CHAPTER 11

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

CHAPTER 11 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Cumulative impacts are those that are occur as a result of regional land development patterns. Analysis of cumulative impacts is required under the CEQA Guidelines, §§15130 and 15355. As defined in §15355, the cumulative impact analysis must consider the change in the environment that would result "from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects." Under §15130, an EIR must identify impacts to which the project's contribution will be "cumulatively considerable" when considered in conjunction with other projects in the area.

The proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project would amend the existing West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) by changing the land use and zoning designations for some parcels and by changing development densities within the project area. The project would result in the development of 1,661 additional residential units and 7.3 additional acres of commercial land uses compared with the development evaluated in the WRSP EIR. Other changes proposed to the land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project area include minor adjustments in acreage for parks, open space, public/quasi-public, and roadway rights-of-way. While the cumulative impacts of the overall WRSP were evaluated in the WRSP EIR, the additional development proposed as part of the SPA project could result in a greater contribution to some cumulative impacts. In addition, other projects have been approved since the time of the WRSP approval that could contribute to cumulative impacts. This Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR chapter evaluates the contribution of the proposed project to cumulative impacts in the project region.

The proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project would not alter the development footprint within Fiddyment Ranch or the overall character of development, and development under this project would continue to be subject to the City's ordinances and standards that require control measures and mitigation for environmental effects. Based on these considerations, the proposed project is not expected to change the WRSP EIR analysis of cumulative impacts with respect to agricultural, biological, cultural, and visual resources; geology and soils; and hydrology and water quality. Additionally, the project would increase residential and commercial land uses within the City, which would increase generation of solid waste and contribute to the cumulative need for expansion of the Western Placer Sanitary Landfill, as discussed in the Initial Study and **CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION**. Although the WRSP EIR includes mitigation measures requiring development to contribute to landfill capacity expansion, the WRSP EIR concludes that this expansion is uncertain and the impact remains significant and unavoidable. The proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project would contribute to this impact but would not change the WRSP EIR analysis.

The 2013 Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR, the Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP and comments received at the 2013 Public Scoping Meeting are provided in Appendix A. In addition, the comments received in response to the 2010 NOP and 2011 Draft Subsequent EIR prepared for a prior version of the proposed project are also provided in Appendix A. One comment provided at the 2010 public scoping meeting inquired whether this Subsequent EIR would consider impacts of the project in light of other new development that has been approved in the area. In written comments submitted on the 2011 Draft Subsequent

EIR, several residents continued to express concern that the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts were not adequately addressed in the 2011 Draft Subsequent EIR. Residents identified other proposed developments of concern including: Sierra Vista, Curry Creek, Creekview and Placer Ranch, all of which are included in the cumulative scenario described below.

11.2 CUMULATIVE SCENARIO

CEQA Guidelines §15130(b)(1) states that the cumulative impacts analysis should be predicated on a defined cumulative land use scenario. This should include a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, or a summary of projections contained in an adopted General Plan or related planning document.

The cumulative land use scenario considered for this analysis is consistent with the assumptions used in the Creekview Specific Plan EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference as discussed in **CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION,** and is summarized below. The cumulative land use scenario assumes buildout of the Sierra Vista and Creekview specific plans, partial buildout of the Placer Ranch and Amoruso Ranch specific plans, existing development in the City and buildout of the General Plan through 2025, buildout of the WRSP, infill development associated with the Downtown and Riverside Specific Plans, and development in the cities of Rocklin and Lincoln, and the counties of Placer, Sacramento, and Sutter.

The cumulative analysis for the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project considers the proposed project and other known approved, active, or reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the project area. These projects are briefly summarized below.

Sierra Vista – The Sierra Vista Specific Plan area is located in the southwestern portion of the City. Development of the area was analyzed at a programmatic-level in the WRSP EIR in 2004 and in a project-specific EIR that was certified in 2010. The Sierra Vista Specific Plan includes a mix of land uses, including 8,679 single-family and multi-family residential units; approximately 259 acres of commercial, commercial mixed use, and business professional uses; approximately 106 acres of parks; approximately 304 acres of open space, and approximately 56 acres set aside for schools and other public/quasi-public uses. The City Council approved the SVSP in 2010 and the Plan area was annexed into the City from unincorporated Placer County. In addition, in 2012 the City approved an application for development within the urban reserve portion of this specific plan area referred to as the Westbrook project.

Creekview – The Creekview Specific Plan area consists of 500 acres located in the western part of the City. Development of the area has been contemplated for some time. Similar to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, it was analyzed at a programmatic-level in the WRSP EIR in 2004 and in a project-specific EIR that was certified in 2011. The Creekview Specific Plan includes a total of 2,011 dwelling units distributed as follows: 826 low-density single family units; 665 medium-density units; and 520 high-density multi-family units. Land uses include a total of 136.2 acres set aside in permanent open space, 15.7 acres for neighborhood parks, a 7-acre elementary

school site, 2.6 acres of utilities sites, and 19.3 acres for commercial development. The The Creekview Specific Plan was approved in 2011.

Amoruso Ranch – Project applications for the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan were submitted in early May 2011. The project includes requests for Annexation, a General Plan Amendment, Pre-Zoning and a Development Agreement for an approximately 674 acre property located on the south side of West Sunset Boulevard approximately 1.5 miles west of Fiddyment Road, northeast of the Fiddyment Ranch project site. The proposed land use plan includes 3,200 residential units in a mix of low, medium and high density, two commercial parcels totaling 55.5 acres, a 7-acre elementary school site, six neighborhood parks and a 6.9-acre fire station/public facilities site. Approximately 140 acres of the site will be set aside as open space preserve.

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

Placer Vineyards - The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area is located on 5,230 acres south of Baseline Road. The project was approved by Placer County in July 2007. At buildout, Placer Vineyards would include 14,132 dwelling units, 274 acres of commercial development, 1,560 acres of parks, open space, schools, and roadways. Development has not yet commenced due to the need to obtain federal approvals needed for filling wetlands and impacting the habitat of endangered and threatened species. A Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) circulated in the summer of 2013 and the project is currently going through the federal permit process.

Regional University - The Regional University Specific Plan is located west of the WRSP area. Access to the site would be through an extension of Watt Avenue, through the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area. The Regional University and Community Specific Plan covers 1,157 acres. It will include a 600-acre private university campus on the western portion of the plan area, and a 557-acre urban community on the eastern portion of the site. Approximately 3,232 residential units and a private high school for 1,200 students would be included in the development. The Regional University and Community Specific Plan was approved by Placer County in December 2008. Development has not yet commenced due to the need to obtain federal approvals needed for filling wetlands and impacting the habitat of endangered and threatened species.

Riolo Vineyards - The Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan is planned as a residential community with open-space, recreational, and commercial components on 525 acres. The development would include a total of 933 residential units consisting of low-, medium- and high-density as well as rural and agricultural residences. Placer

County approved the project in May 2009. The project area is located south of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area.

Curry Creek - The Curry Creek Community Plan area is located immediately west of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area. While the Placer County Board of Supervisors gave direction to County Staff to proceed with studying the area for future development in 2003, no formal specific plan is pending at this time. To be conservative, it is assumed the area would support a mix of housing and commercial uses in the future.

Sutter Pointe - Sutter Pointe was approved by Sutter County in June 2009. It consists of approximately 7,500 acres of land located in the southeast corner of Sutter County, adjacent to the Placer County line. Development planned for Sutter Pointe includes approximately 3,600 acres of commercial and industrial uses, 2,900 acres for residential uses, and 1,000 acres of parks, recreation and open space.

Elverta - The Elverta Specific Plan includes 1,744 acres in the north-central portion of Sacramento County, approximately 7 miles southwesterly of Fiddyment Ranch. Approximately 881 acres would accommodate 4,950 residential units, and 552 acres of agricultural/rural land use. It also would include 19 acres of commercial and office professional units. The Elverta Specific Plan was approved by Sacramento County in August 2008.

City of Rocklin – Market rate development is assumed to occur in the City of Rocklin. This would include development of residential and commercial land uses.

City of Lincoln – Market rate development is assumed to occur in the City of Lincoln. This would include development of residential and commercial land uses.

11.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

When other reasonably foreseeable projects are considered, the cumulative impacts to some resources would be more severe than the impacts from the proposed project alone. The project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts in the project region is evaluated below. For each impact evaluated below, the geographic scope of the effect is defined and the contribution that the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project would make to the effect is evaluated. Where necessary, mitigation measures are identified to reduce the project's contribution to significant cumulative effects.

Land Use

IMPACT 11.1:	**Land Use Incompatibility**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	City of Roseville General Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

For land use compatibility, the immediate vicinity of the Fiddyment Ranch project is considered the cumulative context because any incompatibility would occur primarily at the interface of different land uses and thus the project's effect would be constrained to areas adjacent to the project site.

Once the Fiddyment Ranch project area is fully developed, it would be adjacent to other City residential areas to the south, east and west. The proposed project would increase the intensity of land uses within the project boundaries. Additional residential units would be allowed and some buildings may be up to four stories high compared to the existing vacant land and the one-to-three stories high buildings anticipated for the Fiddyment Ranch site under the currently approved densities.

Although the proposed residential and commercial land uses proposed in the Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project are similar in nature to the existing and planned uses surrounding the site, there is known public controversy regarding the proposal, especially from existing residents within the WRSP south of Pleasant Grove Creek in the Westpark portion of the plan area. It should be noted that the proposed project would not increase densities or change the land use immediately adjacent to these existing neighborhoods. The majority of the proposed project would not be visible to any existing residences, since the parcels affected by the proposed SPA are primarily located north of Pleasant Grove Creek. The project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts related to land use incompatibilities, such as noise, dust, or land use, substantially greater than already identified in the original EIR.

Transportation and Circulation

Project Impacts - 2025 Cumulative Condition

The 2025 Cumulative Condition scenarios represent the 2025 CIP Condition (as evaluated in **CHAPTER 5 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**) plus reasonably foreseeable projects in the City of Roseville and Placer County. The cumulative context for many issue areas extends beyond the City boundaries. Where cumulative impacts extend beyond the City, the cumulative analysis is based on assumptions for growth in Rocklin, Lincoln, unincorporated Placer County, Sacramento County and a portion of Sutter County, through the year 2025. Development included in the Cumulative scenarios, but not in the 2025 CIP scenario, includes:

- Partial buildout of Placer Ranch Specific Plan (50% of residential, 25% of non-residential, and 8,000 university students)
- Buildout of Urban Reserve Properties in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan
- Partial buildout of Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (formerly Brookfield).

The Placer Ranch Specific Plan is assumed to include 6,793 residential dwelling units, 527 acres of business professional and light industrial uses, 150 acres of office, 99 acres of commercial uses and a 300-acre branch campus for the California State University Sacramento on 2,213 acres in unincorporated Placer County. The university campus could accommodate up to 25,000 students. A portion of this development (50% of residential, 25% of non-residential and 8,000 university students) is included in the cumulative analysis.

Due to some land owners dropping out of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, a portion of that plan area has been designated as Urban Reserve, including the recently approved Westbrook project. Buildout of the Urban Reserve areas is included in this cumulative impacts analysis.

In addition to all of the roadways assumed in the 2025 CIP scenarios and the roadways associated with the above projects, the 2025 Cumulative scenarios also include a portion of Placer Parkway as a four lane freeway from SR 65 to the future extension of Watt Avenue and Blue Oaks Boulevard.

The traffic impacts modeling (DKS 2011) on which the following cumulative impacts analysis is based was prepared for the 2009 Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 proposal, which proposed 1,905 new dwelling units compared to the 1,661 additional dwelling units proposed in the current project. Because the assumptions for regional development under the cumulative scenario have not changed, the modeling has not been updated. By evaluating the effects of the project with 244 more dwelling units than is currently proposed, the cumulative traffic impacts modeling may slightly overestimate the project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts.

IMPACT 11.2:	**Increased Traffic Volumes Through City of Roseville Intersections Under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	City of Roseville General Plan City of Roseville Level of Service Policy
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

Tables 41 and 42 in the Transportation Impact Analysis (DKS 2011) provided in Appendix B show the intersection LOS breakdown under 2025 Cumulative conditions for the a.m. peak hour and p.m. peak hour with and without the proposed project. The tables show that the number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse would not change as a result of the proposed project. The tables also show that the number of intersections operating at LOS C or better remains above 70 percent during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact.

As evaluated in the 2011 Draft Subsequent EIR, there was one intersection for which LOS would decrease under 2025 Cumulative plus project conditions. The intersection of Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Fiddyment Road was expected to operate at LOS E in the 2025 Cumulative condition without the project and LOS F with the project. The 2011 Draft Subsequent EIR found that the project's contribution to this cumulative impact would be reduced to a less than

significant level if the City's CIP were updated to include construction of a shared westbound through/left-turn lane to this intersection. All development in the City of Roseville is required to pay a traffic impact mitigation fee based on the improvements included in the CIP and the volume of project-generated traffic through each intersection where improvements are needed. Amending the CIP to include the identified improvement would ensure that development within the Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project site would contribute a fair share amount to the necessary improvements.

The CIP was updated in 2012, following approval of the Creekview Specific Plan to include the identified improvement at the Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Fiddyment Road intersection. Therefore, the 2025 Cumulative condition now includes this improvement. With the improvement included in the CIP and the project's required contribution of fair share funding amounts in accordance with the CIP, the LOS for this intersection in the cumulative plus project condition would be LOS E. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact at this intersection.

IMPACT 11.3:	**Increased Traffic Volumes on City of Rocklin Roadways under 2030 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	City of Rocklin General Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

The addition of the proposed project to Cumulative conditions would cause changes in traffic volumes in intersections within the City of Rocklin. Future intersection analysis was conducted at four intersections in the City of Rocklin -- Blue Oaks & Lonetree, Sunset & Blue Oaks, Sunset & Park, and Sunset & Stanford Ranch. Impacts at these intersections were evaluated using the 2030 Rocklin General Plan model with and without the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project. As shown in the intersection operating condition calculation information in the appendix to the *Revised Project Memorandum* (DKS 2013a), levels of service and volume to capacity ratios were unchanged between the future and future plus project conditions. No future significant impacts in the City of Rocklin are projected, and the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project would not contribute to any significant cumulative transportation impacts in the City of Rocklin. The addition of the proposed project would cause increases in volume through some Rocklin intersections, but not enough to degrade LOS to unacceptable levels. As such, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

IMPACT 11.4:	**Increased Traffic Volumes on Placer County Roadways under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Placer County General Plan Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Regional University Specific Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

The proposed project would result in traffic volume changes on a number of roadways in Placer County. *Table 11.1* shows the projected peak hour levels of service at a number of Placer County intersections in the vicinity of the proposed project. Generally, the County level of service policy stipulates LOS C on rural roadways, except within one-half mile of state highways and within or adjacent to the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area where the standard shall be LOS D. The intersection of Watt Avenue and Baseline Road is not included in this analysis, because under 2025 Cumulative conditions the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area is assumed to be annexed into the City of Roseville. In that case, this intersection would be within the City of Roseville and is considered in the analysis included in **CHAPTER 5 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**.

As shown in the table, three Placer County intersections would operate at an unsatisfactory LOS with or without the proposed project during the a.m. peak hour and two Placer County intersections would operate at an unsatisfactory LOS with or without the proposed project during the p.m. peak hour.

Table 11.1
2025 Cumulative Plus Project Level of Service at Placer County Intersections

Intersection	LOS Standard	2025 Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Proposed Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
Locust Rd & Baseline Rd	D	A	0.53	A	0.50
Watt Ave & PFE Rd	C	C	0.72	B	0.68
Walerga Rd & PFE Rd	C	**E**	**0.96**	**E**	**0.92**
Fiddyment & Athens	C	**F**	**1.17**	**F**	**1.11**
Industrial & Athens	C	**E**	**0.96**	**E**	**0.92**

Intersection	LOS Standard	2025 Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Proposed Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
PM Peak Hour					
Locust Rd & Baseline Rd	D	C	0.73	C	0.73
Watt Ave & PFE Rd	C	B	0.61	B	0.61
Walerga Rd & PFE Rd	C	**E**	**0.97**	**E**	**0.97**
Fiddyment & Athens	C	**F**	**1.66**	**F**	**1.65**
Industrial & Athens	C	B	0.68	B	0.69

Note:
BOLD Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy

The addition of the proposed project would cause minor volume changes at these intersections, but these changes would not be large enough to cause significant changes in LOS. In fact, the addition of the proposed project would decrease the volume-to-capacity ratio in the a.m. peak hour and would have no effect on the volume-to-capacity ratio in the p.m. peak hour. As such, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

IMPACT 11.5:	**Increased Traffic Volumes on Sacramento County Roadways under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Sacramento County General Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

The proposed project would result in traffic volume changes on a number of roadways in Sacramento County. *Table 11.2* shows the changes in a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection level of service at a number of Sacramento County intersections. The table shows that a number of intersections operate at LOS F without or with the proposed project. As shown in the table, the proposed project would contribute to an increase in the v/c ratio at only one location – Watt Avenue at Antelope Road. The 1% change in v/c ratio at this location is a result of 23 additional vehicles moving through the intersection in the peak hour. This correlates to approximately one additional car every 2.5 minutes. Most drivers through the intersection would be exposed to only a few additional vehicles. This is not a noticeable change and would not have a measurable effect on the level of congestion observed at the intersection. Because no intersections would degrade substantially with the project during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hours, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

Table 11.2
2025 Cumulative Plus Project Level of Service at Sacramento County Intersections

Intersection	LOS Standard	2025 Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Proposed Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Elverta Rd	E	D	0.90	D	0.89
Walerga Rd & Elverta Rd	E	D	0.87	D	0.88
Watt Ave & Antelope Rd	E	**F**	**1.14**	**F**	**1.15**
Walerga Rd & Antelope Rd	E	B	0.61	B	0.61
Watt Ave & Elkhorn	E	D	0.88	D	0.88
Walerga Rd & Elkhorn	E	B	0.65	B	0.66
PM Peak Hour					
Watt Ave & Elverta Rd	E	**F**	**1.01**	**F**	**1.01**
Walerga Rd & Elverta Rd	E	**F**	**1.11**	**F**	**1.11**
Watt Ave & Antelope Rd	E	**F**	**1.26**	**F**	**1.26**
Walerga Rd & Antelope Rd	E	D	0.85	B	0.61
Watt Ave & Elkhorn	E	**F**	**1.04**	**F**	**1.04**
Walerga Rd & Elkhorn	E	D	0.89	D	0.89

Note:
BOLD Locations Do Not Meet LOS Policy

Table 47 in the Transportation Impact Analysis (DKS 2011) shows that the segment of Walerga Road south of PFE Road would operate at LOS F with and without the project. The proposed project would not add a significant volume of additional traffic to this segment. As such, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

IMPACT 11.6:	**Increased Traffic Volumes on Sutter County Roadways under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Sutter County General Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

The proposed project would result in traffic volume increases on some Sutter County roadways. *Table 11.3* shows the projected a.m. and p.m. peak hour levels of service at Sutter County intersections in the vicinity of the proposed project under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project conditions. The table shows that both intersections are projected to operate at an acceptable level of service without and with the proposed project.

Table 11.3
2025 Cumulative Plus Project Level of Service at Sutter County Intersections

Intersection	LOS Standard	2025 Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Proposed Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
Pleasant Grove N & Riego	D	B	0.69	B	0.67
Pleasant Grove S & Riego	D	C	0.71	B	0.67
PM Peak Hour					
Pleasant Grove N & Riego	D	B	0.67	B	0.68
Pleasant Grove S & Riego	D	C	0.78	C	0.79

Table 49 in the Transportation Impact Analysis (DKS 2011) shows that the addition of the proposed project is not projected to increase daily traffic on Riego Road east of SR 70/99. Therefore the impact on Sutter County roadways is considered to be less than significant.

IMPACT 11.7:	**Increased Traffic Volumes at State Highway Interchanges under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Caltrans Policies
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

The addition of the proposed project to 2025 Cumulative conditions would cause changes in traffic volumes at State highway interchanges providing access to the site. It should be noted that the project site is approximately three miles from the nearest State highway, so impacts to State highway facilities are forecast to be minimal. It should also be noted that planned improvements at a number of interchange intersections may result in future levels of service improving when compared to existing levels of service.

Table 11.4 shows the 2025 Cumulative and 2025 Cumulative plus project levels of service at a number of interchanges providing access to State highways including State Route 65, Interstate 80, and State Route 70/99. The State's Transportation Concept Reports (TCR's) for these three highways designate a level of service standard of E or better. During the a.m. peak hour and p.m. peak hour, all of these interchanges will continue to function at LOS E or better. Therefore, cumulative impacts at state highway interchanges are considered to be less than significant.

Table 11.4
2025 Cumulative Plus Project Level of Service at State Highway Ramp Intersections

Intersection	LOS Standard	2025 Cumulative Conditions			
		No Project		Plus Project	
		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
AM Peak Hour					
SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	A	0.50	A	0.61
Washington Blvd & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	A	0.46	A	0.66
I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	E	C	0.71	C	0.81
I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	E	A	0.44	A	0.56
SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	A	0.54	A	0.71
SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	A	0.40	A	0.66
I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	E	C	0.72	C	0.61
Stanford Ranch & Sr-65 N/B On	E	A	0.53	A	0.83
Stanford Ranch/Galleria & Sr-65 S/B On	E	A	0.42	A	0.82
Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	E	D	0.84	D	0.97
I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	E	C	0.77	C	0.91
SR 70/99 NB & Riego Rd	D	B	0.67	B	0.64
SR 70/99 SB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.15	A	0.14
PM Peak Hour					
SR 65 N/B Off & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	B	0.61	B	0.61
Washington Blvd & Blue Oaks Blvd	E	B	0.66	B	0.67
I-80 WB Off & Douglas Blvd	E	C	0.81	C	0.81
I-80 WB On & Atlantic St	E	A	0.57	A	0.56
SR 65 N/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	C	0.71	C	0.71
SR 65 S/B Off & Pleasant Grove Blvd	E	B	0.66	B	0.66
I-80 WB Off & Riverside Ave	E	B	0.61	B	0.61
Stanford Ranch & Sr-65 N/B On	E	D	0.83	D	0.83
Stanford Ranch/Galleria & Sr-65 S/B On	E	D	0.82	D	0.82
Taylor & Eureka I-80 EB Off	E	E	0.97	E	0.97
I-80 EB Off/Orlando & Riverside Ave	E	E	0.91	E	0.91
SR 70/99 NB & Riego Rd	D	C	0.76	C	0.64
SR 70/99 SB & Riego Rd	D	A	0.19	A	0.14

IMPACT 11.8:	**Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Caltrans Policies
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	Mitigation Measure 11.8a
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Significant and Unavoidable

The addition of the proposed project to 2025 Cumulative conditions would cause changes in traffic volumes on State highways providing access to the site. *Table 11.5* shows the 2025 Cumulative and 2025 Cumulative plus project volumes on State highway segments. The table shows that much of I-80 and SR 65 are projected to operate at LOS F and the addition of the proposed project would add to some of these already deficient facilities, including the following locations:

- I-80: Taylor Road to SR 65 – 0.1 percent increase in ADT
- SR 65: I-80 to Galleria Boulevard – 0.1 percent increase in ADT
- SR 65: Galleria Boulevard to Pleasant Grove Boulevard – 0.3 percent increase in ADT
- SR 65: Pleasant Grove Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard – 0.4 percent increase in ADT
- SR 70/99: Riego Road to Elverta Boulevard – 0.2 percent increase in ADT
- SR 70/99: Elverta Road to Elkhorn Boulevard – 0.1 percent increase in ADT

Because Caltrans considers any increase in volume on an already deficient facility an impact, this represents a significant impact. Caltrans has recently completed Phases 2 and 3 of the I-80 widening project in Placer County that added High Occupancy Vehicle lanes and Auxiliary lanes from the Sacramento County line to 1,000 feet east of the SR 65 Interchange. These modifications improved operation of these segments of I-80 but would not improve the LOS in the cumulative condition and therefore would not reduce the impacts from the project to less than significant levels.

Table 11.5
2025 Cumulative Plus Project Average Daily Traffic Volumes and LOS on State Highways

Facility	Segment	Lanes	2025 Cumulative Conditions			
			No Project		Plus Project	
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS
I-80	Sacramento County line to Riverside Ave	8	**215,100**	**F**	**214,800**	**F**
	Riverside Avenue to Douglas Blvd	6	**188,400**	**F**	**188,200**	**F**
	Douglas Blvd to Eureka Rd	6	**187,300**	**F**	**187,300**	**F**
	Eureka Rd to Taylor Rd	8	**202,400**	**F**	**202,500**	**F**

Facility	Segment	Lanes	2025 Cumulative Conditions			
			No Project		Plus Project	
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS
	Taylor Rd to SR 65	8	**191,200**	**F**	**191,300**	**F**
SR 65	I-80 to Galleria Blvd	6	**137,700**	**F**	**137,800**	**F**
	Galleria Blvd to Pleasant Grove Blvd	6	**142,100**	**F**	**142,500**	**F**
	Pleasant Grove Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd	6	**131,300**	**F**	**131,800**	**F**
	Blue Oaks Blvd to Sunset Blvd	4	**121,400**	**F**	**121,400**	**F**
SR 70/99	Sankey Rd to Riego Rd	4	60,100	C	60,300	C
	Riego Rd to Elverta Rd	4	**88,300**	**F**	**88,500**	**F**
	Elverta Rd to Elkhorn Blvd	4	**87,200**	**F**	**87,300**	**F**

Notes:
Roadway segment levels of service (LOS) are based on roadway capacities and LOS criteria in Table 5.3 in Chapter 5 Transportation and Circulation
Highway segments operating at LOS F are **BOLD**
Impacts are Shaded
Volumes Exclude Carpool Lanes

The City is working with Caltrans and PCTPA to establish a regional approach to institute a fee program to fund improvements on I-80 and SR 65. *Mitigation Measure 11.8a* requires applicants for development within the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project area to pay impact fees to the City of Roseville in amounts that constitute the project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements if and when Caltrans and the City enter into an enforceable agreement. This requirement is consistent with the Mitigation Fee Act (Gov. Code § 66000 et seq.). Because this fee program is not currently in place and no specific improvements that would provide acceptable LOS on I-80 and SR 65 are programmed, this impact remains significant and unavoidable. Additional information regarding the efforts to establish a regional fee program to fund improvements to state facilities is provided in the Transportation Impact Analysis (DKS 2011) included in Appendix B to this Draft Subsequent EIR.

***Mitigation Measure 11.8a**:* If the City of Roseville has entered into an enforceable agreement with Caltrans regarding construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements to state facilities in the vicinity, the project applicant shall contribute the project's fair share costs of the construction of improvements to I-80 and SR 65 at the time that building permits are issued.

Cumulative Plus Project Without Placer Parkway Conditions

Although Placer Parkway is currently being extensively studied, full construction of this roadway is not yet funded. Therefore, it is appropriate to include a scenario that assumes this important regional roadway is not constructed. This scenario is not intended to identify impacts and mitigation measures. The land use assumptions for this scenario are consistent with the assumptions used in the Cumulative Plus Proposed Project scenario.

The cumulative travel demand model estimates that Placer Parkway would carry about 50,400 daily vehicles between SR 65 and Foothills Boulevard, about 42,200 daily vehicles between Foothills Boulevard and Fiddyment Road, and about 20,200 daily vehicles between Fiddyment Road and Watt Avenue/Blue Oaks Boulevard. It is expected that these volumes would be a result of traffic diverting from I-80, SR 65, and roadways within the western portion of the City of Roseville. Therefore, removing this important regional roadway would push a substantial amount of traffic to other roadways in Roseville and Placer County.

The following discussion compares statistics under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with and without Placer Parkway. *Tables 11.6* and *11.7* show the percentage of signalized intersections projected to operate at LOS C or better under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with and without Placer Parkway, during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, respectively. With or without Placer Parkway, more than 70 percent of the signalized intersections in Roseville would operate at LOS C or better, which meets the City's requirement. *Table 11.8* shows that the number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse during the a.m. peak hour remains at 10 with the removal of Placer Parkway. *Table 11.9* shows that the number of intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worse during the p.m. peak hour increases from 21 to 26 with the removal of Placer Parkway.

Table 11.6

A.M. Peak Hour Number of Intersections Operating at LOS C or Better

	AM Peak Hour			
	With Partial Placer Parkway		Without Placer Parkway	
Level of Service	Number of Intersections	Percentage	Number of Intersections	Percentage
LOS A-C	188	91.7%	187	91.2%
LOS D	10	4.9%	10	4.9%
LOS E	5	2.5%	6	2.9%
LOS F	2	1.0%	2	1.0%
LOS D-F	17	8.3%	18	8.8%
Total	205	100%	205	100%

Table 11.7

P.M. Peak Hour Number of Intersections Operating at LOS C or Better

	PM Peak Hour			
	With Partial Placer Parkway		Without Placer Parkway	
Level of Service	Number of Intersections	Percentage	Number of Intersections	Percentage
LOS A-C	170	82.9%	164	80%
LOS D	21	10.2%	26	12.7%
LOS E	7	3.4%	8	3.9%
LOS F	7	3.4%	7	3.4%
LOS D-F	35	17.1%	41	20%
Total	205	100%	205	100%

Table 11.8 identifies the intersections where LOS degrades when Placer Parkway is removed. As shown in the table, impacts occur only in the p.m. peak hour.

Table 11.8
Roseville Intersections with Significant LOS Changes Without Placer Parkway

Intersection	With Partial Placer Parkway		Without Placer Parkway	
Intersection Name	**LOS**	**V/C**	**LOS**	**V/C**
PM Peak Hour				
Blue Oaks Blvd & Diamond Creek Blvd	C	0.79	**D**	**0.84**
Foothills Blvd & Junction Blvd	C	0.81	**D**	**0.82**
Foothills Blvd & McAnally Dr	C	0.80	**D**	**0.82**
Pleasant Grove Blvd & Gold Coast/Hallissy	C	0.79	**D**	**0.82**
Roseville Parkway & Sierra College Blvd	C	0.80	**D**	**0.82**

Note: **BOLD** Locations operate at LOS D or Worse
Shaded Locations Represent Project Impacts

The above table shows that construction of Placer Parkway would dramatically improve intersection levels of service Citywide under Cumulative conditions. Therefore, it is in Roseville's interest to do all it can do to assure that future projects located within the City provide their fair share contribution toward the eventual construction of Placer Parkway.

Table 11.9 shows that the removal of Placer Parkway would result in increases in traffic volumes on all study roadway segments in the City of Rocklin. These increases range from two percent to seven percent.

Table 11.9
Level of Service at Rocklin Roadway Segments Without Placer Parkway

Roadway Segment	LOS Standard	Lanes	2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions			
			With Partial Placer Parkway		Without Placer Parkway	
			ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS
Lonetree Blvd north of Blue Oaks Blvd	D*	4	29,400	D	31,400	D
Blue Oaks Blvd at Roseville City Limit	D*	4	12,200	A	13,200	A
Pleasant Grove Blvd at Roseville City Limit	C	6	26,900	A	27,500	A
Stanford Ranch Rd at Roseville City Limit	C	6	27,200	A	27,700	A

Note:* Within ½ Mile of Freeway Ramp

Table 44 in the Transportation Impact Analysis (DKS 2011) in Appendix B shows that the removal of Placer Parkway would result in degradation in LOS at one of the study intersections in Placer County during both peak hours. The intersection of Industrial Avenue and Athens Avenue degrades from LOS E to LOS F during the a.m. peak and from LOS B to LOS D during the p.m. peak. Other intersections would experience increases in volume-to-capacity ratio but not sufficient to degrade LOS.

Based on Table 60 in the Transportation Impact Analysis (DKS 2011), the intersection of Watt and Antelope would operate at level of service F with and without the project and with the removal of Placer Parkway during the a.m. peak hour, however, the v/c would increase by less than 0.05. During the p.m. peak hour, the intersection would operate at LOS F, however the v/c would increase by less than 0.05. Therefore, impacts during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour are considered to be less than significant. Table 61 in the Transportation Impact Analysis shows that the segment of Walerga Road south of PFE Road would operate at LOS F with and without the project. The increase on Walerga Road south of PFE Road would degrade that segment's v/c by less than 0.01 which represents a less than significant impact.

Table 62 in the Transportation Impact Analysis (DKS 2011) identifies the level of service for study intersections within Sutter County under the cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario. As noted in that table, the project would not result in any significant traffic impacts under this scenario. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant. Table 63 in the Transportation Impact Analysis identifies the level of service within Sutter County on the roadway segment under the cumulative without Placer Parkway scenario. Level of service would be LOS F without or with the proposed project. Therefore the project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts in Sutter County is less than cumulatively considerable and therefore this impact is less than significant.

Noise

IMPACT 11.9:	**Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Noise Levels**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	City of Roseville General Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Potentially Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	Mitigation Measure 11.9a
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

The cumulative context for noise depends on whether the source is mobile (traffic related) or stationary source related (e.g., factory or generator). Traffic noise from the project would result in noise both inside and outside the area. At the same time, the project area would be subjected to traffic noise from other areas. Consequently, the cumulative context for traffic noise is the City of Roseville and nearby portions of unincorporated Placer County.

Traffic noise levels under buildout of the City's General Plan, as well as year 2025 levels plus the proposed project, are presented in **CHAPTER 6 NOISE** of this Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR. This cumulative analysis qualitatively considers additional traffic noise from development that is not included in the 2025 traffic model, specifically the reasonably foreseeable projects described in Section 11.2.

Construction Noise

Noise impacts would result from operation of construction equipment and from noise generated by vehicular traffic traveling to and from a construction site. The magnitude of the impact would depend on the type of construction activity, the noise level associated with each piece of construction equipment, the duration of construction, availability of noise barriers, and the distance between the source of the noise and receptors. Properties located adjacent to construction sites would be affected temporarily; therefore, short-term construction noise impacts are anticipated. Residents could be affected by development construction activities related to the Placer Ranch Specific Plan to the north, Westpark (part of the WRSP) to the south and Creekview to the west.

It is unlikely that construction activities in these project areas would be close enough to a particular sensitive receptor to create a substantial combined noise level, particularly as the noise source would need to double in magnitude to achieve a noticeable effect. Construction within the WRSP and Fiddyment Ranch would comply with the City Noise Ordinance. As discussed earlier, the construction of any project that occurs within the city would be limited to the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M Saturday and Sunday. Also, any periods in which more than one project was operating in proximity to the same sensitive receptor would likely be very short, and would only occur during the hours mentioned above. For these reasons, the Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 construction noise would not be cumulatively considerable and is considered a less than significant cumulative impact.

Stationary Source Noise

It is not expected that urban uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project area would be exposed to or generate multiple sources of stationary noise that would be close enough to each other to generate a significant noise impact. The sources of noise in the WRSP, and surrounding areas such as Creekview, would be generated from use of schools, parks and commercial areas. No industrial or heavy manufacturing uses are proposed in the WRSP that would generate noise. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate or be exposed to substantial cumulative noise from stationary sources and this cumulative impact is considered less than significant.

Onsite Traffic Noise

Development of the project area would result in onsite noise levels that could exceed city standards. As discussed in **CHAPTER 6 NOISE**, several roadways adjacent to proposed residential areas in the Fiddyment Ranch project area including Hayden Parkway, portions of Crawford Parkway, Holt Parkway, Blue Oaks Boulevard and Fiddyment Road are predicted to have traffic noise levels greater than the 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard. No residential receivers are expected to be exposed to roadway traffic noise levels in excess of 70 dB L_{dn}. Depending on the distance to residences these locations, the exterior and interior noise levels could exceed City standards under 2025 conditions, however with implementation of the mitigation required under **CHAPTER 6 NOISE**, noise exposure to residences within Fiddyment Ranch would remain at acceptable levels.

Future development outside of the project area would further contribute to traffic related noise. Based upon the barrier analyses conducted for the project, the residential uses adjacent to Fiddyment Road and Blue Oaks Boulevard would require an 8-foot tall property line sound wall to reduce traffic noise levels within compliance of the 60 dB L_{dn} standard. The barrier

analyses for Hayden Parkway, Crawford Parkway and Holt Parkway indicate that a barrier height of 6-feet would be required to reduce traffic noise levels within compliance with the 60 dB L_{dn} standard. *Mitigation Measure 6.2a* requires construction of these noise walls and/or completion of site-specific traffic noise levels analyses as part of the processing of each Fiddyment Ranch tentative map that includes residential development adjacent to Fiddyment Road, Hayden Parkway, Crawford Parkway and Holt Parkway.

With implementation of *Mitigation Measure 6.2a*, the project in conjunction with reasonably foreseeable future growth would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to onsite traffic noise.

Offsite Traffic Noise

Cumulative development within the project region is expected to increase roadway noise levels and the 60 dB L_{dn} contour for many roadways. As shown in Table 11 of the Environmental Noise Assessment for the proposed project (provided in Appendix C to this Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR), the proposed project would not contribute more than a 0.3 dB increase in traffic noise levels for roadways in the 2025 Plus Project Conditions. Further, the traffic noise levels in the 2025 conditions for roadways nearest to the Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project site (which is where the project-generated traffic would have the most noticeable effect and greatest contribution to cumulative noise levels) would not result in or contribute to cumulative noise levels at sensitive land uses that exceed the City's conditionally allowable maximum outdoor activity area noise level of 75 dB. Because transportation source noise levels would meet the City's standards, the cumulative impact related to offsite traffic noise in the vicinity of the Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 11.9a: Future residential development adjacent to Fiddyment Road, Blue Oaks Boulevard, Hayden Parkway, Crawford Parkway, and Holt Parkway shall include a property line sound wall to reduce traffic noise levels in compliance with the 60 dB L_{dn} standard. If site conditions are such that base of wall, roadway centerline and building pads are all the same elevation, the required height of the sound walls adjacent to Fiddyment Road and Blue Oaks Boulevard is 8 feet and the required height of the sound walls adjacent to Hayden Parkway, Crawford Parkway, and Holt Parkway is 6 feet. This also assumes a typical setback of 75 feet from the roadway centerline to the barrier, and a setback of 20 to 25 feet from the barrier to the building façade. If site conditions are such that base of wall, roadway centerline and building pads are not all the same elevation, or the setbacks are significantly different than those assumed in the barrier analysis, an analysis of traffic noise barrier effectiveness shall be completed for each Fiddyment Ranch tentative map that includes residential development adjacent to these roadways. The analysis shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant and shall specify the measures required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard at the outdoor activity areas. *(This measure is the same as Mitigation Measure 6.2a.)*

Air Quality

IMPACT 11.10:	**Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Any Pollutant for which the Project Region is Non-Attainment Under an Applicable Air Quality Standard**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	City of Roseville General Plan Sacramento Region Ozone Attainment Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	Mitigation Measure 11.10a
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Significant and Unavoidable

The cumulative context for air quality is the City of Roseville and surrounding areas, including Western Placer County, the City of Rocklin, northern Sacramento County, and eastern Sutter County. Reasonably foreseeable projects in this area are identified in Section 11.2.

Construction Emissions

Generation of fugitive dust and pollutant emissions during construction would increase local air pollutants concentrations over the project's approximate 12-year buildout timeline. This would contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. However the implementation of mitigation measures, such as Best Available Control Measures as prescribed by the Placer County APCD for construction or site grading activities, would reduce overall emissions to the greatest extent feasible. As discussed in Impact 7.1 in **CHAPTER 7 AIR QUALITY**, implementation of mitigation measures during construction would not reduce the project's ROG emissions. However construction emissions would only exceed the APCD thresholds in one construction phase – during painting of the community commercial buildings included in Phase 3B and assumed to be constructed in 2024. During this 15-day period, the project would generate maximum daily emissions of 524 pounds of ROG, which is substantially above the APCD threshold of 82 pounds per day and represents a significant impact of the proposed project. The ROG emissions during this period could contribute to violations of air quality standards for ozone, and therefore represents a substantial contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. Because there is no feasible mitigation available to avoid this impact, construction of the proposed ~~the~~ project would have a significant and unavoidable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts.

Operational Emissions

During operation of the proposed project, the project's ROG and NO_X emissions would exceed the Placer County APCD cumulative thresholds after implementation of the mitigation measures identified in **CHAPTER 7 AIR QUALITY**, as shown in *Table 11.10*. In addition, during project operation, the project's PM_{10} and CO emissions would exceed the Placer County APCD operational thresholds (no separate cumulative thresholds are applicable to PM_{10} and CO). As shown in *Table 7.10* in **CHAPTER 7 AIR QUALITY**, PM_{10} emissions in 2020 would be approximately 163 pounds per day, which is nearly double the threshold of 82 pounds per day, and CO emissions in 2020 would be approximately 1,000 pounds per day, again nearly double the threshold of 550 pounds per day.

Table 11.10
Mitigated Operational Emissions (lbs/day)

Category	ROG	NOx
Area (except consumer products)	~~53.99~~21.7	2.82
Consumer Products	100.27	0
Energy	1.13	9.68
Mobile	228.63	145.39
Total	~~384.02~~351.73	157.89
Cumulative Threshold	10	10
Exceed (Yes/No)?	Yes	Yes

The emissions associated with use of consumer products were modified from the CalEEMod outputs because the CalEEMod outputs assume use of consumer products with all land uses included in the project. The values reported here assume no use of consumer products associated with the park site and parking lots included in the modeling.

As discussed in **CHAPTER 7 AIR QUALITY**, the region is designated as non-attainment with State ozone standards; therefore, any increase in the ozone precursors ROG and NO_X from new projects would contribute to cumulative impacts on regional air quality. Therefore, projects with the potential to emit a substantial amount of ozone precursors in the region would exacerbate existing air quality problems and must implement mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts to the extent feasible. *Mitigation Measure 11.10a* is provided to offset the project's long-term air pollutant emissions. As stated in the measure, it would offset the proposed project's ROG and NOx emissions from a single season by either facilitating or providing funding for the Placer County APCD to facilitate improvements to the operations of other land uses or stationary sources of air pollutants that would reduce ROG and NO_X emissions. ~~As these operational improvements would be set in place and used for ongoing operations, the project would offset its emissions for future years.~~ Payment of a portion of the fee required under Mitigation Measure 11.10a is already required of all development within the WRSP. Specifically, the Development Agreement between the City of Roseville and Fiddyment Farms includes payment of a fee of $134.10 (per section 3.27 of the Development Agreement) and an additional $90.84 (per section 3.15.11 of the Development Agreement), for a total of $224.94. These fees would be applied to the fee required under *Mitigation Measure 11.10a*.

Through the payment of fees, a portion of ~~T~~the project's contribution to cumulative air pollutant concentrations would be offset through this mitigation, however the offset would not be sufficient to reduce~~ing~~ the project's contribution to a level that is not cumulatively considerable. Thus the contribution of project operation to cumulative air pollutant concentrations would be ~~less than~~ significant and unavoidable. ~~In addition, in accordance with the terms of settlement agreement that resulted from litigation regarding the City's approval of the WRSP, developers of residential units within all portions of the WRSP pay $125 into the Placer County APCD Offsite Mitigation Program. This provides additional funding with which the APCD facilitates improvements to existing air pollutant sources to reduce regional air pollutant emissions.~~

In the cumulative condition, it is expected that regional development would contribute to ongoing violations of air quality standards, which is a significant cumulative impact. The

Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (Ozone Attainment Plan) was prepared to document measures the region will implement to achieve compliance with ozone standards. This document has been incorporated in the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The projections of NO_X and ROG emissions on which the Ozone Attainment Plan are based reflect growth projections in the City's General Plan and other local planning documents within the Sacramento region). The proposed project would allow for growth in the City of Roseville that exceeds current growth projections, and therefore some of the air pollutant emissions associated with development under the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project was not previously accounted for in the SIP. The additional emissions associated with the proposed project could hinder the region's ability to come into compliance with State and federal air pollutant standards. Although many criteria air pollutants within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin were accounted for in the SIP, it is likely that current growth forecasts for the Roseville area, with approval of the project, would be higher than expected when the existing plans were prepared.~~;~~ ~~t~~Therefore, emissions associated with the proposed project and buildout of cumulative development will adversely affect the region's ability to achieve compliance with air quality standards.

Because air pollutant emissions associated with the Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 are not accounted for in regional air quality attainment plans, and would exceed the Placer County APCD thresholds for ROG, NO_X, PM_{10} and CO, the proposed development would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts on regional air quality. The proposed project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable; therefore, this is a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measure 11.10a: Prior to issuance of building permits~~Improvement Plan approval~~, the project applicant shall implement one or more of the following mitigation strategies. The mitigation shall be sufficient to offset the amount of summertime project operation emissions of ROG and NO_X from one ozone season that exceed 10 pounds per day. The estimated amount that the mitigation must be sufficient to offset is ~~374.02~~348.19 pounds per day of ROG and 147.89 pounds per day of NO_X, a total of ~~521.91~~496.08 pounds per day for a 182-day period (summer days).

A. Establish mitigation offsite within west Placer County by participating in an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Examples include, but are not limited to participation in a "Biomass" program that provides emissions benefits; retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy duty engines from mobile sources (i.e. busses, construction equipment, road haulers); or other program that the project proponent may propose to reduce emissions.

B. Participate in the Placer County Air Pollution Control District Offsite Mitigation Program by paying the equivalent amount of money, which is equal to the project's contribution of pollutants (ROG and NO_X) in excess of the cumulative threshold of 10 pounds per day during summertime. The payment shall be based on the established fee of $17,080 per ton and shall be calculated based on a single year of summertime emissions (182-days). The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied ~~per~~ pursuant to current California Air Resource Board

guidelines, at the time of ~~Improvement Plan approval~~building permit issuance. (This measure is the same as *Mitigation Measure 7.2b*.)

Climate Change

IMPACT 11.11:	**Make a Considerable Contribution to Global Climate Change**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	AB 32 City of Roseville General Plan
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

As climate change is a global phenomenon, the earth is the true cumulative context for climate change impacts. However, it would be speculative and beyond the scope of this EIR to attempt to identify and evaluate global development assumptions. A smaller cumulative context for climate change could be the State of California, as the state has adopted statewide targets for GHG emission reductions. As demonstrated in the analysis in **CHAPTER 8 CLIMATE CHANGE**, with implementation of mitigation identified in that chapter the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project would be GHG-efficient, would meet the AB 32 Scoping Plan emission target of reducing year 2020 emissions to at least 21% below year 2010 emissions, and would comply with State and City of Roseville strategies, plans, policies, and regulations for reducing GHG emission locally and statewide. Therefore, the project is not expected to make a considerable contribution to this significant cumulative impact.

Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply

IMPACT 11.12:	**Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Demands for Potable Water**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	(as identified throughout Chapter 9A)
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Significant and Unavoidable

The cumulative context for public utilities includes the northern Central Valley, particularly the western Placer County region. As discussed in **CHAPTER 9A POTABLE WATER SUPPLY**, the Water Forum Agreement (WFA) established provisions for regional water supply through the year 2035. The proposed project and other foreseeable future development within the City of Roseville and development in areas that are currently outside the City's boundaries but are anticipated to be proposed for annexation to the City would increase water demands in the City of Roseville in excess of the existing City of Roseville's currently contracted surface water supplies. This is a significant impact. When considering the following development assumptions, total cumulative water demands are estimated at 71,511 acre-feet per year (AFY). Available recycled water supplies are estimated at 6,094 AFY resulting in a total potable water supply need of 65,417 AFY. This is 6,157 AFY more than the City's WFA limitation on diversions from the American River in wet/normal years of 58,900 AFY, but 583 AFY less than

the City's total normal/wet year water supply contracts of 66,000 AFY. The buildout assumptions for this water demand include the following:

- the City's existing General Plan (including the WRSP, Creekview Specific Plan and urban reserve, and Sierra Vista Specific Plan and urban reserve),
- Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan, and
- Placer Ranch Specific Plan.

The analysis of cumulative water supply below is summarized from the Creekview Specific Plan EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference. The Creekview Specific Plan EIR is available for review at the City of Roseville Permit Center and on the City's website.

The focus of this analysis is whether the City will have sufficient water supplies to serve the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project as well as other development anticipated within the City limits. In addition, this analysis considers the potential environmental effects of ensuring a sufficient water supply (including distribution and storage) to serve cumulative development in the region under the provisions of the WFA. The analysis considers water demand from urban land use development as well as agricultural, municipal and industrial water customers. The analysis also reflects regulations that govern regional water supply operations as well as the effects that operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP) may have on regional environmental resources such as changing groundwater levels and groundwater quality, fisheries and aquatic resources habitat, recreational opportunities, and hydropower generation. Finally, the cumulative water supply impact assessment also considers the reasonable certainty of future cumulative water supply availability.

Future Water Supplies

As shown above, the City of Roseville will require additional water supplies in the cumulative condition. The specific additional water supplies and the timing for obtaining them to serve potential future projects are uncertain. In addition to the City's full use of its WFA allocation of surface water from the American River, it is likely that future water supply will come from one or more of the following sources: additional cooperative agreements between WFA water purveyors for surface water from the American River, mandatory conservation measures, new surface water diversions from the Sacramento River, and the City's Aquifer Storage & Recovery (ASR) program, which would allow the City to store treated surface water (potable water) in the aquifer for use when needed. Under this program, surface water can be injected into the aquifer during wet times (wet years or during the rainy season), and then the City's groundwater wells can pump stored surface water during times of need or to reduce peak water demand periods, like those which occur during summer months.

While future water demands, as developed from community General Plan scenarios and other land use projections, are considered in the water supply operations model used for CVP/SWP planning purposes, there are several large water supply projects that have not been assessed either through the current water supply operations modeling or CEQA in a comprehensive manner. Additionally, there has been no comprehensive assessment of the future effect of new federal rules to protect endangered species on regional water supplies. Climate change also may result in additional uncertain effects to future water supply conditions and CVP/SWP

operations. In short, the CVP/SWP system is facing an unprecedented level of uncertainty that makes it impossible for CEQA lead agencies such as the City to predict the future without a large amount of speculation. The sources of such uncertainty are briefly discussed below, while additional information is provided in the Creekview Specific Plan EIR.

- Sacramento River Water Reliability Study (SRWRS): Proposed new surface water diversion (up to approximately 88,000 AFY, of which Roseville would obtain 7,100 AFY) on the Sacramento River upstream of the confluence with the lower American River that would serve to meet demands of the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), the cities of Sacramento and Roseville, and the Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD). The effort was suspended due to reduced economic activity.
- El Dorado Water and Power Authority (EDWPA): Proposed new surface water diversion (40,000 AFY) from the American River basin upstream of and from Folsom Reservoir to serve El Dorado County. CEQA compliance is underway; project will require approval by the SWRCB. A Draft EIR was circulated in June 2010 but project revisions are necessary and additional impact analysis will be required to complete the CEQA compliance process.
- Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP): Comprehensive effort in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to provide for conservation and management of aquatic and terrestrial species, including restoration and enhancement of ecological functions, and to also improve current water supplies and the reliability of water supply delivery conveyed through the State Water Project (SWP) and the Central Valley Project (CVP).The BDCP is being prepared by a group of local water agencies, environmental and conservation organizations, state and federal agencies, and other interest groups. The project is being developed in compliance with the Federal Endangered Species Act and the California Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act. Operations modeling and compliance for CEQA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) are underway, with an anticipated October 2013 release of the Draft EIR. Chapter 3 of the draft BDCP describes the proposed Conservation Strategy, which describes specific conservation measures to achieve the project's goals. Conservation Measure 1 describes the new water facilities that would be constructed, describes how those new facilities would be operated, and identifies changes to operations of current water facilities. Project components could affect special-status species, requiring participation from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration – National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries).
- Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) Expanded Los Vaqueros Reservoir: Recently completed increase in storage capacity from the previous 100,000 AF to 160,000 AF to improve water quality delivered to CCWD customers and adjust timing of Delta diversions to accommodate the life cycles of aquatic species, thus reducing species impact and providing a net benefit to the Delta environment.
- City of Stockton Delta Water Supply Project: Proposed new surface water diversion (up to 126,000 AFY) from the Delta to meet Stockton municipal and industrial demand through 2050. In early 2006, the State Water Resources Control Board approved a water rights permit for the first phase (33,600 AFY).

- New water legislation: Recent negotiations have occurred over legislation that could affect operations of the CVP and SWP, including (i) a new governance structure for "the Delta," (ii) intention to augment the CVP and SWP by building new "storage" facilities, (iii) funding for ecosystem restoration and physical facilities, (iv) aggressive conservation goals, and (v) commitments to certain water users. Currently staff from the California Department of Water Resources is developing regulations and criteria to guide implementation and compliance.
- Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP) for CVP/SWP: The OCAP provides a detailed description of the coordinated operations of the CVP and SWP based on historical data and serves as a starting point for planning future operation. Under their authority provided in the federal Endangered Species Act, the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries can require change to the OCAP. Both agencies have issued Biological Opinions requiring changes to the current OCAP, and both Biological Opinions are the subjects of litigation filed in federal courts. The ultimate resolution of this issue is likely to alter operations of the CVP and SWP, but specific operational changes are unknown at this time. Appendix E3 to this Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR provides an assessment of recent changes in the regulatory framework that governs the integrated CVP/SWP operations and related effects to resource conditions.
- Climate Change: Scientific research to date indicates that observed climate change is likely to result in changes in regional climate conditions that may adversely affect water supply conditions in the Central Valley, and thus is considered in this assessment of future cumulative conditions. However, there is uncertainty regarding the timing, magnitude, and nature of potential climate changes to water resources. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) is conservatively considering the following potential changes in planning for future water supply operations:
  - Mean temperature increases from 2 to 6 degrees Celsius. California's complex terrains will modulate the value locally.
  - Unknown change to precipitation total but an increase in extreme wet and dry conditions. In higher elevations, increases in the amount of precipitation falling as rain and decreases in the amount of precipitation falling as snow.
  - Decreased snowpack particularly in the northern Sierra (up to 90% by 2100) and earlier melt time. Less mountain block recharge from snowpack expected with implications for long-term support of regional aquifers.
  - Annual runoff concentrated more in winter months with more variability and greater extremes.
  - Sea level rise up to 55 inches with the potential for higher rises.

Cumulative Impacts Analysis

One potential scenario has been identified for securing additional water supplies to meet the buildout demand for the City of Roseville land uses under future cumulative conditions. The scenario and its associated impacts are summarized here. Additional details are provided in the Creekview Specific Plan EIR.

Water Supply Provided Through New WFA Purveyor Contracts and Additional Conservation Measures

This scenario for obtaining additional water supply consists of the full utilization of the City's American River supply allocated by the WFA, with additional surface water supplies coming from other regional water supply purveyors, additional conservation measures imposed on new development within the City, or a combination of these two elements. Because the City's WFA allocation is subject to CVP deficiencies under drier year-types, the additional water demands under future cumulative conditions would require additional groundwater pumping in years when the City receives less than a full surface water allocation.

It is assumed that the City of Roseville would gain additional surface water supplies from contractual agreements made with PCWA or other WFA purveyors. It is considered reasonable to assume that these contracts could be established due to the recent recession and the slow pace of development. The WFA provides a framework for providing surface water and groundwater supplies to the region through 2030.

Obtaining additional water supplies while keeping within the WFA limitations could involve additional treated surface water secured from the American River to serve all or a portion of the Urban Growth Areas considered in this analysis (Sierra Vista Specific Plan Urban Reserve, Creekview Specific Plan and its Urban Reserve, Panhandle /University, Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan and Placer Ranch). Appendix E3 to this Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR provides a qualitative discussion of the reliability for water supplies previously allocated to WFA purveyors, and indicates that water supplies will continue to be available under the future cumulative conditions. While the uncertainties discussed above may reduce available water supplies for WFA purveyors, it is expected that CVP operations will still be able to honor existing American River water contracts in all years and meet full American River CVP water contractor diversions in many years. Two of the Urban Growth Areas are within PCWA's service boundaries and could be served by PCWA's proposed Ophir Water Treatment Plant. PCWA prepared and approved in the Foothill Phase II Water Treatment Plant and Pipeline EIR (June 2005) that covered construction of a new water treatment plant and associated transmission lines. The plant evaluated in the EIR would treat up to 30 million gallons per day. PCWA has indicated that it would be possible to provide the City of Roseville with water from the Ophir Water Treatment Plant project to serve future development by extending transmission lines.

Additional and more aggressive water conservation measures implemented in new development areas or realized within existing development would also be a part of this cumulative water supply scenario. Increased use of water efficient fixtures (low flow showers, toilets) has resulted in reduced water consumption. It is likely that new technologies, building codes and other legislative mandates will continue to result in a decrease in water consumption. For example, the State enacted legislation in 2006 requiring an update to the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and requiring all local agencies to update their local ordinances to match the state model. The state legislature also mandated a 20-percent reduction in urban per capita water use by 2020 statewide and the City is required to institute permanent water conservation programs to meet this mandate. At buildout of the existing City boundary it is estimated the City must reduce demands by approximately 10,500 AFY. This reduction in water demands would be accomplished through increased conservation measures such as the water

efficient landscape ordinance, and other future mandates and incentive programs necessary to meet reduction requirements. This could include the conversion of landscaped areas from potable water irrigation to irrigation with recycled water. Future development proposals would also be required to implement water conservation measures to meet the 20-percent conservation goal within their projects. If these measures were implemented, the resulting water conservation would allow new development areas to be served with a portion of the City's existing American River supply (because conservation would reduce the overall demand in the cumulative condition). The impacts of increased conservation are aesthetics related in that less traditional landscaping and less turf are likely a result. Because the level of water conservation is not fully quantifiable at this time, it is possible additional surface water supplies may still be needed.

Environmental Impacts Under Cumulative Water Supply Scenario

As summarized below, environmental impacts associated with the cumulative water supply scenario include impacts related to construction of new water conveyance infrastructure associated with the new PCWA water treatment plant, impacts from diversion of surface water from the American River, and impacts from increased use of groundwater.

- Water Conveyance Infrastructure and Water Treatment Plant Impacts: Impacts that would result from construction of infrastructure necessary to treat and deliver additional PCWA water from the proposed Ophir Water Treatment Plant to the City of Roseville were originally disclosed in the Foothill Phase II Water Treatment Plant and Pipeline EIR and were summarized more recently in the Second Partially Re-circulated Revised (SPRR) Draft EIR for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. These EIRs concluded that there was the possibility for environmental impacts in the following areas: agricultural resources, aesthetics/light and glare, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, traffic/transportation, air quality, noise, public services, and hazards/hazardous materials. Mitigation measures were developed to reduce all potential impacts to less than significant levels with the exception of impacts to Air Quality during construction of the plant. Specifically, construction activities would create dust from earthmoving and NOx from construction vehicle exhaust. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact of cumulative water supply under this scenario. The proposed project would contribute to this impact by increasing water supply demands in the region. In addition, extension of transmission lines to serve the City of Roseville could result in a loss or disturbance of grassland habitat, impacts to vernal pools, and impacts to cultural resources where transmission lines need to cross undeveloped lands. Because the impacts of construction of water supply infrastructure are unknown, the contribution of the proposed project to the need to construct water delivery infrastructure is conservatively considered to be cumulatively considerable and thus Significant and Unavoidable.

- Surface Water Diversion Impacts: An EIR was prepared for the WFA that addresses impacts and mitigation measures resulting from implementation of the water supply program outlined in the WFA. The cumulative impacts assessed in the WFA EIR considered the City's full diversion needs of 58,900 AFY of American River water under normal / wet year-types, and up to 39,800 under the driest year-types, along with the other cumulative water demands and system CVP/SWP operations known at the time

the EIR was prepared in 1999. Under this scenario, the City's cumulative demand would be met by supplies previously allocated and assessed under the WFA EIR. Therefore the WFA EIR provides a reasonable assessment of the incremental indirect effects of meeting the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project water demands under the future cumulative condition. The WFA EIR listed the flow-related environmental impacts that could occur when implementing water diversions under the WFA and concluded that there was the possibility for environmental impacts in the following areas: groundwater resources, water supply, water quality, fisheries and aquatic habitat, flood control, hydropower supply, vegetation and wildlife, recreation, land use and growth inducement, aesthetics, cultural resources, soils and geology. While mitigation measures were developed, some impacts remained significant even after feasible mitigation measures would be applied. The following list identifies the future significant cumulative impacts identified in the WFA EIR, which represents the impacts that would occur as a result of cumulative development in the region, including buildout of the City of Roseville pursuant to its existing General Plan, full development of the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project and development of the cumulative projects and/or development levels identified above.

- Water Supply: Decrease in deliveries to SWP and CVP customers
- Water Quality: adversely affect Sacramento River and Delta water quality
- Fishery Resources and Aquatic Habitat: Impacts to Folsom Reservoir's warm water fisheries; Impacts to fall-run Chinook salmon; Flow and temperature related impacts to splittail (February – May); Impacts to Shasta Reservoir's and Trinity Reservoirs' warmwater fisheries; Temperature related impacts to Sacramento River fishery resources; Impacts to Delta fish populations
- Hydropower Supply: Reduced CVP hydropower capacity and generation; Increased energy requirements for diverters pumping from Folsom Reservoir (economic impact
- Recreation: Impacts on Lower American recreation opportunities (rafting and boating); Reduced Folsom Reservoir boating opportunities; Reduced availability of Folsom reservoir swimming beaches
- Cultural Resources: Physical deterioration of cultural resources in Folsom Reservoir

❖ Increased Use of Groundwater: The City's use of additional groundwater in drier year types would be well within the available sustainable yield of the underlying aquifers. The PCWA August 2006, Integrated Water Resources Plan by Brown and Caldwell indicates a potential safe yield of 95,000 AFY for the North American River Sub basin. It is expected that groundwater pumping in the Sub basin, which primarily serves agricultural uses, will decrease in the future as agricultural lands are converted to urban land uses and served by surface water supplies. As documented in Chapter 9A of this Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR, the retirement of Reason Farms from agricultural production by the City is expected to result in a net banking of groundwater supplies of 270,968 AF over 100 years at buildout of the City, including the proposed project. Therefore, as urban development continues the City's ability to use groundwater in drier year types will increase but is not expected to impact the sustainability of the Sub basin.

The increased water demand created by the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project is estimated to be approximately 202 AFY. Diversion of additional surface water in wet year-types to meet the increased water demand associated with the proposed project, and additional groundwater pumping to provide water in drier year-types, would contribute negligibly to the overall cumulative impacts summarized above. Even so, the City conservatively assumes that the project's incremental contributions to the above-referenced significant unavoidable effects are themselves cumulatively considerable and thus significant and unavoidable.

Public Utilities – Wastewater Treatment

IMPACT 11.13:	**Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Demands for Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	(as identified throughout Chapter 9B)
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Significant and Unavoidable

Wastewater from the project and other regional projects within the boundaries of the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) service area would be treated at either the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) or the Dry Creek WWTP. Potential expansion of both WWTPs was identified in the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Final EIR completed in May 1996 (WWMP EIR). Additionally expansion at the Pleasant Grove WWTP was identified in the WRSP EIR completed in 2004. Construction of either plant expansion to accommodate wastewater flows from cumulative development in the SPWA service area could result in environmental impacts including loss of natural resources, degradation of water quality as a result of increased discharges to Pleasant Grove Creek or Dry Creek, and increases in traffic, noise, and air pollution. The NPDES discharge permit for either wastewater treatment plant would need to be amended to reflect higher flows.

As discussed in **CHAPTER 9B WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND CONVEYANCE**, the proposed project would increase demand for wastewater treatment and the amount of treated wastewater discharges and would contribute to the need to expand the Pleasant Grove WWTP. Because the plant would be expanded (rather than having a new plant constructed), it can be assumed that the construction and operational impacts would be similar to those associated with the existing facility. Expansion of the treatment plant would likely contribute to potential growth inducement, land use compatibility conflicts, traffic, noise, dust, odors, and water quality impacts, including increased outfall to Pleasant Grove Creek and potential impacts to water temperatures. These impacts were evaluated and mitigated to the extent feasible in the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan EIR (SCH #93092079). The onsite impacts that have previously been identified include:

- Loss of vernal pools/seasonal wetlands, and impacts to vernal pool special status species
- Loss of raptor habitat
- Odor and noise emissions

- ❖ Increased criteria air pollutant emissions due to subsequent development

As environmental review for expansion of the Pleasant Grove WWTP has not been prepared, it is uncertain if all impacts associated with construction and operation of an expanded plant can be mitigated to a less than significant level. Therefore, the cumulative impacts associated with expansion of the Pleasant Grove WWTP are considered significant and unavoidable, and the proposed project is expected to make a considerable contribution to these impacts.

Public Utilities – Recycled Water

IMPACT 11.14:	**Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Demands for Recycled Water**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	(as identified throughout Chapter 9C)
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

Currently recycled water is produced at the existing Dry Creek WWTP and Pleasant Grove WWTP and distributed to locations within the city and Placer County. Additional extensions of the recycled water system are proposed to supply additional development in the County including Placer Vineyards, Riolo Vineyards and Regional University. The Sutter Pointe and Eleverta specific plans are outside the recycled water service area.

To adequately serve cumulative development in the project region, the recycled water distribution system would to be expanded and additional storage tanks and pumping facilities would be needed. The extension of the system to areas outside the City of Roseville could result in potentially significant environmental effects, in part, related to construction activities. This could result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts. However, the proposed Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project is located where facilities for distribution of recycled water already exist or are already planned. Further, as discussed in **CHAPTER 9C RECYCLED WATER**, the proposed project would decrease demand for recycled water by implementing water conservation measures as compared to development under the WRSP as currently approved (wherein water conservation measures are not required). The proposed project would not contribute to the need to extend the recycled water system outside the City of Roseville and would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts associated with this construction. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to recycled water would remain less than significant.

Public Services

IMPACT 11.15:	**Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Demands for Public Services**
APPLICABLE POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	(as identified throughout Chapter 10)
SIGNIFICANCE WITH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION MEASURES:	None
SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION:	Less than Significant

Buildout of the city in combination with other development in south Placer County would increase the demand for fire services in the vicinity. Development would be consistent with the City's level of service policies and with mutual aid agreements with neighboring jurisdictions. This would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

Buildout of the City would increase the demand for fire protection and police services in the area. Revenues generated by sales tax and property taxes associated with development would increase the City's General Fund, a portion of which could pay for the additional fire and law enforcement personnel needed to serve this development. In addition, all development within Fiddyment Ranch contributes to the Communities Facility District #3, which provides additional funding for public services, including fire protection and police services. It is expected that development would be generally consistent with the City's goals for police-to-population ratios and through development review, the City would ensure that police response times and fire protection/emergency response times would meet the City's goals. Cumulative impacts related to fire protection and police services would be less than significant.

Buildout of the City in combination with other development in south Placer County would increase the demand on the school districts serving the project area. Existing and planned schools may not have capacity to serve all future development without the need for additional schools sites. School fees would be collected to fund construction of new schools, as required and allowed by State law. New residential development would be required to pay school impact fees to the school districts to offset the capital costs of constructing new schools, which would ensure that the cumulative impacts are less than significant. The identification of school sites and the payment of applicable fees, consistent with State law and City policies would ensure that the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on the local school districts is not cumulatively considerable. This would result in a less than significant impact.

Development within the City and the region would result in growth that would place additional demand on existing library facilities, which could reduce their ability to provide adequate service. This would result in a potentially significant impact in other areas of the City and region by potentially requiring the construction of additional branch libraries or expansion of existing library facilities. Because adequate library facilities are available to meet demands of the Fiddyment Ranch SPA 3 project, the contribution of the proposed project to cumulative impacts on library services is considered less than cumulatively considerable and therefore less than significant.

As Roseville and the surrounding communities continue to grow, there will continue to be a need to create parklands and open space. Development in Placer, Sutter, and Sacramento

counties and the City of Rocklin would also increase demand for parks. Payment of the Neighborhood and Community Park Fee and the Citywide Park Fee would be collected from all residential units developed in the City. In addition, the WRSP includes more than the minimum required amount of parkland relative to the population that would be supported within the WRSP area at full buildout. With the payment of fees and implementation of the General Plan policies requiring parkland dedication, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative demand for parks and recreation facilities would not be cumulatively considerable and would result in a less than significant impact.

This page intentionally left blank.