington Blvd & All America	A	0.58	A	0.58

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
173	Cirby & Cottonwood	A	0.42	A	0.42
174	Secret Ravine & Alexandra	A	0.21	A	0.21
175	Fiddyment Rd & Fiddyment Ranch EW Rd	C	0.75	C	0.77
176	Douglas Blvd & I-80 EB On	C	0.73	C	0.72
Sierra Vista Specific Plan Intersections					
177	Santucci Blvd & Pleasant Grove	A	0.59	B	0.61
178	Santucci Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.47	A	0.50
179	Santucci Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.38	A	0.41
180	Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.84**
181	Westbrook Blvd & Federico Dr	A	0.49	A	0.52
182	Westbrook Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	B	0.67	C	0.72
183	Westbrook Blvd & Baseline Rd	C	0.79	C	0.81
184	Market Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.29	A	0.30
185	Market St & Baseline Rd	B	0.64	B	0.64
186	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Upland Dr	A	0.52	A	0.53
187	Upland Dr & Vista Glen Blvd	A	0.35	A	0.36
188	Upland Dr & Baseline Rd	A	0.58	A	0.58
189	Baseline Rd CMU3 Entrance	A	0.57	A	0.57
190	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.57	A	0.59
191	Vista Glen Blvd Road 2A	A	0.19	A	0.20
192	Vista Glen Blvd & SV NS Coll 5	A	0.25	A	0.25
193	Santucci Blvd & SV CC5 CC6	A	0.47	A	0.49
194	Santucci Blv & Sierra Village Dr	A	0.45	A	0.47
195	Vista Glen Blvd & Road 1	A	0.06	A	0.06
196	Westbrook Blvd & Sierra Glen Dr	A	0.36	A	0.37

TABLE 5-20
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
197	Baseline Rd & SV CC2	A	0.66	A	0.67
198	Baseline Rd & SV CCBP2	A	0.57	A	0.57
199	Baseline Rd & SV CC4	C	0.73	C	0.73
Intersections in Sierra Vista Urban Reserve Areas					
200	Santucci & Road C	A	0.45	A	0.46
201	Westbrook Blvd & Road C	A	0.41	A	0.42
202	Pleasant Grove Blvd & SV NS Coll 1	A	0.24	A	0.24
Creekview Intersections					
203	Westbrook Blvd & Holt Parkway One	N/A		C	0.64
204	Westbrook Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		C	0.65
205	Blue Oaks Blvd & Creekview Plaza	N/A		A	41
Intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone					
P1	Riverside Av & Darling Wy (Ped Overlay)	B	0.62	B	0.62
P2	Vernon & Douglas/Riverside (Ped Overlay)	B	0.66	B	0.67
P3	Vernon & Grant (Ped Overlay)	A	0.57	A	0.57
P4	Vernon & Judah (Ped Overlay)	A	0.58	A	0.58
P5	Vernon & Lincoln (Ped Overlay)	**E**	**0.93**	**E**	**0.92**
P6	Washington & Main (Ped Overlay)	**D**	**0.82**	**D**	**0.82**
P7	Washington & Oak (Ped Overlay)	C	0.73	B	0.75
P8	Grant & Oak	n/a		n/a	

Note: **Bold** locations operate at LOS D or worse **Shaded** locations indicated significant traffic impact

TABLE 5-21
NUMBER OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS C OR BETTER
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY - AM PEAK HOUR

Level of Service	AM Peak Hour			
	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
	No Project		Plus Project	
	Number of Intersections	Percentage	Number of Intersections	Percentage
LOS A-C	185	**91.6%**	188	**91.7%**
LOS D	9	4.5%	8	3.9%
LOS E	6	3.0%	7	3.4%
LOS F	2	1.0%	2	1.0%
LOS D-F	**17**	**8.4%**	**17**	**8.3%**
Total	**202**	**100%**	**205**	**100%**

Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone

TABLE 5-22

NUMBER OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING

AT LOS C OR BETTER

CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

- PM PEAK HOUR

Level of Service	PM Peak Hour			
	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
	No Project		Plus Project	
	Number of Intersections	Percentage	Number of Intersections	Percentage
LOS A-C	167	**82.7%**	165	**80.5%**
LOS D	19	9.4%	25	12.2%
LOS E	9	4.5%	8	3.9%
LOS F	7	3.5%	7	3.4%
LOS D-F	**35**	**17.3%**	**40**	**19.5%**
Total	**202**	**100%**	**205**	**100%**
Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone				

Consistency with 70% Level of Service Policy

Table 5-24 and Table 5-25 shows the percentage of Roseville intersections projected to operate at better than level of service C during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour under Cumulative Conditions without Placer Parkway with and without buildout of the proposed project. During the a.m. peak hour under plus project conditions, 91.2 percent of Roseville intersections will operate at level of service C or better, which is significantly higher than City requirement that 70 percent of the City's signalized intersections function at LOS C or better during the peak period. During the p.m. peak hour under plus project conditions, 80.5 percent of Roseville intersections will operate at level of

service C or which is also significantly higher than City requirement that 70 percent of the City's signalized intersections function at LOS C or better during the peak period. Therefore, this impact is considered to be **less than significant** for both cumulative impacts and CSP's contribution relative to meeting the City's General Plan level of service policy that more than 70% of intersections operate at LOS C or better**.**

Table 5-24 identifies those intersections that would be **significantly** impacted under the Cumulative without Placer Parkway plus project scenario.

TABLE 5-23

ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS WITH DEGRADED LEVEL OF SERVICE

2025 CUMULATIVE PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Intersection		*2025 Cumulative Conditions*			
		With Partial Placer Parkway		*Without Placer Parkway*	
ID	*Intersection Name*	*LOS*	*V/C*	*LOS*	*V/C*
AM Peak Hour					
13	Cirby & Sunrise	**D**	**0.90**	**E**	**0.91**
PM Peak Hour					
10	Blue Oaks Blvd & Diamond Creek Blvd	C	0.81	**D**	**0.84**
57	Foothills Blvd & McNally Dr	C	0.80	**D**	**0.82**
87	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Gold Coast Dr/Hallisey Dr	C	0.81	**D**	**0.82**
117	Roseville Parkway & Sierra College Blvd	C	0.80	**D**	**0.82**
154	Sanford Ranch/Galleria & SR-65 S/B On	C	0.81	**D**	**0.82**

Note: **BOLD** Locations do not meet LOS C Policy
Shaded locations Indicate Significant LOS Impact

Table 5-25 identifies proposed mitigation, where feasible that would reduce the impact from the proposed project. Descriptions of each of these improvements are listed below.

AM Peak:

Cirby Way and Sunrise Avenue - Under the 2025 Cumulative plus proposed project without Placer Parkway scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS D to LOS E. This level of service change is based on a decrease in p.m. peak hour volume of about 23 vehicles, which represents an approximately 0.4% decrease in intersection approach volume. This intersection could be mitigated by adding a third northbound thru lane. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS E with a V/C of 0.91 to LOS D with a V/C of 0.85. However, due to right-of-way constraints and the close proximity of businesses in the area, this improvement is not feasible. Therefore, without any feasible mitigation, the project impact is deemed to be **significant and unavoidable**.

TABLE 5-24
RECOMMENDED INTERSECTION MITIGATION MEASURES
2025 CUMULATIVE PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Intersection	Recommended Intersection Mitigation	Level of Service	
		Before Mitigation	After Mitigation
AM Peak Hour			
Cirby & Sunrise	No feasible mitigation identified	**E**	
PM Peak Hour			
Blue Oaks & Diamond Creek	Re-stripe S/B to include one left-turn lane, one shared thru/left-turn lane and a separate right-turn lane	**D**	C
Foothills & McNally	Add Separate S/B right-turn lane	**D**	**C**
Pleasant Grove Blvd & Gold Coast Dr/Hallisey Dr	Restripe N/B Thru lane to a shared Thru/Left-turn lane	**D**	**C**
Roseville Parkway & Sierra College	No feasible mitigation identified	**D**	**D**
Stanford Ranch/Galleria& SR 65 S/B On	No feasible mitigation identified	**D**	D

PM Peak:

Blue Oaks Boulevard and Diamond Creek Road – Under the 2025 Cumulative plus proposed project without Placer Parkway scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. This level of service change is based on an increase in p.m. peak hour volume of about 280 vehicles, which represents an approximately 6% increase in intersection approach volume. This intersection could be mitigated by restriping the northbound thru lane to a shared thru and left-

turn lane. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS D with a V/C of 0.82 to LOS C with a V/C of 0.80. This improvement is feasible and will be added to the City of Roseville's Capital Improvement program. Development within the Creekview Specific Plan Area will be required to pay fair share costs for this improvement. Therefore, with this mitigation, the project impact is deemed to be **less than significant**.

Foothills Boulevard and McAnally Drive – Under the 2025 Cumulative plus proposed project without Placer Parkway scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. This level of service change is based on an increase in volume of approximately 44 vehicles which represents an increase of about 1.3%. This intersection could be mitigated by adding a separate south bound right-turn lane. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS D with a V/C of 0.82 to LOS C with a V/C of 0.79. This improvement is feasible and will be added to the City of Roseville's Capital Improvement program as part of this Project. Development within the Creekview Specific Plan Area will be required to pay fair share costs for this improvement. Therefore, with this mitigation, the project impact is deemed to be **less than significant**.

Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Gold Coast Drive/Hallisey Drive – Under the 2025 Cumulative plus proposed project without Placer Parkway scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. This level of service change is based on an increase in volume of approximately 230 vehicles which represents an increase of about 5%. This intersection could be mitigated by restriping the north bound thru lane to a shared Thru/left-turn lane. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS D with a V/C of 0.82 to LOS C with a V/C of 0.76. This improvement is feasible and will be added to the City of Roseville's Capital Improvement program as part of this Project. Development within the Creekview Specific Plan Area will be required to pay fair share costs for this improvement. Therefore, with this mitigation, the project impact is deemed to be **less than significant**.

Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard and State Route 65 Southbound On-ramp – Under the 2025 cumulative scenario, this intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS D with the addition of the proposed project. This change is based on an overall p.m. peak hour approach volume change of less than 1%. This impact could be mitigated by adding a fourth northbound through lane. This would improve the intersection operation from LOS D with a V/C of 0.82 to LOS B with a V/C of 0.66. However, due to Caltrans right-of-way and bridge width constraints, this

mitigation is not feasible. Because this improvement would not be feasible, the impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

Cumulative Plus Project without Placer Parkway – City of Rocklin

Table 5-34 identifies the level of service for study roadway segments within the City of Rocklin under the Cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario. In the cumulative condition all segments would operate at an acceptable level of service, therefore there would be no cumulative impacts. As noted in that Table, the project would not result in any significant traffic impacts under this scenario. Therefore, Creekview's contribution to the cumulative condition is considered to be **less than significant**.

TABLE 5-25
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT ROCKLIN ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Roadway Segment	LOS Standard	Lanes	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
			No Project		Plus Project	
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS
Lonetree Blvd north of Blue Oaks Blvd	D*	4	31,600	D	31,400	D
Blue Oaks Blvd at Roseville City Limit	D*	4	12,900	A	13,100	A
Pleasant Grove Blvd at Roseville City Limit	C	4	27,500	A	27,600	A
Stanford Ranch Rd at Roseville City Limit	C	4	27,500	A	27,500	A

Notes: **Shaded** Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
BOLD Locations Indicate Significant LOS Impact
* Within ½ Mile of Freeway Ramp

DKS 2010

City of Lincoln Cumulative Plus without Placer Parkway Traffic Impacts

Traffic from cumulative development would result in a **significant** impact to the Lincoln roadway segment; Athens Avenue east of Fiddyment Road, which would operate at LOS E with or without the CSP. CSP's contribution to this roadway segment would not be cumulatively considerable

because it would add less than one percent to the traffic volume and is therefore considered **less than significant**.

TABLE 5-26
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT LINCOLN SOI ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY PLUS PROPOSED PROJECT SCENARIO

Roadway Segment	*LOS Standard*	*Lanes*	*Cumulative Conditions*			
			No Project		*Plus Project*	
			ADT	*LOS*	*ADT*	*LOS*
Dowd Road north of Catlett Road	C	6	27,700	A	28,900	A
Fiddyment Road north of Athens Avenue	C	6	25,300	A	25,400	A
Industrial Avenue north of Athens Avenue	C	4	29,800	D	30,200	D
Athens Avenue east of Dowd Road	C	4	27,900	C	28,500	C
Athens Avenue east of Fiddyment Road	C	4	**35,800**	**E**	**35,900**	**E**
Moore Road east of Fiddyment Road	C	4	11,500	A	11,700	A

Notes: Bold Locations Do Not Meet Level of service Policy
Shaded Locations Indicate Significant Level of service change

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

Cumulative Plus Project without Placer Parkway – Placer County

Table 5-26 identifies the level of service for study intersections within Placer County under the Cumulative condition without Placer Parkway scenario. As noted in that Table, there would be **significant** cumulative impacts to a number of intersections. The project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable. The impacts would occur with or without the project, and no intersection would have greater than a 0.05 percent change in volume. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts is considered to be **less than significant**.

TABLE 5.7-27
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT PLACER COUNTY INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Intersection	LOS Standard	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
		LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	C	N/A		n/a*	
Watt Ave & PFE Rd	C	B	0.66	B	0.68
Walerga Rd & PFE Rd	C	**E**	**0.91**	**E**	**0.93**
Cook Riolo & PFE	C	**E**	**0.37**	**E**	**0.37**
Fiddyment & Athens	C	**F**	**1.37**	**F**	**1.38**
Industrial & Athens	C	**F**	**1.01**	**F**	**1.02**
PM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	D	n/a	0.81	n/a*	
Watt Ave & PFE Rd	C	A	0.59	A	0.60
Walerga Rd & PFE Rd	C	**E**	**0.97**	**E**	**0.98**
Cook Riolo & PFE	C	**F**	**0.61**	**F**	**0.65**
Fiddyment & Athens	C	**F**	**1.73**	**F**	**1.76**
Industrial & Athens	C	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.85**

Notes: **Shaded** Indicate Significant LOS Change
Bold do not meet LOS policy
* With Sierra Vista Specific Plan, These Intersections are in Roseville, not Placer County

DKS 2010

Table 5-28 identifies the level of service for roadway segments within Placer County under the Cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario. As noted in that Table, several intersections would

continue to operate at LOS E and F conditions with or without the project. This is considered a **significant** cumulative impact.

TABLE 5-28
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT PLACER COUNTY ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Roadway Segment	LOS Standard	Lanes	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
			No Project		Plus Project	
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS
Baseline Rd W/O Sierra Vista SP	D	6	41,500	C	42,100	C
Watt Ave S/O Baseline	D	6	26,500	A	27,600	A
Walerga Rd S/O Baseline	D	4	**39,300**	**F**	**39,400**	**F**
PFE E/O Watt Ave	C	2	8,300	A	8,700	A
Fiddyment Rd S/O Athens	C	4	27,600	C	27,100	**C**
Sunset E/O foothills	C	6	**50,000**	**E**	**51,100**	**E**
Foothills Blvd S/O Athens	C	4	28,500	C	28,400	**C**
Athens Ave E/O Fiddyment Rd	C	4	**37,000**	**F**	**37,00**	**F**
Industrial Blvd N/O Athens Ave	C	4	**30,200**	**D**	**30,500**	**D**
Phillip Rd W/O Creekview	C	2	400	A	400	**A**
Brewer Rd S/O W Sunset	C	2	100	A	100	**A**
W Sunset W/O Fiddyment	C	2	600	A	600	**A**
Dowd Rd S/O Athens	C	4	**30,000**	**D**	**32,700**	**E**

Notes: **Bold** Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
Shaded locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

DKS 2010

The project's contribution to the increase in v/c ratio is less than 0.05 at all of the degraded intersections, and therefore, the CSP's contribution to the cumulative impact would not be considered a significant impact. All other study intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service. Therefore, the CSP's cumulative contribution to Placer County intersections is considered to be **less than significant**.

Cumulative Plus Project without Placer Parkway – Sacramento County

Table 5-30 identifies the level of service for study intersections within Sacramento County under the Cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario. As noted in that Table, the intersection of Watt and Antelope would operate at level of service F with and without the project during the a.m. peak hour. This is considered a **significant** cumulative impact.

The project's contribution to the cumulative condition would add to the volume to capacity ratio by less than 0.05. Therefore, CSP's contribution to the cumulative impact is deemed to be **less than significant** at this location during the a.m. peak hour.

During the p.m. peak hour cumulative impacts would be **significant**. Under the plus project scenario, the intersection of Watt and Elverta would degrade from LOS E to LOS F. Therefore, CSP's contribution to this impact would be considered **significant.** Potential mitigation is listed below.

TABLE 5-29
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SACRAMENTO COUNTY INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Intersection	LOS Standard	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Elverta Rd	E	D	0.90	D	0.90
Walerga Rd & Elverta Rd	E	D	0.88	D	0.88
Watt Ave & Antelope Rd	E	**F**	**1.17**	**F**	**1.15**
Walerga Rd & Antelope Rd	E	B	0.61	B	0.62
Watt Ave & Elkhorn	E	D	0.88	D	0.88
Walerga Rd & Elkhorn	E	B	0.66	B	0.66
PM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Elverta Rd	E	**F**	**1.02**	**F**	**1.03**
Walerga Rd & Elverta Rd	E	**F**	**1.10**	**F**	**1.09**
Watt Ave & Antelope Rd	E	**F**	**1.22**	**F**	**1.24**
Walerga Rd & Antelope Rd	E	D	0.86	D	0.86
Watt Ave & Elkhorn	E	**F**	**1.05**	**F**	**1.05**
Walerga Rd & Elkhorn	E	D	0.88	D	0.88

Notes: Bold Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
Shaded Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

DKS 2010

Table 5-31 shows that the segment of Walerga Road south of PFE Road would operate at LOS F with and without the project, a **significant** cumulative impact. The increase on Walerga Road south of PFE Road would degrade that segment's V/C by 0.02 with CSP, which represents a **less significant** contribution from the project to the cumulative condition.

TABLE 5-30
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SACRAMENTO COUNTY ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Roadway Segment	LOS Standard	Lanes	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
			No Project		Plus Project	
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS
Watt Ave S/O PFE	E	6	52,300	E	52,500	E
Watt Ave S/O Elverta	E	6	40,500	C	40,500	C
Watt Ave S/O Antelope	E	6	38,800	C	39,000	C
Watt Ave S/O Elkhorn	E	6	46,800	D	47,200	D
Walerga Rd S/O PFE	E	4	**50,700**	**F**	**51,100**	**F**
Walerga Rd S/O Elverta	E	4	32,900	E	33,000	E
Walerga Rd S/O Antelope	E	4	33,100	E	33,000	E
Walerga Rd S/O Elkhorn	E	4	30,900	D	30,700	D

Notes: **Bold** Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
Shaded Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

DKS 2010

Cumulative Plus Project without Placer Parkway – Sutter County

Table 5-30 identifies the level of service for study intersections within Sutter County under the Cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario. As noted in that Table, all intersection would operate at acceptable levels. Therefore, there are **no cumulative impacts** and the project's contribution would not result in any significant traffic impacts under this scenario.

TABLE 5-31
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SUTTER COUNTY INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Intersection	*LOS Standard*	*Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway*			
		No Project		*Plus Project*	
		LOS	*V/C or Delay*	*LOS*	*V/C*
AM Peak Hour					
Pleasant Grove N & Riego	D	B	0.69	B	0.69
Pleasant Grove S & Riego	D	B	0.68	B	0.69
SR 70/99 SB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.58	A	0.59
SR 70/99 NB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.11	A	0.11
PM Peak Hour					
Pleasant Grove N & Riego	D	B	0.69	B	0.70
Pleasant Grove S & Riego	D	C	0.77	C	0.76
SR 70/99 SB & Riego Rd	D	C	0.71	C	0.71
SR 70/99 NB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.19	A	0.18

Notes: **Shaded** Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
BOLD Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

DKS 2010

Table 5-31 identifies the level of service within Sutter County on the roadway segment under the Cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario. Cumulative traffic would result in a **significant** impact. Level of service would degrade from LOS E to LOS F with the project. Therefore, CSP's cumulative contribution to Sutter County is considered **significant.** Mitigation to widen the segment to six lanes would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. However since the improvement is outside the jurisdiction of Roseville this is considered a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

TABLE 5-32
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SUTTER COUNTY ROADWAY SEGMENTS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Roadway Segment	*LOS Standard*	*Lanes*	*Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway*			
			No Project		*Plus Project*	
			ADT	*LOS*	*ADT*	*LOS*
Riego Rd E/O SR 70-99	D	4	33,200	**E**	**33,400**	**F**

Notes: **Shaded** Locations indicate Significant LOS Change
BOLD Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy

DKS 2010

Riego Road – Widening of Riego Road from four to six lanes would improve the level of service along this segment to acceptable levels. The City of Roseville shall negotiate in good faith with Sutter County to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving within a reasonable time period after approval of the Creekview Specific Plan commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the Specific Plan for impacts on Reigo Road.

Construction of the improvements noted above would reduce the project impacts to less than significant levels. However, since the City of Roseville does not have control over improvements on Sutter County roadways, the City must conservatively assume that, at the time of project approval by the City, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable.**

Cumulative Plus Project without Placer Parkway – State Facilities

The addition of the proposed project to existing conditions would cause changes in traffic volumes at State highway interchanges providing access to the site. It should be noted that the project site is a number of miles from any State highway, so impacts to State highway facilities are minimal. Table 5-35 shows the cumulative plus project levels of service at a number of interchanges providing access to State highways including State Route 65 and Interstate 80. The

State's Transportation Concept Reports (TCR's) for these three highways stipulate a level of service standard of E or better. The table shows that all intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or better both without and with the proposed project. There is **no cumulative impact**. The addition of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable or cause traffic to back up onto State highway facilities, and therefore this impact is considered **less than significant**.

TABLE 5-33
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SIGNALIZED HIGHWAY RAMP INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Intersection	LOS Standard	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	A	0.53	A	0.54
SR 65 SB & Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd	E	A	0.47	A	0.48
I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	E	C	0.71	C	0.71
I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	E	A	0.44	A	0.44
SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	A	0.54	A	0.54
SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	A	0.42	A	0.43
I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	E	C	0.72	C	0.72
SR 65 N/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	A	0.53	A	0.53
SR 65 S/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	A	0.42	A	0.42
I-80 E/B Off & Taylor/Eureka	E	D	0.83	D	0.84
I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	E	C	0.76	C	0.76
PM Peak Hour					
SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	A	0.59	A	0.59

TABLE 5-33
LEVEL OF SERVICE AT SIGNALIZED HIGHWAY RAMP INTERSECTIONS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Intersection	LOS Standard	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway			
		No Project		Plus Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
SR 65 SB & Washington Blvd/Blue Oaks Blvd	E	C	0.70	C	0.71
I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	E	C	0.80	C	0.80
I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	E	A	0.56	A	0.56
SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	C	0.74	C	0.74
SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	C	0.70	C	0.70
I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	E	B	0.62	B	0.62
SR 65 N/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	D	0.83	D	0.83
SR 65 S/B On & Stanford Ranch/Galleria	E	C	0.81	D	0.82
I-80 E/B Off & Taylor/Eureka	E	E	0.97	E	0.96
I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	E	E	0.92	E	0.92

Notes: **Shaded** Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy
BOLD Locations Indicate Significant LOS Change

DKS 2010

Table 5-35 shows the cumulative plus project levels of service State highway segments. The table shows portions of SR 65 would operate at LOS F with and without the proposed project. This is a **significant** cumulative impact. The addition of the proposed project would add less than one percent to some of these already deficient facilities. Because Caltrans considers any increase in volume on an already deficient facility an impact, this represents a cumulatively considerable **significant** impact from the project.

No specific improvements have been identified to mitigate project impacts on SR 65, and SR70/99 other than what is described in Section 4.3; however, the City is working with Caltrans & the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) to establish a regional approach to institute a fee program for the purpose of funding improvements on these facilities. If and when Caltrans and the City enter into an enforceable agreement, the Project shall pay impact fees to the City of Roseville in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements, consistent with the Mitigation Fee Act (Gov. Code, § 66000 et seq.). The City recognizes the magnitude of the projected growth in Placer County, its resulting increase in travel demand, and the need for a cooperative approach to plan, fund and implement transportation improvements to accommodate that growth, including improvements to the State Highway System in Placer County. The City is working with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) and their member jurisdictions to develop a strategic "Transportation Expenditure Plan" that includes funding for improvements for State highways in Placer County. The Expenditure Plan includes a number of critical transportation projects and programs including construction of the Placer Parkway, improvements to I-80 and SR 65, and construction of SR 65 Lincoln Bypass.

The proposed funding components for the Expenditure Plan are as follows:

- Additional development fees
  - Tier 2 Fee
  - Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee
- Transportation sales tax
- Existing and future State and Federal funds

- The Tier 2 fees for Placer Parkway have been adopted in Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln, and Placer County and will be applied to all new growth areas. The Creekview Specific Plan will be required to participate in this fee program. In addition, the CSP will be required to participate in the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority Fee Program (SPRTA) and the Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority to fund improvements along Highway 65. The additional development fees will need to be adopted by each of the jurisdictions in South Placer County.

TABLE 5-34
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND LOS ON STATE HIGHWAYS
CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY

Facility	Segment	Lanes	Cumulative Conditions Without Placer Parkway				
			No Project		Plus Project		
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS	% Change
I-80	Sacramento County line to Riverside Ave	8	**215,700**	**F**	**215,300**	**F**	-0.05%
	Riverside Avenue to Douglas Blvd	6	**188,700**	**F**	**188,400**	**F**	-0.2%
	Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd	6	**187,500**	**F**	**187,300**	**F**	-0.01%
	Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd	8	**202,400**	**F**	**202,400**	**F**	0.0%
	Taylor Rd to SR 65	8	**191,200**	**F**	**191,100**	**F**	-0.1%
SR 65	I-80 to Galleria Blvd	6	**137,700**	**F**	**138,000**	**F**	**+0.2%**
	Galleria Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd	6	**141,800**	**F**	**142,600**	**F**	**+0.6%**
	Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd	6	**130,900**	**F**	**131,800**	**F**	**+0.7%**
	Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd	4	**121,800**	**F**	**121,800**	**F**	0.0%
SR 70/99	Sankey Rd to Riego Rd	4	60,900	C	61,300	C	+0.3%
	Riego Rd to Elverta Rd	4	**88,500**	**F**	**88,800**	**F**	**+0.3%**
	Elverta Rd to Elkhorn Blvd	4	**87,300**	**F**	**87,500**	**F**	**+0.2%**

Notes:
Roadway segment levels of service (LOS) are based on roadway capacities and LOS criteria
Highway segments operating at LOS F are **BOLD**. Impacts are **Shaded** Volumes Exclude Carpool Lanes

DKS 2010

The City supports implementation of the Transportation Expenditure Plan to fund regional improvements in South Placer County. The City will support Caltrans and regional agencies efforts to:

- Secure as much Federal and State funding for improvements to the State Highway System as possible, including funds for the transportation bond measure approved by the voters in 2006.

Establish impact fees so that development throughout South Placer County pays their fair share of the unfunded cost of regional improvements, including improvements to SR 65.

Because the City of Roseville does not have jurisdiction over State Highway facilities, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable.**

Comparison of Plus Project Scenarios with and without Placer Parkway - Roseville

The cumulative travel demand model estimates that Placer Parkway would carry about 50,400 daily vehicles between SR 65 and Foothills Boulevard, about 42,200 daily vehicles between Foothills Boulevard and Fiddyment Road, and about 20,200 daily vehicles between Fiddyment Road and Watt Avenue/ Blue Oaks Boulevard. As expected, these volumes are a result of traffic diverting from Interstate 80, SR 65, and roadways within the western portion of the City of Roseville.

Although this scenario is not intended to identify impacts and mitigation measures, it is useful to compare traffic conditions under the Cumulative plus project conditions, both without and with Placer Parkway. Table 5-37 and Table 5-38 show the percentage of signalized intersections projected to operate at LOS C or better under Cumulative plus project conditions, with and without Placer Parkway, during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, respectively.

The number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse during the a.m. peak hour increases from 17 to 18 without Placer Parkway. The number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse during the p.m. peak hour increases from 35 to 40 without Placer Parkway. Although the number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse increases without Placer Parkway, the City would still maintain 70% of all signalized intersections operating at LOS C or better during the p.m. peak hour.

TABLE 5-35
NUMBER OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS C OR BETTER CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITH AND WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY – AM PEAK HOUR

Level of Service	AM Peak Hour			
	Cumulative Plus Project			
	With Placer Parkway		Without Placer Parkway	
	Number of Intersections	Percentage	Number of Intersections	Percentage
LOS A-C	188	**91.7%**	187	**91.2%**
LOS D	10	4.9%	9	4.4%
LOS E	5	2.4%	7	2.9%
LOS F	2	1.0%	2	1.5%
LOS D-F	**17**	**8.3%**	**18**	**8.8%**
Total	**205**	**100%**	**205**	**100%**
Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone				

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

TABLE 5-36
NUMBER OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS C OR BETTER CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT WITH AND WITHOUT PLACER PARKWAY – PM PEAK HOUR

Level of Service	PM Peak Hour			
	Cumulative Plus Project			
	With Placer Parkway		Without Placer Parkway	
	Number of Intersections	Percentage	Number of Intersections	Percentage
LOS A-C	170	**82.9**	165	**80.9%**
LOS D	20	9.8%	25	11.82%
LOS E	8	3.9%	8	3.9%
LOS F	7	3.4%	7	3.4%
LOS D-F	**35**	**17.1%**	**40**	**19.1%**
Total	**205**	**100%**	**205**	**100%**
Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone				

DKS 2010

This analysis demonstrates that assuming the construction of Placer Parkway dramatically improves intersection levels of service citywide under Cumulative conditions. Therefore, it is in Roseville's interest to do all it can to assure that future projects located within the City contribute their fair share toward the eventual construction of Placer Parkway.

Super-Cumulative Conditions - Roseville

For informational purposes only, a "Super-Cumulative" scenario that goes beyond what is required under CEQA is included in this EIR in order to provide information on ultimate transportation needs and regional connections. In this context the universe of possible "future projects" goes beyond what can be reasonably anticipated based on approved planning decisions and demographic and market trends; the scenario includes proposed large projects that may be far from approval and even farther away from implementation leading to physical impacts. This scenario also assumes build out for some large specific plan projects (e.g., Placer Vineyards), although that condition will not come into existence for decades into the future. Particularly in assuming significant amounts of development in the Curry Creek area, which currently has no urban general plan designations on it, this scenario may significantly overstate the level of impacts that will actually occur. Because this scenario has been identified for informational purposes only and not for impact analysis, no additional mitigation measures are being proposed based on this scenario. Furthermore, it assumes build out of not only the Creekview Specific Plan but also the Urban Reserve properties. Based on discussions with City staff, the Super-Cumulative scenario includes a number of land use and roadway projects in addition to the Cumulative Plus Project scenario, including:

- Full Placer Parkway improvements (6 lanes from SR 65 to Watt Avenue Extension and 4 lanes from Watt Avenue Extension to SR 79/99 in Sutter County)
- Extension of Westbrook Boulevard north to Dowd Road (6-lanes from Baseline Road to Dowd Road)
- Buildout of Placer Ranch
- Buildout of Placer Vineyards
- Buildout of Lincoln General Plan SOI Expansion Area
- Buildout of City of Rocklin
- Buildout of Curry Creek

- Residential Buildout of Sutter Pointe
- SACOG 2035 Growth Assumptions elsewhere

With buildout of additional growth, traffic demand will increase. Table 5-37 and Table 5-38 show the percentage of intersections projected to operate at LOS C or better under Super-Cumulative conditions with build out of the Proposed Project and build out of the Urban Reserve properties within the City of Roseville. During the a.m. peak hour, the number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse increases by 8 (from 17 to 25) and during the p.m. peak hour the number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse increases by 11 (from 35 to 46). The tables show that, while the number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse increase under Super-Cumulative conditions, the percentage of intersections projected to operate at LOS C or better remains above 70% during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

TABLE 5-37
NUMBER OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS C OR BETTER
SUPER-CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT SCENARIO - AM PEAK HOUR

	AM Peak Hour			
	Cumulative Plus Project		*Super-Cumulative Plus Project*	
Level of Service	***Number of Intersections***	***Percentage***	***Number of Intersections***	***Percentage***
LOS A-C	188	**91.7%**	180	**87.8%**
LOS D	10	4.9%	13	6.3%
LOS E	5	2.4%	7	3.4%
LOS F	2	1.0%	5	2.4%
LOS D-F	**17**	**8.3%**	**25**	**12.2%**
Total	**205**	**100%**	**205**	**100%**
Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone				

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

TABLE 5-38
NUMBER OF ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS C OR BETTER
SUPER-CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT SCENARIO - PM PEAK HOUR

	PM Peak Hour			
	Cumulative Plus Project		Super-Cumulative Plus Project	
Level of Service	Number of Intersections	Percentage	Number of Intersections	Percentage
LOS A-C	170	**82.9%**	159	**77.6%**
LOS D	20	9.8%	26	12.7%
LOS E	8	3.9%	11	5.4%
LOS F	7	3.4%	9	4.4%
LOS D-F	**35**	**17.1%**	**46**	**22.4%**
Total	**205**	**100%**	**205**	**100%**
Note: Excludes intersections in Pedestrian Overlay Zone				

Source: DKS Associates, 2009.

Table 5-39 and Table 5-40 show the intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse under Super-Cumulative conditions during both the AM and PM peak hours. For a full list of super cumulative conditions see Appendix D.

TABLE 5-39
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS D OR WORSE
SUPER-CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		Cumulative Plus Project		Super-Cumulative Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
4	Baseline Rd & Fiddyment Rd	**D**	**0.84**	**E**	**0.97**
7	Blue Oaks & Fiddyment	**D**	**0.86**	**F**	**1.04**
11	Blue Oaks Bl & Foothills Bl	**D**	**0.87**	**E**	**0.94**
13	Cirby & Sunrise	**D**	**0.90**	**E**	**0.93**
14	Cirby Wy & Foothills Bl	**E**	**1.00**	**F**	**1.02**
18	Cirby Wy & Orlando Av	**E**	**0.93**	**E**	**0.94**

TABLE 5-39
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS D OR WORSE
SUPER-CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS –AM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			
		Cumulative Plus Project		Super-Cumulative Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
20	Cirby Wy & Riverside Av	**F**	**1.05**	**F**	**1.04**
23	Cirby Wy & Vernon St	**E**	**0.99**	**E**	**0.98**
30	Douglas Bl & E Roseville Pw	C	078	**D**	**0.84**
50	Foothills & Baseline/Main	**E**	**0.93**	**E**	**0.98**
58	Foothills Bl & Pleasant Grove Bl	**D**	**0.82**	**D**	**0.86**
86	Pleasant Grove and Fiddyment	C	0.78	**D**	**0.82**
93	Pleasant Grove & Roseville Pkwy	**E**	**0.99**	**F**	**1.04**
96	Pleasant Grove & Washington	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.87**
105	Roseville Parkway & Gibson	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.87**
109	Roseville Parkway & Taylor	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.87**
141	Woodcreek Oaks & Baseline	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.89**
155	Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.89**
163	Blue Oaks Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	**A**	**0.51**	**D**	**0.83**
165	Fiddyment Rd & Westhills Dr	C	0.70	**D**	**0.86**
166	Pleasant Grove Blvd & Westbrook Blvd	C	0.78	**D**	**0.87**
169	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd & Parkside Wy	**A**	**0.51**	**D**	**0.85**
171	Roseville Pkwy & Gibson West	**F**	**1.01**	**F**	**1.04**
177	Santucci & Pleasant Grove Blvd	**B**	**0.56**	**E**	**0.93**
180	Watt Ave & Baseline Rd	C	0.71	**D**	**0.90**

Note: Shaded Locations operate at LOS D or worse

Source: DKS Associates, 2010.

TABLE 5-40
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS D OR WORSE
SUPER-CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		Cumulative Plus Project		Super-Cumulative Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
4	Baseline Rd & Fiddyment Rd	**E**	**0.96**	**E**	**0.99**
7	Blue Oaks & Fiddyment	C	0.75	**D**	**0.86**
10	Blue Oaks Bl & Diamond Creek Bl	C	0.79	**E**	**1.00**
11	Blue Oaks Bl & Foothills Bl	**D**	**0.90**	**D**	**0.87**
13	Cirby & Sunrise	**F**	**1.07**	**F**	**1.07**
14	Cirby Wy & Foothills Bl	**F**	**1.14**	**F**	**1.11**
16	Cirby Wy & Northridge Dr	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.93**
18	Cirby Wy & Orlando Av	**D**	**0.89**	**D**	**0.90**
20	Cirby Wy & Riverside Av	**F**	**1.13**	**F**	**1.15**
23	Cirby Wy & Vernon St	**F**	**1.27**	**F**	**1.29**
25	Douglas & Rocky Ridge	**D**	**0.82**	**D**	**0.82**
28	Douglas & Sunrise	**D**	**0.90**	**E**	**0.95**
32	Douglas Bl & Harding Bl	**E**	**0.94**	**E**	**0.97**
36	Douglas Bl & Sierra College Bl	**D**	**0.88**	**D**	**0.88**
50	Foothills & Baseline/Main	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.89**
56	Foothills Bl & Junction Bl	C	0.81	**D**	**0.87**
58	Foothills Bl & Pleasant Grove Bl	**E**	**0.91**	**E**	**0.94**
60	Foothills Bl & Vineyard Rd	**D**	**0.88**	**D**	**0.84**
62	Galleria & Berry	**D**	**0.86**	**C**	**0.81**
63	Galleria & Roseville Pkwy	**F**	**1.02**	**F**	**1.03**
66	Harding Bl & Lead Hill Bl	C	0.77	**D**	**0.84**
70	Junction Bl & Baseline Rd	C	0.80	**D**	**0.86**

TABLE 5-40
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS D OR WORSE
SUPER-CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		Cumulative Plus Project		Super-Cumulative Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
75	Junction Bl & Washington Bl	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.86**
85	Pleasant Grove & Fairway	**D**	**0.85**	**E**	**0.91**
86	Pleasant Grove & Fiddyment	**F**	**1.01**	**F**	**1.13**
87	Pleasant Grove & Gold Coast/Hallissy	C	0.79	**D**	**0.82**
93	Pleasant Grove & Roseville Pkwy	**F**	**1.13**	**F**	**1.20**
96	Pleasant Grove & Washington	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.87**
98	Pleasant Grove Bl & Woodcreek Oaks Bl	**D**	**0.85**	**E**	**0.94**
103	Roseville Parkway & Chase	**D**	**0.85**	**D**	**0.87**
104	Roseville Parkway & Creekside Ridge	C	0.80	**D**	**0.84**
105	Roseville Parkway & Gibson	**D**	**0.84**	**D**	**0.83**
106	Roseville Parkway & N. Sunrise	**E**	**0.92**	**E**	**0.95**
109	Roseville Parkway & Taylor	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.82**
134	Sunrise & Sandringham/Kensington	**D**	**0.85**	**E**	**0.89**
141	Woodcreek Oaks & Baseline	**E**	**0.91**	**E**	**0.92**
148	I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	C	0.81	**D**	**0.87**
153	Stanford Ranch & Sr-65 N/B On	**D**	**0.83**	**D**	**0.87**
154	Stanford Ranch/Galleria & Sr-65 S/B On	**D**	**0.82**	**D**	**0.83**
155	Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	**E**	**0.97**	**F**	**1.05**
157	I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	**E**	**0.91**	**E**	**0.92**
165	Fiddyment Rd & Westhills Dr	**C**	0.70	**D**	**0.84**
171	Roseville Pkwy & Gibson West	**D**	**0.86**	**D**	**0.87**
177	Santucci Blvd & Pleasant Grove Blvd	C	**0.77**	**F**	**1.17**
179	Santucci Blvd & Vista Glen Blvd	**A**	**0.48**	**D**	**0.90**

TABLE 5-40
ROSEVILLE INTERSECTIONS OPERATING AT LOS D OR WORSE
SUPER-CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS –PM PEAK HOUR

Intersection		PM Peak Hour			
		Cumulative Plus Project		Super-Cumulative Plus Project	
ID	Intersection Name	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
180	Santucci & Baseline Rd	**D**	**0.826**	**D**	**0.87**
183	Westbrook & Baseline Rd	**C**	**0.80**	**D**	**0.83**

Note: **Bold** Locations operate at LOS D or worse : Shaded Intersection indicate a significant level of service impact * Overlay Zone excluded from LOS policy

DKS 2010

Air Quality

Construction Emissions

Cumulative development would result in multiple construction projects occurring at the same time, generating emissions from earthmoving activities, heavy equipment operation, workers traveling to and from construction sites, and miscellaneous activities such as paving roadways and parking lots and painting of commercial/residential structures. The emissions from these activities could contain reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter in excess of significance thresholds.

Earthmoving activities could result in substantial fugitive dust (PM_{10}) emissions, and would be likely to result in localized PM_{10} concentrations in excess of State and federal standards. A major portion of PM_{10} would settle on the construction site or its immediate vicinity, while a small fraction would contribute to regional ambient particulate concentrations. PM_{10} emissions associated with construction of the CSP are estimated to exceed the PCAPCD threshold of 82 lbs/day, even with MM 4.4-1 which requires dust control measures.

Exhaust emissions would be generated by construction equipment operations and construction employee vehicle trips. These emissions would include CO, ROG, NO_x and SO_2, and particulates. Painting and paving of roadways would primarily release ROG into the atmosphere. Exhaust

emissions associated with construction of the CSP area are estimated to exceed PCAPCD's thresholds of 82/lbs/day for ROG and NO_x. This is a **significant** cumulative impact.

Although the CSP would contribute to these cumulative impacts on a temporary basis (i.e., construction emissions would end once a project is built), the size of the CSP area and the amount of construction that would occur would result in a substantial contribution to an existing air quality problem. Therefore, CSP contribution to cumulative impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

Even with implementation of the identified rules and regulations, the City of Roseville construction standards, and MM 4.4-1, the development of the CSP would generate emissions exceeding standards. Therefore, development of the CSP would be cumulatively considerable in combination with other development in the region and would result in a **significant and unavoidable** cumulative impact on air quality.

Operational Emissions

The CSP is located in an area that is designated non-attainment for ozone and PM_{10}. Vehicles, commercial operations, and some residential activities would generate ozone precursors contributing to the ozone problem within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. This is a **significant** cumulative impact. Vehicles are the primary sources of reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides (ozone precursors) in the air basin. Area sources, such as residential wood burning stoves and fireplaces, are substantial sources of particulate matter. Operational emissions from buildout of the CSP are estimated to exceed PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x and PM_{10} and therefore the project would be considered cumulatively considerable.

In order to bring the region into compliance with State and federal air pollutant standards, air districts use General Plans and similar planning documents to determine where and how future growth will occur within the region. When development occurs that is not consistent with the intensity of development presented in a General Plan or if it was not previously accounted for, it is assumed that the emissions associated with that development are unaccounted for in the State Implementation Plan (SIP), which could hinder the region's ability to come into compliance with State and federal air pollutant standards. Although many criteria air pollutants within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin were accounted for in the SIP, it is likely that current growth forecasts

for the Roseville area with approval of the project would be higher than expected when the existing plans were prepared; therefore, emissions associated with the proposed project and buildout of cumulative development will adversely affect the region's ability to achieve compliance with air quality standards.

Measures to reduce operational emission could be applied to cumulative development, but the emissions would still increase as the overall amount of development increases.

Compliance with the City's Transportation Systems Management Ordinance and implementation of MM 4.4-1, which requires a number of measures to reduce vehicular and area source emissions, would reduce the amount of emission generated by the CSP. The CSP also includes a variety of policies that would promote the use of alternative forms of transportation and pedestrian access to commercial and office uses within the CSP site. However, because air emission associated with the CSP are not accounted for in regional air quality attainment plans, and CSP emission would still be substantial, development would contribute considerably to the regional degradation of air quality. The project's contribution, as well as in total with buildout of other reasonably foreseeable development, would be cumulatively considerable and would result in a **significant and unavoidable impact**.

Localized CO Emissions

Background carbon monoxide concentrations in Roseville are low, and future roadside CO concentrations are expected to decrease from existing concentrations, despite anticipated increases in traffic volumes due to improved fuel combustion efficiency. Intersections that are projected to operate at LOS D or worse under cumulative 2035 conditions are shown in Table 5-43.

TABLE 5-41
MODELED CARBON MONOXIDE LEVELS FOR
2035 CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

Intersection	Receptor	2035 Cumulative[1]	
		1-hour CO[2]	8-hour CO[3]
Galleria & Roseville Pkwy	1	13.0	6.4
	2	13.2	6.6
	3	13.4	6.7
	4	13.1	6.5
Pleasant Grove & Roseville Pkwy	5	12.5	6.1
	6	13.0	6.4
	7	12.4	6.1
	8	13.3	6.6
Blue Oaks Blvd & Foothills Blvd	9	11.4	5.5
	10	12.1	5.9
	11	12.4	6.1
	12	11.7	5.7
Foothills Blvd & Pleasant Grove Blvd	13	11.4	5.5
	14	11.5	5.5
	15	11.5	5.5
	16	11.7	5.7
Elverta Rd & Walerga Rd	17	12.0	5.8
	18	11.3	5.4
	19	11.9	5.8
	20	11.7	5.7

Notes:

[1] Background concentrations of 5.73 ppm and 2.06 ppm were added to the modeling 1-hour and 8-hour results, respectively

[2] The federal and state 1-hour standards are 35 and 20 ppm, respectively

[3] The federal and state 8-hour standards are 9 and 9.0 ppm, respectively

These levels are below the thresholds and additional planned, proposed, or potential development would not be expected to cause the CO thresholds to be violated. Therefore, the cumulative impact is **less than significant** and CSP in conjunction with buildout of other cumulative development in the area would not be cumulatively considerable.

Noise

The cumulative context for noise depends on whether the source is mobile (traffic related) or stationary source related (factory, generator etc.). Traffic noise from the project would result in noise both inside and outside the area. At the same time, the project area would be subjected to traffic noise from other areas. Consequently, the cumulative context for traffic noise is regional. Traffic noise levels under buildout of the City's General Plan, as well as year 2025 levels of development outside of the City, are presented in Table 5-42. This cumulative analysis is based on the results of the traffic study.

Noise impacts would result from operation of construction equipment and from noise generated by vehicular traffic traveling to and from a construction site. The magnitude of the impact would depend on the type of construction activity, the noise level associated with each piece of construction equipment, the duration of construction, availability of noise barriers, and the distance between the source of the noise and receptors. Properties located adjacent to construction sites would be affected temporarily; therefore short-term construction noise impacts are anticipated. CSP residents could be affected by development construction activities related to the West Roseville Specific Plan to the south and east,

It is unlikely that construction activities in the Placer Vineyards and Regional University projects would be close enough to a particular sensitive receptor to create a substantial combined noise level, particularly as the noise source would need to double in magnitude to achieve a noticeable effect (a 3 db increase). Construction within the WRSP and CSP would comply with the City Noise Ordinance. As discussed earlier, the construction of any project that occurs within the city would be limited to the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M Saturday and Sunday. The County does not have a similar ordinance, but typically limits construction to daytime hours, similar to the City. Also, any periods in which more than one project was operating in proximity to the same sensitive receptor would likely be very short, and would only occur during the hours mentioned above. For these reasons, cumulative noise is considered **less than significant**. CSP's contribution to construction noise would not be cumulatively considerable and is considered a **less than significant**.

TABLE 5-42
2025 PREDICTED CUMULATIVE PLUS
PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS

Roadway	Segment	Distance (Feet)	Traffic Noise Levels (Ldn dBA)			Distance to contours (feet) 2025 CIP			Distance to Contours (feet) 2025 CIP Plus Project		
			2025	2025 Plus Project	Change	70 dB Ldn	65 dB Ldn	60 dB Ldn	70 dB Ldn	65 dB Ldn	60 dB Ldn
Westbrook Blvd	North of Blue Oaks	100	67.1	68.0	0.9	64	137	295	73	158	341
Westbrook Blvd	South of Blue Oaks	100	67.3	68.0	0.7	67	143	309	73	157	339
Blue Oaks Blvd	West of Westbrook	100	62.8	65.5	2.7	33	72	154	50	107	231
Blue Oaks	Westbrook to Westpark	100	66.1	66.9	0.8	55	119	256	62	135	290
Blue Oaks Blvd	Westpark to Hayden	100	66.2	67.0	0.8	55	120	258	63	135	291
Blue Oaks Blvd	Hayden to Fiddyment	100	66.3	67.2	0.9	57	123	265	65	140	303
Blue Oaks Blvd	East of Fiddyment	100	67.7	68.1	0.4	71	152	328	74	160	345
Fiddyment Rd	North of Blue Oaks	100	67.1	67.3	0.2	64	138	298	66	141	304
Fiddyment Rd	Blue Oaks to Pleasant Grove	100	68.1	68.1	0.0	74	160	344	75	161	347
Fiddyment Rd	South of Pleasant Grove	100	67.9	67.8	-0.1	72	155	334	72	155	333
Pleasant Grove Blvd	West of Fiddyment	100	68.9	68.9	0.0	85	182	392	84	181	390
Pleasant Grove Blvd	East of Fiddyment	100	69.3	69.4	0.1	90	194	418	91	196	421

1Distances are measured from the centerline of the roadway.
-- Roadway does not exist under this scenario.

Stationary Source Noise

The sources of noise in the CSP, and surrounding areas such as the West Roseville Specific Plan and development even further away such as Sierra Vista, Placer Vineyards and Regional University, would generate noise from uses in schools, parks and commercial areas, which are expected to

only be localized. Impacts from the REP are addressed in Section 4.4 Noise. Stationary source cumulative noise is **less than significant**. No industrial or heavy manufacturing uses are proposed in the CSP that would generate noise. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate substantial noise from stationary sources. CSP's contribution to noise is considered **less than significant**.

Geology, Soils and Seismicity

The context for evaluation of potential cumulative impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity is based on development in the region, including projected build out under the City of Roseville's adopted General Plan and approved or potential projects in the City, as well as additional foreseeable growth in west Placer County. However, the geologic analysis of cumulative impacts is generally site-specific, rather than cumulative in nature because each development site has unique geologic considerations that would be subject to site development, grading and construction standards.

Cumulative development in the Roseville area, western Placer County would increase the number of people living, working and traveling through the region who would be exposed to seismic hazards or hazards associated with soil constraints (e.g., expansive soils). Although seismic risk in the City of Roseville is low, the potential effects from a large seismic event from regional faults could affect a large geographic area. That said, soil conditions that could affect development would be site-specific. Therefore, cumulative impacts are **less than significant**. The magnitude of these cumulative seismic and soils would be mitigated to a les-than-significant level with implementation of the Uniform Building Code requirements that would be incorporated into project design and subject to review in conjunction with building permits. The project's contribution to these cumulative impacts would not be considerable because all project structures would similarly comply with the Uniform Building Code. A **less than significant** cumulative impact would result

Cumulative development in the Roseville area would involve grading activities that would remove surface vegetation, alter topography, and potentially expose soils to greater erosion potential. The magnitude of this impact would be greatest during construction, particularly if development were to occur simultaneously with development immediately adjacent to the project area north, west, and south. However, implementation of Placer County and City of Roseville grading

standards and use of State General Construction Activity Permit-mandated construction BMPs during construction would reduce ensure that the cumulative impact is **less than significant**. The project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable, and a **less than significant** impact would result. Moreover, upon development of the CSP and Urban Reserve areas, and other projects where undeveloped land is converted to urban uses, exposed soil would be covered with impervious surfaces that would reduce erosion potential over the long term.

Cumulative development in the Roseville area, particularly in areas where Local Farmland of Importance would be converted to urban uses, would result in loss of topsoil. However, the project's contribution to the loss of topsoil would not be cumulatively considerable because this area does not have the potential to produce significant amounts of erodible topsoil. As described previously in this EIR, the project area soils are predominately clay and hardpan which are not easily eroded. A **less than significant impact** would result.

Biological Resources

The cumulative context for the evaluation of impacts on biological resources is regional development, particularly western Placer County, which contains habitat very similar to the CSP area.

Over the past few decades, tens of thousands of acres of grasslands have been developed or designated for development in western Placer County. Development has occurred in and around the cities of Roseville, Lincoln and Rocklin. Development has also occurred further north in the grasslands of Sacramento County. Future development would result in the further decline of native plant communities including vernal pool habitat. The proximity of urban development also would contribute to the distribution of non-native plant and wildlife species, which would further degrade the habitat and available niches for native species in the surrounding region. This is a **significant** cumulative impact.

The full build out of the CSP would significantly contribute to the urbanization of western Placer County.

Vernal Pool Wetlands/Rare Plants

According to the USFWS, Placer County contains almost 35 percent of all vernal pools within the southeastern Sacramento vernal pool region.[6] In 1999, Jeff Glazner, a biologist with North Fork Associates, produced the Placer County Vernal Pool and Grassland Maps for Placer County that indicated there were 20,676 acres of vernal pool grasslands remaining in western Placer County. The proposed CSP would result in the loss of approximately 1,300 acres of grasslands that contain scattered vernal pools. Implementation of the CSP is anticipated to result in the loss of approximately 22 acres of wetlands.

Other development that would convert vernal pool grasslands to urban development includes Placer Vineyards, Regional University, Creekview, Brookfield, Placer Ranch and Curry Creek. Cumulative loss of vernal pools is considered **significant.** CSP's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable**.** MM 4.8-1(a) and 4.8-1(b), and compliance with the 404 permit require net loss of wetlands, which would reduce the Project's contribution to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Raptor Species

Based on information from other environmental documents and the State's Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), potential habitat for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, and other species are widely distributed within Placer and adjacent counties. Other projects in the vicinity will convert grassland and cropland, both of which provide foraging habitat. This is a **significant** cumulative impact.

The CSP and buildout of the Urban Reserve would result in the permanent loss of habitat for these species, which are present within the development boundaries. This is a cumulatively considerable contribution to the **significant** impact.

Mitigation measures are discussed in Section 4.8 of this EIR, to reduce the severity of significant project related impacts to a **less than significant** level. However, even with these mitigation measures, a substantial change in habitat conditions would result as a consequence of cumulative development in the region, transitioning from a rural to an urban environment. The amount of

[6] West Roseville Specific Plan FEIR, February 2004.

undeveloped habitat available for wildlife use will decrease as development occurs and as the amount of habitat decreases, wildlife species that are incompatible with urban development will be displaced.

Cumulative development within the region would result in the loss of grasslands, wetlands, and vernal pool habitat. The loss of this habitat would also result in impacts to special status plant and animal species. These regional impacts would be considered **significant and unavoidable**. The project's incremental contribution to the impact on loss of grasslands, wetlands and vernal pool habitat is considered **significant** even after mitigation

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The cumulative context for the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts on cultural resources is the City of Roseville and western Placer County because impacts to cultural resources are confined to specific sites. Both pre-historic and historic resources are expected to be confined to local development patterns, and not with a broader significance pattern to the State of California or the Federal Government (per CEQA Guidelines and the Federal Historic Preservation Act). Historic resources and prehistoric sites, have been recorded in the Placer Vineyards site and the West Roseville Specific Plan area and could occur elsewhere in south Placer County. Development in the region could result in the damage or destruction of known archaeological and historical resources, as well as any existing undiscovered subsurface artifacts. The cumulative impact is **potentially significant.**

The vicinity of Roseville is known to include both prehistoric and historic cultural resources. Although no evidence of prehistoric resources was discovered during field surveys of the CSP area, archaeological sites are located in the vicinity. Destruction of resources, inadvertently if not properly treated would result in CSP's contribution to the cumulative impact as **potentially significant.**

Numerous laws, regulations, and statues, on both the federal and state levels, seek to protect cultural resources. These would apply to development within and outside the City. In addition, the Roseville General Plan provides local policies that safeguard cultural resources from unnecessary impacts. These policies include inventory and evaluation processes and require

consultation with qualified archaeologists in the event that previously undiscovered cultural materials accidentally exposed.

MM 4.9-5 would reduce the CSP contributions to cumulative cultural resources impacts in the City of Roseville by ensuring that appropriate surveys are conducted to identify cultural resources; that cultural resources discovered within the CSP area are properly recorded and handled; and that known existing resources in the CSP area are appropriately recorded and preserved, when feasible. While mitigation would reduce impacts, if significant historic or cultural resources are discovered, it would result in a potentially **significant and unavoidable** cumulative impact.

Other development throughout south Placer County could encounter paleontological resources. Given how rare such a find would be, it would result in a **significant** cumulative impact. Development of the CSP could potentially result in the discovery of paleontological resources. This would be potentially considerable.

MM 4.9-4 would ensure that paleontological resources, if discovered during project development would be appropriately handled so that information regarding the resource would not be lost. Nonetheless, the CSP's contribution to the cumulative impact even with mitigation would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

Cumulative impacts from hazardous material and public safety are considered **less than significant**. The CSP, in conjunction with cumulative development, would include areas designated for commercial uses as well as public/quasi-public uses. These types of development would increase the use of hazardous materials in the area. The quantities of hazardous materials that would be present during occupancy of the residential and commercial land uses are expected to be minimal and would consist of household and maintenance products (paints, solvents, cleaning supplies, pool chemicals, pesticides and herbicides). Implementation of applicable hazardous materials management laws and regulations adopted at the federal, state and local level would ensure cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials use remain less than significant. Hazardous materials incidents would typically be site specific and would involve accidental spills or inadvertent releases. Associated health and safety risks generally would be limited to those individuals using the materials or to persons in the immediate vicinity of the

materials. Thus the project's contribution to increased use of hazardous materials and associated exposure risks would not be cumulatively considerable. Airborne toxic air contaminant emissions are addressed in the cumulative analysis for air quality. The project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable, and a **less than significant** impact would result.

Exposure Due to Increased Hazardous Materials Transportation

Cumulative impacts from hazardous material transportation are considered **less than significant**. Development in the City of Roseville, including the CSP and buildout of the Urban Reserve areas would result in an increase in hazardous materials transportation in the area, which could expose greater numbers of people to increased risks in the event of an inadvertent release or spill. However, the proposed Project will include normal urban development and will comply with all applicable laws. No heavy industrial uses are proposed within the CSP. Stringent regulatory requirements apply to the common carriers that would handle the deliveries and transport of hazardous materials to and from the project area. While these regulations do not eliminate the potential for accidents and resulting spills, they would reduce the frequency of occurrences and would limit the number of people that could be exposed. Implementation of applicable laws and regulations would ensure that cumulative impacts associated with the transport of hazardous materials within the region such that this activity would remain less than significant. The project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable, and a **less than significant** impact would result.

Exposure of the Public to Areas Irrigated with Recycled Water or Groundwater

Cumulative impacts from use of recycled water and groundwater is considered **less than significant**. It is the City of Roseville's policy, to the extent possible, that new development should use recycled water for irrigation use in parks, recreation fields, landscape medians and landscaping in common areas of higher density residential areas. Recycled water would be supplied to the Project area from the PGWWTP, and would be used for areas accessible to the public. Recycled water must be treated to adopted standards and applied in accordance with State and City regulations. Development of the CSP in combination with development in the City of Roseville and other potential future projects in the region would increase the number of people who could use areas irrigated with recycled water. Because the use of recycled water is highly regulated, the project's contribution to impacts associated with the use of recycled water would

not be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of applicable recycled water laws and regulations adopted at the State and City level would ensure cumulative impacts related to recycled water use remain **less than significant**.

Public Services

Fire Protection

Buildout of the City in combination with other development in south Placer County would increase the demand for fire services in the vicinity. However, this is considered a **less than significant** cumulative impact. Development would be consistent with the City's level of service policies and with mutual aid agreements with neighboring jurisdictions. CSP's contribution to cumulative impacts would be a **less than significant**.

Schools

Buildout of the City in combination with other development in south Placer County would increase the demand on the school districts serving the project area (Roseville Joint Union High School and the Roseville City School District). Existing and planned schools may not have capacity to serve all future development without the need for additional schools sites. This is a **significant** cumulative impact. School fees would be collected to fund construction of new schools, as required and allowed by State law. While school sites would be dedicated in the CSP that could serve some of the students generated by future development, it is likely that an additional school capacity would be needed to serve elementary students, middle and high school students. CSP's contribution to school impacts would be **less than significant** for elementary school students since it will provide an elementary school to serve its demand. CSP's contribution would be considered s**ignificant** for middle and high school students.

MM 4.11-2 requires that school sites be identified as needed at the time development is proposed in the Urban Reserve areas.

New residential development would be required to pay school impact fees to the school districts to offset the capital costs of constructing new schools, which would ensure that the cumulative impacts are less than significant. The identification of school sites and the payment of applicable fees, consistent with State law and City and County policies would ensure that the project's

contribution to cumulative impacts would be reduced. With mitigation this would result in a **less than significant** impact.

Libraries

Development within the City and the region would result in growth that would place additional demand on existing library facilities. This could result in a potentially significant impact in other areas of the City and region by potentially requiring the construction of additional branch libraries or expansion of existing library facilities. This is a **significant** impact. However, CSP's contribution of the proposed Project to libraries is considered less than cumulatively considerable.

Parks and Recreation

As Roseville and the surrounding communities continue to grow, there will continue to be a need to create parklands and open space. Development in the County would also create a demand for parks. This is considered a **significant** impact.

Payment of the Neighborhood and Community Park Fee and the Citywide Park Fee would be collected from all residential units developed in the City. The CSP would be required to dedicate land and to pay park development fees. With the payment of fees and the implementation of the General Plan policies, the CSP contribution to cumulative demand for parks and recreation facilities would not be cumulatively considerable and would result in a **less than significant** impact.

Public Utilities

The project level analysis of impacts on certain public utilities including potable water supply, distribution, storage and treatment, recycled water supply and distribution, wastewater collection and treatment and solid waste disposal, considers buildout of the City's General Plan and other planning efforts through buildout, as well as buildout of the project area. Therefore, while the project-level analysis for the utilities mentioned above considers conditions at buildout of the City's General Plan and other planning efforts, any proposed and anticipated development that occurs outside the City's boundaries for water and solid waste or the 2005 regional wastewater service area boundary (2005 SAB) for wastewater and recycled water must also be considered in the cumulative analysis.

Water Supply, Distribution, and Storage

Development of the CSP, along with other foreseeable future development within the City of Roseville and outside the City's current boundaries, including buildout of the City's existing General Plan, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Urban Reserve area, the Creekview Specific Plan and Urban Reserve, Brookfield future study area, and Placer Ranch Specific Plan, would exceed existing City of Roseville's currently contracted surface water supplies. This is a **significant** impact. Total cumulative water demands are estimated at 71,022 AFY as shown in Table 5-44. Available recycled water supplies are estimated at 6,163 AFY resulting in a total surface water supply need of 64,859 AFY. This is 5,959 AFY more than the City's WFA limitation on diversions from the American River in wet/normal years of 58,900 AFY, but 1,141 AFY less than the City's total normal/wet year water supply contracts of 66,000 AFY.

Because the pace and timing of regional developments in Placer County through 2030 is currently unknown, and because some of the above-referenced pending projects not currently contemplated by the City's General Plan may never come to fruition, the specific additional water supplies and the timing for obtaining them to serve potential future projects are uncertain. In addition to the City's full use of its WFA allocation of surface water from the American River, it is likely that future water supply will come from one or more of the following sources: additional cooperative agreements between WFA water purveyors for surface water from the American River, mandatory conservation measures, and new surface water diversions from the Sacramento River. Because the City's surface water supply under the WFA is insufficient to meet all demands during drier water year-types, the City's cumulative buildout demand (defined in this context to go beyond the current General Plan boundary) also would require additional groundwater withdrawals in years when the surface supply is projected to be insufficient to fully meet the demand.

TABLE 5-43

CUMULATIVE WATER DEMAND

Development Area	Water Demand (AFY)	RW Supply (AFY)	Surface Water Demand (AFY)
City Build out Demand (a)	61,709	4,388	57,321
CSP	900	122	778
CSP Urban Reserve	98	9	89
SVSP Urban Reserve	1,141	117	1,024
PanHandle / University	714	171	543
Brookfield	1,258	110	1,148
Placer Ranch	5,202	1,246	3,956
Total Demand	**71,022**	**6,163**	**64,859**
Total Water Contracts			66,000
American River Allocation per WFA (Normal/Wet Years)			58,900
American River Shortfall (AFY)			**5,959**

(a) City buildout water demands includes the WRSP Fiddyment Ranch SPA #3 project under review by the City.

Approach to Cumulative Water Supply Impact Assessment and Past, Present, and Foreseeable Projects.

The cumulative analysis for water supply, distribution, and storage considers the potential environmental effects of supplying water to the project in addition to regional water demands generated in Placer County and Sacramento County under the provisions of the Water Forum Agreement (WFA). The analysis also considers other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects and regulations that govern regional water supply operations. In particular, the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP) control the major storage reservoirs in the Central Valley, and CVP/SWP operations are integrated and responsive to the water demands imposed by their contractors and other non-project agricultural and municipal and industrial (M&I) demands. Therefore, all regional surface water diversions incrementally affect regional reservoir storage and flow conditions in the Central Valley. In turn, changes in reservoir storage and flow conditions can result in other indirect impacts such as changing groundwater levels and

groundwater quality, when water supply uses shift from surface water to groundwater during periods of drought. Other surface water-dependent environmental resources that are indirectly affected by changes in surface storage and flows include fisheries and aquatic resources habitat, water quality, recreational opportunities (e.g., reservoir access, river rafting), and hydropower power generation. Finally, the cumulative water supply impact assessment also considers the reasonable certainty of future cumulative water supply availability, consistent with the California Supreme Court's February 1, 2007 decision in *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova* (40 Cal.4th 412), although the primary focus, appropriately, is on whether there are reasonably certain supplies available for the Creekview Specific Plan as opposed to future projects that, though reasonably foreseeable or probable for purposes of CEQA, may or may not come to fruition and, in any event, may have to depend on water supplies other than those currently in place.

Future urban growth will result in additional demands for surface water and groundwater in the project area. Future water demands, as developed from community General Plan scenarios and other land use projections, are considered in the water supply operations model used for CVP/SWP planning purposes. For example, the operations modeling by Reclamation for the WFA EIR recognized future cumulative demands of major metropolitan areas and programs including the WFA purveyors, East Bay Municipal Utility District supplemental supply from the Freeport Regional Water Authority (FRWA) project, and CVP/SWP future water demands. However, there are several large water supply projects that have not been assessed either through the current water supply operations modeling (i.e., California Department of Water Resources CALSIMII model) or CEQA in a comprehensive manner. Additionally, there has been no comprehensive assessment of the future cumulative conditions that addresses new federal rules to protect endangered species, which directly and indirectly influence regional water supplies through obligations imposed on the integrated CVP/SWP operations. Climate change also may result in additional uncertain effects to future water supply conditions and CVP/SWP operations. In short, the CVP/SWP system is facing an unprecedented level of uncertainty that makes it impossible for CEQA lead agencies such as the City to predict the future without a large amount of outright speculation. The sources of such uncertainty are discussed below.

The following sections identify major future water supply conditions that are considered in this assessment of the additional water demand of the CSP, pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines:

- Sacramento River Water Reliability Study (SRWRS): Proposed new surface water diversion (up to approximately 88,000 AFY) on the Sacramento River upstream of the confluence with the lower American River that would serve to meet demands of PCWA, the cities of Sacramento and Roseville, and the Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD) up to and beyond 2030. The City's participation in this project to divert up to 7,100 AFY was not assessed in the WFA EIR. Although the City and its partners were planning at one time to release a draft EIR/EIS for the SRWRS in 2009, that effort has been temporarily suspended because the recent economic slowdown has eliminated the urgency once felt by the proponents of the project. The project has not been abandoned, but it is uncertain when the participants will resume work on the EIR/EIS.

- El Dorado Water and Power Authority (EDWPA): Proposed new surface water diversion (40,000 AFY) from the American River basin upstream of and from Folsom Reservoir to serve El Dorado County, including the El Dorado Irrigation District and Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (GDPUD) service areas (GDPUD withdrew from the EDWPA Supplemental Water Rights Project but its service area remains within the project area) CEQA compliance for the EDWPA project, and associated operations modeling, are currently underway. A Draft EIR for the project was circulated in July 2010 for public comment. The project will require approval by the SWRCB, whose actions in response to EDWPA's proposal cannot be predicted with certainty.

- Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP): Comprehensive effort to develop a restoration program to improve Delta conditions for aquatic species and provide increased water supply reliability for CVP/SWP Delta export operations. Operations modeling and CEQA compliance are underway. At this time, it is not possible to predict what the final version of the BDCP will look like; it may or may not include a major new isolated conveyance facility (e.g., a "Peripheral Canal") intended to reduce the extent to which both the CVP and the SWP will have to continue relying on pumps in the south Delta that, while putting water into the Delta Mendota Canal (federal) and the California Aqueduct (state), cause harm to the Delta smelt and other threatened or endangered species. At present, the so-called BDCP Steering Committee, a multi-party group of water users, non-profit environmental organizations, and others, has not yet completed its deliberations regarding the "project" to be proposed for inclusion in BDCP and associated CEQA and

NEPA documentation. Depending on its final form, the BDCP may require the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration – National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) to revisit the terms of recently adopted Biological Opinions for the Delta smelt (USFWS) and various salmonid species (NOAA Fisheries), which are discussed below.

- Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) Expanded Los Vaqueros Reservoir: Proposed increase in storage capacity from an existing 100,000 AF up to a maximum of 275,000 AF for the purpose of improving water quality delivered to CCWD customers and adjusting the timing of its Delta diversions to accommodate the life cycles of aquatic species, thus reducing species impact and providing a net benefit to the Delta environment. Operations modeling and CEQA compliance was completed in 2009.

- City of Stockton Delta Water Supply Project: Proposed new surface water diversion (up to 126,000 AFY) from the Delta to meet Stockton M&I demand through 2050. Operations modeling and partial CEQA compliance was completed in 2005. In late 2005, the City of Stockton certified an EIR that provided "project level" coverage for an initial phase of 33,600 AFY and "program level" coverage for a second phase of up to the remaining total amount of 126,000. In early 2006, the State Water Resources Control Board approved a water rights permit for the first phase (33,600 AFY). According to the EIR prepared for the Stockton General Plan, this initial amount of water should, along with other sources, be sufficient to serve Stockton's water demands through approximately the year 2035.

- New water legislation: at the end of the 2009 legislative session, stakeholders representing a variety of water users, environmental organizations, local governments, and others engaged in intense negotiations over legislation that could effect the operations of the CVP and SWP. The legislation includes language that (i) creates a new governance structure for "the Delta," (ii) expresses an intention to augment the CVP and SWP by building new "storage" facilities, (iii) provides funding for ecosystem restoration and physical facilities, (iv) imposes aggressive conservation goals on water users throughout the state, and (v) includes commitments to certain water users. Currently staff from the California Department of Water Resources is developing regulations and criteria to guide

implementation and compliance. Additional legislation continues to be considered to reinforce the intent of this new legislation.

Appendix H-4 to this EIR provides an assessment of recent changes in the regulatory framework that governs the integrated CVP/SWP operations and related effects to resource conditions. In response to the proposed Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP) for CVP/SWP, the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries consulted with CVP/SWP on the OCAP for compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The ESA authorizes USFWS and NOAA Fisheries to require changes to the OCAP for the protection of special-status species, and the Biological Opinions prepared for the ESA consultation are summarized below:

- USFWS 2008 Biological Opinion: Prepared for the protection of the delta smelt, the Biological Opinion's "reasonable and prudent alternative" (RPA) identifies actions that would restrict Delta pumping operations, impose additional criteria for allowable reverse Old and Middle River (OMR) flows, and require additional flows in fall months for estuarine salinity habitat management.

- NOAA Fisheries 2009 Biological Opinion: Prepared for the protection of Sacramento River winter-run chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon and steelhead, Southern Resident North American green sturgeon, and Southern Resident killer whales, the RPA would restrict Delta pumping operations, impose Shasta Reservoir storage targets to achieve water temperature requirements in the Sacramento River below Keswick Dam, impose lower American River flow standards, require modified Delta Cross Channel operations, and limit reverse OMR flows.

Both of the Biological Opinions are the subjects of litigation filed in federal court by water users unhappy with the restrictions imposed. Although, absent one or more court orders or opinions setting aside the Opinions, it would be speculative to assume that the two Biological Opinions will be superseded by new ones, such a possibility remains. Final resolution of the lawsuits may require years, assuming that appeals to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and even the United States Supreme Court are possible.

Finally, scientific research to date indicates that observed climate change is likely to result in changes in regional climate conditions that may adversely affect water supply conditions in the

Central Valley, and thus considered in this assessment of future cumulative conditions. In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq.), which requires the California Air Resources Board to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other feasible, cost-effective measures to reduce statewide greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, chlorofluorocarbon compounds) to 1990 levels by 2020 (representing an approximate 25 percent reduction in emissions). Although there is much uncertainty regarding the timing, magnitude, and nature of potential climate changes to water resources, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) is conservatively considering the following potential changes in planning for future water supply operations (DWR 2009). [7]

- Mean temperature increases from 2 to 6 degree C. California's complex terrains will modulate the value locally.
- Unknown change to precipitation total but an increase in extreme wet and dry conditions. More precipitation will fall as rain than snow in higher elevations.
- Decreased snowpack particularly in the northern Sierra (up to 90% by 2100) and earlier melt time. Less mountain block recharge from snowpack expected with implications for long-term support of regional aquifers.
- Annual runoff concentrated more in winter months with more variability and greater extremes.
- Sea level rise up to 55 inches with the potential for higher rises

Water Supply Scenarios Considered to Meet City's Cumulative Buildout Water Demand

Two scenarios have been identified for securing additional water supplies to meet the buildout demand for the CSP land uses under future cumulative conditions. "Scenario 1" would consist of the full utilization of the City's American River supply allocated by the WFA, with additional surface water supplies coming from currently available regional water supply purveyors, additional conservation measures imposed on new development within the City, or a combination of these

[7] DWR 2009. The State of Climate Change Science for Water Resources Operations, Planning, and Management. Draft-January 2009. Prepared by Michael Anderson, Ph.D., P.E., State Climatologist. Available at http:/<www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/climate_change/CCScience_DWROperations.pdf

two elements. Because the City's WFA allocation is subject to CVP deficiencies under drier year-types, the additional water demands under future cumulative conditions would require additional groundwater pumping in years when the City receives less than a full surface water allocation.

Based on the recent economic downturn, the future pace of implementation of approved City and County developments has slowed and remains uncertain. Therefore, the ability to establish additional contractual arrangements with WFA purveyors is considered a reasonable assumption. Additionally, as identified in Table 5-25 above, the City's current cumulative buildout demand is slightly less than the supply that would be available from the City's WFA allocation and the SRWRS supply. While the SRWRS–related diversions by PCWA, the City of Sacramento, and SSWD are considered in the future cumulative conditions, it is assumed for Scenario 1 that the City of Roseville would not require any deliveries of SRWRS water through its buildout planning horizon of 2030.

For Scenario 1, it is assumed that contractual agreements with WFA purveyors (i.e., most likely to be PCWA) would provide additional surface water supply that is allocated under the WFA, or is otherwise already developed (i.e., PCWA's contracts for M&I water from PG&E). The WFA provides a framework for providing surface water and groundwater supplies to the region through 2030. A portion of the water supplies provided to the region are proposed to be obtained from the American River through contracts subject to the WFA requirement. Deliveries from the American River, which provides a source of surface supply, include water that is delivered to CVP customers, including the City, San Juan Water District, PCWA, and others. Water delivery could be supplied to area purveyors through the year 2030, provided that additional Sacramento River diversion facilities are constructed to serve PCWA's full WFA allocation.

"Scenario 2" would consist of the City participating in the SRWRS to divert additional water from the Sacramento River. At the time the SRWRS project was initiated, the City's future participation was based on a perceived need for diversion capacity up to 7,100 AFY to meet future water demands exceeding the City's current buildout demand, and thus fully exercise its combined USBR (CVP), PCWA and SJWD contracts totaling 66,000 AFY via some form of transfer agreement. However, if additional water is provided for one or more developments through the contractual arrangements described above for Scenario 1, additional surface water from the SRWRS may not be necessary for many years into the future. Moreover, it is considered remote that the City would

participate in a new diversion project to provide for a small increment of additional demand such as that represented by the CSP development. Therefore, it is assumed that the City would only participate in the SRWRS if a substantial need for additional surface water existed. Therefore, this EIR considers the effects of the City diverting its full allocation from the SRWRS, as previously planned. Similar to Scenario 1, due to CVP cutbacks to the City's WFA allocation in drier year-types, Scenario 2 also would require additional groundwater pumping in years when the City receives less than a full surface water allocation in order to meet the City's cumulative demand.

Scenario 1 Impact Assessment: Water Supply Provided Through New WFA Purveyor Contracts and Additional Conservation Measures

The following describes two elements of the scenario for securing additional water supply within current WFA limitations.

Additional American River Surface Water Supplies: Additional treated surface water secured from the American River could serve all or a portion of the Urban Growth Areas considered in this analysis (SVSP Urban Reserve, CSP and CSP Urban Reserve, Panhandle /University, Brookfield and Placer Ranch). An assessment was prepared by RBI and HDR Engineering (see Appendix H-4) which provides a qualitative discussion of the reliability that water supplies previously allocated to WFA purveyors, and indicates that water supplies will continue to be available under the future cumulative conditions. While new water supply projects (e.g., EDWPA project in the upper American River basin), new CVP/SWP operational regulations for the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries Biological Opinions, and potential climate change may reduce available water supplies for WFA purveyors, it is expected that CVP operations will still be able to honor existing American River water contracts in all years and meet full American River CVP water contractor diversions in many years.

Placer Ranch and Brookfield are currently within PCWA's service area. Water could be provided from any of the agencies supplies, given PCWAs "first come first served" process for serving new development. Conveyance lines could be extended approximately 11 miles west from lines that would be conveyed from PCWA's proposed Ophir Water Treatment Plant. PCWA prepared and approved the "Foothill EIR" in 2005 (Foothill Phase II Water Treatment Plant and Pipeline, June 2005), that covered construction of a new water treatment plant and associated transmission lines. Specifics of the project included the following.

- A new raw water intake pipeline (54-inch diameter) connecting to a planned 54-inch pipeline at the south end of the Auburn Tunnel Pump Station No. 2.
- A new water treatment plant at Ophir (30 million gallons per day)
- A new water transmission pipeline (ranging from 42-to 60 inches in diameter that would connect the line to PCWA's existing transmission system near the intersection of Taylor Road and Rock Springs Road (phase I). Phase II of the pipeline would convey water to near the intersection of Taylor and Callison Roads and continue west to a pipeline to the City of Lincoln and the Sunset 10-million gallon water storage tanks and the Lincoln Storage Tank Farm.

PCWA has indicated that it would be possible to provide the City of Roseville with water from the Ophir Water Treatment Plant project to serve future development. Transmission lines could be extended from Sierra College Boulevard west, down right-of-way, and connect to Placer Ranch west of Highway 65.

Increased Water Conservation: Additional water supplies could come from more aggressive water conservation measures implemented in new development areas or realized within existing development. Increased water efficient fixtures (low flow showers, toilets) over the years have lead to less consumption. It is likely that new technologies, building codes and other legislative mandates will continue to result in a decrease in water consumption.

An example of increased legislative action to encourage conservation is in 2006, the State enacted legislation requiring the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to update the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The updated model ordinance contains several new landscape and irrigation design requirements aimed at reducing water use and waste in landscape irrigation. All local land use agencies were required to adopt the model ordinance, or develop an ordinance that is at least as effective, by January 2010.

The City of Roseville adopted a new ordinance to comply with this mandate, which requires that future landscaping projects, particularly for commercial or large residential turf areas, must include

1. appropriate use of plants,

2. establishment of "water budgets" for properties and penalties for exceeding water budgets,
3. automatic irrigation systems and schedules,
4. soil assessment and soil management,
5. promoting use of and manage recycled water resources, and
6. minimization of overspray and runoff.

The State legislature has passed Senate Bill No. 7 (SBx 7-7) in November 2009 that mandates that statewide a 20-percent reduction in urban per capita water use by 2020 be achieved. The City is required to institute permanent water conservation programs to ensure the 20 percent saving. Several methodologies for calculating required reductions for water agencies are included within the legislation. At buildout of the existing City boundary it is estimated the City must reduce demands by approximately 10,500 AFY. This reduction in water demands would be accomplished through increased conservation measures such as the water efficient landscape ordinance, and other future mandates and incentive programs necessary to meet reduction requirements. This could include the conversion of landscaped areas from potable water irrigation to irrigation with recycled water. Future development proposals would also be required to implement water conservation measures to meet the 20-percent conservation goal within their projects. If these measures were implemented, new development areas could be served with a portion of the City's existing American River supply because additional supply would be freed up by conservation that could be used to meet demand needs. The impacts of increased conservation are aesthetics related in that less traditional landscaping and less turf are likely a result. Because the level of water conservation is not fully quantifiable at this time, it is possible additional surface water supplies may still be needed.

Cumulative Impacts of Water Utility Infrastructure Construction to Meet CSP Demand:

This cumulative analysis considers the potential direct environmental effects of constructing additional infrastructure to deliver and treat water within the context of regional supplies and demands generated in Placer County, Sutter County, and Sacramento County under the provisions of the WFA.

Roseville obtains its surface water supply through facilities owned and operated by the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). These facilities include a pumping plant and pipeline. Water obtained through USBR distribution facilities is then delivered to the City-owned water treatment plant located on Barton Road. The rate at which the City can take water from USBR pumping facilities is limited to 150 cubic feet per second (96.9 million gallons per day (mgd)). This is a contractual limitation outlined in the 1969 water supply contract with USBR. The water treatment plant has a rated capacity of 100 mgd anticipated to serve the City through 2025. The limiting factor on surface water deliveries is not the water treatment plant capacity but rather the rate at which the City can receive water from the USBR (96.9 mgd). To meet cumulative water supply needs in excess of 96.9 mgd, the City will be required to use alternative sources of supply. Those sources could include groundwater, conserved water or expanded use of recycled water. To meet peak deliveries, surplus water could be diverted during off-peak times of the year and stored in the groundwater aquifer to off-set peak deliveries during high use times of the year. This would be done on an as-needed-basis.

Impacts that would result from construction of infrastructure necessary to treat and deliver additional PCWA water from the proposed Ophir Water Treatment Plant to the City of Roseville were originally disclosed in the Foothill Phase II Water Treatment Plant and Pipeline Draft and Final EIR (Foothill EIR) (April 2005) and were summarized more recently in the Second Partially Re-circulated Revised (SPRR) Draft EIR for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. These EIRs concluded that there was the possibility for environmental impacts in the following areas: agricultural resources, aesthetics/light and glare, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, traffic/transportation, air quality, noise, public services, and hazards/hazardous materials. Mitigation measures were developed to reduce all potential impacts to less than significant levels with the exception of the following:

Foothill EIR Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts Due to Water Treatment and Transmission Infrastructure

Air Quality

- Direct construction related air emissions (dust from earthmoving and NOx from construction vehicle exhaust).

The extension of lines from the terminus of the lines studied in the Foothills EIR to serve Placer Ranch, Brookfield, Creekview and the Urban Reserve would need additional environmental review because they extend beyond the boundaries of the approved EIR. Such additional review should be done as part of the CEQA documentation for those individual projects, as the extensions will be needed to serve those projects. Extension of the project to serve the City of Roseville would result in similar impacts from extension of the transmission lines. The transmission lines would likely follow existing right-of-way, but there may be instances where the pipeline would need to cross undeveloped areas. This would result in a loss or disturbance of grassland habitat, and impacts to vernal pools.

Because cumulative development could require the treatment of water from additional sources that are at present un-assured and unfunded, the construction of which, would result in significant unavoidable impacts, the contribution associated with construction of water delivery infrastructure and potable water treatment for CSP and the urban reserve lands is conservatively considered to be **cumulatively considerable and thus significant**.

Indirect Impact of Surface Water Deliveries to Meet CSP Demand:

Under Scenario 1, the water demand associated with buildout of the City's General Plan and the Creekview Specific Plan would be supplied by existing and assured sources of surface water allocated under its WFA, and groundwater to make up shortfalls in surface water deliveries during drought years. An EIR was prepared for the WFA that addresses impacts and mitigation measures resulting from implementation of the water supply program outlined in the WFA. Because the WFA EIR was not challenged in court, the certified document constitutes a legally satisfactory analysis of all the issues addressed therein, including cumulative water supply impacts (see Public Resources Code Section 21167.2). The cumulative impacts assessed in the WFA EIR considered the City's full diversion needs of 58,900 AFY of American River water under normal / wet year-types,

and up to 39,800 under the driest year-types, along with the other cumulative water demands and system CVP/SWP operations known at the time the EIR was prepared in 1999. Because under Scenario 1, the City's cumulative demand would be met by supplies previously allocated and assessed under the WFA EIR, the WFA EIR provides a reasonable assessment of the incremental indirect effects of meeting the CSP project water demands under the future cumulative condition. Although 2030 conditions will likely differ from those projected in the WFA EIR, many of the future actions that will change the 2030 conditions (e.g., full implementation of the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries Biological Opinions; BDCP implementation, and EDWPA implementation) cannot be accurately characterized today, notwithstanding best efforts of professional experts working on California water issues on a day to day basis (i.e., the firm of Robertson-Bryan, Inc., which assisted the City with the preparation of this analysis, and which subcontracted with HDR Engineering, which is intimately involved in numerous water projects, including the BDCP). Therefore, the 2030 conditions remain somewhat uncertain in many ways, including CVP/SWP operations. In light of such uncertainty, the City and its expert consultants have concluded that WFA EIR continues to provide a meaningful characterization of 2030 conditions for the purposes of assessing cumulative impacts, and the CSP project-related contribution to such cumulative impacts.

The WFA EIR listed the flow-related environmental impacts that could occur when implementing water diversions under the WFA and concluded that there was the possibility for environmental impacts in the following areas: groundwater resources, water supply, water quality, fisheries and aquatic habitat, flood control, hydropower supply, vegetation and wildlife, recreation, land use and growth inducement, aesthetics, cultural resources, soils and geology. While mitigation measures were developed, some impacts remained significant even after feasible mitigation measures would be applied. The following presents the future significant cumulative impacts identified in the WFA EIR, which represents the impacts that would occur as a result of cumulative development in the region, including buildout of the City of Roseville pursuant to its existing General Plan, full development of the CSP annexation area including the Urban Reserve parcel. (Harris), and development of the cumulative projects and/or development levels identified above.

WFA EIR Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts

Water Supply

- Decrease in deliveries to State Water Project (SWP) customers
- Decrease in deliveries to Central Valley Project (CVP) customers

Water Quality

- Sacramento River and Delta Water Quality

Fishery Resources and Aquatic Habitat

- Impacts to Folsom Reservoir's warm water fisheries
- Impacts Fall-run Chinook salmon
- Flow and temperature related impacts to splittail (February-May)
- Impacts to Shasta Reservoir's and Trinity Reservoir's warmwater fisheries
- Temperature related impacts to Sacramento River fishery resources.
- Impacts to Delta fish populations

Hydropower Supply

- Reduced CVP hydropower capacity and generation
- Increased energy requirements for diverters pumping from Folsom Reservoir (economic impact)

Recreation

- Impacts on Lower American recreation opportunities (rafting and boating)
- Reduced Folsom Reservoir boating opportunities
- Reduced availability of Folsom reservoir swimming beaches

Cultural Resources

- Physical deterioration of cultural resources in Folsom Reservoir

The water demand created by CSP with full buildout of the urban reserve lands, which is estimated to be approximately 998 AFY, would represent a mere 0.25 % of the total Water Forum Agreement

delivery agreements. The City's use of additional groundwater in drier year types would be well within the available sustainable yield of the underlying aquifers. The PCWA August 2006, Integrated Water Resources Plan by Brown and Caldwell indicates a potential safe yield of 95,000 AFY for the North American River Sub basin. It is expected that groundwater pumping in the Sub basin, which primarily serves agricultural uses, will decrease in the future as agricultural lands are converted to urban land uses and served by surface water supplies. As documented in Section 4.12.1, the retirement of Reason Farms by the City is expected to result in a net banking of groundwater supplies of 274,137 AF over 100 years at buildout of the City, CSP and the Urban Reserve. Therefore, as urban development continues the City's ability to use groundwater in drier year types will increase but is not expected to impact the sustainability of the Sub basin.

Consequently, the diversion of additional surface water in wet year-types to meet CSP demand, and additional groundwater pumping to provide water in drier year-types, would contribute negligibly to the overall cumulative impacts assessed in the Water Forum Agreement EIR. Even so, the City conservatively assumes that the project's incremental contributions to the above-referenced significant unavoidable effects are themselves cumulatively considerable and thus **significant**.

Scenario 2 Impact Assessment: Water Supply Provided Through New Sacramento River Diversion

The second scenario identified to provide water supplies to meet the future cumulative water demand of the City's urban growth areas consist of the full utilization of the City's allocation of American River under the WFA and participation in the SRWRS to divert additional water from the Sacramento River. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the PCWA, on behalf of PCWA, SSWD, and the Cities of Roseville and Sacramento, entered into a Memorandum of Agreement to cost share the development of a feasibility study for the SRWRS project. If approved and constructed the SRWRS would provide water treatment and storage facilities having capacity of 255 mgd (equivalent to 395 cubic feet per second) to meet diversion and delivery requirements of PCWA, SSWD, and the Cities of Sacramento and Roseville. Transmission systems would deliver treated water to, and interconnect with the existing PCWA, SSWD, Roseville and Sacramento distribution facilities.

There are four primary alternatives under consideration by the SRWRS. These alternatives were analyzed in the *Sacramento River Water Reliability Study Initial Alternatives Report* (Alternatives Report) Final version dated March 2005. According to the Alternatives Report, the Elverta Diversion Alternative includes the construction of a joint diversion for PCWA, SSWD, and the Cities of Sacramento and Roseville. It would pump water from the Sacramento River to be treated at a proposed Elverta Water Treatment Facility. Under this alternative, new diversion facilities would be constructed near the existing Natomas Mutual Water Company's Elkhorn Diversion. Additionally, the water treatment facility, storage, and pumping facilities would be located near the river with transmission lines connecting to the existing Cooperative Transmission Pipeline/Northridge Transmission Pipeline in Antelope, which serves the Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD), as well as extend north with service to Roseville and PCWA.

The Elverta Diversion Alternative would construct a water treatment facility on approximately 90 to 100 acres, located approximately one mile east of the Sacramento River pump station on Elverta Road. According to the Alternatives Report, the water treatment facility would "comprise conventional treatment processes, including a grit basin, flocculation/sedimentation basins, filters, clear tank, clearwell, backwash water basin, electrical building, chemical building, operations building, solids handling area, and a storm water detention/habitat conservation program area." In order to accommodate future drinking water regulations, space has also been reserved for an advanced oxidation process. The pipeline associated with this alternative is proposed to traverse along Elverta Road approximately 5.5 miles before turning north along Sorrento Road/Pleasant Grove Road. After approximately 2.5 miles the pipeline will turn east along Riego Road/Baseline Road and connect with the Placer Vineyards project in Placer County. At Fiddyment Road, the pipeline would head north to serve the City of Roseville and other Placer County growth areas served by PCWA.

The purpose of the SRWRS is to develop a plan to implement the Water Forum Agreement objectives to pursue a Sacramento River diversion, to meet the water supply needs of the Placer-Sacramento region and to preserve the Lower American River. The SRWRS investigates the viability of a joint water supply diversion from the Sacramento River to meet the needs of the cost-sharing partners. Reclamation and PCWA propose to prepare a joint Environment Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the SRWRS. Reclamation is the lead Federal agency for the National Environmental Policy Act and PCWA is the lead State agency for the

California Environmental Quality Act. A series of scoping meetings were held on the EIS/EIR in September 2003.

The SRWRS EIS/EIR, also known as the Sacramento Diversion EIS/EIR, has been started. However, at the time of this writing, the SRWRS project had been put on hold due to the economic slow down. While the timeline for completion of the project is, therefore, uncertain, it is likely that the project will go forward at some point in the future. Although it is not certain that all of the original local cost-sharing partners (e.g., the City of Sacramento) will continue to participate, it is very likely that PCWA will reinitiate work on the project in the foreseeable future, as PCWA's various planning documents and water supply assessments in recent years have identified the need for 35,000 afy from the SRWRS in order to serve build-out of PCWA's service area.

Direct Impacts of Water Utility Infrastructure and SRWRS Construction to Meet CSP Demand:

According to the preliminary findings of the Alternatives Report, implementation of the SRWRS as described above could result in the following environmental effects. As noted above, an EIR/EIS is currently in process for this project that will substantially elaborate on the analysis currently available.

Biological Resources. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) and the California Natural Diversity Databases (CNDDB) were queried to identify all State and Federally listed species that could occur within the area of study. The Alternatives Report identified significant terrestrial species impacts due to habitat loss through the fragmentation and elimination of wildlife habitat. Additionally, impacts to vernal pools could result from treated water pipelines traversing wetland habitat that has the potential to impact fairy shrimp and California tiger salamander, which are federally threatened species.

There would be impacts directly associated with diversion of water from the Sacramento River through pumping and conveyance of water through associated pipelines to the water treatment facility. According to the Alternatives Report, there will be long-term operational impacts to fisheries and riparian habitat. Specifically, water flows and temperature could be altered in a way that would result in alterations to anadromous fish spawning and rearing. Aquatic habitat availability may increase or decrease depending on temperature fluctuations and flow rates in the area of the pumping station. Flow rates and temperature fluctuations could decrease

reproductive activities as well as impacts to maturation of cold water fisheries, such as anadromous species.

Hydrology/Water Quality. The Alternatives Report recommended additional analysis to identify any potential effects. Potential impacts could include a reduction in downstream dilution of pollutants. Potential water quality issue, however, are considered to be relatively minor, due in part to the relatively lower water quality of the Sacramento River in comparison to that of the water in the Lower American River. Additional analysis would identify the potential for operations to violate a federal, state or local water quality guidelines or standards.

Recreation. The pump station would protrude directly into the Sacramento River resulting in restrictions to recreation in the vicinity of the diversion. Implementation of this alternative would result in potential impacts to the quality of recreation.

Land Use. Implementation of the proposed alternative may require coordination with the Sacramento International Airport to resolve potential conflicts with existing or planned land uses in the area. Although not discussed in the Alternatives Report, the project would also permanently remove approximately 100 acres of agricultural land from product ion for water treatment and storage facilities. Operation of the water treatment facility would also entail operation of machinery and equipment that could have visual and noise effects. In addition, various chemicals would be used and water materials produced that could prove hazardous. However all such activities would be carried out in strict adherence with established regulations for their use (Agricultural, 80 acre minimum parcel size) by Sacramento County, and removed from any developed areas that could be exposed to any of the effects of the proposed facility.

While mitigation measures will be developed as part of the SRWRS EIR/EIS work, it is expected that some impacts identified above will remain significant even after feasible mitigation measures are applied. Therefore, based on available information, future significant cumulative impacts are conservatively expected as a result of implementation of the SRWRS in the following issue areas:

SRWRS Anticipated Cumulative Impacts Due to Water Treatment and Transmission Infrastructure

- Biological Resources

- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Recreation
- Biological Resources
- Land Use

Cumulative impacts to the above issue areas are expected to occur as a result of cumulative development in the region under Scenario 2, including buildout of the City of Roseville pursuant to its existing General Plan, full development of the CSP annexation area including the Urban Reserve parcel, and development of the cumulative projects and/or development levels identified above. To date these effects have not been evaluated in a certified or adopted CEQA document.

Because under Scenario 2 cumulative development could require the treatment of water from the SRWRS project, the construction of which is expected to result in significant unavoidable impacts, the contribution associated with construction of water delivery infrastructure and potable water treatment for CSP and the urban reserve lands is conservatively considered to be **cumulatively considerable and thus significant**.

Indirect Impact of Surface Water Deliveries to Meet CSP Demand:

Under Scenario 2, the City's diversion of up to 7,100 AFY from a new SRWRS project facility on the Sacramento River reflects a new diversion that has not been assessed with CALSIMII operations modeling for its effects on CVP/SWP operations; nor has CEQA compliance been completed to assess the effects of diversions on reservoir storage and river flow conditions. The following discussion presents the significant future cumulative impacts that would occur as a result of cumulative water demands from development in the region, including buildout of the City of Roseville pursuant to its existing General Plan, full development of the CSP annexation area including the Urban Reserve parcel and development of the cumulative projects and regulations identified above.

Additional surface water diversions to meet new regional water demands (e.g., EDWPA, City of Stockton) will result in reduced Delta inflow. In response to reduced flows, it can be expected that CVP/SWP operations will respond to the reduced water supply and ensure compliance with OCAP operational requirements and environmental commitments.

As identified above, the WFA EIR cumulative impact analysis fully addressed the City's WFA allocation of 58,900 AFY from the American River and use of groundwater in dry years when surface water allocations would be reduced, as well as the other approximately 351,000 AFY of wet-year demands from the American and lower Sacramento River by other WFA purveyors. Additionally, the operations modeling and impact analyses for the WFA EIR considered PCWA and City of Sacramento diversions under the Sacramento River. Consequently, the future significant cumulative impacts identified in the WFA EIR (and listed above under Scenario 1) provide a reasonable characterization of the potential cumulative impacts of the City's full buildout water demand including the SRWRS project, particularly since most of the City's water supply will continue to be provided from the American River basin. The following provides additional characterization that considers the potential effects of other foreseeable projects:

- *SRWRS and Other Major Water Supply Projects:* Additional demands for Central Valley surface water supplies such as SRWRS, City of Stockton, the EDWPA Supplemental Water Project, City of Stockton's Delta Water Supply Project, and the proposed expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir by the Contra Costa Water District ("CCWD") will incrementally reduce the water supply available to meet agricultural and M&I demands. In particular, the integrated CVP/SWP operations during drier year types will be appropriately responsive to the reduced supply to comply with environmental water release requirements (i.e., reservoir storage targets, in stream flows, and Delta flow requirements). CVP/SWP operations during periods of low water supply availability would be expected to result in incrementally reduced deliveries to agriculture, followed by junior water rights holders and contractors, and finally by senior contractors and/or water rights holders. The City of Roseville is a USBR contractor for 32,000 AFY of CVP water supplies and contracts for Middle Fork Project water for the remaining 34,000 AFY.

    - *EDWPA:* The additional 40,000 AFY demand by EDWPA in the upper American River basin could incrementally reduce water supplies available to other WFA purveyors. However, as noted above, CVP operations would be expected to be responsive to ensure, to the extent possible, that the deliveries to other contractors would be honored. In the event that, in order to accommodate a new diversion of 40,000 AFY from the American River system, the Bureau of Reclamation might have to reduce deliveries to CVP Contractors in the Lower

American River Basin, such a possibility might lead to the acceleration of renewed pursuit of the SRWRS by some or all of its proponents (PCWA, City of Sacramento, SSWD, and Roseville).

- *USFWS and NOAA Fisheries Biological Opinions:* While the requirements of the new Biological Opinions have not been fully integrated into CVP/SWP operations, the respective RPAs are designed to prevent the extinction and aid recovery of special-status fish populations in the Delta and upper watersheds. Therefore, it is expected that the future cumulative conditions for fisheries populations and habitat would be improved relative to the current baseline condition. However, the implementation of the Biological Opinions is expected to require additional in stream flows and limit Delta exports, thereby reducing water supply availability for agricultural and M&I uses.

- *BDCP:* As noted above, the purpose of the BDCP is to promote water flow and habitat restoration actions to contribute to the recovery of endangered and sensitive species and their habitats in the Delta, while improving water supply reliability for Delta exports. However, the ability of the BDCP to achieve the program goals set forth is uncertain at this time.

Based on the assessment of impacts presented in the WFA EIR, which provide a reasonable characterization of potential adverse indirect effects of agricultural and M&I demands in the Central Valley, the additional future projects and regulations can be expected to result in the following additional effects:

- *Water Supply Reliability:* Additional water demands and deliveries associated with SRWRS and other projects, and the potential for reduced water supplies resulting from implementation of the Biological Opinions, would collectively reduce water supply reliability for agricultural and M&I uses. Because the effectiveness of the BDCP to improve water supply reliability is uncertain, this significant cumulative impact assessed in the WFA EIR is **considered to remain significant**.

- *Fisheries and Aquatic Resources:* Improvements to in stream flow and habitat conditions are expected through the CVP/SWP implementation of the Biological Opinions. It is uncertain whether the previously identified future significant cumulative conditions

identified in the WFA EIR would be improved to the point of becoming less than significant. Therefore, for the purposes of this EIR, the cumulative conditions are **considered to remain significant**.

The water demand created by CSP with full buildout of the urban reserve lands, which is estimated to be approximately 998 AFY, would represent about 0.25 % of the total WFA delivery agreements and a very minor fraction of the combined consumptive water use from the greater Central Valley water supplies. Consequently, the diversion of additional surface water in wet year-types to meet CSP demand, and additional groundwater pumping to provide water in drier year-types, would contribute negligibly to the overall cumulative impacts identified herein. Buildout of the CSP would result in the use of additional groundwater in drier year types when surface water deliveries of American River water under the WFA are reduced. However, as noted above for Scenario 1, the project is not expected to cause or contribute to groundwater pumping that exceeds the sustainable yield of the underlying aquifers and in fact with the City's retirement of Reason Farms, a net banking of groundwater is anticipated. Additional detail regarding these potential indirect water supply impacts of cumulative City demand would be developed when CEQA compliance for the SRWRS project is completed. As explained in Chapter 4.12-1, the City is able to serve the CSP itself without any need for the SRWRS.

The potential mitigation measures that may be available to reduce the SRWRS-related contributions to significant impacts are unknown at this time. The City's ASR groundwater banking project may provide opportunities to minimize the effects of additional water demands on reduced water supplies during drier year types when surface water delivery allocations are reduced. Even so, because demands from the CSP will contribute to overall City demands under the cumulative scenario, the City conservatively assumes that the project's incremental contributions to the above-referenced significant unavoidable cumulative impacts under this scenario are themselves **cumulatively considerable and thus significant.**

Increased Conservation

Additional supplies could come from more aggressive water conservation measures. Increased water efficient fixtures (low flow showers, toilets) over the years have lead to less consumption. It is likely that building codes and other legislative mandates will continue to result in a decrease in water consumption.

An example of increased legislative action to encourage conservation is in 2006, the State enacted legislation requiring the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to update the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The updated model ordinance contains several new landscape and irrigation design requirements aimed at reducing water waste in landscape irrigation. All local land use agencies were required to adopt the model ordinance, or develop an ordinance that is at least as effective by January 2010.

The City of Roseville completed an update to its ordinance to comply with this mandate. The result is that future landscaping projects particularly for commercial, or large residential turf areas require:

- Appropriate use of plants
- Establish "water budgets" for properties and penalties for exceeding water budgets
- Require automatic irrigation systems and schedules
- Require soil assessment and soil management
- Promote use of and manage recycled water resources
- Minimize overspray and runoff.

The State legislature has passed Senate Bill No. 7 (SBx 7-7) in November 2009 that mandates that statewide a 20-percent reduction in urban per capita water use by 2020 be achieved. The City is required to institute permanent water conservation programs to ensure the 20 percent saving. Several methodologies for calculating required reductions for water agencies are included within the legislation. At buildout of the existing City boundary it is estimated the City must reduce demands by approximately 10,500 AFY. This reduction in water demands would be accomplished through increased conservation measures such as the water efficient landscape ordinance, and other future mandates and incentive programs which could be used to meet reduction requirements. This could include the conversion of landscaped areas from potable water irrigation to irrigation with recycled water. If due to increased conservation measures such as the water efficient landscape ordinance, or future mandates, existing city consumption could be substantially reduced. If future development proposals meet a minimum 20-percent conservation goal within their projects, such development could be able to be served with a portion of the City's existing supply because additional increments would be freed up by

conservation. The impacts of increased conservation include aesthetics (less traditional landscaping, less turf). Even with conservation, it is likely that additional surface water supplies would still be needed. This is a **significant unavoidable** cumulative impact.

While water demand associated with buildout of the City's General Plan and the Creekview Specific Plan would be supplied by existing and assured sources of City water, any increase in water demand including increased water supply needed to serve the Urban Reserve areas, in a region that does not have adequate and assured water supplies for cumulative development would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be **significant and unavoidable** impact.

Potable Water Treatment

This cumulative analysis considers the potential environmental effects of treating water within the context of regional supplies and demands generated in Placer County, Sutter County, and Sacramento County under the provisions of the WFA.

Roseville obtains its surface water supply through facilities owned and operated by the United States Bureau of Reclamation. These facilities include a pumping plant and pipeline. Water obtained through USBR distribution facilities, is then delivered to the City owned water treatment plant located on Barton Road. The rate at which the City can take water from the USBR pumping facilities is limited to 96.9 mgd. This is a contractual limitation outlined in the 1969 water supply contract with the USBR.

The water treatment plant has a rated capacity of 100 mgd anticipated to serve the City through 2025. The limiting factor on surface water deliveries is not the water treatment plant capacity by the rate at which the City can receive water from the USBR (96.9 mgd). To meet cumulative water supply needs in excess of 96.9 mgd, the City will be required to use alternative sources of supply. Those sources could include groundwater, conserved water or expanded use of recycled water. To meet peak deliveries, surplus water could be diverted during off-peak times of the year and stored in the groundwater aquifer to off-set peak deliveries during high use times of the year. This would be done on an as-needed-basis.

Because cumulative development could require the treatment of water from additional sources that are at present un-assured and unfunded, the construction of which, would result in significant

unavoidable impacts, the cumulative impact associated with water treatment is also considered **significant and unavoidable**. CSP's incremental contribution to the cumulative impacts is considered **less than significant** since it would be relying on existing city supplies.

Recycled Water

Currently, recycled water is produced at the existing DCWWTP and PGWWTP, and distributed to locations within the City and County. Additional extensions of the recycled water system are proposed to supply additional development in the County including Placer Vineyards, Riolo Vineyards and Regional University. Sutter Pointe and Eleverta Specific Plans are outside this service area.

The distribution system to convey the recycled water would be expanded, and additional storage tanks and pumping facilities would be needed. The extension of the system to areas outside the City of Roseville, where such facilities do not exist could result in potentially significant environmental effects, in part, related to construction activities. These impacts have been identified in the Placer Vineyards, Riolo Vineyards, and Regional University EIRs previously approved by the County. Recycled water will accommodate growth, and will result in the indirect effects of growth (traffic, air quality, loss of habitat, and noise) and could result in **significant** cumulative impacts. The incremental contribution from CSP would result in a **significant** impact. No mitigation is available that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Wastewater

Wastewater from the project and other regional projects would be treated at either the PGWWTP or DCWWTP. Potential expansion of both the PGWWTP and DCWWTP were identified in the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Final EIR completed in May 1996 (WWMP EIR). Additionally expansion at the PGWWTP was identified in the WRSP EIR completed in 2004. Expansion of either plant to serve the flows could result in impacts on the environment associated with construction to increase the capacity of the plant, loss of natural and other resources to expand the footprint of the facility, and degradation of water quality as a result of increased discharges to Pleasant Grove Creek or Dry Creek. The NPDES discharge permit for either wastewater treatment plant would need to be amended to reflect higher flows.

The construction and operation of additional wastewater treatment facilities, as well as wastewater collection systems to areas outside of the WWMP EIR service area and identified in the South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation, where such facilities do not exist, could result in potentially significant environmental effects, in part related to construction activities. Each development proposal that comes forward would be subject to environmental review on a project-by-project basis. The construction of additional wastewater treatment and collection facilities, where such facilities do not exist, could result in indirect growth effects (e.g., traffic, air, and noise), which could be **significant and unavoidable** on a cumulative basis. The project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts is considered **significant**.

Solid Waste

Currently the MRF has permitted processing capacity up to 1,750 tons per day and the landfill is anticipated to be able to accept waste until 2042. However, the need for processing capacity at the MRF and for a final closure date at the landfill would be influenced by several factors including: regional growth rates, economic conditions, and the efficiency of waste recovery. Depending on these factors, waste from the project in combination with other cumulative development, would shorten the lifespan of the MRF and the landfill. As a result both facilities would need to be expanded and/or solid waste would need to be transported elsewhere. This would be considered a **significant impact**. The project's incremental contribution to cumulative solid waste demand is considered **significant and unavoidable**. Development would be required to pay collection fees, a portion of which is used to service bonds necessary to fund landfill expansions. However, since the City of Roseville does not control the WPWMA and the ability to expand the landfill, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable

Electricity

Cumulative development in the region must comply with Title 20 and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations to reduce overall energy demand. However, regional electricity demands are directly related to changing power generation and distribution in the Western U.S. Further, the sources of energy are diverse and widespread. The exact source that would supply future development in the City or the region is not known at this time. Currently, the region obtains power from combustion (natural gas), hydroelectric facilities, and geothermal projects. The

Roseville Energy Park provides a portion of the City's electric needs. The following table shows the mix of power sources used by Roseville in 2008.

TABLE 5-44

SUMMARY OF ROSEVILLE ELECTRIC RESOURCE MIX FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2008

Resource Type	Total Electricity (MWh)	Percent of Total
Biomass & waste	13,715	1.1%
Geothermal	74,764	5.7%
Small hydroelectric	3,415	0.3%
Large Hydroelectric	153,397	11.8%
Natural Gas	749,306	57.5%
Market Purchases	309,240	23.7%
Total	**1,303,838 MWh**	**100.0%**
Renewable Energy Summary	**Total Electricity (MWh)**	**Percent of Total**
CA Eligible Renewable	91,894	7.0%
Other Renewable	153,397	11.8%
TOTAL Renewable	245,292	18.8%

SOURCE: Roseville Electric 2008 Annual Power Content Label

Potential residential and commercial development would require electricity expansion. The electric distribution system in the CSP would be expanded. The proposed substation as part of the project is sized sufficiently to accommodate future buildout of the Urban Reserve.

Buildout of the CSP along with new regional growth could require the construction of new or expanded facilities. WAPA has determined that the existing transmission lines in the greater Sacramento Area have reached their maximum power transfer limits for serving the area's energy demands. In order to correct the problem, WAPA proposes to construct approximately 31 miles of new, double circuit, 230 kV transmission lines between its O'Banion Substation and the area just south of SMUD's Elverta Substation. In addition, SMUD's existing 230/115kV transmission line

between Elverta and Natomas Substations will be reconstructed. A number of alternative routes for the 230 kV line were studied and public hearings held. One of the alternative routes, Segment 2C2, would be located in a north-south direction along the western edge of the Sierra Vista project. However, based on the environmental review process, Alternative B was selected as the environmentally preferred action alternative which is located along the 99 corridor.

Construction impacts associated with the new transmission lines could include soil erosion, storm runoff, increased noise, dust, and air quality. In addition, sensitive habitats, visual resources, and cultural resources could be affected. This is considered a **significant** impact.

The regional strategy is to continue to rely on electricity from the Western Area Power Administration; acquire new sources of energy, and continue to promote energy conservation and green technology. Refer to Section 4.5, *Climate Change* for a list of measures the City of Roseville and Roseville Electric have employed to reduce energy demand and reduce green house gas emissions.

Because Roseville Electric has planned for the provision of adequate electricity for the annexation area, including provision of transmission facilities, and will construct a new substation with the CSP, the project's contribution to this cumulative impact is not cumulatively considerable and would be **less than significant**.

Natural Gas

Distribution facilities (six-inch and eight-inch plastic lines) will be sized to accommodate the future buildout of the Urban Reserve areas. In addition to pipe size, this may also increase the required joint trench size. With additional residential, commercial, elementary school and public facilities, the peak gas demand at buildout is estimated at 629 thousand cubic feet per hour (MCFH). This is an increase of 157 MCFH over the proposed project.

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) supplies natural gas service to the City of Roseville and the region. Natural gas regulators and transmission lines are required to serve residences and businesses. Expansion of these types of facilities would be required to serve the growing population of the region, and would be constructed as new development is approved. The construction and operation of additional natural gas transmission facilities to areas outside the City of Roseville where such facilities are not available could result in potentially significant environmental effects,

in part, related to construction activities. Any infrastructure improvements would be subject to additional environmental review. The construction of additional natural gas transmission facilities, where such facilities do not exist, could result in indirect growth effects (loss of habitat, traffic, air, and noise) which could be **significant and unavoidable** on a cumulative basis. The project's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact is considered **significant** because adequate facilities do not exist and PG&E has indicated that the project would need to be served with the planned new gas line south of the project area on Baseline Road.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Cumulative development in the Roseville area, which includes the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed watershed, would increase the amount of impervious surface which would, in turn, generate storm water runoff peak flows. This is a **significant** cumulative impact. Projects upstream and east of State Route 65 in Lincoln and Rocklin have constructed or have planned regional detention storage basins along Pleasant Grove Creek and its tributaries. Both City of Roseville and Placer County General Plan policies require that individual projects mitigate their contribution of increased surface water flows to minimize the potential for increased on- and off-site flooding. CSP's contribution is considered **significant**.

As described in Section 4.13 *Hydrology and Water Quality,* the City is planning a regional storm water retention basin at Reason Farms. A Draft EIR (SCH#200272084) evaluated the potential environmental effects of construction and operation of the regional retention basin. The Final EIR was certified in January 2003. The proposed regional retention basin would be required to mitigate cumulative stormwater volumes. Because the regional retention facility in the Reason Farms property is funded and approved, the cumulative impact would be less than significant for the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed. It is anticipated the regional retention facility will be constructed 2015 or after. The CSP would contribute storm mitigation fees.

Therefore, with mitigation cumulative impacts to Pleasant Grove Creek are **less than significant**.

Water Quality

Buildout of the CSP would drain into Pleasant Grove Creek. The changes in water quality that could occur as a result of construction activities and urban runoff would not be expected to differ from other development that contributes flows upstream of the project area.

Cumulative urban development would involve soil disturbing construction activities, such as vegetation removal, grading and excavation. These soil disturbances would expose soil to wind and water generated erosion, possibly at accelerated rates. Therefore, surface runoff would carry increased sediment loads. As previously described, sediment from erosion can have long and short-term water quality effects, including increased turbidity, which could result in adverse impacts on fish and wildlife habitat, reduced water pump life due to abrasion. Development in the region would cause **significant** cumulative water quality impacts. CSP's contribution is **potentially significant**.

The City requires that erosion control plans be prepared and approved by the City to reduce water quality impacts during construction activities. The General Plan also requires that urban runoff measures, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and buffer areas, be implemented as part of individual project development to protect water quality from urban development. The City of Roseville is developing a stormwater quality management program in accordance with adopted NPDES Phase 2 requirements.

Implementation of applicable State General Permit requirements for stormwater runoff during construction and anticipated NPDES Phase II requirements would reduce potential degradation of receiving water quality attributable to the CSP such that the CSP contribution would be reduced to a **less than significant** level.

Groundwater Use

The cumulative context for groundwater impacts is the groundwater aquifer generally underlying western Placer County and northern Sacramento County. The boundary of this area is defined in the North American River Integrated Groundwater and Surface Water Model (IGSM) Sutter/Placer model. This model, which was used in the Sacramento Water Forum process to evaluate acceptable groundwater yields and conjunctive use alternatives, was used to determine dry-year

groundwater impacts of the CSP. The WFA currently represents the most likely long-term plan for development of groundwater and surface water supplies in Placer and Sacramento counties, and it reflects projected land use and water demand throughout the two counties in year 2030 as envisioned in current approved general plans.[8]

The groundwater sub-basin is defined by DWR as the area bounded on the west by the Feather and Sacramento Rivers, on the north by the Bear River, on the South by the American River and on the east by the Sierra Nevada Range. The sub basin is located within the Sacramento valley Groundwater Basin. It includes a surface area of 548 square miles.

When a well first begins extracting groundwater from an aquifer, groundwater is initially extracted from groundwater storage. The result is a localized cone of depression with an approximately 1,000 foot- radius that fluctuates with operation of the well. When extraction ceases, the aquifer typically recharges back to its pre-extraction conditions. Over time, a well can also induce an incremental decline in groundwater elevations. Cones of depression with a larger aerial extent can form in areas where multiple groundwater extraction wells are in operation. The location and shape of a regional cone of depression is influenced by the same factors as a single well. A sequence of successive dry years can also decrease the amount of natural recharge to the aquifer, creating an imbalance between natural recharge and extractions. To overcome the imbalance, the aquifer elevations lower to include more natural recharge. Over time, the shape and location of the aquifer's regional cone of depression fluctuates.

Urban growth in northern Sacramento County beginning in the 1950s increased the demand on groundwater such that the groundwater elevation trend along the Sacramento/Placer county line began to show a steady decline of one to 1.5 feet per year. Ground water elevations continued to decline at a relatively steady rate though the droughts of 1976-1977 and 1987-1992. The effect of the 1987-1992 droughts on groundwater elevations in most of the basin was relatively minor; with the 1990 groundwater levels about five to ten feet lower than the 1985 conditions.

Controlling the fluctuation of groundwater levels within an acceptable range is the focus of regional groundwater management efforts. The City of Roseville, the City of Lincoln, PCWA, and the California American Water Company have cooperatively developed the Western Placer County Groundwater Management Plan (WPCGMP). The overarching goal of the WPCGMP is to maintain

[8] MWH, Groundwater Impact Analysis for Proposed Reason Farms Land Retirement Plan, January 2003.

the quality and ensure the long term availability of groundwater to meet backup, emergency, and peak demands without adversely affecting other groundwater uses within the WPCGMP area.

It is recognized that groundwater is used in dry years to supplement surface water supplies, and during peak times, to supplement pumping constraints. Up to 6,695 AFY of groundwater could be used to supplement City supplies. In addition, nearby Placer County projects could use groundwater in the short-term, including Regional University, west of the project site.

Because of the sustained recoveries of groundwater elevation since 1997 and the significant efforts to protect groundwater resources in the region, the cumulative impact on groundwater resources is considered **less than significant**.

The use of ASR would ensure that surplus water is injected in the groundwater basin to ensure no net decrease in groundwater levels. The longer term net effect on groundwater resources is not expected to be significant or adverse. Therefore, in combination with the CSP, cumulative groundwater resources impacts would be **less than significant**.

Groundwater Recharge

Development in the City of Roseville would result in the creation of new impervious surfaces by converting undeveloped, primarily grazing land to urban uses. As discussed in Section 4.8 *Hydrology and Water Quality*, recharge occurs primarily along stream channels and through applied irrigation water. Further, less than five percent of total recharge into the Sacramento Valley groundwater basin under natural conditions is attributable to Placer County. Much of western Placer County consists of hydrologic group "d" soils, which are characterized by high runoff and low infiltration potential. Other areas of the City of Roseville and western Placer County are situated on soil and rock units similar to the CSP, and do not have water intensive irrigation uses. Therefore, the cumulative effects on recharge are **less than significant**. CSP's contribution would also be **less than significant**.

Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Cumulative development in southwest Placer County has resulted in the conversion of a primarily rural landscape to urban development, thereby permanently altering the visual character of the area, both during daylight and at night. This trend is anticipated to continue, which could result in

a **significant** cumulative aesthetics impact. In combination with existing and approved development, including Placer Vineyards, Regional University, Riolo Vineyards, Sierra Vista, Brookfield and Placer Ranch, a large area would be urbanized. The CSP would **significantly** contribute to the loss of open space and would introduce new sources of light and glare.

Although development in the City of Roseville would be required to meet the City's Community-wide Design Guidelines, ensuring that proposed development would be visually compatible with surrounding development, it would nonetheless permanently and substantially alter the environment, causing a cumulative aesthetic impact. The project's contribution is considered cumulatively considerable. The impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

Climate Change

Refer to Chapter 4.5, for a cumulative discussion relative to climate change. Because climate change is global in scope, it is inherently cumulative in nature, and therefore, there is not a separate cumulative discussion in this chapter.

This page intentionally left blank