CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

and

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE CITY COUNCIL

for the

NORTH ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN PHASE 3

August 2000

I.
INTRODUCTION

The NRSP (Phase 1) was adopted by the City of Roseville in 1997 to provide comprehensive planning for over 1,000 acres of remaining land in the northern and western portion of the incorporated City of Roseville. The City adopted a final land use plan for Phase 2 of the NRSP in May 1999. The project applicant is requesting that the City amend the NRSP to include Phase 3 and to annex the parcel to the City of Roseville. The proposed project would add an additional 160 acres to the City and would provide a logical extension of existing development. The NRSP has been amended to include the proposed project site and addresses all aspects of the project, including land use, circulation, infrastructure, public services, implementation, and design characteristics. (Draft EIR, p. 3-3.)

These findings, which address only the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project, have been prepared to comply with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 *et seq.*) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.).

II.
DEFINITIONS

"APCD" means Air Pollution Control District.

"BMPs" means best management practices.

"Board of Supervisors" or "Board" refers to the Placer County Board of Supervisors.

"CDFG" means the California Department of Fish & Game.

"CEQA" means California Environmental Quality Act.

"cfd" means cubic feet per day.

"cfs" means cubic feet per second.

"CIP" means capitol improvement project.

"CNEL" means community noise level equivalent.

"CO" means carbon monoxide.

"City Council" means the City of Roseville City Council.
"CWA" means Federal Clean Water Act.

"dBA" means A-weighted decibels.

" Draft EIR" means the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Final Environmental Impact Report.

"du/acre" means dwelling units per acre.

"Final EIR" means the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Final Environmental Impact Report.

"gpd" means gallons per day.

"gpm" means gallons per minute.

"HOV" means high occupancy vehicle.

"LOS" means level of service.

"MMRP" means Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

"MOU" means Memorandum of Understanding.

"msl" means "mean sea level."

"NOI" means Notice of Intent.

"NO_x" means nitrogen oxide.

"NPDES" means National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

"PCTPA" means Placer County Transportation Planning Agency.

"PCWA" means Placer County Water Agency.

"PGWWTP" means Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant.

"Planning Commission" refers to the City of Roseville Planning Commission.

"PM_{10}" means particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less.

"RCSD" means Roseville City School District.

"RJUHSD" means Roseville Joint Union High School District.

"ROC" means Reactive Organic Compounds.

"ROG" means reactive organic gases.

"RRTP" means Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant.

"RWQCB" means Regional Water Quality Control Board.

"SCH" means State Clearinghouse.

"SOI" means Sphere of Influence.

"SO_x" means sulfur dioxide.

"SWRCB" means the State Water Resources Control Board.

"SWPPP" means Storm Water Pollutant Protection Plan.

"TSM" means Transportation System Management.

"UBC" means the Uniform Building Code.

"USACOE" means the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

"USFWS" means the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

III.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The NRSP (Phases 1 and 2) is located in western Placer County, California along the northern and western boundaries of the City of Roseville, as shown in Figure 3-1 of the Draft EIR. The proposed project (Phase 3 of the NRSP) is located on an approximately 160-acre site in the southeast corner of Placer County immediately adjacent to the northwest corner of the City of Roseville. Phase 1 of the NRSP is the area west of Foothills Boulevard, north of Blue Oaks Boulevard to the city limits and south of Blue Oaks Boulevard to the Woodcreek Golf Club. The second phase (Phase 2) consists of two discontiguous parcels -- Neighborhood "C" and Neighborhood "D." Neighborhood C is 161 acres immediately west of the Phase 1 site. Neighborhood D is a 492-acre site bounded by the Del Webb Specific Plan to the north, the Northwest Roseville Specific Plan to the east, Fiddyment Road to the west, and Baseline Road to the south, as shown on Figure 3-1 of the Draft EIR. Phase 3, or Neighborhood E, is immediately north of Neighborhood C (Phase 2) and west of Neighborhood A (Phase 1) of the NRSP. (Draft EIR, p. 3-1.)

The project site is generally situated six miles west of Interstate 80 (I-80). State Highway 65 (SR 65) provides access from the northwest and intersects I-80 in Roseville. The project site is approximately one mile west of the Blue Oaks Boulevard interchange on SR 65. (Draft EIR, p. 3-1.)

Site Characteristics

The project site lies in a rural agricultural area in western Placer County. The site is bounded by the City of Roseville (NRSP Area Phase 2 to the south and Phase 1 to the east), Fiddyment Road to the west, and vacant pasture/dry farmland to the north. All of the land in the project site is currently within the unincorporated area of Placer County, but is within the City of Roseville's Sphere of Influence (SOI). The project site is currently located within the County's Sunset Industrial Area and is designated for agricultural uses and is zoned F-B-X 80 with an 80-acre minimum lot size (farm with a minimum lot size of 80 acres). (Draft EIR, p. 3-1.)

The land formation within the project site is generally composed of rolling topography with mild slopes, ranging less than 5 percent. The average site surface elevation of the project site is approximately 115 feet above mean sea level (msl). (Draft EIR, p. 3-1.)

The project site is characterized with native and nonnative annual grasslands. Cattle and sheep have grazed in portions of the project site for several decades. The predominant land use of the project site is agricultural grazing. No native oaks exist on the site; however, a stand of non-native "Tree of Heaven" trees are located in the southwest corner of the project site. Approximately 0.17 acres of wetlands, including 0.1 acres of vernal pools, .03 acres of seasonal wetland, and a drainage swale of .04 acres, have been identified on the site. (Draft EIR, p. 3-3.)

Project Objectives

The proposed project is intended to meet the objectives set forth in the NRSP which provide for the orderly and systematic development of a mix of residential neighborhoods, schools, parks, community commercial and business/professional uses in a manner consistent with the policies of the City and the characteristics and natural features of the land.

Specific objectives identified by the City are:

(1) Provide public services to meet the needs of development within the plan.

(2) Provide a distinct identity, sense of organization and order for the plan area.

(3) Provide a housing supply near the employment centers in the northwest area of the city to enhance the potential for jobs/housing balance and to minimize trip length for employees to and from the employment center.

(4) Provide a range of housing types and densities that include dwellings affordable to households in a variety of income categories.

(5) Provide a pedestrian and bicycle path system and access to public transit to encourage residents to minimize auto use for shopping, services and leisure activities.

(6) Complete the land use and infrastructure planning for the northwestern portion of the City.

(7) Expand the City's boundaries in a manner that is consistent with State law, the Placer County LAFCO standards and criteria, and the City's General Plan, and that increases the City's residential holding capacity as foreseeable job growth creates a demand for additional housing within the City.

(Draft EIR, p. 3-3.)

Required Permits and Approvals

As part of the implementation of the proposed project, several permits and approvals would be necessary prior to construction. These are listed below, and the relevant agencies involved in the review process are identified.

- Section 404 Permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Environmental Protection Agency)
  The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE) regulates the placement of fill or dredged materials that affect waters of the United States, which include stream courses and jurisdictional wetlands. The USCOE regulates these activities under the authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has commenting and vetoing authority on USCOE decisions. The USCOE would regulate development in the project site that affects jurisdictional wetlands.

- Water Quality Certification (State Water Resources Control Board)
  Construction of the proposed project has the potential to directly or indirectly affect "waters and wetlands of the United States". Water or wetlands disturbance could result in a discharge to Pleasant Grove Creek or the South Branch of Pleasant Grove Creek. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) would require a water quality certification.

- Storm Water Discharge Permit (SWRCB)
  Construction of the proposed project will involve clearing, grading, and excavation activities that would result in the disturbance of five acres or more of land. As such, the proposed project would require a SWRCB permit for storm water discharge. The permit process would include identification of Best Management Practices (BMP's) to control pollutants in storm water discharges both during construction and after construction is completed. BMP's for the proposed project would include perimeter controls, diversion channels, sedimentation collection systems, soil stabilization, storm water treatment ponds and wetlands, wet and dry detention ponds, and grassed waterways.

- ☐ General Plan Amendment (City of Roseville)
  The proposed project will require a General Plan Amendment to include the project site within the City's General Plan and increase the City's unit allocation from 45,042 to 45,721.

- ☐ Specific Plan Amendment (City of Roseville)
  The NRSP will need to be revised to add Phase 3. In addition, Phase 2 will be modified to reflect the revised collector alignment.

- ☐ Development Agreement and Development Agreement Amendment (City of Roseville)
  A development agreement will be prepared, setting forth needed infrastructure improvements, park dedication requirements, timing and methods for financing improvements and other specific performance obligations of the property owner and the City of Roseville. In addition, the Development Agreement for Phase 2 will be amended to reflect the revised collector alignment and other modifications.

- ☐ Prezone/Rezone from to zone districts consistent with the Specific Plan (City of Roseville)

- ☐ Large Lot Subdivision Map to create specific plan parcels (City of Roseville)

- ☐ Encroachment Permit to connect proposed project roadways to Fiddyment Road (Placer County Public Works Department)

- ☐ Annexation to the City of Roseville (Placer County LAFCO)
  The Placer County LAFCO will use this EIR to assess impacts associated with annexation of the project site to the City of Roseville.

  (Draft EIR, pp. 3-4 - 3-5.)

Pursuant to the State Public Resource Code and the CEQA Guidelines, subsequent approvals may not require additional environmental analysis.

Public Resources Code § 21083.3 includes the provision that if an EIR has already been certified for a particular zoning or planning action, subsequent approvals (e.g., subdivision map) consistent with the approved zoning or community plan would be limited to "effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior EIR." Section 21158.5 allows tiering from the prior EIR for multi-family residential development of fewer than 100 units or commercial or retail mixed-use development of not more than 100,000 square feet, if certain conditions are met.

Section 15181 of the CEQA Guidelines allows the lead agency to approve a project that involves residential development or neighborhood commercial facilities in an urbanized area using an EIR prepared for a Specific Plan.

Under CEQA Guidelines § 15182, residential development proposals that are consistent with the Specific Plan and this EIR will not require subsequent environmental analysis. For discretionary approval of other projects under the Specific Plan, the City will determine at the time of the proposal whether any environmental analysis (beyond that contained in this EIR) is necessary. Any future environmental analysis is anticipated to be "tiered" from this EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15152 and other cited sections in order to streamline the environmental analysis.

(Draft EIR, pp. 3-5 - 3-6.)

IV.
BACKGROUND

Project History

The NRSP (Phase 1) was adopted by the City of Roseville in 1997 to provide comprehensive planning for over 1,000 acres of remaining land in the northern and western portion of the incorporated City of Roseville. The City adopted a final land use plan for Phase 2 of the North Roseville Specific Plan (NRSP) in May 1999. The project applicant is requesting that the City amend the NRSP to include Phase 3 and to annex the parcel to the City of Roseville. The proposed project would add an additional 160 acres to the City and would provide a logical extension of existing development. The NRSP has been amended to include the proposed project site and addresses all aspects of the project, including land use, circulation, infrastructure, public services, implementation, and design characteristics. (Draft EIR, p. 3-3.)

The public has had several opportunities to review and comment on the proposed project. This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) was available for public review and comment for 45 days. The Planning Commission and City Council each held a public hearing on the EIR. Community members and other interested parties could provide written comments at any time during the review period, or verbal comments at the hearings. (Draft EIR, p. 3-6.)

V.
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- The Notice of Preparation and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project;
- The North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Final EIR;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day public comment periods on the Draft EIR;

- All comments and correspondence submitted to the City with respect to the Project, in addition to timely comments on the Draft EIR;

- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the Project;

- All findings and resolutions adopted by City decision makers in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;

- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the City, consultants to the City, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's actions on the Project;

- City of Roseville General Plan;

- Final Environmental Impact Report, City of Roseville General Plan;

- Placer County General Plan Update Draft General Plan Background Report, Volume I and II, September, 1992;

- Placer County Farmland Map;

- Placer County General Plan. August 16, 1994;

- North Roseville Specific Plan Draft EIR, May 1997;

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, July 1998;

- All documents submitted to the County by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project, up through the close of the public hearing on September 13, 2000;
- Minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project;

- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;

- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;

- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and

- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The custodian of the documents comprising the record of proceedings is Patty Dunn, Planning Director, whose office is located at 316 Vernon Street, Suite 104, Roseville, California, 95678.

The City Council has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3, even if not every document was formally presented to the Commission or City Staff as part of the City files generated in connection with the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the Project files fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the Commission was aware in approving the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3. (See City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-392 [142 Cal.Rptr. 873]; Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6 [252 Cal.Rptr. 620].) Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to City Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the Commission. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the Commission's decisions relating to the adoption of North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21167.6, subd. (e)(10); Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866 [226 Cal.Rptr. 575]; Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155 [39 Cal.Rptr.2d 54].)

VI.
FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

As noted earlier, Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" (Emphasis added.) The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will *avoid* or *substantially lessen* such significant effects." (Emphasis added.) Section 21002 goes on to state that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that "[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).) The second permissible finding is that "[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(2).) The third potential conclusion is that

"[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(3).) Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also Citizens of Goleta Valley, supra, 52 Cal.3d at p. 565.)

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417.) "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (Ibid.; see also Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn, supra, 23 Cal.App.4th at p. 715.)

Neither CEQA itself nor the CEQA Guidelines define the difference between "avoiding" a significant environmental effect and merely "substantially lessening" such an effect. The City must therefore glean the meaning of these terms from the other contexts in which the terms are used. Public Resources Code section 21081, on which CEQA Guidelines section 15091 is based, uses the term "mitigate" rather than "substantially lessen." The CEQA Guidelines therefore equate "mitigating" with "substantially lessening." Such an understanding of the statutory term is consistent with the policies underlying CEQA, which include the policy that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects." (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.)

For purposes of these findings, the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. In contrast, the term "substantially lessen" refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less than significant level. These interpretations appear to be mandated by the holding in Laurel Hills, supra, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521, in which the Court of Appeal held that an agency had satisfied its obligation to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects by adopting numerous mitigation measures, not all of which rendered the significant impacts in question (e.g., the "degradation to air quality") less than significant.

Although CEQA Guidelines section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is "avoid[ed] *or* substantially lessen[ed]," these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been reduced to a less than significant level, or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant.

Moreover, although section 15091, read literally, does not require findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as merely "potentially significant," these findings will nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR.

In short, CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or a feasible environmentally superior alternative, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated that, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any . . . development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (Citizens of Goleta Valley, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

These findings constitute the Placer County Planning Commission's best efforts to set forth the rationales and support for their decision under the requirements of CEQA.

VII.
LEGAL EFFECTS OF FINDINGS

To the extent that these findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, the City hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when City decisionmakers formally approve the Project.

The mitigation measures are also referenced in the Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted concurrently with these findings, and will be effectuated through the process of constructing and implementing the Project.

VIII.
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project and has been adopted concurrently with these Findings. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6, subd. (a)(1); CEQA Guidelines, § 15097.) The City will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

IX.
SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Final EIR identified several significant environmental effects (or "impacts") that the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project will cause. Some of these significant effects can be fully avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Others cannot be avoided by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives; however, these effects are outweighed by overriding considerations set forth in Section XI below. This Section (IX) presents in greater detail the Commission's findings with respect to the environmental effects of the Project.

A. LAND USE

Standards of Significance

For purposes of this EIR, an impact is considered significant if implementation of the proposed project would:

- Lead to impairment of the productivity of adjacent or nearby Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance or conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses;
- Result in a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses;
- Lead to development of land uses that are incompatible with each other or adversely change the character of existing and/or proposed adjacent land uses;
- Allow development that would be inconsistent with the City of Roseville General Plan or other City plans, policies or ordinances; or
- Allow development that would be inconsistent with the Placer County LAFCO policies.

(Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-9 - 4.1-10.)

Impact: 4.1-1: **Agricultural land use conversion.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-10.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project would require the annexation of the project site to the City of Roseville and conversion of approximately 160 acres of land currently designated by Placer County for agricultural use to non-agricultural uses, primarily residential development. This would represent a change in the designated land use on the site. However, from a land use perspective, the proposed project appears to be a logical extension of existing development that has been approved on areas in the immediate vicinity by the City of Roseville. The project site is not irrigated and historically has been used for dry grazing. The site is not classified as having any Prime, Unique or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The conversion of grazing land is considered a less-than-significant impact because of the relatively low value of the property for agricultural purposes. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-10.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-10.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.1-2: Incompatible with land uses in unincorporated areas of Placer County. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-10.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The project site is located in an unincorporated area of Placer County, immediately adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Roseville. The site lies on the border between unincorporated County land used for grazing and incorporated land, within the City of Roseville, currently being developed for housing and other urban uses. The project site is located adjacent to land currently designated for agricultural uses to the north (Agricultural 80 acre minimum) under the Sunset Industrial Area Plan (1997) and to the west in the unincorporated County. Due to the proximity of agricultural land to the project site, there is the potential for incompatible activities to occur (i.e., odor, dust, and noise associated with grazing activities). (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-10.)

The Placer County General Plan recommends a minimum 50-foot buffer between residential living structures and agricultural uses. The proposed project includes a minimum 50-foot buffer between residential living structures and agricultural uses to the north and west of the project site. The buffer includes existing roadways (e.g., Fiddyment Road), landscape corridors, and rear yard setbacks. In addition, the project design guidelines require a solid wood or masonry fence be constructed in areas adjacent to agricultural uses. Because the proposed project includes a 50-foot buffer between residential and agricultural uses to the north and west of the site, the same as what was required for Phase 1 and 2 of the NRSP and by the Placer County General Plan, impacts associated with potential land use incompatibilities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-10 - 4.1-11; Final EIR, pp. 3-14, 3-24.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-10.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.1-3: Inconsistency with Placer County LAFCO guidelines and policies.

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The Placer County LAFCO will determine whether to approve annexation of the project site to the City of Roseville and related matters, including detachment of this area from the Sunset Industrial Area, the Dry Creek Fire Protection District and County Service Area 28. The LAFCO's objectives under the Cortese/Knox Act include preserving agricultural land, encouraging logical patterns of growth, and discouraging urban sprawl. The project does not propose to annex Fiddyment Road; however, to address Policy 1d(3), Section 4.5, Traffic and Circulation evaluates an option annexing a portion of Fiddyment Road to the City of Roseville. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-11; Final EIR, p. 3-14.)

The project site is relatively small, has not been intensively used for agricultural or other uses, has required little if any services, and has had a relatively low property valuation in agricultural use. Therefore, detachment of the project site is not expected to have a significant effect on the Sunset Industrial Area, the Dry Creek Fire Protection District, or County Service Area 28. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

The proposed project would result in a loss of agricultural land, but this loss is not considered substantial since the productivity of the site for agricultural use is limited, as discussed above under Impact 4.1-1. Annexation and development of the site as proposed would represent a logical pattern of growth, as indicated above, due to its location adjacent to other incorporated areas that will be developed. The proposed project would not represent "leap-frog" development or promote urban sprawl. Therefore, the project as proposed appears largely consistent with applicable LAFCO objectives and policies, and the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-11.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.1-4: **Inconsistency with City of Roseville plans and policies.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Implementation of the City's General Plan policies, as well as City Improvement Standards and Design Standards has been assumed in the analysis of the project's impacts. In some cases (e.g., noise) the General Plan policies were used as the standard against which the significance of impacts were measured. General Plan policies were reviewed to determine whether the proposed project could be inconsistent with the direction of the General Plan and individual policies. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

The General Plan would need to be amended to include the project in the City and reflect the additional units proposed by the project. This would result in an increase in the City's unit allocation from 45,042 to 45,721. This amendment is included with the proposed project entitlements, and no other policy amendments are anticipated. No inconsistencies (with the exception of the increase in the City's unit allocation noted above) have been identified. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.1-5: **Incompatibility with the adjacent NRSP and other City land uses in the project vicinity.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project is designed to complement development of adjacent land within the NRSP to the east (Phase 1) and south (Phase 2). Integrated planning for this area through the NRSP should assure that uses and facilities are coordinated and that related concerns or conflicts are minimized. Like the project site, the Diamond Creek property (Neighborhood A) to the east and the Mourier 160 property (Neighborhood C) to the south are planned for residential development and related uses, including schools, open space and park areas. Off-site uses within adjacent Phase 1 and Phase 2 areas would be Low-Density Residential, matching those on-site with the exception of the area south along Fiddyment Road where Medium Density Residential on-site would be adjacent to Low-Density Residential off-site. The proposed project contains residential, school, and park uses that are similar in type and density to existing and planned development in the City of Roseville. Because uses under the proposed project would be compatible with adjacent uses in the City of Roseville and the NRSP, this impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-12 - 4.1-13.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-12.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.1-6: **Incompatibility of on-site land uses.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-13.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project would provide for low-density and medium-density housing, an elementary school, a park, roadways and other infrastructure. The NRSP would be amended to include Phase 3 and is designed to assure that these uses are as compatible and complementary as possible. The NRSP and Design Guidelines provide centrally located park and school sites, which should be accessible to all residents of Neighborhood E and nearby areas. The Roseville City School District (RCSD) may determine that the proposed school site is not required in the project site. With or without the school, no incompatibility of land uses would occur. All of the proposed on-site land uses are considered compatible uses and would not result in a significant impact. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-13.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-13.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.1-13.)

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project site and other areas approved for future development contain land designated as grazing land. Given that no Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance falls within the project site conversion of grazing land and the conversion of grazing land is not considered a significant impact, therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 5-3.)

Impacts regarding the compatibility of adjacent land uses have been identified within the project site. Future development would likely cause similar impacts. Protections to ensure that adjoining land uses would be compatible are contained within the General Plan, the City's Community Design Guidelines, the NRSP, the City's Noise Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance (Design Review Permit procedures are contained in the Zoning Ordinance). These protections include proper screening, berming, buffering, building placement, and site access. Future development within the City would be subject to these protections; therefore, significant cumulative impacts regarding conditionally compatible adjacent land uses are not expected to occur. Therefore, the project's incremental contribution to any cumulative impacts to compatibility of adjacent land uses is less than cumulatively considerable. (Draft EIR, p. 5-3; CEQA Guidelines, § 15130, subd. (a).)

B. FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

Standards of Significance

Impacts are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site;

- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; or

- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-7 - 4.2-8.)

Impact 4.2-1: Increase in the rate of stormwater runoff. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-8.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The project site is currently undeveloped. The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface coverage over that which currently exists. This increase in the amount of impervious surface coverage would increase the rate of surface runoff entering Pleasant Grove Creek and its tributaries. In addition, development and grading would alter the existing runoff patterns and conveyance capacities on the properties. Increased flows and altered drainage patterns could increase the potential for localized and regional flooding on-site and upstream and downstream of the project area. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-8.)

Previous hydrological studies prepared in 1994 and 1996 for the NRSP assumed full buildout of the watershed. The 1996 study concluded that on-site detention facilities would not be necessary for future NRSP development that would contribute flows to the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed. Because of the proposed project's location within the lower portion of the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, the conclusion that on-site detention storage would not be advisable to manage peak flows from Neighborhood E is still valid. The 1996 study also evaluated flood flows at four locations along Pleasant Grove Creek: at the confluence with the South Branch of Pleasant Grove Creek; about one mile downstream of the confluence; at Brewer Road; and at the downstream end of Pleasant Grove Creek. Although the proposed project results in an increase in stormwater runoff, the results of the study showed that future 100-year and smaller flood peak flow rates at each location along Pleasant Grove Creek would be slightly reduced due to a change in runoff timing. The release of runoff would be timed so that the water from various portions of the watershed pass through certain points of the creek at different times and result in a decrease in the rate of stormwater runoff. Thus, runoff timing would be more critical in decreasing the rate of stormwater runoff than the volume of water. Therefore, impacts related to the increased rate of stormwater runoff would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-10.)

The information summarized from the 1993 study (*Auburn Ravine, Coon, and Pleasant Grove Creeks Flood Mitigation,* prepared for Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District by CH2M Hill) regarding stormwater flows attributable to future planned development in Placer County and potential downstream effects in Sutter County provided in the impact discussion (DEIR, page 4.2-10) was intended to provide an overall context regarding regional drainage. Site-specific estimates of stormwater runoff attributable to the proposed project were prepared as part of this DEIR. The source of the data is Baker-Williams Engineering Group, September 1999, as indicated at the bottom of Table 4.2-3. The discussion on page 4.2-10 in the DEIR explains that previous hydrologic studies addressing development in the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed were prepared in 1994 and 1996 for North Roseville Specific Plan (NRSP) development. These studies assumed full buildout of the NRSP. The applicant's engineer, who evaluated the results of the site-specific runoff estimates in combination with these studies, concluded runoff generated as a result of development of Neighborhood E would not alter the previous recommendations for managing stormwater runoff from NRSP development. (It should be noted that Neighborhood C is not part of the proposed project, but is located south of the proposed project.) The analysis of project-specific effects on pages 4.2-8 through 4.2-11 does not rely on the 1993 study, as suggested by the commentor.

It is correct the proposed project drainage design must conform to the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (PCFCWCD) Stormwater Management Manual (not "Plan," as stated by the commenter). The PCFCWCD Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM), adopted in 1994, specifically directs *when* [emphasis added] storage is to be used to mitigate downstream impacts due to increased flows generated by development of a site, the objective flow shall be taken as the estimated pre-development peak flow rate less 10 percent of the difference between the estimated pre-development and post-development peak flow rates from the site for all standard design storms ranging from the 2-year and up to and including 100-

year. In no case, however, shall the objective flow be less than 90 percent of the estimated pre-development flow.[i] The SWMM does not require that *"all* [emphasis added] development maintain 90 percent of pre-project flows," as the commenter asserts.

The City of Roseville coordinates regularly with the PCFCWCD regarding drainage issues in western Placer County. The PCFCWCD has formally commented on drainage effects related to North Roseville Specific Plan development. In a letter to the City of Roseville dated June 30, 1997, the PCFCWCD stated:

> We have reviewed the hydrologic analysis by CH2M Hill for the North Roseville Specific Plan [NRSP] dated February 4, 1997. In general, our policy generally recommends detention to mitigate increases in downstream peak flows in this watershed. We have concluded, however, that this project [NRSP] is so located in the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed that detention for the project would more likely add to downstream peak flows than not under reasonably foreseeable conditions, and, further, the project [NRSP] would have little impact on localized flooding. The [NRSP] EIR needs to make this distinction because: a) the offsite rate of runoff will increase for most development projects in the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed including this one [NRSP], with mitigation, [and] b) the resulting increase from a particular project may be perceived as small in relationship to total watershed flow, but the cumulative impact of all developments is likely to be significant.

As noted by the commenter and as shown in Table 4.2-3 in the DEIR, the proposed project would increase runoff over existing conditions. Although runoff would increase, consistent with the PCFCWCD conclusions cited above and site-specific evaluation, the description of runoff effects and the rationale for <u>not</u> recommending detention for the proposed project is correctly described on page 4.2-10 in the DEIR. Thus, the conclusion that increased peak flows would be less than significant is supported by substantial evidence, and mitigation is not necessary. Moreover, as stated on page 3-13 in the Project Description in the DEIR, necessary storm drainage management for the proposed project would be implemented through a Development Agreement, which includes conditions related to the provision of infrastructure improvements and financial obligations. Item 3.5.1 of the Development Agreement requires that a Master Drainage Plan be developed for the project that identifies the size, location, and timing of all major drainage facilities. Items 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 require that the drainage plan be prepared to the satisfaction of the City of Roseville City Engineer and other agencies having jurisdiction over drainage (in this case, the PCFCWCD).

As noted above, the DEIR does not rely on the 1993 study for the analysis of project effects. The DEIR (page 4.2-10) merely reiterates the conclusions of the study that the inundation of several hundred additional acres in Sutter County could occur as a result all planned future development in Placer County. It is not necessary nor required, for purposes of this DEIR, to update the 1993 analysis to "conform to year 2000 reality" or to analyze the impact of several hundred of acres of flooding in Sutter County because the proposed project would not in and of

itself cause several hundred acres of flooding. The proposed project would, however, incrementally contribute to that effect, as discussed in the cumulative analysis on page 5-4 in the DEIR.

As stated on page 5-4 in the DEIR, the City has developed a regional flood control strategy, which includes provisions for construction of a regional stormwater retention facility to mitigate for increased amounts of stormwater. The regional facility would be funded by new development through the payment of fees based on each projects contribution to increase in runoff. While a specific location has not been identified, there is adequate, vacant land in the City and surrounding area to accommodate a retention facility. The City believes a retention facility is a reasonable, feasible option for addressing the City's contribution to runoff volumes, including that generated by the proposed project. Nonetheless, as discussed on pages 5-4 through 5-5 in the DEIR, while storage of project flows in a regional retention facility would reduce the project's contributions to regional flooding and would serve to reduce the magnitude of the project's cumulative effect, the City of Roseville could not and is not obligated to fully mitigate the cumulative effects of increased flows for the entire region. Therefore, as stated on page 5-5 in the DEIR, the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

It should be noted that the City of Roseville and Sutter County have met on a number of occasions over the previous years to discuss alternative flood control strategies. In these meetings, Sutter County has expressed interest in exploring alternatives to a retention facility to mitigate Roseville's share of regional runoff. To date, no formal alternatives or preferences have been identified by Sutter County. As a result, the City continues to move forward planning a retention facility to mitigate its share of regional impacts.

As indicated on page 3-12 in the Project Description in the DEIR, the project applicant would be required to contribute toward a regional flood control strategy as a condition of project development. As such, additional mitigation for the project's contribution to cumulative effects is not necessary. The commenter's concern regarding strategies to mitigate City-wide effects on downstream flooding and the mechanism to implement them is noted and will be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration during the decision-making process. (Final EIR, pp. 3-17 – 3-19)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-8.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.2-2: **Increase in on-site and off-site water surface elevations.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-10.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:
The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface coverage over that which currently exists. This increase in the amount of impervious surface coverage would increase the volume of surface runoff entering Pleasant Grove Creek and its tributaries. In addition, development and grading would alter the existing runoff patterns and conveyance capacities on the properties. Increased flows and altered drainage patterns could increase the potential for localized and regional flooding on-site and upstream and downstream of the project area. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-10.)

Although the amount of runoff generated by the proposed project is minimal, the City of Roseville requires that the project applicant contribute their fair share toward a regional flood control strategy through payment of the Pleasant Grove Drainage Fee. This strategy would retain stormwater and mitigate for increased volumes of stormwater. The size of the retention facility and drainage fees to be paid by the project applicant will be determined by the Drainage Master Plan that is currently being prepared for the City by an engineering firm, Civil Solutions. The plan assumes development of the proposed project and additional projects in the surrounding area, such as NRSP Phases 1 and 2, and the North Industrial Specific Plan. The size of the retention facility will be designed in accordance with the conclusion of the Drainage Master Plan to adequately mitigate the City's contribution to on-site and off-site water elevations within Pleasant Grove Creek, which includes the proposed project. Therefore, the increase in on-site and off-site water surface elevations would be adequately mitigated and this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-10.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-10.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.2-3: **Construction and occupancy of the proposed project could result in degraded water quality.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-11.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Implementation of the proposed project would result in grading of the 160-acre site for construction of roadways, building pads, structures and other facilities. Construction activities associated with project development would disturb more than five acres, so contractors would be required by State law to obtain and comply with the State General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit. This would prevent or reduce any adverse water quality impacts due to construction. In addition, project construction would be required to comply with the City's Improvement Standards, which require an Erosion Control Plan be prepared and retained on-site. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-11.)

The primary sources of stormwater pollution from urban development include roadways, automobiles, landscaping, industrial activities, non-stormwater connections to the drainage system, accidental spills and illegal dumping. It is anticipated that runoff from the proposed project would be typical of urban runoff water quality for the identified uses. Runoff from residential uses (including roadway and parking lot areas) generally contains oil, grease, and heavy metals. Runoff from landscaped areas and recreational fields (residential and park uses) could contain high concentrations of nutrients, i.e. fertilizers and pesticides. Open space uses would not be expected to contribute high levels of urban contaminants because they would remain in a relatively undeveloped state (similar to pre-development conditions). (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-11.)

Project-generated contaminants that could be present in urban stormwater runoff, could incrementally contribute to contaminants that may be present in Pleasant Grove Creek, which could adversely affect surface water quality. It is unlikely, however, that the proposed project's contribution would result in a violation of water quality objectives or substantially degrade water quality, because of regulatory requirements and the implementation of several water-quality protection measures, which are described in greater detail below. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-11.)

Consistent with the General Plan, development of the proposed project would incorporate a system to control post-construction stormwater pollution. Both non-structural and structural BMPs would be implemented to assure effective water quality control. Structural measures could include procedures such as perimeter controls, diversion channels, sedimentation collection systems, and soil stabilization. In addition, the proposed project would comply with the State General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and prepare a SWPPP to manage urban stormwater runoff. The proposed project would also be required to comply with the CWA, and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act to help maintain existing water quality. Compliance with the above-mentioned regulations would also further reduce impacts on aquatic species. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-12.)

Implementation of General Plan policies and applicable federal and State water quality protection regulations would ensure that water quality impacts associated with urban development would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-12.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.2-8.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of General Plan policies and on-site detention basins would reduce site-specific contributions to regional flood levels. However, the City of Roseville cannot fully mitigate flood impacts alone. Therefore, until a regional flood control plan has been implemented, this would be considered a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. Implementation of General Plan Policies and compliance with applicable State General Permit requirements for storm water runoff would reduce potential degradation of receiving water quality; however, the conveyance of urban pollutants to receiving waters would not be eliminated. Therefore, cumulative water quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

C. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Standards of Significance

Impacts are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Result in a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, to any endangered, threatened or rare species;
- Result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modification on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special-status species in local or regional plans;
- Result in a substantial interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites;
- Result in a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans;
- Violate the Tree Preservation chapter of the Roseville Zoning Ordinance, including damage, removal or encroachment into the protected zone of native oak trees greater than 6 inches in diameter at dbh; or

- Conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-13.)

Impact 4.3-1: Loss of vernal pools, seasonal wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-13.)

Finding:
Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The proposed project would result in fill of up to approximately 0.17 acres of vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, swales and intermittent drainages. Wetland delineations based on the methodology approved by the USCOE have been prepared for the project site (see Appendix D). (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-13; Final EIR, pp. 3-1 – 3-2.)

Correspondence with the project applicant indicates that mitigation for loss of wetlands would involve the purchase of preservation credits for the 0.1 acres of vernal pools at a ratio of at least 2:1in a USFWS-approved mitigation bank to satisfy the needs for mitigation. If this option is not acceptable to the regulatory agency at the time of project permitting, the applicant shall also dedicate at least one vernal pool creation credit for every acre of habitat directly affected. This would include the 0.1 acres of vernal pools at a ratio of at least 1:1 for a total mitigation ratio of 3:1 for preservation and creation credits. (Final EIR, pp. 2-4, 3-2.)

With the purchase of mitigation credits, the project applicant would be relieved of any further responsibility and liability. A suitable approved mitigation bank is available in the region, called Wildlands, Inc. In the event that this mitigation option is pursued, no further surveys of on-site wetlands, salvage notification, or monitoring reports would be required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-14.)

It cannot be stated at this time what mitigation would be agreed upon between the project applicant, the USCOE and the USFWS. However, the project applicant would be required to obtain a Section 404 Permit from the USCOE prior to any construction activity on the site. It is anticipated that compliance with the requirements of these two agencies would minimize adverse impacts due to loss of vernal pool and wetland habitats. Compliance with the USCOE and USFWS requirements for "no net loss" of wetlands would ensure that the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The federal government recognizes certified mitigation banks as acceptable mitigation tools. Under CEQA, compliance with the USCOE and USFWS requirements is recognized as adequate mitigation to offset the loss of wetland areas. Therefore, after mitigation the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

4.3-1: Purchase credits in an approved wetland mitigation fund or other mitigation required by the 404 permit to ensure no net loss of wetlands. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-13; see also Final EIR, p. 3-2.)

Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant.

Impact 4.3-2: Loss of grassland habitat. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-14.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the significant environmental effect associated with impacts to grassland habitat. No mitigation is available to render the effect less than significant. The effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Development of the proposed project would require the removal and/or disturbance of a substantial area (approximately 159 acres) of annual grassland habitat including a mature stand of Tree of Heaven trees, which would have an adverse impact on the foraging and breeding of a variety of raptors, mammals, amphibians, and other species. From a botanical point of view, the non-native annual grassland community is considered to have limited value; most plant species are not California natives, and few rare or endangered plant species are found in this plant community. However, grassland habitat does provide important foraging, nesting and hibernation habitat for numerous wildlife species, including foraging raptors. In addition to grasslands, approximately 0.17 acres of vernal pools and other wetlands would be affected by the proposed project (see Impact 4.3-1). The long-term loss of grassland habitat is considered a significant impact because it provides nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of animal species. Therefore, the loss of grassland habitat that supports wildlife habitat is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-14; Final EIR, p. 3-2.)

Mitigation Measures:

None available. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-14.)

Significance after Mitigation

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-3: Substantial interference with the movement of resident and migratory wildlife species. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-14.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Implementation of the proposed project could result in a substantial impediment to the movement of wildlife that presently occurs in undeveloped areas to the north, south and west of the project site. Those wildlife species that are adapted to live in grasslands and trees, or that move between isolated pockets of water, would not easily move across the future urbanized landscapes. In urban settings, wildlife species are often injured or killed by automobile traffic, intercepted and/or injured by domestic pets, or are unable to traverse large distances without benefit of shade or intermediate resting areas. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15.)

However, due to the type of habitat existing on the project site it is anticipated that no wildlife migratory or movement corridors exist on the project site. It is anticipated because no wildlife migratory corridors have been identified on the project site, the impact on wildlife movement would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-14.)

Significance

Less than significant.

Impact 4.3-4: **Loss of special-status plant species occurring in vernal pools.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with impacts to special-status plant species occurring in vernal pools. No mitigation is available to render the effect less than significant. The effect therefore remains potentially significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Bogg's Lake hedge hyssop, slender orcutt grass and Sacramento orcutt grass are the only federal or State listed plant species that are reported to potentially occur in the vicinity of the project site; however, they were not encountered in field surveys. Bogg's Lake hedge hyssop (State endangered) is restricted to vernal pool habitats. At least three other vernal pool species with

either candidate or CNPS 1B status could also occur; however, deterministic surveys have not been completed. Species with candidate or CNPS 1B status are not protected under the Endangered Species Act. Therefore impacts on them are not considered significant unless there is a "substantial" effect on the species. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15.)

Suitable habitat is reported to occur in the project site for a number of non-listed, special-status species, including dwarf downingia, legenere, and Sanford's arrowhead. Legenere and Sanford's arrowhead are both designated as a federal species of special concern. None of these species were observed during the preparation of wetland delineations for the project site, but the delineation was not prepared during the appropriate time of year to observe these plants. These plants are generally federal or State candidate species or have been included in the CNPS 1B list, which is intended to include only those species that appear to meet the criteria for federal or State listing; for these species only a "substantial" adverse effect would be considered a significant impact. Because specific surveys for these species were not performed, it is not possible to definitely conclude that the species do not occur on the project site. While the likelihood of these species being present and not detected is considered small, the potential impact is considered potentially significant, because there is not direct evidence that these species are not present. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15.)

The wetland mitigation plan developed for Section 404 permits proposes to purchase credits in an approved wetland mitigation fund as compensation for those lost as a result of developing the project site. However, because these species, if they are present, would be lost, this impact is considered potentially significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15.)

Mitigation Measures:

4.3-1: Purchase credits in an approved wetland mitigation fund or other mitigation required by the 404 permit to ensure no net loss of wetlands. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-15.)

Significance after Mitigation

Potentially significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-5: **Loss of vernal pool crustaceans habitat.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-16; Final EIR, p. 2-5.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with impacts to vernal pool fairy crustaceans. No mitigation is available to render the effect less than significant. The effect therefore remains potentially significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

At least one species of listed fairy shrimp has been observed in the project vicinity, and could be considered likely to occur in the vernal pool on the project site. No vernal pool tadpole shrimp were observed. The vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp are federally listed species and the "take" of these species is prohibited without specific authorization from the USFWS under Sections 7 or 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-16; Final EIR, p. 2-5; Final EIR, pp. 3-4 – 3-5.)

As an alternative to constructing new vernal pools, the project applicant has decided to purchase credits in a USFWS-approved mitigation bank to satisfy the needs for mitigation, in which case salvage and incorporation of inoculate would be not be required. While the magnitude of the impact would be reduced by the purchase of off-site credits, the species would still be lost due to project implementation. Therefore, the impact is considered potentially significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-16; Final EIR, p. 3-7.)

Mitigation Measures:

4.3-1: Purchase credits in an approved wetland mitigation fund or other mitigation required by the 404 permit to ensure no net loss of wetlands. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-16.)

Significance after Mitigation

Potentially significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-6: **Potential disturbance of Swainson's hawk and other legally protected raptors.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-16.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Special-status species evaluations on the project site concluded that grassland habitat on the site is considered suitable habitat for foraging raptors, including the Swainson's hawk. In addition, the existing grove of trees on the project site might support nest site for other raptors including the red tail hawk, red-shouldered hawk, and the great horned owl. There are no records of Swainson's hawk nests within the project site, and the existing grove of trees would not be considered suitable nesting habitat for the Swainson's hawk. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-16.)

Disturbance resulting in active nest abandonment, removal of an active nest or otherwise injuring, pursuing or killing a Swainson's hawk or other raptor would be prohibited under the California Endangered Species Act. To ensure that legally-protected birds-of-prey are not taken during project construction, to the extent possible, tree removals should occur during the period when raptors are not nesting (August through February). If removal of trees during the nesting season is unavoidable, pre-construction raptor nest surveys should be conducted to determine whether or not legally protected raptor nests are present in trees designated for removal. In the event that nests are present, appropriate protocols should be developed in consultation with DFG and followed during the removal or relocation of those nests. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts on the nesting raptor habitat to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-16 - 4.3-17.)

Mitigation Measures:

4.3-2: Conduct pre-construction nest survey and implement appropriate restrictions. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-16.)

To ensure that fully protected and raptor species are not injured or disturbed by construction in the vicinity of nesting habitat, the project applicant shall implement the following measures:

(a) When feasible, all tree removal shall occur between August 30 and March 15 to avoid the breeding season of any raptor species that could be using the area, and to discourage hawks from nesting in the vicinity of an upcoming construction area. This period may be modified with the authorization of the DFG, or

(b) Prior to the beginning of mass grading, including grading for major infrastructure improvements, during the period between March 15 to August 30, all trees within 350 feet of any grading or earthmoving activity shall be surveyed for active raptor nests by a qualified biologist. If active raptor nests are found, and the site is within 350 feet of potential construction activity, a fence shall be erected around the tree at a distance of up to 350 feet, depending on the species, from the edge of the canopy to prevent construction disturbance and intrusions on the nest area. The City shall determine the appropriate buffer. The City may consult with CDFG regarding the appropriate buffer distance.

(c) No construction vehicles shall be permitted within restricted areas (i.e., raptor protection zone), unless directly related to the management or protection of the legally protected species.

(d) In the event that a nest is abandoned, despite efforts to minimize disturbance, and if the nestlings are still alive, the developer shall contact CDFG and, subject to CDFG approval, fund the recovery and hacking (controlled release of captive reared young) of the nestling(s).

For tree removal, the following measure shall be implemented:

(e) If a legally protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 30, or until the adults and young of the year are no longer dependent on the nest site as determined by a qualified biologist.

(Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-18 - 4.3-19.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.3-7: Potential conflict with a proposed City of Roseville Habitat Conservation Plan. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-17.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The City of Roseville has not adopted a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The City is currently preparing to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the USFWS that addresses the area encompassed within the service boundaries of the new Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant. The MOU would allow all projects that have been approved by the City and have their entitlements to develop to move forward while meeting the mitigation responsibilities for impacts on federally listed endangered vernal pool species provided in the programmatic Biological Opinion (BO) issued to the USCOE by the USFWS. Under this MOU the City will commit to participate in preparation of a HCP in the future. The MOU is not yet a signed agreement; however, any future projects would have the ability to "opt" into the process if necessary. The proposed project would not present a conflict with the City's HCP, because the City has not yet prepared such a plan and the project would be incorporated into such a plan when prepared. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-17.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

Significance

Less than significant.

Cumulative Impact

The cumulative context for the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts on biological resources including habitat areas is development assumed to occur through buildout of the City through 2020 including all the Specific Plan areas, which includes those areas within the City's Sphere of Influence. A substantial change in habitat conditions would result as a consequence of the area transitioning into an urban environment with cumulative development. Similar impacts would result from other future development. The amount of undeveloped habitat available for wildlife use decreases as development occurs. As the amount of habitat decreases, wildlife species that are incompatible with the urban environment will be displaced. (Draft EIR, p. 5-5.)

Significant unavoidable impacts would occur from cumulative development with respect to the loss of annual grasslands and the loss of habitat potentially supporting sensitive plant and animal species in vernal pools. The General Plan contains numerous policies relating to protection and enhancement of biological resources including limiting access to sensitive areas. Impacts of cumulative development on biological resources would be reduced with implementation of existing General Plan policies and other existing biological regulatory programs (e.g., 404 permitting, endangered species protection, etc.). Nonetheless, significant cumulative impacts to biological resources would still occur. (Draft EIR, p. 5-6.)

D. AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Standards of Significance

Aesthetic and visual impacts are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Substantially change the existing visual character (day or night) and quality of the site and its surroundings, including alterations to the natural terrain or topography;
- Allow development that would be inconsistent with the City's General Plan and Community Design Guidelines; or
- Create new sources of light and/or glare that would directly illuminate adjacent and nearby residences or public uses and would affect nighttime views in the area.

(Draft EIR, p. 4.4-8.)

Impact 4.4-1: **Conversion of undeveloped landscape to urban development.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Finding:

No mitigation is available to render the effect less than significant. The effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

" \f D Implementation of Phase 3 would urbanize a segment of the undeveloped landscape that used to dominate south Placer County. The visual character of the proposed project site is dominated by open, rolling grasslands and is visible from a variety of viewpoints, primarily along Fiddyment Road. The area east of the project site is Phase 1 of the NRSP and is currently under construction designated for future residential and commercial uses. To the south of the project site is Phase 2 of the NRSP also slated for future residential development. To a certain extent, development of the site would be an extension of this urban edge. Nonetheless, implementation of Phase 3 would substantially and permanently alter the visual character of the area by introducing a roadway network, residential uses, a school, and other urban facilities into an undeveloped area. This is considered a significant impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Phase 3 would retain approximately 13.6-acres of land designated for both active and passive park uses. However, the majority of grasslands on the site would be developed, so that the undeveloped character of the area would be lost. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

The visual character of Phase 3 would be subject to the Roseville Community Design Guidelines, and the NRSP Design Guidelines, which address the size, type and treatment of buildings, setbacks, landscaping, and so on. While these standards would beneficially direct the scale and consistency of architecture, as well as the configuration of site improvements and landscaping, they would not preserve the existing undeveloped character of the site. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Mitigation Measures:

None available. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Significance after Mitigation

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.4-2: **Disturbance of Plan Area residents due to artificial light and glare.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Within Phase 3, new residential development would require lights in and around buildings for both safety and convenience. The introduction of artificial light into a rural area contributes to the change in that area's character. In addition, lighting can be a nuisance if it spills into backyards or homes, as it can interfere with sleeping, watching television or other activities. The City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines, and the NRSP Design Guidelines specify that "cut-off" light fixtures be used. These fixtures are screened to direct light into specific areas and prevent it from spilling into areas where it is not required. For example, with cut-off fixtures, a security light can be directed entirely toward the parking area and "cut-off" at the fence line. With the use of cut-off lights, the impact on surrounding land uses would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Glare is caused by light reflections from pavement, vehicles and building materials such as reflective glass and polished surfaces. During daylight hours, the amount of existing glare depends upon the intensity and direction of sunlight; at night, artificial lighting can create glare. Particularly in commercial and business/professional areas, windows comprise a large proportion of building surfaces, creating the potential for glare which would increase with the use of reflective coatings and reflective building materials. The problem is most noticeable with large buildings that have reflective surfaces. Residential uses, such as those anticipated under the proposed project, are not likely to be large enough to generate substantial glare. Therefore, this impact is less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.4-9.)

Significance

Less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative context for the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts on visual quality is the City of Roseville and surrounding area.

The proposed project would contribute to the cumulative loss of open, undeveloped areas. The landscape and visual character of the region is being substantially altered, because much of the land slated for development under the proposed and related projects is currently undeveloped and naturally scenic. The conversion of open space and the alteration of the existing landscape would be widespread if all related projects are developed. This is considered a significant cumulative impact. (Draft EIR, p. 5-6.)

E. TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

Standards of Significance

Traffic and circulation impacts are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Not meet the General Plan's level of service policy. The proposed project is considered to have a significant impact on those intersections that would operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS "C" or better) under the No Project Alternative, but would operate at LOS "D" or worse under the proposed project and thus require additional mitigation;

- Result in an inability of existing planned transit services to meet the needs of the proposed project, which includes helping the City meet its level of service standard, transportation systems management standards and air quality goals; or

- Result in planned bicycle facilities that would not meet the needs of the proposed project, or the policies and guidelines of the Bikeway Master Plan.

(Draft EIR, p. 7-2.)

Impact 4.5-1: **The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on City of Roseville roadways, but would not cause any intersection to operate at LOS "D" or worse that would operate at LOS "C" or better under the No Project scenario. Under the "No School" version of the project would, however, cause an unacceptable level of service at the Washington/Pleasant Grove intersection.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-28.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.) Under the "no school" version of the project, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Development of the proposed project would contribute an estimated 6,740 additional daily vehicle trips to the northwestern area of the City. These trips increase traffic volumes on roadways serving the project area, particularly Fiddyment Road and Blue Oaks Boulevard. Some trips would remain internal to the project, such as residents of the proposed project traveling to and from the elementary school in the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-28; Final EIR, p. 3-16.)

The p.m. peak hour intersection analysis indicates that the proposed project (which includes an elementary school site) would not cause any intersection to operate at LOS "D" or worse, that would operate at LOS "C" or better under the No Project scenario. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-28.)

The proposed project without the school would contain 10 fewer dwelling units (669), and would generate 690 fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project with the school. However, the lack of an elementary school would cause the school-related trips from residents of the proposed project to travel to a school outside the project site, probably in the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 1 area. The redistribution of trips due to this change in the project description would cause an unacceptable level of service at one intersection: Washington Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard. This project option would not cause any other intersection to operate at LOS "D" or worse, that would operated at LOS "C" or better under the No Project scenario. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-28.)

Under the Future Baseline (2015 Market/No Project) scenario, the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard would operate at LOS "C" (V/C .81) during the p.m. peak hour. This analysis assumes the same geometry as the City's CIP (consisting of three through lanes and an exclusive right turn lane on all approaches, dual left turns on the northbound and southbound approaches, and triple left turns on the eastbound and westbound approaches). Under the proposed project without school scenario, which contains 10 fewer dwelling units than the proposed project, this intersection would operate at LOS "D" (V/C .82) during the p.m. peak hour, assuming the same intersection geometry. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-28.)

A feasible improvement to this intersection would involve a fourth westbound through lane. This improvement would allow the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard to operate at LOS "C" or better conditions under the project without school option. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-28.)

Mitigation:

None required if the school is included.

Under the "no school" scenario, the following mitigation would be implemented:

4.5-1: If the No School Option is selected, the City shall update Long-Range Transit Master Plan. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.) Development of the proposed project shall be included as part of the Long Range Transit Master Plan and shall be consistent with the applicable General Plan transit policies in the City's Circulation Element. The City shall revise the CIP to add a fourth westbound through lane to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. With this improvement, the intersection of Pleasant Grove and Washington will operate at LOS C or better. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.5-38 - 39.)

Significance

Less than significant.

Impact 4.5-2: **The proposed project would contribute to an increase in traffic volumes on State highways.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-31.)

Finding:
Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The analysis shows that I-80 through Roseville would operate at LOS "F" conditions under the 2015 Market/No Project scenario west of SR 65. The proposed project would not significantly increase traffic volumes on State highways. The changes in traffic volumes on State highways associated with the proposed project are low due to: 1) the distance between the proposed project and I-80, 2) future congestion on I-80, and 3) the regional redistribution of travel that is forecasted by the City's travel demand model. The travel model does not simply add traffic traveling to and from the proposed project to the 2015 Market/No Project scenario, but rather redefines the origin and destination of all travel in the region in response to the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-31.)

Due to congestion on I-80 under the 2015 Market No Project scenario, travel speeds would be very low during peak periods. The travel model's trip distribution and traffic assignment process accounts for that congestion and has forecasted limited increases in traffic on I-80 caused by the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-31.)

The poor level of service anticipated on I-80 under the 2015 Market/No Project scenario could be improved by the addition of HOV lanes, ramp metering (throughout the I-80 corridor) and regional TSM elements. Such improvements and measures should be resolved on a regional level, such as the on-going I-80 Corridor Major Investment Study being conducted by SACOG, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) and Caltrans. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-31.)

An analysis of p.m. peak hour intersection level of service was also conducted for intersections of state highway ramps with the adjacent roadway system and is shown in Table 4.5-12 of the Draft EIR. This analysis indicates that the proposed project would not cause any of these intersections to operate at LOS "D" or worse. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-31.)

The additional traffic volumes generated by the proposed project would not cause any significant change in the level of service on the State highway system compared to conditions under the Future Baseline (2015 Market/No Project) scenario. Therefore, the proposed project represents a less than significant impact to State highways. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-34.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-31.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.5-3: **The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Placer County roadways.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-34.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The impacts of the proposed project on roadways within the unincorporated areas of Placer County were evaluated using the County's 2010 travel model and assumptions, per the Settlement Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Roseville and Placer County. The County's General Plan Model assumes the roadway system depicted in the County's 2010 CIP. That system assumes that Sunset Boulevard would be extended to Fiddyment Road just north of the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-34.)

The planning assumptions for the proposed project were used to evaluate impacts on County roadways in place of those used in the County's 2010 model. The proposed project would generate approximately 6,740 average daily vehicle trips. By comparison, the County's General Plan model assumed no vehicle trips would be generated by the same area. Daily traffic volumes were forecast using the County's travel demand model and analyzed using the level of service methodology from the County General Plan EIR. The proposed project would not cause any roadway segment in unincorporated Placer County to operate at LOS "D" or worse conditions. Therefore, the impact is less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-34.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.5-4: **The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on City of Rocklin roadways.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-35.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The additional traffic volumes generated by the proposed project would increase daily traffic volumes on Sunset Boulevard east of SR 65 by approximately 100 vehicles per day and on Blue Oaks Boulevard east of SR 65 by approximately 300 vehicles per day. The proposed project would not increase daily traffic volumes on roadways in Rocklin by more than one percent compared to the 2015 Market/No Project scenario. An analysis of the 2015 Market/No Project scenario indicates that all of the roadways in Rocklin would operate at LOS "C" or better in 2015. The proposed project would not cause any of Rocklin's roadways to operate at LOS "D" or worse. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on City of Rocklin roadways is considered to be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-35.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-35.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-35.)

Impact 4.5-5: **The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sutter County roadways.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-35.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

It was determined that daily traffic volumes on Baseline Road at the Placer/Sutter County line would increase by roughly 100 vehicles per day (from 19,400 to 19,500) due to the proposed project. Daily traffic volumes on both Sunset West Boulevard (which becomes Howsley Road upon entering Sutter County) and Catlett Road were forecast to remain the same as the No Project Alternative. The 1999 MTP calls for Baseline Road to be widened to four lanes between Watt Avenue and the Placer County line and that Riego Road would have four lanes from the Placer County Line to SR 70/99. Four lanes on Riego Road would provide level of service "C" or better under 2015 Market conditions, including the proposed project. If Riego Road is not widened to four lanes, it would operate at LOS "F" conditions with or without the proposed project under 2015 Market conditions. The MTP also calls for construction of an interchange at Riego Road and SR 70/99. This interchange would provide LOS C or better operations at this

location under 2015 Market conditions, including the proposed project. Without this interchange, or major at-grade improvements, the intersection of Riego Road and SR 70/99 would operate at LOS F conditions with or without the proposed project under 2015 Market conditions. Therefore, the impact on Sutter County roadways is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-36.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-35.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.5-6: **The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Fiddyment Road exacerbating an existing safety hazard.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The annexation of Fiddyment Road by the City of Roseville is not included in the project description and is not part of the proposed project. If in the future Fiddyment Road is annexed to the City, the annexation would require approval of the Placer County LAFCO. In the Subsequent EIR prepared for the NRSP Phase 2, a potential realignment of Fiddyment Road was evaluated as part of a project alternative. Under this alternative, Fiddyment Road would be moved west of its current alignment between the south end of the proposed project and its existing crossing of Pleasant Grove Creek. The new 2,500 foot long segment assumed in that alternative would replace two existing 90-degree curves with a long "S" curve. The City of Roseville and Placer County have had discussions about this type of realignment and its implementation may occur in the future. However, the evaluation of the proposed project assumes the existing alignment of Fiddyment Road. The proposed project would increase traffic on Fiddyment Road north of Blue Oaks Boulevard adjacent to the project from 5,700 daily vehicle trips to 6,100 daily vehicle trips. This represents an increase of approximately 9 percent. The increase in traffic volumes on Placer County roadways including Fiddyment Road would not result in an unacceptable LOS; therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.5-7: **The proposed project would increase demand for transit service (both bus and light rail).** (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The City currently has limited transit services. The travel demand forecasts in the General Plan Update EIR included extension of light rail transit to Roseville, as well as a substantial increase in the local bus system within the City. The bus system assumed for that analysis was the same as that used by Sacramento Regional Transit for its long-range Systems Planning Study. In 1992, a Long-Range Transit Master Plan was developed for the City to guide the development of intra-city and inter-city transit service through the year 2010. This plan did not consider bus service to the area of the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.)

It is estimated that the average percentage of transit use in the City of Roseville would not exceed one or two percent of total daily traffic in the year 2010. The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 6,740 daily vehicle trips, so no more than 130 daily trips (approximately 20 p.m. peak hour trips) would be expected to use transit if it were available to the proposed project. This represents a less-than-significant portion of the overall daily trips that would use the transportation system in the vicinity of the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.)

Transit service would be available to transit dependent riders in the proposed project through Roseville Transit Services RADAR. The City's Long Range Master Transit Plan was recently updated and included an analysis of the transit demand under the current General Plan. Typically, fixed route service is needed along major arterials and is implemented when demand warrants it and funding is available. Should demand for fixed-route service to the proposed project ever become sufficient, the City would have to determine if it would be more feasible to alter existing transit routes or establish new service; such decisions would likely be made as part of a future update to the Long Range Master Transit Plan, should fixed route transit ever be determined to be warranted. The City's Long Range Transit Master Plan would be updated not only to include bus service to the proposed project, but also to identify a funding source to which the project and other areas served by transit can contribute their fair share towards the capital and operating expenses. This impact is considered to be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-38.)

Mitigation Measures:

4.5-2: If the No School Option is selected, the City shall update Long-Range Transit Master Plan. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-37.) Development of the proposed project shall be included as part of the Long Range Transit Master Plan and shall be consistent with the applicable General Plan transit policies in the City's Circulation Element. The City shall revise the CIP to add a fourth westbound through lane to Pleasant Grove Boulevard. With this improvement, the intersection of Pleasant Grove and Washington will operate at LOS C or better. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-39.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.5-8: The proposed project would increase demand for transportation-related bicycle trips. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-38.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The City's Bicycle Master Plan specifies that Class II bike lanes will be included on several arterials in the vicinity of the proposed project, including:

- Fiddyment Road,
- Blue Oaks Boulevard,
- Diamond Creek Boulevard, and
- Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard.

The proposed project also identifies each of the above roadways as bicycle commuter routes. The project could result in a substantial demand for safe and convenient pedestrian/bicycle facilities by residents and employees of the proposed project for primarily transportation-related purposes. According to the project description, a pedestrian and bikeway system would be incorporated that will allow travel throughout the project site and provide linkage to the City's planned bikeway system. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-38.)

The project applicant has included a network of bicycle facilities to accommodate travel through the proposed project site and provide linkage to the City's proposed bikeway system. No further improvements are required in order to satisfy the City's General Plan policies regarding bicycle transportation. The Bicycle Master Plan should be updated to reflect proposed bicycle facilities within the NRSP 3. Impacts to bicycle facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-38.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.5-38.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts related to transportation are anticipated to be significant with or without implementation of the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 5-11.)

F. AIR QUALITY

Standards of Significance

A project will normally result in significant air quality impacts if it would:

- Cause or contribute to local carbon monoxide concentrations exceeding 20 parts per million (ppm) over a 1-hour averaging period or 9 ppm over an 8-hour averaging period at worst-case locations near congested intersections;

- Result in emissions from all project-related sources (including mobile sources) that exceed the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's New Source Review Rule. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District has not developed thresholds to determine the significance of air quality impacts under the CEQA. However, its New Source Review Rule contains the following thresholds for application of best available control technology on new and modified sources:

Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	82 pounds per day
Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)	82 pounds per day
Particulate Matter < 10 microns (PM_{10})	82 pounds per day
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	550 pounds per day

  Emissions exceeding these values could have a significant effect on regional air quality and attainment of California air quality standards;

- The project would be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan or relevant air quality plans; or

- Result in emissions of criteria air pollutants or toxic air contaminants emitted from existing or proposed sources that could substantially affect sensitive receptors.

  (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-10.)

Impact 4.6-1: **Short-term construction-related air pollutant emissions.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-10.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that substantially lessen, and avoid the long-term effect, however, do not avoid the short-term significant environmental effect associated with impacts to construction-related air pollutant emissions. No mitigation is available to render the short-term effect less than significant. The short-term effect therefore remains potentially significant and unavoidable, however the long-term will be reduced to less then significant.

Explanation:

Equipment and vehicles used during the grading portion of Phase 3 construction would temporarily increase particulate emissions during clearing of vegetation, excavation, and grading. In addition, construction vehicles traveling on unpaved surfaces generate dust, as does wind blowing over exposed earth. The exhaust of the powered equipment and vehicles would emit a variety of different pollutants, most importantly reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide, as well as small amounts of particulate matter. In addition, application of architectural coatings and asphalt results in short-term emissions of reactive organic gases. Such emissions could contribute to regional air pollution problems and (particularly for particulate matter and carbon monoxide) locally elevated pollutant concentrations that could affect nearby receptors. Such receptors could include residents of existing adjacent homes, future homes adjacent to the project site, and future homes within the proposed project. Potentially vulnerable off-site residences would include those of the NRSP Phase 1 and Phase 2 located adjacent to the proposed project site. Project residential and parkland uses would be affected as subsequent phases of the proposed project are constructed. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-10 - 4.6-11.)

Compliance with the City's Grading Ordinance would help to reduce particulate emissions during grading and site preparation, and exhaust emissions from mobile and stationary equipment. In addition, compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 would ensure all measures are taken to minimize construction emissions. However, after mitigation, impacts would remain short-term significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-11.)

Mitigation Measures:

4.6-1: Prepare a Construction Control Emissions Plan.

To reduce construction-generated particulate emissions, the contractor shall prepare a construction control Emissions Plan in consultation with the Placer County APCD that shall include the following requirements, if feasible.

(I) The project applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District for approval prior to ground breaking.

(ii) The contractor shall water as indicated by City inspectors to keep all earth surfaces moist during clearing, grading, earthmoving, and other site preparation activities.

(iii) The contractor shall sweep streets within and adjacent to the project as needed or as directed by City inspectors.

(iv) The contractor shall schedule clearing, grading and earthmoving activities during periods of low wind speeds, and restrict those construction activities during high wind conditions (wind speeds greater than 20 mph average during an hour).

(v) The contractor shall not engage in open burning of wood or vegetative waste from project construction. This waste shall be chipped, mulched, and converted to biomass fuel.

(vi) The contractor shall use low nitrogen oxide generating equipment, if feasible.

(viii) The contractor shall maintain construction equipment per the manufacturer's guidelines.

(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-14.)

Significance after Mitigation

Short-term significant and unavoidable, but less than significant long-term impact.

Impact 4.6-2: Operational air pollutant emissions. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-11.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with impacts to operational air pollutant emissions. No mitigation is available to render the effect less than significant. The effect therefore remains potentially significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Project development would result in air pollutant emissions from project-generated motor vehicle trips and stationary sources, such as wood-burning stoves and fireplaces. Projected emissions associated with the project would not change significantly if the school site is not included as part of the project, because the number of residential units would be slightly reduced. Project-related emissions of nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, and particulate matter would be expected to exceed significance thresholds. Residential landscaping equipment powered by small combustion engines would also contribute to pollutant emissions. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-11.)

The National Electric Code requires that two external outlets be provided in the front and back of new residences, which facilitates the use of electric landscaping equipment. The use of electric equipment would reduce some potential emissions. Mitigation Measures 4.6-2(a), and 4.6-2(b) would further reduce project-related nitrogen oxide and particulate matter emissions; however, they would not reduce this impact below the significance threshold. Therefore, the impact on air quality would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-12.)

Mitigation Measures:

4.6-2(a): Provide public awareness materials.

Require developers to include educational materials regarding air quality in homeowners/renters packages for all residential occupants. Information contained in these packages should, at a minimum, provide information regarding transportation control measures. These materials should inform project occupants of transportation-related amenities at the project site, including ridesharing and mass transit availability and schedules. The project applicant should also provide maps showing pedestrian and bicycle paths to community centers, shopping areas, recreational areas, and schools. These materials would help reduce project-related air quality impacts by influencing occupant driving habits, although impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, 4.6-15.)

4.6-2(b): Require EPA-certified wood burning devices.

All wood-burning devices in project residences should be EPA-certified devices. EPA-certified devices are commonly available and would help reduce project-related air quality impacts by producing fewer particulate and combustion-related emissions than non-certified devices. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, 4.6-15.)

Significance after Mitigation

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.6-3: **Carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections during project operation.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-12.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Project development would result in carbon monoxide emissions from project-generated motor vehicle trips and stationary sources, such as wood-burning stoves and fireplaces. During summer, project-related operations would result in approximately 505 pounds of carbon monoxide per day. About 497 pounds of this would be emitted from mobile sources, while the remaining 8 pounds would be emitted from stationary sources. During winter, project-related operations would result in approximately 3,220 pounds of carbon monoxide per day. About 950 pounds of this would be emitted from mobile sources, which emit more carbon monoxide during winter. The remaining 2,270 pounds would be emitted primarily from wood-burning stoves and fireplaces. Carbon monoxide concentrations in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin have not violated the ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide since 1993. For this reason, project-related carbon monoxide emissions would not be expected to substantially affect regional carbon monoxide levels. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-12.)

Carbon monoxide emissions at congested intersections, where motor vehicles slow down and idle, can at times exceed the 20 ppm 1-hour standard or the 9 ppm 8-hour standard under certain conditions. However, according to the traffic analysis presented in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIR, Traffic and Circulation, intersections near the project site are relatively uncongested. Carbon monoxide concentrations are better able to dissipate at less congested intersections. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-12.)

Compared to year 2015 conditions without the project, the transportation analysis indicates that the project would not cause the level of service at any study intersection to drop below LOS D. According to a 1998 report by the Institute of Transportation Studies, *Modeling Carbon Monoxide Concentrations at Level-of-Service D Intersections,* intersections in the Sacramento area operating at LOS D or better rarely, if ever, exceed carbon monoxide concentration standards. Therefore, carbon monoxide concentrations at these intersections are unlikely to exceed the 1-hour and 8-hour ambient air quality standards. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-12.)

In the Roseville area, the intersection of Harding Boulevard and Douglas Boulevard and the intersection of Sunrise Avenue and Cirby Way would both operate at LOS E with or without the project. The vehicle to capacity ratio at these intersections would be the same or less with the project. However, if the school were not built, the volume to capacity ratio at Sunrise Avenue and Cirby Way would increase by 0.01, a relatively small amount. Carbon monoxide concentrations at Sunrise Avenue and Cirby Way have been

estimated using the CALINE89 model provided by the California Air Resources Board. As required by the model protocol, numerous conservative assumptions were made in the analysis; therefore, the carbon monoxide estimates tend to overstate the actual carbon monoxide concentrations that could be exist. The results study found that, without the project, the 1-hour average carbon monoxide concentration at Sunrise Avenue and Cirby Way could be as much as 11.8 ppm with the project in 2015, and the 8-hour average concentration could be as much as 7.1 ppm. These values are far below the 20 ppm and 9 ppm standards for carbon monoxide concentrations. For this reason, the relatively small project-related increase of 0.01 in the volume to capacity ratio (which would only be the case if the school were not built) would not be expected to result in violations of the carbon monoxide standards. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-12 - 4.6-13.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-12.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.6-4: **Exposure of project residents to stationary source pollutants.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-13.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Future residents of the proposed project would be exposed to air pollutant emissions, including criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants, from industrial areas north and east of the project site. No on-site stationary sources are included within the proposed project. The effects of criteria pollutants from these stationary sources on project residents would be minor relative to local carbon monoxide impacts from nearby roadway traffic, area-wide effects of particulate emissions, and regional ozone. In addition, new or revised stationary sources must obtain a permit from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District before they can operate. Any new stationary sources would be required to comply with Placer County Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations, which require emissions controls when necessary. New or revised stationary toxic air contaminant sources would also need to obtain a permit from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District and complete a health risk assessment before being allowed to operate. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-13.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-13.)

Significance after Mitigation
Less than significant.

Impact 4.6-5: **Inconsistency with Air Quality Attainment Plans.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-13.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the significant environmental effect associated with impacts to Air Quality Attainment Plans. No mitigation is available to render the effect less than significant. The effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Vehicle emissions are the primary sources of reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides. During winter, stationary sources, such as wood-burning stoves and fireplaces, are also substantial sources of particulate matter. These criteria air pollutants are addressed in regional and county air quality plans. The 1994 Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan (upon which the State Implementation Plan is based in part) and the 1991 Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan (updated in 1994 and 1997) anticipate a certain amount of growth in the region and contain measures to off-set the effects of this growth. The growth projections on which these plans were based were developed by the SACOG. Current growth forecasts are now higher than expected in 1994 and 1997. The increment of growth associated with Phase 3 of the NRSP was not anticipated when these plans were prepared. Furthermore, the residential development proposed as part of NRSP Phase 3 exceeds the City of Roseville's current allocation of residential units. For this reason, project-related growth would make it more difficult for the region to attain the federal and State ambient air quality standards, and efforts to implement the existing plans for attainment could be unsuccessful because they did not account for this level of growth. For this reason, these inconsistencies with relevant air quality plans would be considered a significant impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-13.)

Compliance with the City's Transportation Systems Management Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6-2(a) and (b) would help to lessen this impact, but because the project would remain inconsistent with relevant air quality plans, it would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-14.)

Mitigation Measures:

Implement above Mitigation Measures 4.6-2(a) and (b). (Draft EIR, p. 4.6-13.)

Significance after Mitigation

Significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative Impacts
The cumulative air quality context is the Sacramento Valley Air Basin.

Cumulative development would result in multiple construction projects occurring at the same time. Emissions from project-related earth-moving activities, heavy equipment operations, construction worker commutes, and other construction-related activities (including paving roads and parking lots and painting new homes) could include reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter in excess of significance thresholds. Therefore, during construction, the combined emissions of simultaneous construction projects would also be expected to exceed significance thresholds. The project would contribute to these cumulative impacts on a temporary basis. The Air Quality Element of the City of Roseville's General Plan contains provisions related to controlling construction emissions. These controls are intended to reduce construction-related impacts. Implementing Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 would also alleviate the project's contribution to cumulative impacts. Nevertheless, the cumulative impact of multiple construction projects occurring at once would likely be significant. (Draft EIR, p. 5-11.)

The proposed project would contribute to cumulative emissions of ozone precursors (i.e., reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides) and particulate matter from automobiles and other mobile and stationary sources. Vehicles are substantial sources of reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides. Stationary sources, such as residential wood-burning stoves and fireplaces, and motor vehicles are substantial sources of particulate matter. Criteria air pollutants are addressed in regional and county air quality plans, but current growth forecasts for the Roseville area are now higher than expected when the existing plans were prepared. These plans did not anticipate the increment of growth associated with Phase 3 of the NRSP. For this reason, project-related growth would make it more difficult for the region to attain the federal and state ambient air quality standards. The City of Roseville's General Plan contains goals and policies intended to minimize air quality impacts. Compliance with the City's Transportation Systems Management Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6-2(a) and (b) would also help to lessen this impact. However, these measures would not be expected to avoid a significant cumulative impact on regional air quality resulting from the combined effects of the current amount of growth forecast for the region. (Draft EIR, p. 5-11.)

Background carbon monoxide concentrations in the Roseville area are relatively low compared to the established concentration standards. The highest 1-hour and 8-hour concentrations measured at nearby California Air Resources Board monitoring stations during the last three years were 5.7 ppm and 3.6 ppm. (The standards are 20 ppm and 9

ppm.) By itself, the project would not cause local carbon monoxide concentrations at any study intersection to exceed the standards. Cumulative development in the Roseville area could, however, increase traffic at some of the intersections affected by the project. Improvements in the engine efficiencies of new vehicles and the eventual retirement of older, more polluting vehicles would tend to offset increases in carbon monoxide emissions due to cumulative traffic increases. Furthermore, the CALINE89 model has been used for some intersections in the Roseville area that operate at LOS E and F under cumulative conditions. The results demonstrate that local carbon monoxide levels at these intersections would not exceed significance standards. Therefore, cumulative carbon monoxide emissions at Roseville area intersections would not be expected to result in a significant cumulative impact. (Draft EIR, p. 5-12.)

G. NOISE

Standards of Significance

An impact would be significant if the project would:

Generate an increase in traffic noise levels of greater than three (3) dBA (which is the lowest change in noise levels audible to the human ear) and has the potential to cause or contribute to noise levels at existing or approved land uses exceeding the City standards summarized in Table 4.7-4 of the Draft EIR.

- Introduce land uses into areas where transportation noise exceeds the maximum allowable levels indicated in Table 4.7-4 of the Draft EIR.

- Introduce land uses into areas where non-transportation-source noise exceeds the maximum allowable levels indicated in Table 4.7-5 of the Draft EIR.

- Allow noise-generating project construction activities to occur outside the allowable City of Roseville Noise Ordinance hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. weekends.

Impact 4.7-1: **Temporary increases in noise levels due to earthmoving and general construction activities.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-12.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Construction activities would temporarily increase noise levels in the vicinity of the project site due to earthmoving, materials handling, stationary and impact equipment, and vehicles which would generate noise during site clearing, excavation, grading, general

building, roadway, and pipeline construction related to residential and recreational areas associated with the proposed project. Construction vehicle traffic traveling to the area would also generate noise. It is anticipated that construction traffic would access the project site from several major roadways such as Blue Oaks Boulevard and Fiddyment Road. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-12.)

These activities could disturb residents of existing adjacent homes, future homes adjacent to the project site, and future planned residential uses within the project site. Potentially vulnerable off-site residences would include those along the northern edge of the NRSP Phase 2 and the western edge of the NRSP Phase 1 adjacent to the project site. Project residential land uses would be affected as subsequent portions of the project site are constructed. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-14.)

Actual noise levels experienced at residences would be influenced by several different kinds of equipment. Since the number, type and location of each kind of equipment that will be used is not known, it is not possible to precisely predict the noise level at nearby residences. Nevertheless, generalized noise level estimates were made assuming one tractor, one grader, one loader, one backhoe and one truck all operating at the same time without feasible noise control and within an area of 28,600 square feet. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-14.)

The model HICNOM was used in the area source mode and noise levels were calculated for four locations, 10, 50, 100 and 500 feet from the construction area. Calculated worst-case temporary noise levels of 90 dBA could be expected for receptors 10 feet from the construction area, 86 dBA for receptors 50 feet from the construction area, 83 dBA for receptors 100 feet from the construction area, and 72 dBA for receptors 500 feet from the construction area. This is assuming that there is direct line-of-sight between the noise sources and the exterior receptor. Noise levels for receptors inside buildings with the windows closed would be about 20-25 dBA lower. Project construction must comply with the provisions of Section 9.24. 090.E.3 of the City code, which requires all impact tools and equipment to have intake and exhaust mufflers approved by the City's Public Works Director and any pavement breakers and jackhammers be equipped with acoustically alternating shields or shrouds to accomplish maximum noise attenuation. The Director of Public Works can also prescribe specific methods for maximum noise attenuation. Because noise levels at sensitive receptors would not exceed City standards, construction activities would be short-term in nature, and project construction would comply with the provisions of the City code, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-14.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-12.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.7-2: **Exposure of project receptors to non-transportation-source noise.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-14.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Peaking Facility: Based on the noise measurements at the North Roseville Peaking Facility, facility-generated L_{eq}'s at the nearest potential Phase 3 land uses would likely be less than 50 dBA, even under very favorable noise propagation conditions. More commonly, facility-generated L_{eq}'s would probably be in the low 40's at this location, compared with the City's 50-dBA daytime standard for non-transportation noise sources. Furthermore, as stated previously, the facility is most likely to be operating while ambient temperatures are very high; under these conditions, area residents would most likely be indoors, and therefore less exposed to the noise impacts. However, the use of the Peaking facility may increase over time, including use in nighttime hours. Given the distance of Phase 3 from the facility, it is not anticipated to exceed City noise standards. While the Peaking Facility is the source of noise, it is the proposed project that could create an impact by locating sensitive receptors (residences) in proximity of the noise source. Nonetheless, due to the circumstances described above, and the small proportion of the time during which this source would operate, noise impacts from this source are considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-14 - 4.7-15.)

Industrial Sources: Existing light industrial uses in the vicinity of the project site would not create enough noise to affect the proposed project. In addition, future industrial uses in the vicinity of the project will need to comply with City/County noise standards to minimize any noise impacts on residential uses. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-14.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.7-3: **Traffic noise level increases along roadways near off-site residential areas.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Development within the project site is predicted to generate noise level increases of well below 3 dB on area roadways. Table 4.7-6 of the Draft EIR shows that development of the proposed project would result in noise level increases relative to No Project conditions which range from -0.1 to +0.7 dB. These levels are well below the 3 dB standard for existing noise-sensitive land uses. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.7-4: **Exposure of future residences within the Phase 3 Plan Area to transportation noise.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Table 4.7-8 of the Draft EIR shows that future (cumulative) traffic noise levels within the project site would exceed 60 dB Ldn at the reference 100 foot location along the roadway segments that would directly affect the project development. In the absence of intervening artificial or topographic barriers, noise levels along these roadway segments could exceed applicable City standards (e.g., 60 dBA for residential development) at proposed residential uses. In the absence of specific design for roadways and residential development in the project site, this exposure is considered potentially significant. An initial discussion of setback and/or noise barrier options is presented in Mitigation Measure 4.7-1, with further acoustical analysis called for to establish specific mitigation design. Additional acoustical analysis is recommended where barriers would be included in the mitigation design. This mitigation would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Mitigation Measures:

4.7-1: Provide appropriate noise attenuation, e.g., barriers and/or setbacks, based on site-specific acoustical analyses. (Draft EIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Noise impacts would result from the operation of construction equipment and from noise generated by vehicular traffic traveling to and from the 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 activities, the presence or absence 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 with cumulative development. While compliance with the City Noise Ordinance, which limits construction to daytime hours, would reduce noise impacts, there may be short periods when noise levels would be exceeded. Therefore, construction noise is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. (Draft EIR, p. 5-12.)

In the absence of intervening artificial or topographic barriers, noise levels along these roadway segments could exceed applicable City standards (e.g., 60 dBA for residential development) at proposed residential uses. In the absence of specific design for roadways and residential development in the project area, this exposure is considered potentially significant. For the internal roadways potentially affecting future project site land uses, an initial discussion of setback and/or noise barrier options is presented in Mitigation Measure 4.7-1, with further acoustical analysis to determine the appropriate setbacks and/or barriers needed to achieve the City standards. This mitigation would reduce the cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, p. 5-12.)

I. PUBLIC SERVICES

Standards of Significance

Public service impacts are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Result in an increased water demand greater than the anticipated supply, treatment capacity, and storage and distribution system capacity; or
- Allow development that would be inconsistent with the City's General Plan, and other City plans, policies, and ordinances.
- Result in an increased quantity of wastewater exceeding the City's collection, treatment or disposal capacities.
- Result in an increased demand for police protection services which could interfere with the ability of the police department to provide adequate services.

- Result in an increased demand for fire protection services which could substantially interfere with the ability of the fire department to provide adequate service.

- Substantially increase the public school student population exceeding current and planned school capacity.

- Fail to meet the required supply of neighborhood recreation and open space facilities.

(Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-10, 4.8-20, 4.8-27, 4.8-30, 4.8-35 and 4.8-42.)

Impact 4.8-1: **Increased demand of domestic water used in the City.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-10.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The proposed project includes the development of 99 medium-density residential units and 580 low-density residential units, a 13.6-acre park, and an elementary school on an 8-acre site. As shown below in Table 4.8-3 of the Draft EIR, the proposed development would generate an average day water demand of 513,923 gallons per day (gpd) or 0.51 mgd or 576 af/yr. The proposed project currently includes a school site. However, if the Roseville City School District (RCSD) decides at a later date not to include a school as part of the proposed project, the number of residential units would be reduced by 10 units for a total of 669 units. The proposed project without the school site would generate an average day demand of 488,340 gpd, or 0.49 mgd, or 547 af/yr, which represents a slight decrease when compared to the proposed project with the school site. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-11; Final EIR, pp. 3-2 – 3-3.)

Mitigation Measures:

Depending on which water purveyor serves the site, the applicant shall do one of the following:

<u>Option 1 (City of Roseville)</u>

4.8-1: (a) Contribute funds toward the recycle water system connecting Diamond Oaks Golf Course to the existing system;

(b) Retrofit the Diamond Oaks Golf Course irrigation system; and (c) Provide "fair share" of groundwater wells;

Option 2 (PCWA)

4.8-2: Obtain water supply from PCWA out of the 35,500 af American River allocation under compliance of PCWA's purveyor specific agreement;

Option 3 (SJWD)

4.8-3: Obtain water supply from SJWD out of the 25,000 af from the PCWA contract. The use of this supply would require dry year offsets through the use of groundwater supplies as outlined in SJWD's purveryor specific agreement.

(Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-10 - 4.8-11; Final EIR, p. 3-11.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.8-2: **Increased demand for water treatment and conveyance.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-14.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The City may purchase water from another provider to serve the proposed project. However, whether the City or another provider supplies the water to the project, the water would still be "wheeled" through the City's treatment and conveyance facilities. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-14.)

The City of Roseville Water Treatment Plant (WTP) can supply 48 mgd of potable water. However, under the City's current contract with the USBR, the maximum amount of water that can be conveyed to the City is 96 mgd. The City's 1997 maximum daily water demand was 39 mgd. Under the City's 2010 General Plan, excluding the proposed project, a maximum daily water demand of 91 mgd is anticipated, which would exceed the capacity of the City's existing treatment and conveyance facilities. The proposed project is anticipated to create an average daily demand for water of approximately 513,923 gpd, or 0.51 mgd, or 576 af/yr. This results in a maximum day demand of 1.02 mgd. This would increase the City's water demand at buildout of the General Plan to 92 mgd (55,476 af/yr) and further exceed the capacity of the City's existing treatment and conveyance facilities. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-15.)

Currently, the proposed project includes a school site. However, if the Roseville City School District decides at a later date not to include a school as part of the proposed project, the number of residential uses developed would be reduced by 10 units. The proposed project, without the school site, would create a daily demand for water of approximately 462,840 gpd, or 0.46 mgd, or 519 af/yr. This demand represents a slight decrease in water demand when compared to the proposed project with implementation of the school. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-15.)

A 12 mgd expansion of the City's treatment plant is planned for completion by 2001, bringing the treatment capacity to 60 mgd. A second 15 mgd expansion is planned and would be implemented sometime after 2001. This expansion would bring treatment capacity to 75 mgd. The City intends to collect additional fees to fund expansion of the plant beyond 75 mgd. In addition, the proposed project would comply with General Plan Policy F-5, which requires that all development provide for and pay a fair share of the cost for adequate water distribution, including plant expansions. If another water provider supplies water to the project, additional water would be treated at the WTP than previously assumed. However, the City has indicated that the City WTP would have adequate capacity to treat additional water and this development would pay the appropriate connection fees. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-15.)

Conveyance

A 12-inch water distribution line on the site would be constructed to serve the proposed project. The water line would connect to the 12-inch line in Neighborhood A (Phase 1 of the NRSP) and the 12-inch lines in Neighborhood C (Phase 2 of the NRSP). The proposed lines would be designed to accommodate 1.73 mgd peak hour and adequately serve the proposed project with or without construction of the school site. If another water provider supplies water to the project, an increase of water would be conveyed through the City's conveyance system. However, the City has indicated that the City's conveyance system would have adequate capacity to serve the increase of water. Additional fees would apply, due to reimbursement requirements to water lines conveying water through north central. Therefore, the impact on the conveyance system is considered to be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-15.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-14.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.8-3: **Increased use of recycled water.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-17.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project includes recycled water infrastructure to provide landscape irrigation for the proposed park. The proposed recycled water line would run north-south, on the western side of the project site. The proposed line would connect to the recycled water lines constructed in Phase 1 and 2 of the NRSP. The proposed project includes the infrastructure to provide recycled water, and the City can currently deliver up to 6.0 mgd of recycled water. Once the PGWWTP is operational, the City's recycled water supply and delivery capability would be increased and would be able to supply the proposed project. Any impact on the recycled water distribution system would be considered less than significant as potable water would be conserved, extending the City's water supply during emergency conditions or periods of drought. Further, the recycled water lines would be provided in existing and future roadways and the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 1 and 2 areas (see Figure 4.8-1 of the Draft EIR), which have been subject to environmental review. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-17.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-17.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Wastewater Project-Specific Impacts

Impact 4.8-4: **Increased demand on wastewater collection system.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-20.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project would increase average wastewater flows in the City's collection system by approximately 306,160 gallons per day (gpd) or 0.31 mgd. Peak daily wastewater flows would increase by 0.713 mgd. Because the increased demand on the

wastewater collection system from the proposed project would be accommodated, this impact would be considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-20, 4.8-23.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-20.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.8-5: **Increased demand on the wastewater treatment plant.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-23.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project would generate an average of 195,609 gpd or 0.2 mgd of wastewater to be treated, and a maximum of 0.5 mgd. As discussed above, the proposed project currently includes a school site. However, if the Roseville City School District decides at a later date not to include a school on the project site, the park would still be included and the number of residential units developed would be reduced by 10 units for a total of 669 units. The proposed project without development of the school site would generate 184,739 gpd of wastewater that would require treatment at the plant, as shown in Table 4.8-8 of the Draft EIR. This represents a decrease in treatment of wastewater at the plant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-23.)

The first 100 dwelling units of the proposed project could be temporarily served by the Dry Creek WWTP until the City constructs the new treatment plant on Pleasant Grove Creek. The PGWWTP is anticipated to be operational by the end of 2002. As discussed above, the first 100 units of the proposed project would be served by the Dry Creek WWTP on an interim basis through the wastewater distribution system installed in Neighborhood C. These 100 residential units would generate approximately 0.026 million gallons per day of wastewater flow to the Dry Creek WWTP. Upon completion of the new treatment plant, all wastewater flows from the proposed project would be directed to PGWWTP, which would reduce wastewater flows to the Dry Creek WWTP. Therefore, increased demand on both the Dry Creek WWTP during the interim and the PGWWTP would be considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-23.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-23.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Police Protection Services

Impact 4.8-6: **Increased demand for police protection services.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-27.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

The City does not have an adopted police-to-population ratio. Currently, the ratio of police to population is approximately 1.17 officers per 1,000 persons. The proposed project is anticipated to generate a population of approximately 1,725 new residents with development of 679 residential units. As discussed above, if the Roseville City School District decides at a later date not to include the school site, 669 residential units would be developed, which would generate 1,699 new residents. Based on maintaining the preferred ratio, development of the proposed project with out without the school site, would result in the need for approximately two additional officers. Revenues generated by sales tax and property tax, and other sources as a result of the project implementation would increase the City's general fund, which would be expected to partially pay for the additional law enforcement personnel required. The remaining amount would come from revenues in the City's general fund generated by sales tax and property tax from other development. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-27.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-27.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Fire Protection Services

Impact 4.8-7: **Increased demand on fire protection services.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-31.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

As part of the proposed project, annexation of the project site from Placer County to the City of Roseville would occur. At approval of the project, the Dry Creek Fire Protection District or the County Service Area 28 would no longer serve the project site. The RFD would serve the project site. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-31.)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in 580 low-density residential units and 99 medium-density residential units, generating an additional 1,725 residents. As discussed above, the Roseville City School District could decide at a later date not to include a school site as part of the proposed project. If this occurs, the number of residential units developed would be reduced by 10 units for a total of 669 units, which would result in 1,699 new residents. The proposed project, with or without the school on the project site, would result in the need for additional fire services. As discussed in the Setting, RFD currently maintains the standard of a four-minute response time, 80 percent of the time for fire emergency and basic life support. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-31.)

The applicant would be required to pay the Fire Service Construction Tax, which requires that 0.5 percent of the value of any new construction be collected as part of the building fee and designated for fire suppression and protection. These funds supplement the General Fund and are specifically intended for capital improvements. These funds would help provide additional fire protection resources. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-31.)

The proposed Blue Oaks Fire Station would serve the project, but a specific site has not been secured at this time. The proposed station would be located east on Blue Oaks Boulevard, between Woodcreek Oaks and Foothills Boulevard. Fire Station No. 5, located in close proximity to Neighborhood D of the NRSP area, would serve as the second responding engine for the proposed project. Although construction of an additional fire station in the vicinity would occur and a second responding engine in the project area exists, RFD has indicated that current response standards would not be met for the entire project site. Development of the proposed Blue Oaks Fire Station would allow RFD to maintain the standard of a four-minute response time, 80 percent of the time for almost half of the southern portion of the project site. Due to the location of the proposed fire station the response standards would not be met for the northern portion of the project site. However, the entire project site can be reached within six minutes, 80 percent of the time. In addition, RFD has indicated that over 60 percent of the calls they receive are medical calls, and they would be able to meet the response time by providing advanced life support services within four to six minutes, 90 percent of the time to the entire project site. It should be noted that RFD does not consider this a significant impact because of their ability to meet the emergency fire services standard for the entire NRSP project area (Phase 1, 2, and 3) and the City of Roseville. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-31.)

Because implementation of the Fire Service Construction Tax would help provide additional fire protection resources, construction of the Blue Oaks Fire Station would occur, and RFD does not consider this a significant impact, increased demand on fire protection services would be a less-than-significant impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-32)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-31.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Schools

Impact 4.8-8: **Increased demand for school services in the Roseville Joint Union High School District.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-35.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

There would be 161 additional students generated by the proposed project, which would require accommodation by the RJUHSD. It should be noted that the proposed project currently includes development of an elementary school site. If the Roseville City School District decides at a later date not to include a school site, the number of residential units developed would be reduced by 10 units for a total of 669 units. Under this option, 158 students would be generated. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-35.)

Currently, RJUHSD is operating at 95 percent capacity, and with the addition of the 161 students, District enrollment would increase to approximately 98 percent of capacity. If the school site is not included as part of the proposed project, 158 students would be generated and would increase District enrollment to approximately 98 percent capacity as well. All new development within the City is required to pay Stirling fees or school impact fees to help construct new schools and to purchase equipment, which may be, required to accommodate new students. Therefore, the landowners of the proposed development would be required to enter into a Mutual Benefit Agreement with the District for the payment of school impact fees. As discussed above in the Setting, the district is only allowed to collect additional fees in an amount, which would approximate 50 percent of the cost of additional facilities. The project would contribute its "fair share" of taxes (e.g., property tax), a portion of which would support schools. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-35.)

In addition, school fee mitigation agreements between the applicants and school districts assure that full funding will be available to provide land and construct the schools. RJUHSD would be able to accommodate the additional students generated by the proposed project. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-36.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-35.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 4.8-9: **Increased demand for school services in the Roseville City School District.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-36.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

There would be 349 additional elementary and junior high school students generated by the proposed project. As previously discussed, RCSD may decide to not include an elementary school on the project site. If the school site is not developed, 344 additional elementary and junior high school students would be generated. Currently, RCSD is operating at 90 percent capacity. The proposed project with or without the school site would increase the operational demand to 98 percent of capacity. Two elementary schools and one intermediate school would be developed as part of the NRSP that would increase the RCSD's capacity. The additional junior high schools students generated by the proposed project would be accommodated at the new junior high to be constructed in Neighborhood B. The proposed project would generate an additional 274 elementary school students with development of the school, and 270 students without development of the school. Existing and proposed schools in RCSD would accommodate these elementary school students. If the proposed project does not include development of a school on the project site, expansion of existing schools would be required in order to adequately serve the additional students. However, all new development within the City is required to pay Stirling fees or school impact fees to help construct new schools and to purchase equipment that may be required to accommodate new students. Therefore, the landowners of the proposed development would be required to enter into a Mutual Benefit Agreement with the District for the payment of school impact fees. As discussed above in the Setting, the district is only allowed to collect additional fees in an amount that would approximate 50 percent of the cost of additional facilities. The project would contribute its "fair share" of taxes (e.g., property tax), a portion of which would support

schools. In addition, school fee mitigation agreements between the applicants and school districts assure that full funding will be available to provide land and construct the schools. Therefore, increased demand for school services in the RCSD would be considered less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-36.)

If the elementary school is included as part of the proposed project, a school/park joint use arrangement could be made between the RCSD and the Roseville Parks and Recreation Department. The park and school would be jointly planned, and the arrangement would allow either entity to use both facilities. Through scheduling of activities and coordination of the RCSD and the Parks and Recreation Department, these facilities would also be open for public use. In the past, through the school/park joint use arrangements, entities have shared parking lots. If this arrangement is made, no additional impacts other than those already discussed in this EIR would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-37.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-36.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Parks and Recreation

Impact 4.8-10: **Increased demand for park facilities.** (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-42.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

Explanation:

Implementation of the proposed project would result in 1,725 new residents with development of the school or 1,699 residents without development of the school. The proposed project must comply with General Plan Policy PA-1, which requires 9 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. Based on the ratio of nine acres per 1,000 residents, the proposed project, with or without the school site, would need approximately 16 acres of new parks. The proposed project would include the development of a 13.6-acre, single neighborhood, Active Park. The size of this park may be reduced. This park would accommodate active sports, as well as passive and informal recreation. The park would provide picnic areas, children's play grounds, two basketball courts, two softball fields and a soccer field. A Class II bike path along the adjacent collector streets would connect this park to the Class I bike trail along Pleasant Grove Creek. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-42.)

The 13.6-acre park (or smaller if reduced) would be less than the ratio required by the City for the proposed project. However, NRSP Phases 1 and 2 also include the development of park uses. Phase 1 includes the development of approximately 88 acres (approximately 53 acres are required), and Phase 2 includes the development of approximately 35 acres (approximately 56 acres are required). Total park acreage to be provided by the NRSP Phases 1, 2 and 3 would be approximately 138 acres, which would exceed the ratio requirements for the entire NRSP by 13 acres. Therefore, if the park size is reduced, adequate park facilities for the NRSP Phases 1, 2 and 3 would be still be adequate. In addition, as described above in the Setting, parks and recreation facilities are funded through a variety of mechanisms. The Neighborhood and Community Park Fee and the City-Wide Park Fee would be collected from all residential units. The applicant and residents of the proposed project would require the dedication of land and to pay park development fees. Therefore, adequate park facilities would be provided and this impact is considered to be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-42.)

Mitigation Measures:

None required. (Draft EIR, p. 4.8-42.)

Significance after Mitigation

Less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The implementation of the proposed project, in conjunction with other regional development, is considered a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on water supplies. Because adequate water treatment plant capacity would be available for the proposed project regardless of whether the City supplies water to the site or not, significant cumulative impacts on water distribution are not expected to occur to water treatment capacity. Because adequate water distribution and conveyance facilities would be provided whether the City supplies water to the site or not, significant cumulative impacts on water distribution are not expected to occur. (Draft EIR, p. 5-14.)

With implementation of the wastewater treatment plant, cumulative demand would be a less-than-significant impact. The cumulative contribution associated with the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the cumulative impact on recycled water is less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 5-15.)

The proposed project and cumulative development would contribute to demand for police services. The expansion of police services is demand-responsive and with the implementation of existing policies and implementation measures, these facilities would continue to be adequately funded and provided based on evolving service goals. Therefore, the cumulative impact on police services would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 5-16.)

Given current policies and implementation measures, the cumulative impact on fire services would be considered less than significant. With the payment of the fees and the implementation of the General Plan policies, a significant cumulative impact on school services would not occur. Lastly, because existing General Plan policies require new parks and recreation facilities with new development, significant cumulative impacts are not expected to occur. (Draft EIR, p. 5-17.)

X.
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Where a lead agency has determined that, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, a project as proposed will still cause one or more significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, the agency, prior to approving the project as mitigated, must first determine whether, with respect to such impacts, there remain any project alternatives that are both environmentally superior and feasible within the meaning of CEQA. As noted earlier, in Section VI of these Findings, an alternative may be "infeasible" if it fails to fully promote the lead agency's underlying goals and objectives with respect to the project. Thus, "'feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." of a project. (City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; see also Sequoyah Hills, supra, 23 Cal.App.4th at p. 715.)

The detailed discussion in Section IX demonstrates that all significant environmental effects of the project have been either substantially lessened or avoided through the imposition of existing policies or regulations or by the adoption of additional, formal mitigation measures recommended in the EIR. Thus, the City is under no obligation to consider whether any of the proposed alternatives are feasible within the meaning of CEQA. (See Laurel Hills, supra, 83 Cal.App.3d at pp. 519-527; see also Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731 [270 Cal.Rptr. 650]; and Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403 [253 Cal.Rptr. 426].)

For the sake of full disclosure, however, the Council does acknowledge that, though certain significant effects have been substantially lessened, they nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable. The impacts in question are:

4.3-2: potential loss of vernal pool plant species and crustaceans;
4.4-1: conversion of undeveloped landscape to urban development;
4.6-1: increase in short-term construction-related air pollutant emissions;
4.6-2: increase in operational air pollutant emissions; and
4.6-5: inconsistency with regional air quality attainment plans.
Cumulative water quality impacts
Cumulative impacts to biological resources with respect to vernal pools and grasslands
Cumulative aesthetic impacts with respect to the loss of open space

Cumulative traffic conditions with or without the project
Cumulative air pollutant emissions during construction
Cumulative ozone precursor emissions associated with vehicular traffic

Though not required to do so, because all of these impacts have been substantially lessened, the Findings will nevertheless address the extent to which particular alternatives might or might not be environmentally superior with respect to them. In the further interest of full disclosure, moreover, these Findings will also address the environmental merits of the alternatives with respect to all broad categories of impacts. The Findings will also assess whether each alternative is feasible in light of the project objectives and compliance with the goals and policies of the North Roseville Specific Plan or the City of Roseville General Plan.

As noted earlier, specific objectives identified by the City are:

(1) Provide public services to meet the needs of development within the plan.

(2) Provide a distinct identity, sense of organization and order for the plan area.

(3) Provide a housing supply near the employment centers in the northwest area of the city to enhance the potential for jobs/housing balance and to minimize trip length for employees to and from the employment center.

(4) Provide a range of housing types and densities that include dwellings affordable to households in a variety of income categories.

(5) Provide a pedestrian and bicycle path system and access to public transit to encourage residents to minimize auto use for shopping, services and leisure activities.

(6) Complete the land use and infrastructure planning for the northwestern portion of the City.

(7) Expand the City's boundaries in a manner that is consistent with State law, the Placer County LAFCO standards and criteria, and the City's General Plan, and that increases the City's residential holding capacity as foreseeable job growth creates a demand for additional housing within the City.

(Draft EIR, pp. 3-3 3-4.)

The Draft EIR (p. 6-3) identified the following four potentially feasible alternatives to the Project: No Project/No Development (Alternative 1); Reduced Density (Alternative 2); Offsite (Alternative 3); and Fiddyment Road Annexation (Alternative 4). Alternative 4 does not involve a change to the proposed project other than annexing a portion of Fiddyment Road along the city limits.

A. NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE - 1

Section 15126.6, subdivision (e), of the CEQA Guidelines require the evaluation of the "No Project" alternative. Such an alternative "shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services."

Under the "No Project" alternative, environmental conditions of the site would remain unchanged. Impacts predicted to occur as a result of the proposed project would not occur. Cumulative development would occur as described in the EIR, but the "No Project" Alternative would not contribute to these effects. The "No Project" Alternative would cause the fewest environmental impacts of any alternative, but would not achieve any of the project objectives of the North Roseville Specific Plan. (Draft EIR, p. 16-2.)

Land Use and Agricultural Resources

Significant land use impacts were not identified for the proposed project. Nonetheless, the less-than-significant impacts that were identified would not occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative because the project site would remain undeveloped; therefore, conversion of agricultural land would not occur and any incompatibilities between residential and other uses would not be created. The site would remain under the County's jurisdiction and would not require annexation to the city. Based on the above discussion, the impacts identified under the No Project/No Development Alternative would be less severe than under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-4.)

Flooding and Drainage

Under the proposed project, all impacts on flooding, groundwater recharge, and water quality would be less than significant, or could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of State and City requirements and additional mitigation measures. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, there would not be any grading, so erosion-related degradation of water quality would not occur. New impervious surface would not be created, so impacts on flooding and water quality due to increased stormwater runoff would not take place, and groundwater recharge would not be affected. Based on the above discussion, impacts under the No Project/No Development Alternative would be less severe than impacts under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-4.)

Biological Resources

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on biological resources due to the loss of wildlife habitat, and vernal pool plants and crustaceans. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, loss of biological resources would not occur and no mitigation would be required because there would be no development on the project site. Seasonal grazing could impact biological resources; however, based on the above discussion, impacts under the No Project/No Development Alternative would be less severe than impacts under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-4.)

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The proposed project would convert the visual character of the site from an undeveloped environment to a developed landscape. This impact would be significant and unavoidable. With the exception of conversion of the undeveloped landscape to an urban character, the visual impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant, or could be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of City and NRSP guidelines. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, none of the visual impacts described above would occur. The project site would retain its undeveloped character and no night-lighting would be introduced to the area. Therefore, impacts under the No Project/No Development Alternative would be less severe than impacts under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Traffic and Circulation

Under the proposed project, there would be traffic increases associated with the project. Yet, these increases would not cause any intersection to operate at LOS "D" or worse that would operate at LOS "C" or better under the No Project scenario. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the project site would remain designated for agricultural uses and there would not be any increases in traffic, so there would not be any impact on City or other adjacent city/county roadways. For these reasons, impacts under the No Project/No Development Alternative would be less severe than impacts under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Air Quality

Short-term air emissions due to site grading and construction and operational emissions due to project-related traffic, and inconsistencies with the regional Air Quality Attainment Plan would be significant and unavoidable impacts under the proposed project. There would be no impact on air quality under the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no construction, traffic, or other activities that create air pollutants would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Noise

Under the proposed project, temporary increases in noise levels due to construction would be less than significant at adjacent residences. The exposure of future residences to increases in transportation noise would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

There would be no noise impacts under the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no construction, traffic or other noise-generating activities would occur. Noise would be generated from agricultural uses if the proposed project is not constructed. However, agricultural noise is part of the existing setting, and would be less severe than urban noise impacts. Therefore, impacts under the No Project/No Development Alternative would be less severe than impacts under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Public Services and Utilities

The proposed project would create an increased demand for utilities, including water supply, water treatment and conveyance, storm drainage, and use of recycled water. In addition to utilities, the proposed project would increase demand for police and fire services, solid waste disposal, schools, and parks and recreation. Impacts associated with the increased demand for public services and utilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not increase demand for public services or utilities, because there would be no increase in population. Therefore, no impacts would occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Conclusion

There would not be any significant and unavoidable impacts under the No Project/No Development Alternative. The No Project Alternative would also not achieve any of the Project objectives identified by the City. Implementation of the "No Project" alternative would result in the property remaining undeveloped for an unknown period of time. Considering ongoing growth in the South Placer area, and the favorable economic climate that currently prevails, however, it is unrealistic to presume the property would remain idle for any extended period of time. It is probable that a new development proposal would be forthcoming in the near future. The form of the new project is unknown, and it would be speculative to discuss potential benefits or adverse impacts of such a proposal at this time.

Relationship of Alternative to NRSP Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative is inconsistent with all of the NRSP objectives, which "provide for the orderly and systematic development of a mix of residential

neighborhoods, schools, parks, community commercial and business/professional uses". Though the No Project alternative would avoid the impacts of the project (at least until a replacement project is proposed and approved), the No Project alternative would provide none of the benefits of the project, and would not accomplish those NRSP objectives that the project would effectuate. For these reasons, the City Council concludes that the No Project Alternative is not feasible. (See City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; Sequoyah Hills, supra, 23 Cal.App.4th at p. 715.)

B. REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE - 2

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, a total of 413 dwelling units would be constructed, a reduction of 266 dwelling units from what is assumed under the proposed project. Under this alternative, the elementary school and park site would remain the same as the proposed project but fewer acres would be designated for residential uses. Based on the current densities, the parcel currently designated DR-3 (256 units on 52.5 acres with a density of 4.9 du/ac) would be left undeveloped and 2 acres from DR-4 (257 units on 51.4 acres with a density of 5 du/ac) would be left undeveloped for a total of 53.4 acres left in undeveloped open space on the site. Implementation of this alternative would generate a population of approximately 1,049. If the school district decides not to construct a school on the project site, this alternative assumes the same number of residences be constructed as described above. (Draft EIR, p. 6-6.)

For this analysis, it is assumed that the roadway system and infrastructure would be the same as those planned for the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-6.)

Land Use and Agricultural Resources

The Reduced Density Alternative would covert fewer acres to residential uses and would ultimately create more undeveloped open space on the project site. However, a majority of the site would still be converted to a developed environment. The impacts would be very similar to the proposed project, but slightly less severe. The agricultural land use conversion would remain less than significant, as would the potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses and potential inconsistency with City of Roseville plans and policies. (Draft EIR, p. 6-6.)

For both the Reduced Density Alternative and the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant. Under the Reduced Density Alternative, land use impacts would be consider slightly less severe than under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-7.)

Flooding and Drainage

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, impacts on stormwater runoff, water quality, and water surface elevations would be similar to those identified under the proposed project because a substantial amount of the site would be developed. As with the proposed

project, water quality impacts and the increase in stormwater runoff would be considered less than significant. Onsite and offsite flooding impacts would be less than significant with contributions to the regional flood control strategy. (Draft EIR, p. 6-7.)

Because a majority of the project site would be developed, the flooding and drainage impacts associated with this alternative would be very similar to those of the proposed project, but slightly less severe. (Draft EIR, p. 6-7.)

Biological Resources

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, a total of approximately 53.4 acres would be left in undeveloped open space. This includes the vernal pool identified in the northwest corner of the project site. Therefore, impacts identified under the proposed project on the loss of vernal pools and plant and animal habitat within the pools would be less than significant under this alternative. However, because a majority of the site would be developed, the loss of grasslands would still be considered a significant and unavoidable impact of project development. (Draft EIR, p. 6-7.)

Therefore, the impact on biological resources would be similar to the proposed project, but less severe because no impacts associated with the loss of the vernal pools would occur under this alternative. (Draft EIR, p. 6-7.)

Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Under the proposed project, development of the project site would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to the conversion of undeveloped land to a developed environment. The increase in light and glare would result in a less than significant impact. (Draft EIR, p. 6-8.)

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the conversion of the project site from its current undeveloped state to a developed environment would result in the same impact as the proposed project. However, because less of the area would be developed the impact would be considered less severe than under the proposed project. The increase in light and glare would also remain less than significant under this alternative. Therefore, impacts on the visual quality of the area would be similar to the proposed project, but less severe due to a reduction in the size of the project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-8)

Traffic and Circulation

Alternative 2 would generate about 4,350 daily vehicle trips, compared to 6,740 daily vehicle trips under the proposed project, a difference of 35 percent. Under the proposed project, there would be traffic increases associated with the project. Yet, these increases would not cause any intersection to operate at LOS "D" or worse that would operate at LOS "C" or better under the No Project scenario. With fewer trips generated, Alternative 2 would also not cause any intersection to operate at LOS "D" or worse that would operate at LOS "C" or better under the No Project alternative. As under the proposed

project, traffic increases due to Alternative 2 on State highways and on roadways in Placer and Sutter counties and the City of Rocklin would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-8.)

Because the residential uses and population would be less under Alternative 2 than the proposed project, the demand for transit services would also be less, yet still significant. The demand for transit services from Alternative 2 could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by updating the Long Range Transit Master Plan (Mitigation Measure 4.5-2). Alternative 2 would contain the same bikeway system as the proposed project and thus the impact on the demand for bicycle facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-8.)

Air Quality

Under the proposed project, significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality would occur due to project construction and operation and inconsistency with Air Quality Attainment Plans. The exposure of residents to stationary sources and CO impacts from increased CO emissions at intersections would be considered less than significant and would not require mitigation. (Draft EIR, p. 6-8.)

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the increase in emissions associated with project construction and operation would be less severe than the proposed project, but the impact would not be reduced below the significance threshold. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. The same as the proposed project, impacts associated with an increase in pollutants from stationary sources and increased levels of CO would remain less than significant. Therefore, under the Reduced Density Alternative air quality impacts would be similar to the proposed project, but less severe due to a reduction in the size of the project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-8.)

Noise

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, impacts related to construction noise, future traffic noise, and non-traffic noise would be the same as the proposed project. Noise associated with project construction would be considered less than significant under the proposed project and this alternative. (Draft EIR, p. 6-9.)

As with the proposed project, residential uses would not be located in close proximity to non-traffic noise sources; therefore, the impact would be considered less than significant. Residential uses would be located in close proximity to roadways and subject to increased traffic noise. Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would ensure that noise attenuation (e.g., setbacks, soundwalls, etc.) be used to reduce traffic noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. The noise impacts of the Reduced Density Alternative would be the same as the proposed project, but less severe because fewer residents would be exposed. (Draft EIR, p. 6-9.)

Public Services and Utilities

Because implementation of the Reduced Density Alternative would result in 266 fewer dwelling units than assumed under the proposed project, demand for public services and utilities would decrease. Individual public service and utility impacts are described below. (Draft EIR, p. 6-9.)

Water

The Reduced Density Alternative would have a lower water demand than the proposed project because there would be a reduction of 266 dwelling units. The Reduced Density Alternative would require a water demand of 0.37 million gallons per day (mgd), 0.2 mgd less than the proposed project. This difference would apply to maximum daily and peak hour flows as well. In addition, the City of Roseville Water Treatment Plant would be expanded and an onsite water distribution line would be constructed, as assumed under the proposed project. Therefore, as with the proposed project, the demand for water supply and impacts on water treatment and capacity would be less than significant but slightly less severe under this alternative due to the decrease in units. (Draft EIR, p. 6-9.)

Wastewater

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, demand for wastewater treatment and conveyance would be slightly lower than under the proposed project because there would be fewer dwelling units. This alternative would generate approximately 0.2 mgd of wastewater compared to the 0.31 mgd the proposed project would generate. Under the Reduced Density Alternative, 0.13 mgd would require treatment at the wastewater treatment plant, 0.07 mgd less than under the proposed project. The daily and peak hour wastewater flows would be reduced as well. As with the proposed project, the increased demand for wastewater treatment and conveyance would be less than significant and slightly less severe under this alternative because of the decrease in units. In addition, as with the proposed project, the onsite gravity sewer line and the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant would be constructed. (Draft EIR, p. 6-9.)

Police

The Reduced Density Alternative would generate a lower demand for police protection services than the proposed project because a smaller number of residents would result. Under this alternative, one police officer would be required, as opposed to two police officers under the proposed project. Revenues generated in sales tax, property tax, and other sources as a result of project implementation would increase the City's general fund, which would be expected to pay for the additional law enforcement personnel required. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact. Therefore, impacts to police protection services under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project but less severe. (Draft EIR, p. 6-10.)

Fire

The Reduced Density Alternative would generate a lower demand for fire protection services because of the decrease in residential units and population. Therefore, demand for fire protection under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, but slightly less severe because of the reduced number of dwelling units. Under the proposed project, the RFD has indicated that they would not be able to meet standard response times to serve the project site. According to the RFD, slightly more than half of the northern portion of the project site could not be served in four minutes, 80 percent of the time. However, RFD does not consider this to be a significant impact because more than 60 percent of the calls they receive are medical calls, and they would be able to meet the response time for providing advanced life support services. Under this alternative, 266 fewer dwelling units would be constructed, and fewer units would be located in the northern portion of the site. Therefore, this would be considered a less-than- significant impact, similar to the proposed project but less severe. (Draft EIR, p. 6-10.)

Schools

The Reduced Density Alternative would generate fewer school children than under the proposed project. This alternative would generate a total of 311 students, consisting of 167 students in Grades K-6, 46 students in Grades 7-8, and 98 students in Grades 9-12. Implementation of this alternative would result in 199 fewer students than under the proposed project with the school site. Under this alternative, the proposed elementary school would still be constructed as part of the project. In addition, the school district would still collect fees in an amount that would approximate 50 percent of the cost of additional facilities. School fee mitigation agreements between the applicants and school districts assure that full funding will be available to provide land and construct schools. Therefore, impacts associated with school services would be less than significant and less severe than under the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-10.)

Parks

The Reduced Density Alternative would result in a population of 1,049 residents. This alternative would generate a demand of approximately 9 acres of parkland, as compared to the demand of 16 acres under the proposed project. The Reduced Density Alternative includes the development of a 13.6-acre park site and 53.4 acres of undeveloped open space, which would adequately serve the development assumed under this alternative. Therefore, demand for parkland would be a less-than-significant impact, the same as the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-10.)

Conclusion

The significant irreversible effects of the Reduced Density Alternative would be almost identical to the proposed project, but of slightly lower magnitude because fewer residential units would be constructed and less grassland habitat would be converted to urban uses. Significant irreversible effects would include reduction in natural vegetation,

alternation of visual character of the project site, increased air emissions, and construction noise. Like the proposed project, this alternative would extend roadways and water and sewer lines, into an area that is undeveloped at present. Development of this infrastructure could be considered growth-inducing because it would remove an existing obstacle (lack of infrastructure) to development for adjacent land in the County, which could increase pressure to convert other undeveloped areas in the region. (Draft EIR, p. 6-11.)

As discussed throughout the above analysis, the impacts of this alternative would be very similar to the proposed project, but generally less severe because fewer residential units would be developed. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be similar to the proposed project, but would generally contribute a smaller portion to the cumulative impacts identified. (Draft EIR, p. 6-10.)

Relationship of Alternative to NRSP Project Objectives

Although Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior with respect to the significant unavoidable impacts of the project, it would not fully achieve objecting (3) to "provide a housing supply near the employment center" as well as the proposed project due to fewer residential lots being proposed, nor will Alternative 2 provide as many affordable housing units also as a result of fewer lots. The project may also be better than the alternative in helping the applicant to "realize a reasonable return on investment." In short, in reasonably balancing the competing environmental, economic, and social considerations presented by the project and this alternative, the Council concludes that the alternative is infeasible.
(See City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; Sequoyah Hills, supra, 23 Cal.App.4th at p. 715.) Furthermore, the Council sees no reason to turn down the mitigated project as proposed, which reflects the landowner's considered judgment regarding how to develop its property in light of the realities of the marketplace. The Council believes it is appropriate to give some weight to this judgment. (See Laurel Hills, supra, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521 (a "public agency may approve a developer's choice of a project once its significant adverse effects have been reduced to an acceptable level -- that is, all avoidable damage has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable").)

C. OFFSITE ALTERNATIVE - 3

The proposed project includes a residential development project on approximately 160 acres. There are few undeveloped areas in or near the City of Roseville that are of this size and close enough to existing or planned infrastructure (e.g., roads, sewer and water lines) to make connections possible without extensions through undeveloped land, which would create new impacts (especially regarding growth-inducement) rather than reduce impacts. Therefore, the only alternative location to be evaluated is land within the Sunset Industrial Area located in Placer County, but within the City's Sphere of Influence. The

Offsite Alternative site includes the portion of the Sunset Industrial Area south of Nichols Drive and west of Industrial Avenue, an area that is roughly equivalent to 160 acres. (Draft EIR, p. 6-11.)

Land Use and Agricultural Resources

The Offsite Alternative has the same less-than-significant impacts on conversion of agricultural land as the proposed project. No other conflicts would occur between adjacent land uses in the City of Roseville or onsite uses. The same as the proposed project these impacts would be considered less than significant. Like the proposed project, the Offsite Alternative is located in the County and would need to be annexed to the City. It is assumed that the annexation of this site would not be considered a significant impact because the site is located adjacent to the city limits and existing infrastructure, is within the City's Sphere of Influence, and would not be considered "leap frog" development. Therefore, the impact would be considered less than significant, the same as the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-13.)

Flooding and Drainage

Impacts of this alternative on stormwater runoff, onsite and offsite water surface elevations, and water quality would be similar to the proposed project, because a similar amount of ground disturbance and development of impervious surface would be expected. The alternative site is also located in the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, and runoff would enter into either the Pleasant Grove Creek or a tributary of the creek. As with the proposed project, development would contribute towards a regional flood control strategy, which would retain stormwater and would mitigate for increased volumes of stormwater. In addition, compliance with federal, State and local regulations on stormwater management and water quality control, including the use of BMPs would occur. Therefore, under the Offsite Alternative, impacts to flooding and drainage would be similar to the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-13.)

Biological Resources

The biological resources that exist on the Sunset Industrial Area Offsite Alternative site primarily include grasslands and vernal pools. In addition, a portion of Pleasant Grove Creek bisects this area and there are numerous native oak trees adjacent to the creek. The variety of habitats on this site is very similar to the proposed project, except that the alternative site contains more vernal pools as well as oak trees. Impacts identified under the proposed project relating to the interference of migration corridors would be considered less than significant under this alternative. The loss of grassland habitat would also be considered a significant and unavoidable impact, the same as the proposed project. Impacts on vernal pools would be similar to the proposed project and the mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would help reduce the impacts. However, because this site contains more vernal pools, oak trees, and includes a portion of Pleasant Grove Creek the biological impacts of developing this site would be considered more severe than the proposed project. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-13 - 6-14.)

Aesthetics and Visual Quality

The Offsite Alternative is located within the Sunset Industrial Area Plan area, west of SR 65 and Industrial Avenue, east of Foothills Boulevard, and north of Blue Oaks Boulevard. As identified under the proposed project, the conversion of an undeveloped area to developed uses would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. The same is true under this alternative. The conversion of this area from undeveloped to developed would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact. The disturbance of adjacent residents due to an increase in night lighting would also be considered a less-than-significant impact of project development. Therefore, under this alternative, the impacts would be identical to the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-14.)

Transportation and Circulation.

Alternative 3 would result in a greater increase in traffic volume at the Foothills Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard intersection. Therefore, it is likely that this alternative would cause the Foothills Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard intersection to operate at LOS "D" or worse conditions and thus require additional improvements. Alternative 3 would also result in a greater increase in traffic volumes on Sunset Boulevard in the Sunset Industrial Area than the proposed project. This increase could cause a level of service impact at intersections along this roadway between Foothill Boulevard and SR 65. As under the proposed project, the demand for transit services from Alternative 3 would cause a significant impact. This impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by updating the Long Range Transit Master Plan (Mitigation Measure 4.5-2). If Alternative 3 contains a similar bikeway system as the proposed project and is connected to planned bikeways on Foothill Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard, than the impact on the demand for bicycle facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-14 - 6-15.)

Air Quality

The Offsite Alternative would require the same level of development as the proposed project, so construction-related emissions associated with this alternative would be essentially the same as the proposed project. The same intersections analyzed under the proposed project would be effected by development in this area. Therefore, no significant CO impacts would be anticipated and the increase in regional emissions would be the same as the proposed project. It is expected air pollutants associated with project construction and operation would be considered significant and unavoidable impacts, the same as the proposed project. Because construction activities and the number of vehicle trips associated with the project would be the same, impacts under this alternative would be almost identical to the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-15.)

Noise

Under the Offsite Alternative, the same number of units would be constructed. However, the location of this alternative is adjacent to industrial uses, which could be a noise source. Also, the North Roseville Peaking Facility is within close proximity of this alternative, and contains two turbines that would also be considered a noise source. (Draft EIR, p. 6-15.)

Peak hour traffic volumes on major roadways including Foothills Boulevard and Blue Oaks Boulevard would increase proportionally as would traffic volumes on major arterials affected by the project site. As with the proposed project, traffic volumes on new arterial and collector roadways would also increase proportionally, but are not anticipated to be significant. However, because there are additional noise sources adjacent to the location of this alternative, such as the peaking facility, the noise impacts associated with this alternative are expected to be more severe than the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-15.)

Public Services and Utilities

Under the Offsite Alternative, the proposed land uses and number of units would be identical to the proposed project. Demand for other public services and utilities would be identical or similar to the proposed project due to the same amount and type of development. There are no existing City public services infrastructure in the immediate vicinity of the area of this alternative, because it is in Placer County. Most infrastructure would be extended north from the Foothills Boulevard corridor including extension of the road, water, sewer, and electric facilities. The Offsite Alternative would be located in closer proximity to the proposed fire station on Blue Oaks Boulevard. Therefore, the RFD would be more likely able to serve the project site within the standard response time of four minutes, 80 percent of the time. Impacts associated with fire protection services would be less than significant under this alternative, but less severe than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts associated with water, wastewater, police protection, schools, and parks would be less than significant but more severe because there is no City infrastructure in the immediate vicinity. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-15 - 6-16.)

Conclusion

The significant irreversible effects of the Offsite Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, because the levels of development would be identical. Significant irreversible effects would include reduction in natural vegetation and wildlife communities, commitment of energy resources, alternation of visual character of the project site, increased air emissions; and the short-term commitment of non-renewable and/or slowly renewed resources such as lumber, water, minerals, and energy, for construction. (Draft EIR, p. 6-16.)

Like the proposed project, the Offsite Alternative would extend major infrastructure, including roadways and water and sewer lines, into an area that is presently undeveloped. Development of this infrastructure could be considered growth inducing because it would remove an existing obstacle (lack of infrastructure) to development. This could increase pressure in other areas of the county to develop; however, because the area to the north of the site in the county is slated for development under the Sunset Industrial Area Plan it is not anticipated that development of the project on this site would be growth-inducing. As discussed throughout the above analysis, impacts of the Offsite Alternative would be very similar to the proposed project. Therefore, cumulative impacts would also be similar. (Draft EIR, p. 6-16.)

Relationship of Alternative to NRSP Project Objectives

Alternative 3 does not meet the objectives set forth in the NRSP which "provide for the orderly and systematic development...", nor does it fully achieve the project objectives to "complete the land use infrastructure planning for the northwestern portion of the City." More fundamentally, there is no indication that the proponents of the Project can obtain ownership or control of the alternative property. Because the applicants apparently cannot obtain such ownership, this alternative would, as a practical matter, require project denial. The CEQA Guidelines and CEQA case law clearly demonstrate that an applicant's inability to make development occur at another site is a basis for rejecting an off-site alternative as infeasible. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6, subd. (f)(1) ("whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to [an] alternative site" is a factor that may be considered in assessing feasibility); Citizens of Goleta Valley, supra, 52 Cal.3d at p. 574 ("[a] feasible alternative is one which can be 'accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors'"; "[s]urely whether a property is owned or can reasonably be acquired by the project proponent has a strong bearing on the likelihood of a project's ultimate cost and the chances for an expeditious and 'successful accomplishment'").)

The Council declines to deny the Project, and notes that, in light of the demand for housing in the foreseeable future within the Roseville area, approval of the project does not preclude future approval of development of an alternative site. As noted above, moreover, the current project reflects the landowner's' considered judgment regarding how to develop its property in light of the realities of the marketplace.

For all of these reasons, the Council concludes that Alternative 3 is not feasible within the meaning of CEQA. (See City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; Sequoyah Hills, supra, 23 Cal.App.4th at p. 715.)

D. FIDDYMENT ROAD ANNEXATION ALTERNATIVE - 4

Under this alternative, the portion of Fiddyment Road adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Roseville city limits would be annexed to the city. Fiddyment Road is presently under the jurisdiction of Placer County. If this portion of Fiddyment Road were annexed to the city, the city would be responsible for maintaining and improving this segment of the roadway. (Draft EIR, p. 6-16.)

If Fiddyment Road is annexed, there is the possibility that the city would realign a 2,000 foot-long portion of roadway north of Blue Oaks Boulevard that contains two 90-degree curves. In addition, if the City annexes this portion of roadway a small parcel of land, approximately 15 acres located north of Blue Oaks Boulevard would also be annexed to the City and could be developed. The impacts associated with realigning this portion of the roadway and annexing the 15-acre parcel were addressed in the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase II DEIR (SCH # 98112063) on pages 5-12 through 5-17. (Draft EIR, p. 6-16.)

Fiddyment Road adjacent to the proposed project is located in, and maintained by, Placer County. If Fiddyment Road is not annexed to the City, it will continue to be maintained by the County. The County would also review the proposed project roadway improvements and would be responsible for future roadway improvements and maintenance. If the City of Roseville annexes this section of Fiddyment Road, the City will take over its maintenance and improvement. (Draft EIR, p. 6-17.)

The internal circulation system includes a direct connection to Fiddyment Road. Whether the City or the County has control of Fiddyment Road, this intersection would be designed using standard engineering practices, including those involving stopping-sight distances, signage and lighting. Such practices would ensure that the design provides adequate safety at this intersection. (Draft EIR, p. 6-17.)

Placer County's 2010 CIP calls for the addition of shoulders to Fiddyment Road between Baseline Road and Moore Road, but not a widening of Fiddyment Road to four lanes. If it is annexed by the City of Roseville, it would be incorporated into the City's 2015 CIP and would remain a two-lane roadway in the vicinity of the project site. The annexation of this section of Fiddyment Road could result in some difference in how it is designed and/or maintained, primarily due to the City requiring street lights. But these would not have a significant impact on the capacity or safety of Fiddyment Road. The annexation of Fiddyment Road would result in a less-than-significant impact. (Draft EIR, p. 6-17.)

Because improvements to Fiddyment Road, including access to the project site, would be the same whether or not the roadway is annexed, this alternative would not result in any impacts different in nature or severity form the impacts of the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-17.)

E. ALTERNATIVES PROPOSED BY COMMENTERS

The Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission proposed an alternative that would involve splitting the proposal between two or more sites that might together meet the objectives of the project within the existing City limits. (Final EIR, Letter No. 6, pp. 1-2.)

Absorption projections prepared for the City (in compliance with LAFCO policy 3(c)(1)(a)) estimate that Roseville's supply of residential land will be exhausted by 2010. These projections take into account land uses planned not only within the City, but also elsewhere in the region. This depletion of the City's residential land use is less than 10 years away, and well within a reasonable 15 to 20 year planning horizon as recognized by LAFCO. The City has examined alternatives to meet this unmet residential demand, and promote a balance of land uses in the City and region. All lands within the existing City limits are designated within adopted land uses, which have been accounted for in the absorption projections. As a result, shifting the project to currently undeveloped residentially designated land within the City will not meet the unmet demand as these lands are all already projected to be developed by 2010. In fact, most currently undeveloped residential lands in the City have already received subdivision map approval and are entitled for development. As a result, the only way to meet the unmet residential demand within the existing City limits would be to convert currently undeveloped non-residential land (industrial, office or commercial) to residential uses. Absorption projections also show a significant long-term demand for these non-residential uses, which are all important to provide services and job growth within the City and region. In addition, residential and non-residential lands have significantly different needs/constraints for siting, such as relation to major transportation corridors, visibility, and land use adjacencies. Converting some of the remaining non-residential use in the City to residential creates potential land use compatibility issues and inconsistencies with the City's General Plan. As a result, the City has concluded that there are no vacant or undeveloped lands in the City that could accommodate the project, meet the unmet residential demand, not impact area service and job growth, not result in land use conflicts or General Plan inconsistencies and meet the objectives of the project. The alternatives analysis required by CEQA as stated in Section 15126.6(c) of the Guidelines, is to ensure that "the range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects." In addition, "an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project." The alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR satisfy the requirements of CEQA and provide a reasonable range of alternatives that feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the project and avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts. In addition, CEQA states "the key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location." No vacant or undeveloped parcels within the City limits were identified which could accommodate the proposed project (either in one or multiple locations). (Final EIR, pp. 3-12 – 3-13.)

XI.
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the City's approval of the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project will result in a number of impacts that, while substantially lessened by mitigation, will nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable. Despite these impacts, however, the Council has chosen to approve the Project (as mitigated). To do so, the Council must first adopt this Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a Court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Council would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section (XI), and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in Section V.

The City finds that the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project would have the following economic, social, or other benefits:

Diversification and Expansion of the City's Housing Stock. The adoption and implementation of the North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 project will provide for the development of 679 dwelling units, which would house approximately 1,725 new residents in the area previously zoned for agricultural uses. If a school is not developed on the project site, then the number of housing units would be reduced by 10 units for a total of 669 units and 1,699 units. (Draft EIR, p. 5-18.) A wide variety of housing types, from low density to medium density residential units will be offered.

Substantial industrial and commercial development, including the Hewlett-Packard complex, has occurred within the North Roseville Industrial area. These facilities provide local employment, which in turn attracts new families to the region. In light of the region's robust job-generating sector, the community has a need for housing employees in that sector, so as to avoid long commute trips with the attendant traffic and air quality effects. The North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 Project will help fulfill this need for housing by offering a range in size of residential housing lots.

Provision of Temporary Construction Jobs. The North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 project will involve the construction of 1,725 residential lots. Implementation of the Project would require the employment of temporary construction jobs for the construction of roads and basic infrastructure. North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 can provide temporary construction employment with the construction of infrastructure and eventual construction of homes.

Consistency with the City's NRSP Objectives City of Roseville General Plan and LAFCO Polices. The project is consistent with the NRSP objectives to "provide for the orderly and systematic development of a mix of residential neighborhoods, schools, parks, community commercial and business/professional uses". The approval of this

project will satisfy the project objective to "complete the land use and infrastructure planning for the northwestern portion of the City." Maintaining a more cohesive and compact form of development will also minimize pressure for leapfrog development that could occur in the County.

The LAFCO's objectives under the Cortese/Knox Act include preserving agricultural land, encouraging logical patterns of growth, and discouraging urban sprawl. Clearly, this Project is not an example of urban sprawl, but rather constitutes orderly, well-planned, and environmentally sensitive development. The project will also promote many of City of Roseville General Plan policies (LH-3 and LH-5, concurrently) to "encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed area of the City." and to also "accommodate projected population and employment growth areas... ." The North Roseville Specific Plan Phase 3 area is a logical extension of existing development, and will help meet the needs of existing development within the area.

088101wl

---

[i] *Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Stormwater Management Manual*, Version 3, February 1994, p. VII-4. For example, if the existing rate was 1,000 cfs, and an unmitigated project were to increase the rate to 1,100, the project would need to mitigate post-project flows to 990 cfs under the proposed revision. Under the current policy (achieve 90% of pre-project flows), the project would need to mitigate post project flows to 900 cfs in this example.