

**CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE FOR
THE SIERRA VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN**

**I.
INTRODUCTION**

The City of Roseville (“City”), as lead agency, has prepared the Final Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2008032115). The EIR consists of the November 2009 Draft EIR, Volumes 1 through 6 (“Draft EIR” or “DEIR”), and the April 2010 Final EIR, Volumes 7 and 8 (“FEIR” or “Final EIR”). The EIR is a combined program-level EIR pursuant to Section 15168 of the State “CEQA Guidelines” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 *et seq.*) and a project-level EIR pursuant to Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The EIR analyzes the significant effects on the environment (“significant impacts”) of the “Project,” which consists of a specific plan (“SVSP” or “Specific Plan”) for a 1,624-acre area (the “SVSP area”); amending the City’s sphere of influence (“SOI”) to bring a 373-acre area west of the City’s corporate boundaries into the City’s SOI; and annexing a 2,064-acre area, consisting of the SVSP area and the adjacent 432-acre “Urban Reserve area,” to the City. The combined SVSP area and Urban Reserve area are referred to herein as the “Project site.” No development is proposed for the Urban Reserve area. The applicant for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan portion of the Project is the Sierra Vista Landowners Group (“Applicant”).¹

The Specific Plan involves the development of a mix of land uses, including: 6,650 residential units, approximately 215 acres of commercial and office uses, approximately 60 acres of public/quasi-public, 267 acres of open space uses, 14 acres of paseos, and 90 acres of parks. The majority of the SVSP area is already within the City’s SOI, which was expanded in 2004 as part of the West Roseville Specific Plan (“WRSP”) annexation. The Project site is located in unincorporated Placer County immediately west and south of the City’s existing corporate boundaries. (See DEIR, Figure 2-1, Location Map, Ch. 2, “Project Description”, pp. 1-1, 2-1 to 2-2.) The Project site is surrounded by the Del Webb Specific Plan, the West Roseville Specific Plan, and the North Roseville Specific Plan areas. (DEIR, pp. 4.1-4 to 4.1-10, 4.1-46, 7-5.)

These findings, as well as the accompanying statement of overriding considerations in section X, *infra*, have been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 *et seq.*) and the CEQA Guidelines.

¹ The Sierra Vista Landowner Group is made up of : Baseline P & R LLC; Baybrook LP; D.F. Properties, Inc.; Mourier Investment, LLC; Mourier Investment, LLC Bagley & Associates; Mourier Investment, LLC Computer Deductions; Mourier Investment, LLC Wealth Properties Inc.; Cyril G. Barbaccia Trust; and Westpark Federico LLC.

II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

A. LOCATION

The Project site is located approximately 6 miles west of Interstate 80 and State Route 65, 10 miles northeast of the City of Sacramento, 10 miles east of State Route 99, 5 miles west of downtown Roseville, and four miles east of the Sutter County line. The Project site is west of Fiddymont Road and north of Baseline Road, and extends west from Fiddymont Road to approximately one-half mile west of the intersection of Watt Avenue and Baseline Road. (DEIR, p. 2-1.)

B. OVERVIEW

The land uses in the proposed SVSP include low, medium, and high density residential uses; community commercial, commercial mixed-use, and commercial/business professional mixed-use; public/quasi-public uses, parks and recreation areas, open space and paseos; landscape corridors, urban reserve areas, and roadways. At buildout, the SVSP will provide approximately 6,650 dwelling units, and generate a population of approximately 16,891 persons, based on the City's General Plan assumption of 2.54 persons per household. The SVSP could add as much as approximately 2,235,000 square feet of commercial and employment uses, resulting in approximately 4,966 jobs, assuming one job per 450 square feet of commercial/office space. In addition to the Specific Plan, the Project includes amending the City's SOI to add a 373-acre area west of the City's corporate boundaries. The Project also includes annexation of the entire 2,064-acre SVSP and Urban Reserve areas to the City, which includes the 373-acre area west and currently outside of the City's SOI.

The majority of the Project site is undeveloped and historically has been used for agricultural or grazing activities. Current land uses include four large-lot single-family residences, generally in the central and southwestern portion of the Project site, and other smaller structures along Baseline Road associated with ongoing dry farming agricultural production activities. In addition, strawberry fields are present in two small areas of the Project site along Baseline Road.

Four parcels in the northwest portion of the Project site would be given an Urban Reserve land use designation following annexation. Combined, these parcels constitute approximately 432 acres. The Urban Reserve land use designation is applied to lands that are anticipated to receive urban land use entitlements at some time in the future, but are constrained on an interim basis by growth management policies or other limitations. In this instance, the owners of the parcels are not interested in pursuing development at this time.

The EIR analyzes at a programmatic level the significant environment impacts of annexing the Urban Reserve area, and analyzes the significant impacts of the Specific Plan for the SVSP area at a project-level. While no development is proposed within the Urban Reserve area, is the EIR assumes that these four parcels will ultimately develop with a mix and density of land uses similar to that in the balance of the Project site and includes this assumption in the environmental

analysis accordingly. If development is proposed in the Urban Reserve area in the future, any such proposed development would require general plan and specific plan amendments, applicable Federal approvals/permits, and additional environmental review. (DEIR, pp. 2-1 to 2-2, 2-13.).

C. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As set forth in section 2.3 of the Draft EIR (pp. 2-9 to 2-12), the project objectives for the SVSP are as follows:

1. **Complete Comprehensive Planning for the SVSP Area:** Formulate a specific plan and related land use planning documents and regulatory approvals for the SVSP as a means of expanding the City in an orderly manner, and that accommodates the City's share of future regional population growth, that is compatible with surrounding land uses, that complements the pattern and intensity of existing development in the City, and that provides new benefits to the City.
2. **Mix of Land Uses:** Provide for a mix of land uses within the SVSP to create a balanced community with approximately 6,650 residential units; 215 acres of commercial, commercial mixed-use, and business professional uses; 60 acres of public/quasi-public uses, 357 acres of parks and open space, 14 acres of paseos, and 432 acres of urban reserve uses.
3. **Existing Policies:** Satisfy the City policies, regulations and expectations as defined in the General Plan, City/Placer County Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU"), City/U.S. Fish and Wildlife MOU, Growth Management Visioning Committee recommendations, Council Edge Policy, Zoning Ordinance, Improvement Standards, and other applicable plans, documents and programs adopted by the City.
4. **Blueprint Consistency:** Provide for development that meets the City's nine identified Blueprint Implementation strategies to achieve the Blueprint Principles adopted by the City Council in June 2005. Achieve project design characteristics that are reflective of the general policy direction embodied in the City's adopted General Plan and Blueprint Implementation Strategies, including connectivity between neighborhoods and commercial uses, services, schools and parks. By focusing development on lands adjacent to existing urban areas and infrastructure, the Blueprint strives to reduce the pressure to urbanize other agricultural or habitat lands within the greater Sacramento region, and thereby minimize long-term environmental impacts within the region.
5. **Commercial/Employment Center:** Provide for retail/commercial and office opportunities along key sub-regional transportation corridors such as Baseline Road and Watt Avenue.
6. **Jobs/Housing Balance:** Strive for a land use mix and pattern of development that will provide linkages between jobs and employment uses, will provide a reasonable jobs/housing balance, and will maintain the fiscal viability of the City.

7. **Housing Opportunities:** Plan for approximately 6,650 residential units to provide housing choices in varying densities that respond to all market segments, including opportunities for rental units and affordable housing consistent with the City's General Plan.
8. **Regional Housing Needs Allocation:** Aid the City in meeting its recognized obligation to accommodate a percentage of future population growth in the region (as embodied in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA") identified by the Sacramento Council of Governments ("SACOG") and the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD")) by increasing the residential holding capacity by 6,650 residential units in an area identified as appropriate for such development in the City/County MOU, the SACOG Blueprint Project Preferred Alternative (December 2005), and the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Feasibility Analysis (April 2007).
9. **Community Form:** Shape a physical form and character of development that is functional and creates a sense of place that will:
 - Establish an identifiable western edge of the City consistent with the City's edge policy, through inclusion of open space, urban reserve, and park uses.
 - Organize neighborhoods to be identifiable and walkable, and to incorporate gathering places such as village centers, parks, and schools.
 - Provide adequate school services to serve students generated in the SVSP area.
10. **Mixed-Use Nodes:** Create livable neighborhoods within the SVSP, with higher density development nodes anchored by commercial mixed-use centers that site retail, office, and service opportunities in proximity to residential neighborhoods.
11. **Regional Roadways:** Provide a safe and efficient circulation system that interconnects uses and promotes pedestrian circulation and alternate transportation options. Provide for an extension of Westside Drive to provide a parallel facility to Fiddymont Road to alleviate traffic congestion. Also provide an extension of Watt Avenue within the western portion of the SVSP and develop the frontage with a mix of land uses that take advantage of higher-density nodes around potential transit stops. In addition, develop an east-west roadway connection through the SVSP that parallels Baseline Road and provides an alternative east-west travel route for SVSP residents and enhances regional transportation systems.
12. **Land Use and Transportation Integration:** Provide for a mixture of land uses along the Watt Avenue and Baseline Road transportation corridors to take advantage of higher-density nodes around potential transit stops. Provide opportunities for potential bus rapid transit along Watt Avenue.
13. **Citywide Park Facilities:** Plan for a citywide park facility within the Plan Area with compatible adjacent land uses that will support adult and youth sporting programs.
14. **Bicycle Facilities:** Develop a system of Class I and Class II bikeway facilities that provide an alternative transportation mode and connect with planned city bikeway facilities to adjacent lands.

15. **Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections:** Provide connections throughout the **community** in the east-west direction and north-south direction via a system of open space and paseos.
16. **Public Transportation Options:** Through implementation of City arterial and collector street improvement standards, provide the opportunity to install fixed-route bus stops in appropriate locations. Operate Commuter, Dial-a-Ride, and fixed-route public transit services, as funding allows.
17. **Linking Public Use Areas:** Provide schools and accompanying parks with links to Plan-wide open spaces and residential neighborhoods.
18. **Habitat Conservation and Creation:** Balance development with resource protection, including preservation of the creek corridors, sensitive habitat and wetland resources in an inter-connected permanent open space. Where feasible, create multi-functional habitat within the open space corridors that will provide onsite habitat and aid in water quality. Develop the Plan Area and associated mitigation to compliment the Placer County Conservation Plan (“PCCP”).
19. **Positive Fiscal Impact:** Include commercial and other tax-generating land uses that will allow the project to have an overall positive fiscal impact on the City and Placer County. Phase development to allow the timely provision of services with the timing of development.
20. **Long Term Growth:** Plan for long-term growth to be positioned to react to market demand. The Specific Plan is intended to guide development over a 20-year horizon, and is not intended to provide short-term supply of land uses.

The project objectives for the Urban Reserve parcels are to provide a platform for orderly and systematic future development consistent with General Plan policies, the Guiding Principles, and the natural features of the land. (DEIR, p. 2-12.) It is recognized that the Urban Reserve parcels are a logical location for future growth, as identified in the 1997 Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) between the City of Roseville and Placer County. Annexation of the Urban Reserve area and the SOI amendment will enable the City to begin a long-term planning process to ensure that the Urban Reserve area ultimately develops to the City’s standards. In addition, these actions will allow the City to adequately plan for and size future infrastructure.

D. DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

The discretionary actions by the City, as lead agency, that are required to fully implement the Specific Plan are listed below. In addition to complying with CEQA by certifying the Final EIR, adopting these findings and the associated statement of overriding considerations, and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, the Applicant has applied for the following approvals from the City:

- approval of general plan amendments,

- adoption of the SVSP and Sierra Vista Design Guidelines,
- pre-zoning of property to be consistent with the SVSP land uses,
- approval of large lot tentative subdivision maps,
- approval of development agreements between the City and the project applicant,
- approval of tree permits,
- approval of Community Facilities District and/or other financing mechanisms,
- amendment of the Urban Water Master Plan,
- approval of the Water Supply Assessment,
- amendment of the Capital Improvement Program,
- amendment of the Bicycle Master Plan,
- allocation of 3,915 acre-feet per year of City surface water to the SVSP area, and
- condemnation or acquisition of property and right of way for City and public improvements.

(DEIR, pp. i-iii.)

The Applicant has requested these approvals in order to allow the proposed development on lands it controls (i.e., lands owned or under option by the Applicant). Hence, the analysis for the SVSP area in the EIR has been conducted at a project level. However, some these approvals also would apply to lands in the Urban Reserve area. Approximately 432 acres of the Project site consists of parcels controlled by non-participating landowners (specifically, the Chan and Richland parcels). No development is proposed for the non-participating parcels; therefore, the environmental analysis in the EIR of annexation of the Urban Reserve area is at a programmatic level. If and when development is proposed in the Urban Reserve area, additional environmental review and approvals would be required. It is anticipated that the City also would rely on this EIR (at least in part) for approval of other future discretionary entitlements and permits, but the City may need to supplement and update the analysis of the EIR to address site-specific information and any changes in circumstances that might exist by that time. The City will rely on this EIR to the degree that it adequately addresses the impacts of future development on the Project site, and to the degree that the future, subsequent development applications are within the scope of this EIR.

Other Project approvals action by responsible agencies and federal agencies include, or may include, the following:

- approval of a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, for discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States,
- approval of a Section 401 Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (“RWQCB”),
- expansion of the 2005 Service Area Boundary by the South Placer Wastewater Authority to include the SVSP area,
- approval of a Municipal Services Report by the Placer County Local Area Formation Commission (“LAFCO”),
- approval by LAFCO of a Sphere of Influence Amendment,
- approval by LAFCO of annexation of the SVSP area to the City and reorganization of the City’s corporate boundaries,
- approval by LAFCO of annexation of the entire Baseline Road right-of-way along the southern boundary of the SVSP,
- consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act,
- approval of a General Construction permit, including the development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, by the State Water Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”),
- approval of a Master Reclamation permit by SWRCB to address recycled water delivery from the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (“PGWWTP”),
- approval by RWQCB for the modification of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) permit for the PGWWTP,
- approval of a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game,
- approval of a permit to operate from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (“PCAPCD”), and
- oversight of removal and remediation activities by the appropriate agency (e.g., Department of Toxic Substances Control, Placer County Department of Environmental Health, the City, RWQCB, etc.) if hazardous materials are detected on the Project site. (DEIR pp. 2-67 to 2-71).

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) of an EIR on March 28, 2008. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15023(c) and 15087(f), the State Clearinghouse in the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research was responsible for distributing environmental documents to State agencies, departments, boards, and commissions for review and comment. The City followed required procedures with regard to distribution of the appropriate notices and environmental documents to the State Clearinghouse. The State Clearinghouse was obligated to make, and did make, that information available to interested agencies for review and comment. The NOP was received by the State Clearinghouse (SCH #2008032115) and a 30-day public review period ended on April 29, 2008. The County also held a scoping meeting on April 16, 2008, to receive comments on the NOP. The NOP and all comments received on the NOP are presented in Appendix B of the Draft EIR and Appendix A of the Final EIR. (DEIR, p. 1-13.)

The EIR includes analyses of the following issue areas:

- Land Use and Agricultural Resources
- Population, Employment and Housing
- Transportation and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Noise
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Vegetation and Wildlife
- Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources
- Hazardous Material and Public Safety
- Public Services
- Public Utilities
- Hydrology, Water Quality and Groundwater
- Aesthetics and Visual Resources

(See DEIR, p. 1-11.)

On November 10, 2009, the City distributed the Draft EIR to public agencies, the general public, and the State Clearinghouse for a 59-day public review period that ended on January 7, 2010. A public workshop on the DEIR was held on November 12, 2009. Public hearings on the Draft EIR were held before the Transportation Commission on November 17, 2009; before the Public Utilities Commission on November 19, 2009; and before the Parks and Recreation Commission on December 7, 2009. The Planning Commission held public hearings on the Draft EIR on December 10, 2009 and April 22, 2010. (FEIR, p. 11-10.)

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e), the record of proceedings for the City’s decision on the Project includes the following documents:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project;

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Draft EIR for the Project (November 2009) and all appendices, as well as all documents cited or referenced therein;
- SVSP Sanitary Sewer Master Plan and Addendum;
- SVSP Water Supply Assessment, and all documents cited therein;
- Transportation Analysis and Data;
- Air Quality Modeling Results and Data;
- Noise Data;
- SVSP Preliminary Drainage and Stormwater Master Plan;
- SVSP Technical Dry Utilities Study;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- The City of Roseville General Plan;
- The City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance and all other Municipal Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the City;
- The West Roseville Specific Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the West Roseville Specific Plan;
- Any and all resolutions adopted by the City regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any additional documents expressly cited in the Draft and Final EIRs and these findings; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e).

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

The documents constituting the record of proceedings are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at the City of Roseville Permit Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678. The custodian of these documents is the Community Development Manager.

V.

CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE PLANS

The EIR evaluated the Specific Plan to determine whether it is consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations. The relevant plans, policies, and regulations are summarized below.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE GENERAL PLAN

The City last completed a comprehensive update of the General Plan in 2004 with the approval of the West Roseville Specific Plan. The City's Housing Element is currently undergoing an update. The General Plan includes goals, objectives, and policies for growth management in the City. The Project site is not in the City but is in Placer County. The Placer County General Plan currently designates most of the project site as Agriculture/Timberland, with 40 to 80 acre minimum parcel sizes. Following annexation to the City, however, the Project will be subject to the City's General Plan.

As part of the Project, revisions to the City's General Plan are proposed to accommodate the Specific Plan. The revisions to the General Plan are proposed, in part to reflect the addition of the SVSP and its land uses to the City as a result of the annexation and current conditions related to water supply and noise levels. These changes include updating tables and figures to incorporate the proposed Specific Plan land use, and text amendments to provide a description of the Specific Plan. (DEIR, pp. 4.1-8; 7-3 to 7-5.)

CITY OF ROSEVILLE ZONING ORDINANCE

The Zoning Ordinance was last updated comprehensively in 2004. Periodic revisions are ongoing to keep the Zoning Ordinance up to date, including the most recent amendment in June 2008. The Zoning Ordinance, specifies building setbacks, building heights, building densities, and site coverage, and also ensures that development occurs in a planned, logical fashion.

Proposed uses in the SVSP are illustrated by DEIR Figure 2-5, “Land Use Plan.” DEIR Table 4.1-1, “Proposed Sierra Vista Specific Plan Land Uses,” provides a breakdown of the land uses and acreage amounts. The types of uses allowed under the SVSP are those that are permitted or conditionally permitted in the Zoning Ordinance. The SVSP proposes an R1/DS zone (Single-Family Residential/Development Standard Overlay) that would reduce the minimum lot standard and would allow for flexibility and deviation from standards included in the primary use medium-density residential districts.

The Project site is not in the City but is in Placer County. The Placer County Zoning Ordinance designates the project area as Farm Combining Building Site (FB-X-80). Permitted uses within this zone, either by right or conditional use permit, generally include single family dwellings, crop and tree farming, small livestock farming, dairies, public and quasi-public uses, industrial plants processing agricultural products, and churches. Following annexation to the City, however, the Project will be subject to the City’s Zoning Ordinance, not the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.

PLACER COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Successful implementation of the Project requires approval by Placer County LAFCO of the City’s proposed annexation and sphere of influence amendment, which will require a municipal service review prior to approving the sphere of influence amendment. (DEIR, pp. 4.1-30 to 4.1-43.)

WEST ROSEVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN

The Project site was designated in the West Roseville Specific Plan EIR (February 2004) (State Clearinghouse No. 2002082057) as a “MOU Remainder Area.” With approval of the WRSP, a majority of the project site was included in the City’s sphere of influence. The Roseville City Council, in approving the sphere of influence, determined that the Project site was appropriate for future development.

Potential development of the Project site was analyzed at a program-level in the WRSP EIR. Mitigation measures were adopted by the City Council for area covered by the WRSP and the MOU Remainder Area, and these mitigation measures continue to apply to the MOU Remainder Area, including the Project site and the Urban Reserve area, unless otherwise changed by this EIR and subsequent City Council approvals based on this EIR. (DEIR, pp. 1-4 to 1-5.)

SACOG PREFERRED BLUEPRINT SCENARIO

SACOG adopted its Preferred Blueprint Scenario (Blueprint Plan) in December 2004. The Blueprint Plan is a regional vision to accommodate the projected growth and the long-term needs of the region's transportation system over a 50-year time span, and includes the City of Roseville and the Project site. By recommending that local jurisdictions in the region embrace a more compact development pattern adjacent to existing city services and infrastructure, with a balance of employment, housing, retail and recreation opportunities, the Blueprint Plan is premised on the notion that development consistent with the plan could reduce the eventual need for an additional 400,000 acres of land for development, and reduce traffic congestion and associated air quality impacts.

The Project site is identified as an appropriate area to accommodate growth within the Preferred Blueprint Scenario. The SVSP is consistent with the seven growth principles of the Blueprint Plan, as well as with the City's nine strategies found in its adopted Smart Choices, Implementation Strategies to Implement the Blueprint Project. (DEIR, pp. 1-10, 4.1-25 to 4.1-30.)

VI.

EXPLANATION OF FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

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

The mandate and principles established by the Legislature in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement in Public Resources Code section 21081 that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which an EIR is required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a Project, the approving agency must make a written finding reaching one or more of three conclusions. The first such finding is that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. The second permissible finding is that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. The third potential conclusion is that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(1)-(3); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a).) As defined by CEQA, "feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological

factors. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(f)(1) [determining the feasibility of alternatives].) The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*Sequoayah Hills, supra*, 23 Cal.App.4th at p. 715.) Moreover, “‘feasibility’ under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001-1002 (*City of Santa Cruz*.)

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur.

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are infeasible to avoid or substantially lessen, a public agency may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons that the project’s benefits outweigh its significant unavoidable adverse environmental effects. ((Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21001, 21002.1(c), 21081(b).) The City’s Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project is included herein in Section XI, below.

VII. **SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT**

Approving the Project will result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts, some of which can be reduced, although not to a less-than-significant level, through implementation of feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR and adopted in connection with the Project. It is hereby determined that these significant and unavoidable adverse impacts are acceptable for the reasons specified in Section XI, below.

Impact 4.1-4, Potential incompatibility from overflight operations at McClellan Airfield. Occupants and users of the Project site would experience frequent overflights from large aircraft (over 75,000 pounds) operating under 3,000 feet above ground level that originate at McClellan Air Field. The Project site is outside any adopted safety hazards area associated with proximity to the runways, however, and is also outside the 60dbA noise contour. Hence, while safety impacts would not be significant nor would average noise impacts be expected to be significant, single event noise levels could be loud and annoying to noise-sensitive uses. Because future residents could find overflights annoying, this could cause a significant compatibility land use impact. A deed disclosure notifying future residents and sensitive uses of the potential for overflights from McClellan is a condition of the Project, but would not reduce the impact due to annoyance from loud, single event noises to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.2-4, Inducement of substantial population growth. Development of the SVSP will increase the overall population in the City. The Project would include 6,650 homes in the SVSP area, which could accommodate approximately 16,891 additional persons. At buildout of the SVSP, the total number of units in the City would be 64,874.

The inclusion of commercial and business professional uses would generate approximately 7,500 additional jobs. While most of these jobs would be held by City residents, it would be anticipated that workers would also be drawn from work forces outside of the City. Growth may result in physical impacts to various kinds of natural or environmental resources, such as air, water, or land. No feasible mitigation is available; therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

While no development is proposed at this time for the Urban Reserve area, annexation to the City increases the likelihood that the parcels will develop in the future. Growth may result in physical impacts to various kinds of natural or environmental resources, such as air, water, or land. Regardless of whether or not workers commute to the City or current City residents occupy the new jobs created in the Urban Reserve area, population growth would be significant. No feasible mitigation measures to reduce the significant effects are available. As a result, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-6, Increased traffic volumes on Placer County roadways intersections under existing conditions. In the SVSP area, the Project would degrade traffic operations at the intersections of Locust/Baseline Road, Watt Avenue/PFE Road, and Walerga Road/PFE Road in Placer County during the AM peak hour. Under the Existing Plus Project scenario, all of these intersections would operate at unacceptable levels of service. Development within the SVSP area will be required to participate in a joint fee program with Placer County for improvements along Baseline Road and Walerga Road, including turn lanes, through lanes, and signals, that would result in acceptable levels of service. Because the City does not have control over improvements on Placer County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Placer County, the impact to the intersection of Watt Avenue and PFE Road that cannot be mitigated by an existing inter-jurisdictional funding program would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Similarly, development of the Urban Reserve area would impact Placer County roadways, including Watt Avenue, Baseline Road, and Walerga Road during the AM peak hour. Because the City does not have control over improvements on Placer County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Placer County, the City must conservatively assume that, at the time of project approval by the City, impacts to roadways not subject to existing inter-jurisdictional funding programs (such as Watt Avenue and PFE Road) would be considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer County.

Impact 4.3-7, Increase traffic volumes on Placer County roadway segments under existing conditions. Under the Plus Project scenario in the SVSP area, traffic volumes would increase along Baseline Road west of the Specific Plan, Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road, and Walerga Road south of Baseline Road to unacceptable levels of service. Development within the SVSP area will be required to participate in a joint fee program with Placer County for improvements along Baseline Road west of the Specific Plan and Walerga Road south of Baseline Road, including through lanes, which would result in acceptable levels of service. Implementation of the identified mitigation measure would reduce the significance of this impact. However, because the City does not have

control over improvements on Placer County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Placer County, the City must conservatively assume that, at the time of project approval by the City, the impacts that cannot be mitigated by an existing inter-jurisdictional funding program (i.e., impacts to Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road) are considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer County.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would likely significantly impact Placer County roadways in the vicinity of the project area, including Watt Avenue, Baseline Road, and Walerga Road. However, because the City does not have control over improvements on Placer County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Placer County, the impacts to roadways not subject to existing inter-jurisdictional funding program (i.e., impacts to Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road) would be considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer County.

Impact 4.3-9, Increased traffic volumes on existing Sacramento County roadway segments. Implementation of the Specific Plan would increase traffic volumes along Watt Avenue South of PFE Road and operate at LOS F. The construction of a second northbound and southbound through lane would improve the level of service to LOS D. Watt Avenue would also need to be widened to six lanes to achieve LOS D. Construction of these improvements would reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, because the City does not have control over improvements on Sacramento County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Sacramento County, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Sacramento County.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would likely increase traffic volumes in the vicinity of the area, and cause impacts similar to those of the SVSP on Sacramento County roadway volumes. Implementation of the identified mitigation measure would reduce the impact, but it would remain significant and unavoidable. This conclusion takes into account that the City will be acting first, without certain knowledge of Sacramento County actions, and that whether or not Sacramento County enters into an agreement is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the County.

Impact 4.3-10, Increased traffic volumes on existing Sutter County intersections. Implementation of the Specific Plan would increase the delay at the Pleasant Grove South and Riego Road intersection during the AM peak hour under the Existing Plus Project scenario. The addition of the Project would also increase delays at the Riego Road/ Pleasant Grove North intersection and the Riego Road/ Pleasant Grove South intersection during the PM peak hour. Construction of roadway improvements, including through lanes, turn lanes, a signal, and roadway widening, would improve operations at these intersections. Because the City does not have control over improvements on Sutter County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Sutter County, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Sutter County.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would likely have impacts on Sutter County intersections similar to those of the SVSP. This conclusion takes into account that the City will be acting first, without certain knowledge of Sutter County actions, and that whether or not Sutter County enters into an agreement is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the County. The City anticipates cooperation with Sutter County and successful implementation, however, in light of actions by the County Board of Supervisors in July 2009 approving mitigation measures for the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan and direction to address inter-jurisdictional traffic impacts and mitigation obligations (although not directed specifically at Roseville). Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-13, Increased traffic volumes on existing State highways. Implementation of the Specific Plan would increase traffic volumes on some already-deficient State highway facilities by less than one percent. Caltrans considers any increase in volume on an already deficient facility to be a impact, however. Caltrans is currently moving forward with the I-80 widening project in Placer County, which will improve operations on I-80. Impact fees paid to the City that constitute the project's fair share for the construction of transportation facilities and improvements, in addition to the required participation of the SVSP in the Transportation Expenditure Plan, will also improve operations. However, because the City does not have control over improvements on State facilities, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Caltrans, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Similarly, development of the Urban Reserve area would increase traffic on State highways, and for the same reasons as stated above this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-14, Increased traffic on City of Roseville under 2025 conditions. The Project would increase traffic volumes on City roadways under 2025 CIP Plus Project scenario and result in significant level of service impacts at certain intersections in the SVSP area during the AM and PM peak hours. The level of service could be improved during the AM peak hour at Foothills Boulevard and Baseline Road with the construction of an additional through lane. However, widening would exceed the maximum feasible improvements deemed appropriate by the City's General Plan. The level of service during the AM peak hour at Industrial Avenue and Alantown Drive also could be improved with the construction of an additional turn lane and receiving lane. However, the existing rail line and bridge structure makes these improvements infeasible.

The levels of service of a few intersections would degrade during the PM peak hour with the proposed Project (Cirby Way and Northridge Drive, Foothills Boulevard and Junction Boulevard, Junction Boulevard and Baseline Road, and Roseville Parkway and Sierra College Boulevard) in the SVSP area. These intersections could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by adding additional through lanes. However, because of the close proximity of homes in the area and the associated right-of-way that would be required, this mitigation would not be feasible. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would increase traffic on local roadways and likely would impact the same intersections that would be impacted by the SVSP during the AM and PM peak hours. The identified mitigation measure would lessen the significant impact associated with traffic on city roadways, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Similar to the SVSP area, the roadway improvements would be infeasible because of existing physical constraints and concerns expressed by area residents. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-16, Increased traffic on Placer County intersections under 2025 conditions. Development of the Urban Reserve area would result in traffic volume increases on a number of roadways in Placer County under 2025 CIP conditions. Because the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road is projected to operate at an unacceptable level of service, it is possible that development of the Urban Reserve area could result in a significant impact. Implementation of the identified mitigation measure would lessen the significant impact associated with increased traffic on Placer County intersections by requiring the Applicants to participate in a joint fee program to fund improvements. However, it is not clear whether this would be sufficient to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-17, Increased traffic on Placer County segments under 2025 conditions. Development of the SVSP area would increase traffic volumes on Walerga Road south of Baseline Road and operate at LOS F under the 2025 CIP Plus Project scenario. Widening Walerga Road to six lanes would improve the operation of this roadway segment to LOS B. This improvement is located within Placer County and the City does not have control over improvements on Placer County roadways, which is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Placer County. Therefore, the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Placer County.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would increase daily traffic volumes on Placer County roadways under 2025 CIP and 2025 CIP plus project conditions. The identified mitigation measure would require the project applicant in the Urban Reserve to contribute the fair share cost of construction of facilities on Placer County facilities. However, the City would be acting first without certain knowledge of Placer County actions. The City cannot force Placer County to enter into an agreement against its will. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-19, Increased traffic on Sacramento County roadway segments under 2025 conditions. Implementation of the Project would increase traffic volumes on Walerga Road south of PFE Road under the 2025 CIP Plus Project scenario. Widening Walerga Road to six lanes would improve the operation of this roadway segment and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Because this improvement is located within Sacramento County, the County may determine the improvement to be infeasible. Should Sacramento County determine that the widening is feasible, pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 the City of Roseville will negotiate in good faith to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving a commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the Specific Plan for impacts on Walerga Road. However, because the City does not have control over improvements on

Sacramento County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Sacramento County, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Sacramento County.

Impact 4.3-21, Increased traffic on Sutter County roadway segments under 2025 conditions. Development of the SVSP area would degrade traffic operations on Riego Road in Sutter County from LOS E to LOS F under the Plus Project scenario. The identified mitigation measure will facilitate the widening of Riego Road to six lanes by requiring the City to negotiate in good faith with Sutter County to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving a commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the Specific Plan for impacts on Riego Road. However, because the City of Roseville does not have control over improvements on Sutter County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Sutter County, the City considers the impact significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Sutter County.

Development of the Urban Reserve area is expected to have impacts on Riego Road similar to those of the SVSP. Although the identified mitigation measure would facilitate the widening of Riego Road to six lanes, the City does not have control over improvements on Sutter County roadways, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Sutter County. Therefore, this impact could be considered significant and unavoidable, despite the City's own commitment to work with Sutter County.

Impact 4.3-24, Increased traffic volumes on existing State highways. Development of the SVSP area would increase traffic volumes on I-80, SR 70/99 and SR 65, which are already deficient facilities, by less than one percent. No specific improvements have been identified to mitigate project impacts on I-80, SR 70/99 and SR 65; however, the City is willing to work with Caltrans and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) to establish a regional approach to institute a fee program for the purpose of funding improvements on these facilities. Additionally, the City is working with PCTPA, the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) and their member jurisdictions to develop a strategic "Transportation Expenditure Plan" that includes funding for improvements for State highways in Placer County. The SVSP area will be required to participate in the fee program with PCTPA, the SPRTA Fee Program, and the Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority fee program. The additional development fees will need to be adopted by each of the jurisdictions in South Placer County. However, because the City does not have jurisdiction over State Highway facilities, which are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Caltrans, the City considers the impact significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the SVSP area, development of the Urban Reserve area would increase traffic volumes on SR 70/99 and SR 65, which are already deficient facilities, by less than one percent. The identified mitigation measure would reduce the significant impacts associated with increased traffic volumes on State highways, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No specific improvements have been identified to mitigate project impacts on I-80, SR 70/99 and SR 65.

Impact 4.3-25, Short and long-term construction impacts. Construction of the identified improvements for the Project may result in environmental effects on agricultural lands, biological resources, water quality, air quality, cultural resources, noise, and aesthetics. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the EIR to address construction impacts to air quality would reduce construction emissions by applying emissions control measures; however, these measures would not reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. Although cultural resource surveys would be performed prior to construction activities and work would cease if cultural resources are found during construction, mitigation measures identified in the EIR would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because cultural resources could continue to be disturbed. Substantial noise from construction activities would be reduced by implementation of mitigation measures identified in the EIR, but upon completion of construction, traffic noise could increase and may exceed adopted noise standards. Finally, no mitigation is available to reduce visual impacts because new roads to support the new urban and commercial/office uses would be constructed through rural areas. Therefore, these impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.4-1, Generate short-term construction-related emissions. Development of the SVSP area would result in construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and ozone precursors (ROG and NO_x) that would exceed PCAPCD's significance threshold of 82 lb/day. Construction emissions could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Dust and construction control measures would reduce construction emissions, but not to a level that is less-than-significant. Therefore, this short-term impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would generate construction-related emissions of PM₁₀. It is expected that grading would generate in excess of 82 lbs per day, but these emissions would vary by day, depending on the amount of grading. Dust control and emissions reductions measures would be used to reduce construction-related emissions. Additionally, compliance with PCAPCD Rules 205 and 207 and City Construction Standards would reduce construction emission from future development. However, because the amount of grading on a single day would likely exceed PCAPCD thresholds, this short-term impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.4-2, Generate long-term operation-related (regional) emissions. Implementation of the Project would result in the generation of criteria pollutant emissions from mobile and area sources. While mitigation measures identified in the EIR would reduce operational emissions, no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce these emissions to levels that are less than the thresholds. Therefore, operational impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, stationary sources of air pollutants in the SVSP area would likely be required to obtain permits to operate under PCAPCD Rule 501-General Permit Requirements and Rule 507-Federal Operating Permit Program. The permit process would assure that these sources would be equipped with the required emission controls and, individually, would comply with permitting requirements. However, collectively, all of these stationary sources will be additive to the estimated area and mobile source emissions, resulting in a significant impact. Thus, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.4-6, Consistency with plans and policies. Implementation of the Project would increase operational emissions in excess of the PCAPCD thresholds for CO, ROG, NO_x and SO₂, and particulate matter. The project area is not currently included in the City of Roseville or Placer County General Plans. As a result, the emissions associated with the development of the Project site are not accounted for in the State Implementation Plan (“SIP”). Therefore, growth associated with the annexation area would hinder the PCAPCD’s ability to bring the region into attainment of federal and State ambient air quality standards. Amending the SIP is not within the jurisdiction or control of the City of Roseville. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. Mitigation measures identified in the EIR would reduce air quality emissions, but not to a less-than-significant level, and would not result in consistency with the SIP.

Impact 4.5-1, Increased short-term construction-related and long-term operational greenhouse gas emissions. Development of the SVSP area would generate emissions of GHGs due to short-term construction and long-term operation of the Project. This would result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact of global climate change. It is currently unknown whether the project-specific measures selected during each project phase, in combination with the GHG reductions realized from the regulatory environment that exist at that time, would result in a reduction from business-as-usual emission levels projected for 2025. However, due to the current disparity between the amount of existing global GHG emissions and the goals of AB 32, even with mitigation measures incorporated, the proposed SVSP would result in a cumulatively considerable, incremental contribution to global GHG emissions. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would have impacts similar to those of the SVSP with respect to short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and compliance with the City’s General Plan Greenhouse Gas policies would reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from development of the Urban Reserve area, but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.6-1, Short-term noise generated by construction activity. Implementation of the Project would generate noise levels that may affect residences surrounding the Project site due to construction activities. Pile driving may be necessary for bridge construction or other facilities, which can create impacts when residents are sleeping. Construction activities are anticipated to occur during normal daytime working hours; however, certain activities such as construction of wells would occur during continuous periods exceeding normal construction hours. Even with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR, noise from construction activities may still be significant because construction-related noise would occur beyond the hours in which such noise is considered acceptable under the City’s Noise Ordinance. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.6-6, Existing plus project increase in traffic noise. Development of the Project would increase traffic noise levels by 0.3 dB to 5.0 dB compared to existing

conditions. The largest increase would occur on Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road, and would exceed the 4.0 dB threshold of significance. In addition, the one existing roadway segment, Fiddymont Road north of Blue Oaks Boulevard, which has noise levels that currently meet the General Plan noise standards of 60 dB Ldn under existing conditions, would degrade to a noise level of 61.2 Ldn following Project development. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR, traffic noise levels would be reduced. However, because the increase in traffic from the Project would be offsite, there are locations where the construction of sound walls would be infeasible, either due to physical constraints or because the sound walls would be within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Placer County. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.6-7, Year 2025 plus project increase in traffic noise outside the plan area. Implementation of the Project would increase traffic on existing roadways in the Project vicinity that already exceed the noise level of 60 Ldn. Feasible measures are not available to reduce the Project's contribution to traffic noise impacts on existing residents within the City immediately adjacent to major roadways. Buildout of the SVSP would also increase traffic-related noise on roadways in unincorporated Placer County in the vicinity of the SVSP area. Due to existing physical constraints, it may not be possible to locate sound barriers without affecting access and vehicle sight distances. Further, any such improvements on Placer County roadways would be within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Placer County. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.6-9, Consistency with the General Plan Noise Element for transportation noise sources and General Plan Amendment. Implementation of the Project would add between 0.2 to 4.5 Ldn to the traffic noise levels, which are projected in 2025 to exceed the City's General Plan noise standard on 14 roadway segments in the vicinity of the Project site with or without the Project. Amending the General Plan would change the allowable noise levels along transportation corridors city-wide. As the City becomes increasingly urban, implementing effective and feasible noise mitigation measures along major transportation corridors is becoming more difficult. This would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Impact 4.6-10, McClellan overflight noise. Implementation of the Project would expose residents to potential overflight noise from McClellan Airport. The area in the vicinity of McClellan Airfield is subject to frequent overflights of large aircraft (over 75,000 pounds) operating under 3,000 feet above ground level, which can cause annoyance to residential or other sensitive noise uses. A condition of the Project would require notice to residents of the potential for over-flights. However, notification alone would not substantially reduce the impact from annoyance from loud, single event noises. No other feasible mitigation is available; therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.9-1, Disturb, damage or destroy unidentified subsurface archaeological or historical resources or human remains during project construction. Implementation of the Project could result in encountering subsurface historic or prehistoric resources or

human remains during grading, excavation, and/or construction. If such resources are encountered, either onsite or offsite, during construction associated with the Project, they could be damaged, destroyed, or removed, resulting in a loss of integrity. The identified mitigation measure would reduce impacts to unknown cultural resources that qualify as either historical resources or unique archaeological resources and human remains. Because it is possible, however, that unearthed cultural resources cannot feasibly be avoided or that human remains may inadvertently be destroyed, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.9-4, Damage or destroy historical, archaeological, prehistoric, or paleontological resources during construction of off-site infrastructure. Implementation of the Project could result in disturbance of subsurface historical, archaeological, or prehistoric resources during construction and installation of off-site improvements. In most cases, offsite infrastructure would be located within existing or planned roadway rights-of-way. However, in some cases, improvements may not coincide with the precise areas that were previously evaluated or may be proposed in areas that are not currently planned for development or have not been subject to environmental review. The mitigation measures identified in the EIR would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, except with respect to any historical resources that might be discovered and for which avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout. This impact on historical, archeological, prehistoric or paleontological resources would be significant and unavoidable, because avoidance may be infeasible, with the result that there could be “substantial adverse change in the significance” of such resources.

Impact 4.12.1-1, Availability of water supplies to meet demand in wet years. Development of the Urban Reserve area, in conjunction with the City’s existing General Plan and the SVSP, would result in a total water supply need of 63,335 acre-feet per year (“AFY”) in 2025, and 63,471 AFY if water conservation is assumed. If water conservation measures are achieved at the same level as planned within the SVSP, the City would have sufficient water supplies for the Urban Reserve area and a surplus of 70 AFY. Without the estimated water conservation reduction, a shortfall of 66 AFY in water supply would exist, requiring a new source of water supply for the Urban Reserve area. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the EIR would provide a new water supply for the Urban Reserve. However, because other environmental impacts associated with securing a new water supply are unknown, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

Impact 4.12.4-2, Increased demand for solid waste services at the landfill. Development of the SVSP area would generate a total of 37,081 tons per year (101.6 tons per day) of solid waste. Of this amount, 17,985 tons per year would be buried at the landfill. Development of the Urban Reserve area would produce approximately 6,721 tons per year (18.4 tons per day) of solid waste for landfill disposal. Collectively, the SVSP and the Urban Reserve will require approximately three percent of the landfill’s remaining capacity, and will shorten the life of the landfill by 13 months. Although expansion of Western Regional Sanitary Landfill would address the increased demand for landfill capacity, the City cannot guarantee landfill expansion beyond current plans.

Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 4.12.4-13.)

Impact 4.12.4-3, Expansion of the landfill. Development of the Project would contribute to the need to expand the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill in the future. The effects from landfill expansion cannot be fully characterized at this time. However, because of the identified expansion site's proximity to the existing landfill, the impacts of an expansion may be similar to those attributed to the existing landfill, including construction-related and operational impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures already required of the existing landfill, in addition to the permitting process, may reduce impacts. However, impacts such as loss of biological and agricultural resources may not be reduced to a less-than-significant level, even after mitigation. As a result, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.14-1, Alteration of the visual character of the site and vicinity. Implementation of the Project site would convert over 1,600 acres of currently undeveloped grassland to urban uses. Although the SVSP would be visually compatible with surrounding developed and approved development to the north, it would substantially and permanently alter the existing visual character of the SVSP area. Implementation of the General Plan policies and the SVSP Design Guidelines would help reduce the significant impacts, but not to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the impact due to visual alteration of the Project site would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.14-2, New sources of light and glare. Development of the SVSP area would increase the ambient nighttime illumination level due to light from urban development, such as residences and commercial uses, as well as recreational facilities, streetlights, and vehicles. Although proper site design and restrictions on the hours that outdoor lighting may be used are likely to reduce light impacts to a large degree, if a level of lighting appropriate for competitive-level sporting events is necessary it may not be feasible to significantly reduce the amount of light. Additionally, because construction of sports facilities associated with schools would be under the jurisdiction of the school districts, implementation of the SVSP Design Guidelines and the mitigation measures identified in the EIR would be within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the School District. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Development of the Urban Reserve area would introduce urban lighting into this currently unlighted area, and the mitigation measure identified in the EIR would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 4.14-3, Degradation of scenic resources. Implementation of the Project would result in development of large-scale projects that could impair views of the Sierra Nevada by placing buildings within view corridors. All such development would be required to comply with the City's Design Guidelines, General Plan policies, and Sierra Vista Design Guidelines (in the SVSP area), all of which are intended to reduce aesthetic impacts, but would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

VIII.
SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT ARE REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT
LEVEL BY MITIGATION MEASURES
ADOPTED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT

The EIR identifies the significant impacts associated with the Project that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures identified in the EIR. The City's findings with respect to each of the Project's significant impacts and mitigation measures are set forth in Table 2² which is attached to these findings and is incorporated herein by this reference.

For Impacts 4.1-1, 4.1-2, 4.1-3, 4.1-4, 4.1-5, 4.2-1, 4.2-2, 4.2-3, 4.2-4, 4.3-1, 4.3-2, 4.3-3, 4.3-4, 4.3-5, 4.3-6, 4.3-7, 4.3-8, 4.3-9, 4.3-10, 4.3-11, 4.3-12, 4.3-13, 4.3-14, 4.3-15, 4.3-16, 4.3-17, 4.3-18, 4.3-19, 4.3-20, 4.3-21, 4.3-22, 4.3-23, 4.3-24, 4.3-25, 4.4-1, 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-4, 4.4-5, 4.4-6, 4.5-1, 4.5-2, 4.6-1, 4.6-2, 4.6-3, 4.6-4, 4.6-5, 4.6-6, 4.6-7, 4.6-8, 4.6-9, 4.6-10, 4.7-1, 4.7-2, 4.7-3, 4.7-4, 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-3, 4.8-4, 4.8-5, 4.8-6, 4.8-7, 4.8-8, 4.8-9, 4.8-10, 4.8-11, 4.8-12, 4.8-13, 4.8-14, 4.8-15, 4.8-16, 4.8-17, 4.9-1, 4.9-2, 4.9-3, 4.9-4, 4.9-5, 4.10-1, 4.10-2, 4.10-3, 4.10-4, 4.10-5, 4.10-6, 4.10-7, 4.11-1, 4.11-2, 4.11-3, 4.11-4, 4.11-5, 4.12.1-1, 4.12.1-2, 4.12.1-3, 4.12.1-4, 4.12.1-5, 4.12.1-6, 4.12.1-7, 4.12.2-1, 4.12.3-1, 4.12.3-2, 4.12.3-3, 4.12.4-1, 4.12.4-2, 4.12.4-3, 4.12.4-4, 4.12.5-1, 4.12.5-2, 4.12.5-3, 4.13-1, 4.13-2, 4.13-3, 4.13-4, 4.13-5, 4.14-1, 4.14-2, 4.14-3, identified and analyzed in the EIR, it is hereby determined that these impacts will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level or avoided by adopting Mitigation Measures MM 4.1-1, MM 4.6-1, MM 4.6-2, MM 4.14-1, MM 4.1-2, MM 4.1-3, MM 4.3-1, MM 4.3-2, MM 4.3-3, MM 4.3-4, MM 4.3-7, MM 4.3-5, MM 4.3-6, MM 4.3-1, MM 4.3-2, MM 4.3-3, MM 4.3-4, MM 4.3-7, MM 4.3-6, MM 4.1-2, MM 4.4-1, MM 4.6-1, MM 4.8-1, MM 4.8-1(a), MM 4.8-1(b), MM 4.8-2, MM 4.8-3, MM 4.8-5, MM 4.8-6, MM 4.8-7, MM 4.9-1, MM 4.9-2, MM 4.9-3, MM 4.10-1, MM 4.13-2, MM 4.13-3, MM 4.4-1, MM 4.4-2, MM 4.5-1, MM 4.5-1, MM 4.5-2, MM 4.6-1, MM 4.6-2, MM 4.6-3, MM 4.6-4, MM 4.6-4, MM 4.8-1, MM 4.8-1(b), MM 4.8-1(a), MM 4.8-1(b), MM 4.8-4, MM 4.8-1(a), MM 4.8-1(b), MM 4.8-1, MM 4.8-1(a), MM 4.8-2, MM 4.8-4, MM 4.8-1, MM 4.8-3, MM 4.8-4, MM 4.8-4, MM 4.8-1, MM 4.8-5, MM 4.14-3, MM 4.8-50, MM 4.14-3, MM 4.8-1(a), MM 4.8-1(b), MM 4.8-2, MM 4.8-3, MM 4.8-4, MM 4.8-5, MM 4.8-6, MM 4.8-7, MM 4.8-1(a), MM 4.8-3, MM 4.9-1, MM 4.9-2, MM 4.9-1, MM 4.9-2, MM 4.9-3, MM 4.10-1, MM 4.11-3, MM 4.12.3-1, MM 4.12.3-1, MM 4.13-1, MM 4.13-2, MM 4.13-3, MM 4.13-2, MM 4.13-3, MM 4.14-1, MM 4.14-2, MM 4.14-3, which are identified in the EIR and are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, and by continuing to implement previously adopted Mitigation Measures WMM 4.1-2, WMM 4.1-2, WMM 4.4-3, WMM 4.5-2, WMM 4.2-1, WMM 4.3-9, WMM 4.3-7, WMM 4.3-4, WMM 4.3-4, WMM 4.3-1, WMM 4.3-4,

² Table 2 provides a summary description of each significant impact of the Project, all of which are evaluated in full in the EIR; describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the EIR and adopted or readopted by the City; and states the City's findings on the significance of each impact after adoption and incorporation into the Project of these mitigation measures, accompanied by a brief explanation. Full explanations of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the EIR. These findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts, including but not limited to the EIR in its entirety. In making these findings, the City Council ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the EIR and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

WMM 4.4-3, WMM 4.5-2, WMM 4.7-2, WMM 4.7-3, WMM 4.7-5, WMM 4.7-11, WMM 4.7-15, WMM 4.8-2, WMM 4.8-13, WMM 4.9-2, WMM 4.4-2, WMM 4.4-3, WMM 4.4-4, WMM 4.4-6, WMM 4.4-7, WMM 4.4-7(a), WMM 4.4-4, WMM 4.4-6, WMM 4.4-4, WMM 4.4-6, WMM 4.5-2, WMM 4.5-4, WMM 4.5-8, WMM 4.5-10, WMM 4.5-8, WMM 4.5-10, WMM 4.7-2, WMM 4.7-2, WMM 4.7-3, WMM 4.7-2, WMM 4.7-2, WMM 4.7-5, WMM 4.7-2, WMM 4.7-7, WMM 4.7-9, WMM 4.7-9, WMM 4.7-11, WMM 4.7-13(d), WMM 4.7-2, WMM 4.7-3, WMM 4.7-5, WMM 4.7-9, WMM 4.7-11, WMM 4.7-15, WMM 4.8-2, WMM 4.8-11, WMM 4.8-11, WMM 4.8-13, WMM 4.9-2, WMM 4.10-4, WMM 4.10-7, WMM 4.10-8, WMM 4.11-1, WMM 4.11-4, WMM 4.11.6, WMM 4.11-6, WMM 4.11-7, WMM 4.11-7, WMM 4.11-11, WMM 4.12-1, WMM 4.12-2, WMM 4.12-3, WMM 4.12-4, and WMM 4.13-2, which are hereby readopted and incorporated into the Project. The City hereby adopts and/or readopts these mitigation measures, for the reasons set forth in these findings and summarized in Table 2, and incorporates them into the Project. To the extent that these mitigation measures will not mitigate or avoid all significant effects on the environment, however, it is hereby determined that any remaining significant and unavoidable adverse impacts are acceptable for the reasons specified in Section XI, below.

Other significant impacts identified in the EIR and listed in Table 2 cannot be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives, and thus will be significant and unavoidable. These significant and unavoidable impacts are described in Section VII, above, and summarized in Table 2. For reasons set forth in Section XI, *infra*, however, the City has determined that overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Project outweigh the significant effects on the environment associated with the Project.

ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The City hereby adopts and incorporates into the Project all of the mitigation measures identified in Table 2. Some of the mitigation measures identified in Table are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other agencies. To the extent any of the mitigation measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other agencies, the City finds those agencies can and should implement those measures within their responsibility and jurisdiction.

IX. MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring Program has been prepared for the Project, and will be approved by the City Council by the same Resolution that adopts these findings. The City will use the Mitigation Monitoring Program to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures. The Mitigation Monitoring Program will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

X.
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. BASIS FOR ALTERNATIVES-FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” Where a lead agency has determined that, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, a project as proposed will still cause one or more significant environmental effect that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, the agency, prior to approving the project as mitigated, must first determine whether, with respect to such impacts, there are any feasible project alternatives that are both environmentally superior and feasible within the meaning of CEQA. Although an EIR must evaluate this range of potentially feasible alternatives, an agency decision-making body may ultimately conclude that a potentially feasible alternative is actually infeasible. (*City of Santa Cruz, supra*, 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 981, 999.) The failure of an alternative to fully satisfy project objectives determined to be important by decision-makers, or the fact that an alternative fails to promote policy objectives of concern to such decision-makers, are grounds for finding an alternative to be infeasible. (*Id.* at pp. 992, 1000-1003.) Thus, even if a project alternative will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of a proposed project as mitigated, the decision-makers may reject the alternative for such reasons.

Under CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a), the alternatives to be discussed in detail in an EIR should be able to “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project[.]” For this reason, the Objectives described above in section II.C of these Findings provided the framework for defining possible alternatives. The selection of alternatives analyzed in the EIR took into account the project objectives, and primary consideration was given to alternatives that would reduce any of the project’s significant impacts while still meeting most of the basic project objectives. Based on these objectives, the City developed four alternatives that it addressed in detail in the EIR, and another six alternatives that were considered but were not addressed in further detail. All of the alternatives assume no development in the Urban Reserve area, because there are no proposals for development in that area at this time.

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6, and in light of the Project Objectives, the following alternatives to the Project were identified:

- No Project Alternative
- Reduced Footprint, Increased Density Alternative
- Reduced Footprint, Same Density Alternative
- Same Footprint, Reduced Density Alternative

The City Council finds that that a good faith effort was made to evaluate a range of potentially feasible alternatives in the EIR that are reasonable alternatives to the Project and could feasibly obtain most of the basic objectives, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of some of the project objectives and might be more costly. (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(b).) As a result, the scope of alternatives analyzed in the EIR is reasonable. (See, e.g., DEIR, pp. 6-1 to 6-58.)

These findings address whether the alternatives analyzed in the EIR substantially lessen or avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the Project and also consider the feasibility of each alternative. Under CEQA, “[f]easible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15364; see also CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f)(1).) As explained earlier, the concept of feasibility permits agency decision makers to consider the extent to which an alternative is able to meet some or all of a project objectives, which are found in Draft EIR Section 2.3 and in section II(C) of these findings. In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses “desirability” to the extent that an agency’s determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social, and technological factors supported by substantial evidence.

B. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES AND DETERMINATION OF FEASIBILITY

Potential alternatives to the Project were evaluated with respect to the objectives of the Project as discussed in Chapter 6, “Alternatives” of the Draft EIR and this section of the Findings. The Draft EIR identified and compared in detail the environmental effects of the four alternatives listed below with environmental impacts resulting from the Project. (See DEIR, pp. 6-1 through 6-58.) The City Council has independently reviewed, analyzed, and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the administrative record, and finds that all the alternatives are either infeasible or would not meet most of the project objectives for the reasons set forth below.

ALTERNATIVE 1 (No Project Alternative)

1. Description

The no project alternative must be analyzed and must describe the environmental conditions that exist at the time that the Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) is circulated, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. (CEQA Guidelines 15126(e)(2).)

Under the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), the Project area would remain in its current agricultural and rural use, with a minimum 80-acre farming zoning. Although a number of prior planning decisions by the City and LAFCO indicate the City’s intention to annex most or all of the project area into the City, the current Placer County zoning does not contemplate urban uses for this area. Without annexation, general plan amendments, a specific plan, rezoning, and other approvals such as those sought as part of the Project, it is not reasonably foreseeable that the area would develop with urban land uses. While as many as 25 farms at 80-acres each could theoretically occupy the SVSP area, such subdivision of agricultural land is not common in south Placer County. Therefore, it is assumed that no development would occur. (DEIR, p. 6-8.)

2. Analysis of Alternative 1's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

None of the impacts identified in Chapters 4 or 5 of the DEIR, including the significant and unavoidable impacts, would occur under the No Project Alternative, because the Project area would remain in its current state. As a result, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the Project.

However, the No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives because it does not propose a development project. Most notably, the No Project Alternative is inconsistent with the objective that seeks to meet the City's share of regional housing needs and to be consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Preferred Land Use Map. The Blueprint Preferred Land Use Map accommodates projected regional growth. The No Project Alternative would divert projected growth to another location in the region or away from the existing urban footprint, which would create additional environmental impacts. Because of its inconsistency with SACOG Blueprint principles, the No Project Alternative, while environmentally superior to the Project in the short term, compared to existing conditions, would likely be environmentally inferior to the Project in the long-term as measured against a future baseline condition assuming all 2050 regional growth anticipated by SACOG. Under the latter scenario, the Project would be superior to the No Project Alternative with respect to long-term per capita consumption of land, water, electricity, natural gas, and vehicle fuels, long-term per capita wastewater generation, and long-term per capita air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, as shown in the SACOG Blueprint Preferred scenario. (DEIR, pp. 6-8 to 6-9.)

3. Feasibility of Alternative 1 (No Project)

Under the No Project Alternative, none of the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR would occur. Hence, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the Project. The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible, however, because it would not achieve any of the project objectives primarily because this alternative does not propose a development project. Most notably, this alternative would not meet Project Objective 4 (provide for development that meets the Blueprint implementation strategies to achieve the Blueprint Principles) or Project Objective 8 (assist the City in meeting its regional housing needs obligation). (DEIR, p. 6-9.)

Additionally, the No Project Alternative would be infeasible, because it would be inconsistent with the SACOG Preferred Scenario Land Use Map. The project area is within an area identified for growth in the SACOG Preferred Growth Scenario. SACOG adopted this land use scenario for the Sacramento region as a vision for growth that promotes compact, mixed-use development and more transit choices as an alternative to low-density development. Although the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the Project in the short term and when viewed in isolation from regional growth trends, this alternative would likely be environmentally inferior to the Project in the long term as measured against a future baseline condition of all 2050 regional growth anticipated by SACOG. Under the latter scenario, the Project would be superior to the No Project Alternative with respect to long-term per capita consumption of land, water, electricity, natural gas, and vehicle fuels, long-term per capita wastewater generation, and long-term per capita air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, as shown in the SACOG Blueprint

Preferred scenario. The baseline SACOG Blueprint scenario showed how additional consumption of greenfield development would occur, if development is spread out and not concentrated near existing infrastructure and jobs. (DEIR, p. 6-9.)

For all of the foregoing reasons, and for any of them individually, the City Council determines that Alternative 1 is infeasible and is hereby rejected.

ALTERNATIVE 2 (Reduced Footprint, Increased Density Alternative)

1. Description

Under the Reduced Footprint, Increased Density Alternative (Alternative 2), open space acreage would substantially increase compared to the Project with the addition of 343 acres in the areas within the Specific Plan that contain the greatest concentrations of vernal pools or drainage areas. (See DEIR, p. 6-12, Figure 6-2, "Increased Density Site Plan.") While the open space land use designation would increase, the citywide park proposed as part of the Project would be eliminated. Under this alternative, there would be a corresponding reduction in land area for residential, commercial, and office uses. On this reduced footprint, the residential densities would increase to accommodate a number of residential units similar to what is proposed under the Project. Community commercial uses along Baseline Road would be decreased by 57 acres. The Commercial Mixed-Use land acreage would be reduced by 24 acres, and Community Commercial/Business Professional uses would be reduced by 25 acres. The number of schools would remain the same. (DEIR, pp. 6-10 to 6-11.)

2. Analysis of Alternative 2's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

a. Land Use and Agricultural Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable land use compatibility impacts from overflight operations at McClelland Airfield. The Project would also result in significant or potentially significant land use compatibility impacts from agricultural uses located adjacent to sensitive uses, increased noise levels due to temporary construction activities, and conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses. Mitigation measures have been adopted and incorporated into the Project to reduce these significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Under Alternative 2, a mix of residential land use would be provided, but at higher densities in order to keep the number of units relatively similar to what would be allowed under the Project while increasing open space. As a result, the mix of residential units would be: 3 percent low-density residential, 58 percent medium-density residential, and 36 percent high-density residential. Commercial uses would also be reduced. There would be a reduction in parks acreage with the elimination of the citywide park, but open space would otherwise increase. With the exception of the open space area located on the southwest corner of the site, it is unlikely that any of the other areas would continue to support agricultural uses, because of their size and because these other areas would be surrounded by development.

The potential conflicts with agricultural practices and future development of the Urban Reserve areas would remain the same under this alternative as for the Project. This would remain a significant impact. Additionally, the potential impacts on sensitive uses due to over-flights from McClellan Airport would remain a significant and unavoidable impact. (DEIR, pp. 6-11 to 6-13.)

b. Population, Employment and Housing

The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to substantial population growth spurred by the increased residential, commercial, and business professional opportunities created by the Project. While mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce the significant impact, no mitigation is available to lessen the significant and unavoidable impact.

Some of the population, employment, and housing impacts would be reduced when compared to the Project. Under both Alternative 2 and the Project, ten percent of residential units would be designated as affordable units, which is consistent with City policy. Unlike the Project, this alternative would provide a greater percentage of high density housing opportunities, thus increasing the likelihood of more affordable housing opportunities than the Project. As a result, this alternative would allow the City to better meet its RHNA obligation. However, Alternative 2 proposes a similar number of residential units and would result in correspondingly similar population growth. Thus, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Alternative 2 would be required to comply with all applicable plans and policies, as would the proposed SVSP. This alternative would provide additional opportunities for meeting the Blueprint project objectives because of its higher density design. Hence, overall consistency with plans and policies would remain less-than-significant for this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-13.)

c. Transportation and Circulation

The Project would contribute to increased traffic volumes on the City, Sutter County, Sacramento County, Placer County, and the State roadway intersections and segments. The Project also would result in a significant and unavoidable impact from short-term construction-related traffic and long-term operational impacts associated with construction of new traffic improvements. The Project would result in significant or potentially significant impacts from increased peak hour traffic volumes in the City and increased demand for bicycle facilities in the project area.

Under Alternative 2, some of the traffic and circulation impacts would be reduced when compared to the Project. DKS Associates provided a quantitative analysis of traffic impacts for Alternative 2 and based its analysis on 2025 conditions, rather than existing conditions, to provide a comparison under worst-case conditions. Alternative 2 would result in approximately 17 percent less traffic than the Project (107,436 daily trips would be generated, compared to 128,684 daily trips generated by the Project). Similar to the Project, over 80 percent of the City intersections would operate at LOS C or better. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

Compared to the Project, two intersections would improve to an acceptable level of service (Junction/Baseline and Roseville Parkway/Sierra College Boulevard), and level of service

conditions at one intersection, Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Washington Boulevard, would deteriorate under Alternative 2. (See DEIR Table 6-2, “Intersections with Significant LOS Changes.”) Therefore, this alternative would result in fewer traffic impacts overall compared to the Project. Nonetheless this alternative would still result in a significant impact. Alternative 2 would have significant level of service impacts to the following three intersections that would not be significantly adversely impacted by the Project: Baseline Road and Fiddymont Road; Galleria and Roseville Parkway; and, Pleasant Grove and Washington Boulevard. Thus, as to these intersections, the traffic impact would be significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, pp. 6-13 to 6-15.)

d. Air Quality

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions that could contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and expose sensitive receptors to pollutants. The Project would result in a significant impact due to the fact that the project is not accounted for in the State Implementation Plan, which would hinder the Placer County Air Pollution Control District’s (“PCAPCD”) ability to bring the region into attainment. The Project also would result in a potential exposure of toxic air contaminants to sensitive receptors. With respect to the significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Under Alternative 2, emissions of all pollutants would continue to exceed PCAPCD thresholds under this alternative and would be a significant impact. (See DEIR Table 6-3, “Comparison of Criteria Pollutant Emissions Generated by Alternative 2.”) However, there would be a slight reduction in the amounts of air pollution that would be generated compared to the Project. Additionally, construction of Alternative 2 would result in slightly lower PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions compared to the SVSP because less grading would be required with increased open space. Site grading is the largest single source of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} dust emissions associated with construction. Alternative 2’s emissions of other criteria pollutants, including ROG and NO_x, would likely be similar to or lower than those of the SVSP because it would involve denser development, including more multi-family and less single family residences.

Even with lower emissions, construction of Alternative 2 would result in a significant impact because emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ would exceed the PCAPCD’s significance thresholds. Implementation of mitigation measures outlined in DEIR Chapter 4.4, Air Quality, would reduce emissions, but those emissions would still exceed the PCAPCD’s thresholds. Thus, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, pp. 6-15 to 6-16.)

e. Climate Change

The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to increases in short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions of greenhouse gases, predominantly in the form of CO₂. Under Alternative 2, greenhouse gas emissions would be slightly lower than for the Project because of the lower vehicle miles traveled and the higher ratio of higher density residential development. The contribution to greenhouse gas emissions would remain significant and unavoidable, however. (See DEIR Table 6-4, “Alternative 2 Operations Green House Gas

Emissions, Unmitigated Metric Tons Per Year.”) Mitigation is available to reduce impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR, p. 6-16.)

f. Noise

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to short-term construction activities and from exposure of sensitive land uses to overflight noise from McClellan Airfield. Significant and unavoidable impacts would result from increased traffic-generated noise levels in the SVSP area under Existing Plus Project conditions, and for the Project site as a whole under Year 2025 conditions. The Project would add to the existing noise levels on roadway segments, which are projected in 2025 to exceed the City’s General Plan noise standard of 60 Ldn in the project area, with or without the Project. Significant impacts would result from increased stationary source noise associated with proposed land uses and park activities. With respect to the significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

As with the Project, construction activities could occur in proximity to sensitive receptors, primarily residences. Because the urban land use pattern would be nearly the same over a smaller geographical area, construction noise would be approximately the same as the Project but would occur in a smaller area. Construction noise would be associated with a slightly different land use mix. Construction noise would be significant, but reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.

Under Alternative 2, the project area would still be developed with a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, and parks. Similar to the Project, noise levels from commercial land uses and park activities could exceed City noise standards at some residences. These impacts would also be significant, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation.

Similar traffic levels would be generated as under the Project, and noise levels would still be expected to exceed the City’s noise standard of 60 Ldn along some roadways. Because Alternative 2 would result in a 17 percent reduction in traffic compared to the proposed project, development of Alternative 2 would result in slightly less traffic noise on roadways outside of the project area. Nevertheless, traffic noise would still be significant and unavoidable. Mitigation would not be available to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR, pp. 6-16 to 6-19.)

g. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Both the Project and Alternative 2 would result in no significant impacts. Impacts associated with development of the Project, or Alternative 2, and exposure of people and structures to seismic hazards are considered less-than-significant, and no mitigation is required.

h. Vegetation and Wildlife

The Project would result in significant impacts due to the loss, disturbance, or degradation of wetlands, “other waters” of the United States, vernal pool habitat, habitat for Western Spadefoot,

rare plant populations, legally protected raptors, riparian habitat and stream corridors along Curry Creek and other drainages, and special status species. The Project would interfere with the movement of resident and migratory bird species and would convert grassland habitat to urban uses. In the SVSP area, development would have a significant impact on California black rail marsh habitat. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative 2, although the amount of open space would increase, wetland impacts would still occur. Impacts to federally protected wetlands and “other” waters of the U.S. would consist of the loss of 13.59 acres of vernal pool impacts (compared to a loss of approximately 25 acres of waters of the U.S. for the Project). Similar to the Project, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation, including onsite and offsite preservation, and no net loss of wetlands.

The impacts on nesting raptors would be similar to of the Project, because construction-related activity would still occur. Grassland foraging habitat would be lost, although to a lesser degree than the Project; thus, the significant impact of this alternative would be somewhat less than the Project. With mitigation, including on and offsite preservation of grassland, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Under Alternative 2, the impacts from offsite infrastructure would be similar to those of the Project because construction activity would still occur. Alternative 2 would require the same off-site infrastructure as the Project; hence, the impacts would be identical and, with mitigation, the impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. (DEIR, pp. 6-19 to 6-20.)

i. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from subsurface construction activities that could uncover previously unidentified archaeological or historical resources and construction of off-site infrastructure that could damage historical resources. The Project would also result in significant impacts from construction activities that may disturb unknown paleontological resources and construction of off-site infrastructure that could damage archaeological and paleontological resources. However, with respect to these significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Alternatives 2 would not disturb as much land as the Project, therefore, the likelihood of encountering subsurface cultural or paleontological resources would be slightly less. However, the potential for impacts to cultural or paleontological resources would still exist from any development that would disturb potential subsurface resources. Thus, even with mitigation, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 6-20.)

j. Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

The Project would result in a significant impact from potential exposure to soil or groundwater contamination associated with past use of rural residential parcels. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. Pacific Gas and Electric (“PG&E”) Company is

proposing to construct and operate a natural gas transmission pipeline along Baseline Road as part of a larger project that spans Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento and Placer Counties. Project construction would involve a combination of trenching, horizontal directional drilling, and conventional boring. Hazards related to natural gas pipelines generally include ruptures, leaks, and explosions. However, because of design elements, surveying, and an operations and maintenance plan, any impacts from construction of or exposure to the proposed pipe would be less-than-significant.

Development of Alternative 2 would result in the same impacts as those identified for the Project related to the routine use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials, use of recycled water in areas accessible to the public, and location of residential and school uses in relation to sources of electromagnetic fields. This is considered a potentially significant impact; however, with mitigation, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

This alternative would result in lesser concerns related to locating sensitive land uses within 800 feet of the proposed PG&E gas line. Low density residential uses would not be located within 1,000 feet from the gas line. Only a small portion of high density residential uses are proposed in the vicinity of Watt Avenue, which would result in reduced potential incompatibility impacts compared to the Project. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level similar to what is anticipated with the Project. (DEIR, p. 6-20.)

k. Public Services

The Project would result in a potentially significant impact associated with development in the SVSP area and a significant impact for the Urban Reserve area due to increased demand for elementary, middle, and high school services. The Project would also result in a significant impact on fire protection and emergency medical services in the SVSP area. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation. Because the number of residents would be the same under this alternative as the Project, the impacts to public services, including schools, parks, and libraries, would be identical to the Project. Thus, these impacts would be less-than-significant under Alternative 2. (DEIR, pp. 6-20 to 6-21.)

l. Public Utilities

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to an increased demand for solid waste services and the resulting need to expand landfill capacity. The Project would also result in significant impacts due to required expansion of the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant because of increased demand for wastewater facilities; water quality impacts from wastewater discharges outside of the South Place Wastewater Authority's service area boundary; and disposal of construction debris. In the Urban Reserve area, significant impacts would result from the need for adequate water supply during wet and dry years as well as the need to extend potable water distribution infrastructure (such as pipelines, storage tanks, and wells) to the area. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The amount of surface water supply required under Alternative 2 would be 1,096 AFY less than for the Project. (See DEIR Table 6-5, "Water Supply.") As with the Project, water supply needs for this alternative would be met with a combination of surface water from Folsom Lake and recycled water supplies during wet/normal years, with the addition of increased water conservation and groundwater during dry and driest years. The impact would be less-than-significant because there would be adequate surface water to serve the Project. Because water supply needs are less for Alternative 2 than for the Project, the demand for water treatment, storage and conveyance would be less compared to the Project as well. Consequently, the less-than-significant environmental impacts for Alternative 2 would be slightly less than for the Project. Moreover, because the total water demand would be less than for the Project, groundwater impacts for Alternative 2 will be less than those analyzed for the Project. Groundwater recharge impacts also would be reduced compared to the proposed SVSP as more land would be left as open space. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

With respect to recycled water, the demand from Alternative 2 would be less than for the Project because the amount of undeveloped, non-irrigated open space would increase substantially. (See DEIR Table 6-5, "Water Supply.") Because the committed recycled water supply for this alternative is less than for the Project, the environmental impacts for Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to the Project. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on recycled water resources.

Under Alternative 2, the demand for wastewater treatment would be reduced compared to the Project because less development is proposed under this alternative. (See DEIR Table 6-6, "Wastewater Flows," for a comparison of the Average Dry Weather Flow between the Project and Alternative 2.) It is likely that a sewer lift station would still be required under this alternative. Because the wastewater flow demands for Alternative 2 are less than for the Project, the associated environmental impacts for Alternative 2 would be slightly reduced compared to the Project. However, it is expected that expansion of the PGWWTP would still be needed under this alternative, which would be a significant impact. With mitigation, including expansion of the PGWWTP, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Solid waste generation under Alternative 2 would be approximately 31 tons per year more than under the Project. The slight increase in waste generated would result in a slightly increased impact compared to the Project. Because the increase very small compared to the total waste expected to be generated, the increase is considered negligible and the impacts associated with Alternative 2 are equivalent to for the impacts of the Project. Although the landfill could be expanded to increase capacity, impacts on the landfill would remain significant and unavoidable because the landfill is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another agency.

Regarding electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications needs, because Alternative 2 has the same number of residents as the proposed SVSP, it is expected that this alternative would result in a similar demand for these services. Thus, this would remain a less-than-significant impact. (DEIR, pp. 6-21 to 6-24.)

m. Hydrology and Water Quality

The Project would result in significant impacts from increased stormwater runoff entering Curry Creek as a result of increased impervious surfaces. Significant impacts would also result from erosion and runoff from construction sites containing materials that could degrade water quality in local streams as well as impacts from the change in types and amounts of pollutants discharged due to the conversion of land from agricultural/open space uses to urban uses. In the Urban Reserve area, significant impacts would occur from the increase of stormwater runoff from urban uses as well as the reduced capacity of Curry Creek to handle flows due to the placement of fill or structures in the floodplain. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative 2, approximately 29 percent of the project area would remain as open space and would not be developed with new impervious surfaces. As a result, the rate and amount of stormwater discharged into Federico and Curry Creeks would be proportionately reduced compared to the Project. This would reduce the magnitude of the peak flow impacts identified for the Project; however, a large portion of the project site would still be graded and developed. Thus, the impact would remain significant. Mitigation would be implemented, including the conditions of NPDES permit(s) and low impact development standards, which would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR, p. 6-24.)

n. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from the change in the existing visual character of the Project site and vicinity due to conversion of over 1,600 acres of currently undeveloped grassland to urban uses, and due to introduction of new sources of light. Significant and unavoidable impacts would also result from blocking views of the Sierras and surrounding areas with urban development. Even with mitigation, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Like the Project, Alternative 2 would be an extension of the urban edge that exists east of the Project site. Development of Alternative 2 would be visually compatible with surrounding developed uses, but would substantially and permanently alter the existing visual character of the site by introducing an extensive roadway network, houses, offices, and commercial and other urban facilities into an undeveloped area. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

Although Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of land developed as urban uses, compared to the Project it would still result in a substantial change in the amount of light generated on the site and would alter nighttime views of the site. Light would be generated by residences, businesses, streetlights and vehicles, all of which would increase the ambient nighttime illumination level. In addition, schools with sports facilities could use high-intensity lights for playing fields, which would create a large amount of nighttime light. With development of this alternative, views to the Project site that are currently uninterrupted by light from the site would change to views of a developed, lit environment. This would be a significant impact. Impacts from light and glare for Alternative 2 would be somewhat reduced in comparison to the Project, because the amount of area to be developed with light and glare-producing uses would be reduced, and a citywide sports complex would not be developed. (DEIR, pp. 6-24 to 6-25.)

3. Feasibility of Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the Project, because substantially fewer acres would be developed and an additional 332 acres would be designated as open space. With respect to most environmental resources, the impacts of Alternative 2 would be the same as or reduced compared to the Project. This alternative would provide additional housing opportunities for meeting Blueprint objectives, because this alternative proposes 6,685 dwelling units on a smaller footprint than the Project. However, no impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable under the Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with this alternative. (DEIR, pp. 6-13, 6-25.)

Although Alternative 2 would result in the same or reduced impacts compared to the Project, the City Council finds that this alternative is infeasible for a variety of reasons. Some of these reasons are discussed in the *Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR Alternatives Analysis* prepared by Matt Johnson and Al Johnson of Al Johnson Consulting, LLC (April 13, 2010) (“Al Johnson Report”). Al Johnson Consulting, LLC analyzed each alternative in comparison to the Project in terms of infrastructure burden, fiscal impacts, and ability to address the Project’s economic objectives.

The Al Johnson Report concluded that Alternative 2 would not be fiscally positive and would not pay for its cost of service. Several points support this conclusion. First, the proposed balance of land uses under Alternative 2 would result in an annual deficit of \$570,000 and reflects a \$2.1 million decrease in annual revenues at buildout compared with the Project (which would generate an annual surplus of \$1.5 million in taxes and fees at buildout) that would be required to support relatively fixed infrastructure costs and increased open space maintenance costs. This shortfall would require the City to use its existing resources to compensate for the deficit. Second, Alternative 2 would generate \$1.35 million less in impact fees than the Project, and these fees would be needed to support the construction and equipment needs of the Fire Station. As a result, the City would be required to either increase impact fees or make a contribution from the General Fund to make up for this shortfall. Third, with the decrease in non-residential development and low-density residential development, approximately \$12.5 million in backbone infrastructure costs would be redistributed to the remaining residential and non-residential uses. Allocating the same backbone infrastructure costs to fewer units and less square footage would mean that the per-dwelling-unit and per-square-foot costs for backbone infrastructure would increase by 14 to 18 percent for residential and non-residential development proposed in Alternative 2. Finally, with the increase in open space acreage under Alternative 2, because of the reduction in the number of dwelling units and the square footage developed, increased maintenance costs (for fire breaks, litter removal, maintenance of trails, and monitoring of wetlands) will require a higher annual assessment on each individual property. Annual maintenance charges will increase for residential units by 11 percent and for non-residential units by 15 percent. Consequently, \$203,000 of annual maintenance costs will be redistributed to the remaining residential and commercial land uses. Furthermore, while it is anticipated that major backbone infrastructure and annual maintenance costs will be financed by Community Facilities Districts (CFDs), Alternative 2 exceeds the City’s routine practice of using 1.7 percent as a burden test for CFD financing. (Memorandum from Russ Branson, City of Roseville Administrative Services Director/Treasurer, to Al Johnson Consulting, LLC, dated April 21, 2010.) As a result, an owner equity contribution to Alternative 2 would be required to lower the

amount of infrastructure required to be financed to a level acceptable to the City. (Al Johnson Report, pp. 14-21.)

On balance, Alternative 2 would create a fiscal burden on the City that the City cannot afford, and would require subsidies from other areas of the City to support the Project. (Al Johnson Report, p.20.) Similarly problematic, requiring landowners to contribute \$12.5 million to compensate for the backbone infrastructure costs would decrease the residual land value of the project by \$16,700 per acre. Equity contributions tend to put projects at a competitive disadvantage compared with projects that do not require such contributions. Moreover, the City Council finds it particularly significant that the negative fiscal effect of this alternative is contrary to the City's General Plan policy that specific plans strive to maintain a neutral or positive fiscal benefit to the City. (General Plan Growth Management Policy 5; DEIR, pp. 4.1-39, 6-25.)

The City Council also finds that this alternative would not meet some of the project objectives as discussed in the Draft EIR and by professional land use planner Vance Jones of PBS&J in his memorandum, *Evaluation of EIR Project Alternatives for Consistency with Project Objectives* (April 13, 2010) ("PBS&J Memorandum"). In the PBS&J Memorandum, Mr. Jones analyzed each alternative based on several factors relevant to actual feasibility, including site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, and other plan or regulatory limitations.

As the PBS&J Memorandum concluded, the proposed reduction in development footprint under Alternative 2 affects the ability of this alternative to achieve several of the Project Objectives. First, this alternative would be inconsistent with Project Objective 2, because the increase in residential densities would create a disproportionate mixture of unit types by significantly decreasing the total percentage of low-density units from 38 to 6 percent. This change would be infeasible from a market absorption perspective, because low-density units are needed to fund the initial phases of project infrastructure that will later benefit the whole project. Second, this alternative would not meet Project Objective 4, because it would be inconsistent with Blueprint Implementation Strategies and SACOG's Preferred Development Scenario. The increase in open space under this alternative would create "barriers" between residential and commercial areas, thereby inhibiting connectivity which is an important element to promote alternative transportation modes. Third, this alternative would not comply with Project Objective 5, because the elimination of approximately 58 acres of commercial and office uses from the Baseline Road and Santucci Boulevard transportation corridors would reduce opportunities for economic growth and job creation along these corridors. By not providing these uses within the Specific Plan area, automobile usage will ultimately increase for residents who seek these uses outside the area. Fourth, this alternative would result in a significant reduction of the percentage of low-density units and a significant increase in the percentages of medium- and high-density units, which would be inconsistent with Project Objective 7. Rather, this alternative would shift residential densities in a manner that would eliminate the ability to provide a plan-wide mixture of housing choices, which is necessary to support all market segments. Fifth, as noted before, the open space areas incorporated into the land use plan would create several "barriers" within the Specific Plan area, which would make it infeasible to facilitate a development pattern that is called for in Project Objectives 9 and 10. This alternative would not provide a high level of connectivity between uses, and would reduce the ability to create walkable neighborhoods.

Sixth, this alternative would not meet Project Objective 13, because it does not include a citywide park facility. The City's General Plan includes a citywide park land dedication requirement and the City has a general policy of providing a citywide park facility in new development projects, such as the Sierra Vista Specific Plan. (PBS&J Memorandum, pp. 1-4; DEIR, pp. 4.11-32 to 4.11-33.)

The PBS&J Memorandum also concluded that this alternative would not meet Project Objectives 12, 18, and 19. This alternative would not meet Project Objective 12, because under this alternative development areas would no longer be efficiently linked to transportation systems. Alternative 2 would be inconsistent with Project Objective 18, because the addition of approximately 343 acres of open space would not achieve the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's preference for large-scale, comprehensive off-site mitigation rather smaller, more piecemeal on-site mitigation to compensate for potential impacts to listed species on-site. Finally, the reduction in commercial and office development would result in a loss of approximately \$1,532,106 in annual sales tax revenue (and other project-generated revenue) that would not be generated under this alternative as compared to the Project. The projected loss of annual tax and fee revenues also would make it infeasible for the City to provide public services at levels required by several General Plan policies. Thus, Alternative 2 would not be fiscally viable and would be inconsistent with Project Objective 19. In addition, as noted above, the City's General Plan includes a policy that specific plans must strive to maintain a neutral or positive fiscal benefit to the City. (PBS&J Memorandum, pp. 4-5; DEIR, p. 6-25.)

For all of the foregoing reasons, and for any of them individually, the City Council therefore determines that Alternative 2 is infeasible and is hereby rejected.

ALTERNATIVE 3 (Reduced Development Footprint, Same Density Alternative)

1. Description

Under the Reduced Development Footprint/Same Density Alternative (Alternative 3), open space would be substantially increased. (See DEIR Figure 6-3, "Alternative 3, Reduced Footprint/Same Density Site Plan.") Alternative 3 was developed by increasing open space by 343 acres in the areas of the site that contain the greatest concentrations of vernal pools or drainage areas. While this alternative would provide additional open space acreage, the citywide park would be eliminated. Developed areas would be reduced to 1,027 acres, and open space would increase to 599 acres (compared to 267 acres in the Project area). The residential densities would be reduced by 26 percent. Compared to the Project, this alternative would provide 4,931 dwelling units, which would be 1,719 units less than the Project, and on a smaller footprint.

2. Analysis of Alternative 3's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

a. Land Use and Agricultural Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable land use compatibility impacts from overflight operations at McClelland Airfield. The Project would also result in significant or

potentially significant land use compatibility impacts from agricultural uses located adjacent to sensitive uses, increased noise levels due to temporary construction activities, and conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce these significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Under Alternative 3, a mix of residential land use would be provided at lower densities to lessen some of the impacts of the Project, while increasing open space avoidance. As a result, the mix of residential units would be: 36 percent low-density residential, 36 percent medium-density residential, and 26 percent high-density residential. There would be a reduction in park acreage by approximately 41 acres, and a reduction of commercial uses (60 fewer acres of Community Commercial, and 79 fewer acres of Commercial Mixed Use). There would be an increase in Community Commercial/Business Professional uses of approximately 21 acres. This would be as a result of a shift to more Business Professional uses near the northwest corner of Baseline Road and West Side Drive. Open space would increase by 343 acres.

With the possible exception of the open space area located on the southwest corner of the site, it is unlikely any of the other areas would continue to support agricultural uses because of their small size and the fact that they would be surrounded by urban development. Furthermore, the potential conflicts with agricultural practices and future development of the Urban Reserve areas would be the same under this alternative as for the Project, which would be a significant impact.

The potential impacts on sensitive uses due to over-flights from McClellan Airport would be the same under this alternative, only to a lesser degree because there would be fewer residents. This would remain a significant impact under Alternative 3. (DEIR, pp. 6-26 to 6-29.)

b. Population, Employment and Housing

The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to substantial population growth spurred by the increased residential, commercial, and business professional opportunities created by the Project. While mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce the significant impact, no mitigation is available to lessen the significant and unavoidable impact.

Alternative 3 would have the same types of residential development as proposed under the Project, and in the same density ranges. However, Alternative 3 would have fewer acres of development, and 4,929 residential units instead of the 6,655 units in the SVSP area. The reduction of 1,726 residential units would result in 4,384 fewer residents than the Project. Impacts resulting from population growth would remain significant and unavoidable. With respect to affordable housing, ten percent of residential units would be made affordable under either the Project or Alternative 3, consistent with City policy. Thus, this would be a less-than-significant impact.

Alternative 3 would be required to comply with all applicable plans and policies, as would the Project. This impact would remain less-than-significant. However, this alternative would be less consistent with the SACOG Blueprint and would reduce the City's ability to accommodate its regional housing allocation. Lower density development associated with this alternative would make it more difficult for residents to walk or bike to services, because fewer developed urban

uses would be in convenient proximity to each other. Because Alternative 3 would have fewer residential units, it would reduce the City's ability to accommodate its share of projected regional growth and to achieve the long-term regional benefits of consistency with the Blueprint, including reduced long-term per capita consumption of land, water, electricity, natural gas, and vehicle fuels, reduced per capita wastewater generation, and reduced per capita air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. (DEIR, pp. 6-29 to 6-30.)

c. Transportation and Circulation

The Project would contribute to increased traffic volumes on the City, Sutter County, Sacramento County, Placer County, and the State roadway intersections and segments. The Project also would result in a significant and unavoidable impact from short-term construction-related traffic and long-term operational impacts associated with construction of new traffic improvements. The Project would result in significant or potentially significant impacts from increased peak hour traffic volumes in the City and increased demand for bicycle facilities in the project area.

Alternative 3 would result in an approximately 24 percent reduction in traffic compared to the Project. DKS Associates prepared a quantitative analysis of traffic impacts for Alternative 3 and based its analysis on 2025 condition rather than existing condition to provide a comparison under worst-case conditions. Approximately 97,532 daily trips would be generated compared to 128,684 daily trips generated by the Project. Similar to the Project, over 80 percent of the Roseville intersections would operate at LOS C or better. This is a less-than-significant impact.

This alternative would result in significant traffic impacts on level of service at the following intersections: Baseline Road and Fiddymont Road; Galleria and Roseville Parkway; Pleasant Grove and Washington Boulevard; and Westside Drive and Baseline Road. Two intersections would improve to an acceptable level of service (Junction/Baseline and Roseville Parkway/Sierra College Boulevard), and level of service conditions at two intersections, Galleria/Roseville Parkway and Westside Drive/Baseline Road, would deteriorate under Alternative 3. (See Table 6-9, "Intersections with Significant LOS Changes.") The net difference compared to the Project would be one less intersection significantly impacted (four versus five intersections operating at LOS D or worse with the project). Traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, pp. 6-29 to 6-30.)

d. Air Quality

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions that could contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and expose sensitive receptors to pollutants. The Project would result in a significant impact due to the fact that the project is not accounted for in the State Implementation Plan, which would hinder PCAPCD's ability to bring the region into attainment. The Project also would result in a potential exposure of toxic air contaminants to sensitive receptors. With respect to the significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Alternative 3 would result in lower PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions compared to the Project, because less grading would be required and more areas would be left as ungraded open space. Site grading represents the largest single source of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} dust emissions associated with construction. The emissions of other criteria pollutants, including ROG and NO_x, would also be lower than the Project. However, construction of Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact because emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ would exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds. Implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 4.4, Air Quality, would reduce emissions, but those emissions would still exceed the PCAPCD's thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, pp. 6-31 to 6-32.)

e. Climate Change

The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact due to increases in short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions of greenhouse gases, predominantly in the form of CO₂. Greenhouse gas emissions associated with Alternative 3 would be slightly lower because of the lower vehicle miles traveled and the lower amount of residential development compared to the Project. However, the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, pp. 6-32 to 6-33.)

f. Noise

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to short-term construction activities and the exposure of sensitive land uses to overflight noise from McClellan Airfield. Significant and unavoidable impacts would result from increased traffic-generated noise levels in the SVSP area under Existing Plus Project conditions, and for the Project site as a whole under Year 2025 conditions. The Project would add to the existing noise levels on roadway segments, which are projected in 2025 to exceed the City's General Plan noise standard of 60 Ldn in the project area, with or without the Project. Significant impacts would result from increased stationary source noise associated with proposed land uses and park activities. With respect to the significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

As with the Project, construction activities associated with Alternative 3 could occur in proximity to sensitive receptors, primarily residences. This would be a significant impact. With respect to commercial noise, noise levels could exceed City noise standards at some residences under this Alternative, which would be similar to what is expected under the Project. With mitigation, however, this impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Noise from schools and parks would be at less-than-significant levels under Alternative 3. Schools would be constructed within the project area, similar to the Project. Therefore, noise impacts from schools would remain the same. Because Alternative 3 does not include a citywide park, potential incompatibilities associated with noise and lighting would be eliminated under this alternative. However, noise associated with other neighborhood park uses would remain the same as the Project and the impact would be less-than-significant.

Under Alternative 3, reduced amounts of traffic would be generated compared to the Project, but noise levels would still be expected to exceed 60 Ldn along some roadways because 4,931

residential units and approximately 100 acres of commercial uses would be constructed which would result in associated traffic noise levels. Development of Alternative 3 would increase traffic noise on roadways outside of the Project site, which would be a similar impact under the Project. Traffic noise would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact. (DEIR, pp. 6-33 to 6-34.)

g. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Both the Project and Alternative 3 would result in no significant impacts. Impacts associated with development of the Project, or Alternative 3, and exposure of people and structures to seismic hazards are considered less-than-significant impacts for which no mitigation is required.

h. Vegetation and Wildlife

The Project would result in significant impacts due to the loss, disturbance, or degradation of wetlands, “other waters” of the United States, vernal pool habitat, habitat for Western Spadefoot, rare plant populations, legally protected raptors, riparian habitat and stream corridors along Curry Creek and other drainages, and special status species. The Project would interfere with the movement of resident and migratory bird species and would convert grassland habitat to urban uses. In the SVSP area, development would have a significant impact on California black rail marsh habitat. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative 3, the amount of open space would be greater than under the Project. However, impacts to wetlands would still occur. Impacts to federally protected wetlands and “other” waters of the U.S. would consist of the loss of 13.59 acres of vernal pool impacts (compared to the loss of approximately 25 acres of waters of the U.S. under the Project). This is considered a significant impact. Mitigation to achieve no net loss of wetlands through offsite preservation would be needed to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Under Alternative 3, the impacts on nesting raptors and grasslands would be similar to those of the Project because construction activity would still occur. Because grassland foraging habitat for raptors would be developed, the impacts of Alternative 3 would be similar to, although less than, the Project. This would be a significant impact. With mitigation, this impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level. With respect to grasslands, the increased amount of open space would reduce the area of grasslands that would be impacted. Because grassland foraging habitat would be removed, impacts under this alternative would be similar to, but somewhat less than, the Project.

The impacts from offsite infrastructure also would be similar to those of the Project, because construction activity would still occur and this would be considered a significant impact. Alternative 3 would require the same off-site infrastructure as the Project, and the impacts associated with off-site infrastructure would be identical. (DEIR, pp. 6-34 to 6-35.)

i. Cultural Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from subsurface construction activities that could uncover previously unidentified archaeological or historical resources and construction of off-site infrastructure that could damage historical resources. The Project would also result in significant impacts from construction activities that may disturb unknown paleontological resources and construction of off-site infrastructure that could damage archaeological and paleontological resources. However, with respect to the significant impacts mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Compared to the Project, this alternative would not disturb as much land. Therefore, the likelihood of encountering subsurface cultural or paleontological resources would be slightly less. However, the potential for uncovering resources would still exist, and would remain significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 6-35.)

j. Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

The Project would result in a significant impact from potential exposure to soil or groundwater contamination associated with past use of rural residential parcels. However, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. PG&E is proposing to construct and operate a natural gas transmission pipeline along Baseline Road as part of a larger project that spans Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento and Placer Counties. Project construction would involve a combination of trenching, horizontal directional drilling, and conventional boring. Hazards related to natural gas pipelines generally include ruptures, leaks, and explosions. However, because of design elements, surveying, and an operations and maintenance plan, any impacts due to construction of or exposure to the proposed pipe would be less-than-significant.

Development of Alternative 3 would result in the same impacts as those identified for the Project related to the routine use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials within the Project site, use of recycled water in areas accessible to the public, and location of residents and schools in proximity to sources of power and gas lines. Therefore, the impact would be significant. (DEIR, p. 6-35.)

k. Public Services

The Project would result in a potentially significant impact associated with development of the SVSP area, and future development of the Urban Reserve area, due to increased demand for elementary, middle, and high school services. The Project would also result in a significant impact on fire protection and emergency medical services in the SVSP area. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative 3, approximately 41 acres of parks would be provided, with 13 acres each of Neighborhood Community Park, Citywide Park, and Open Space. Alternative 3 would provide approximately 599 acres of open space and 41 acres of active park uses within the SVSP area. While Alternative 3 would provide greater overall open space than the Project, it would not meet the City's requirement for parks. Therefore, the impact on park and recreation facilities would be

similar to that of the Project, and would require mitigation in the form of park dedication and/or payment of in lieu fees. As a result, the impact would be less-than-significant.

With respect to library services, a new library branch or expansion of existing branches would not be warranted under the City's standard of one new branch for every 20,000 residents because Alternative 3 would add approximately 12,519 new residents to the SVSP area. This is a less-than-significant impact. The impact on existing libraries under Alternative 3 would be less than the proposed Project because there would be approximately 4,384 fewer residents.

While the demand for schools, parks, and fire and police staffing would be reduced with this alternative, because Alternative 3 would result in a smaller population there would still be a need for a new fire station. (DEIR, p. 6-36.)

I. Public Utilities

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to an increased demand for solid waste services and the resulting need to expand landfill capacity. The Project would also result in significant impacts due to required expansion of the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant because of increased demand for wastewater facilities; water quality impacts from wastewater discharges outside of the South Place Wastewater Authority's service area boundary; and disposal of construction debris. In the Urban Reserve area, significant impacts would result from the need for adequate water supply during wet and dry years as well as the need to extend potable water distribution infrastructure (such as pipelines, storage tanks, and wells) to the area. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Water supply needs for this alternative would be met in the same manner as for the Project: a combination of surface water from Folsom Lake and recycled water supplies during wet/normal years, with increased water conservation and groundwater during dry and driest years. However, the amount of surface water supply required under Alternative 3 would be 1,084 AFY less than for the Project and would be a less-than-significant impact. (See Table 6-12, "Water Supply.") Thus, the demand for water treatment, storage and conveyance would be reduced compared to the Project.

The impact to groundwater would be less-than-significant. The amount of groundwater required to serve Alternative 3 during dry and driest years also would be less than the Project. (See DEIR Table 6-12, "Water Supply.") Groundwater recharge impacts also would be reduced compared to the Project, because more land would be left as open space. As with the Project, the impact on groundwater would be less-than-significant, because adequate groundwater recharge is available from the City's Reason Farms project, which took rice farming out of production.

Alternative 3 would have a less-than-significant impact on recycled water demand. The demand for recycled water would be less because the amount of non-irrigated undeveloped open space would increase substantially. (See DEIR Table 6-12, "Water Supply.") Because the committed recycled water supply for this alternative is less than that for the Project, the associated less-than-significant environmental impacts of the Project would be further reduced under Alternative 3.

With respect to wastewater, the need to expand the PGWWTP would still exist under Alternative 3. This would be a significant impact. Because less development is proposed under this alternative than for the Project, there would be a corresponding reduction in the demand for wastewater treatment. (See DEIR Table 6-13, "Wastewater Flows," for a comparison between the Project and Alternative 3 of the Average Dry Weather Flow.) It is anticipated that a sewer lift station would still be required under this alternative. Because the wastewater flow demands for this alternative are less than for the Project, the associated less-than-significant environmental impacts of the Project would be further reduced under Alternative 3.

Development of Alternative 3 also would result in a significant impact on the capacity of the landfill. Solid waste generation under Alternative 3 would be approximately 6,680 tons per year less than for the Project, resulting in a decreased impact compared to the Project. This would remain a significant and unavoidable impact, however, because the control the timing of land fill expansions is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another agency.

Finally, Alternative 3 would result in an approximately 26 percent reduction in the level of development proposed for the SVSP. Demand for electricity and natural gas would be a less-than-significant impact because there is adequate capacity in both systems. It is expected that the telecommunications infrastructure would be the same as for the Project. (DEIR, pp. 6-36 to 6-39.)

m. Hydrology and Water Quality

The Project would result in significant impacts from increased stormwater runoff entering Curry Creek as a result of increased impervious surfaces. Significant impacts would result from erosion and runoff from construction sites containing materials that could degrade water quality in local streams as well as impacts from the change in types and amounts of pollutants discharged due to the conversion of land from agriculture/open space use to urban uses. In the Urban Reserve area, significant impacts would occur from the increase of stormwater runoff from urban uses as well as the reduced capacity of Curry Creek to handle flows due to the placement of fill or structures in the floodplain. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative 3, a greater amount of acreage would remain as open space and would not be developed with new impervious surfaces. As a result, the rate and amount of stormwater discharged into Federico and Curry Creeks would be proportionately reduced compared to the Project. This would reduce the magnitude of the peak flow impacts identified for the Project. The magnitude of the construction site and post development urban runoff water quality impacts would also be reduced compared to the Project, and mitigation would be implemented, including the conditions of NPDES permit(s) and low impact development standards, which would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR, p. 6-39.)

n. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from the change in the existing visual character of the Project site and vicinity due to the conversion of over 1,600 acres of currently undeveloped grassland to urban uses, and due to introduction of new sources of light.

Significant and unavoidable impacts would also result from blocking views of the Sierras and surrounding areas with urban development. Even with mitigation, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Like the Project, Alternative 3 would be an extension of the urban edge that exists east of the Project site (the existing City of Roseville). Development of Alternative 3 would be visually compatible with surrounding developed uses, but would substantially and permanently alter the existing visual character of the site by introducing an extensive roadway network, houses, offices, and commercial and other urban facilities into an undeveloped area. Like the Project, the conversion of the site to urban uses would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Mitigation under this alternative is not available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Although Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of land developed as urban uses compared to the Project, it would still result in a substantial change in the amount of light generated on the site and alter nighttime views of the site. Light would be generated by residences, businesses, streetlights, and vehicles, all of which would increase the ambient nighttime illumination level. In addition, schools with sports facilities could use high-intensity lights for playing fields, which would create a large amount of nighttime light. With development of this alternative, views to the Project site that are currently uninterrupted by light from the site would change to views of a developed, lit environment. Impacts from light and glare for Alternative 3 would be somewhat reduced in comparison to the Project because the amount of area to be developed with light and glare-producing uses would be reduced, and there would not be a citywide sports complex. With mitigation, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR, pp. 6-39 to 6-40.)

3. Feasibility of Alternative 3

According to the Draft EIR, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the Project because substantially fewer acres would be developed and an additional 342 acres would be designated as open space. With respect to most environmental resources, the impacts of Alternative 3 would be the same as, or less than, those of the Project, and would not create any additional significant impacts. However, no impacts that were identified as significant and unavoidable under the Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-40.)

While Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the Project, the City Council finds that this alternative is ultimately infeasible for a number of reasons. Among them are economic/policy reasons based on the professional judgment expressed in the Al Johnson Report. First, this alternative would generate a smaller positive annual revenue stream for City improvements and services than would occur under the Project. Although Alternative 3 would generate \$820,000 per year at build-out, this amount is \$740,000 less per year than the Project at buildout. Second, the alternative would result in a shortfall of \$1.6 million from impact fees compared to the Project to support the construction and equipment needs of the Fire Station. Third, because Alternative 3 would reduce residential and commercial square footage, approximately \$23 million in backbone infrastructure costs would be redistributed to these land uses, which translates into an increase in backbone infrastructure costs of between 31 to 33

percent to these land uses. The City would not have the ability to finance this additional burden, in addition to annual maintenance costs, with CFD financing. Furthermore, Alternative 3 exceeds the City's routine practice of using 1.7 percent as a burden test for CFD financing. Consequently, without financing, project proponents would be required to make an additional equity contribution to lower the amount of infrastructure required to be financed. If the project proponents are required to make an equity contribution of \$23 million to finance the backbone infrastructure, it would decrease the residual land value by \$30,000 per acre. This decrease in land value would make it difficult, if not impossible, to proceed with development under this alternative given the current and foreseeable economic circumstances. Finally, as explained in the analysis provided by Al Johnson Consulting, LLC, Alternative 3, with the increase in open space acreage under Alternative 3, because of the reduction in the number of dwelling units and the square footage developed, increased maintenance costs (for fire breaks, litter removal, maintenance of trails, and monitoring of wetlands) will require a higher annual assessment on each individual property. As a result, maintenance charges would increase approximately 24 percent on residential units and 42 percent on non-residential square footage per year. (Al Johnson Report, pp. 23-30.)

Moreover, although Alternative 3 would meet most of the project objectives, this alternative would be inconsistent with other key project objectives, according to the Draft EIR and the PBS&J Memorandum. First, the reduction in residential units would significantly impact the City's ability to provide for its share of the region's projected population growth, which would be inconsistent with Project Objectives 1 and 8. With the reduction in residential units, the City would be less able to reduce long-term per capita consumption of land, water, electricity, natural gas, vehicle fuels, wastewater generation, air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions through development that is consistent with the SACOG Blueprint. (DEIR, pp. 6-29 to 6-30.) Second, Alternative 3 would be inconsistent with Project Objective 18, because the addition of approximately 342 acres of open space would not achieve the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's preference for large-scale, comprehensive off-site mitigation rather smaller, more piecemeal on-site mitigation to compensate for potential impacts to listed species on-site. Third, this alternative would not meet Project Objective 4, which calls for consistency with the City's Blueprint Implementation Strategies and SACOG's Preferred Development Scenario because the location and size of the additional open space areas throughout the Plan Area would create several "barriers" between residential neighborhoods and commercial areas. Additionally, lower density development associated with this alternative would make it more difficult for residents to walk or bike to services, which would be inconsistent with the Blueprint strategies. (DEIR, p. 6-29.) The Base Case Blueprint Scenario used in SACOG's Blueprint process demonstrated that lower density projects adjacent to existing infrastructure and services would result, in the long-term and on a regional basis, in greater greenfield development, loss of open space, air quality impacts and traffic congestion than if development occurred at higher densities. (DEIR, p. 6-40.) Fourth, Alternative 3 would be inconsistent with Project Objective 5, because approximately 57 acres of commercial and office uses are eliminated from the Baseline Road and Santucci Boulevard transportation corridors, thereby reducing opportunities for economic growth and job creation along these corridors. If these commercial and office uses cannot be provided within the Specific Plan area, automobile usage would increase for residents needing these types of commercial goods and services. Fifth, the reduction of residential units under this alternative would make it infeasible to achieve Objective 7, because a plan-wide mixture of residential unit types needed to support all market segments would not be achieved. Sixth, the physical form and development

pattern of the Plan Area would be adversely affected in a manner that would make it infeasible to facilitate a high level of connectivity between uses, which is called for in Project Objectives 9 and 10. (PBS&J Memorandum, pp. 6-7; DEIR, pp. 6-29, 6-30, 6-40.) Objective 8 would be more difficult to achieve under this alternative, because it would result in less high density residential uses that would help the City meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

The PBS&J Memorandum also finds that Alternative 3 would fail to meet Project Objectives 12, 13, 18, and 19. Under Alternative 3, development areas would no longer be efficiently linked to transportation systems, which would be inconsistent with Project Objective 12. Without linkages to transportation systems, increases in vehicle miles traveled and air quality issues, in addition to adverse climate change effects, would occur. This alternative would fail to meet Project Objective 13 because of the elimination of a citywide park facility under Alternative 3. For this reason, Alternative 3 would be inconsistent with the City's General Plan requirement for citywide park land dedication and the City's policy of providing a citywide park facility in new development projects, such as the Sierra Vista Specific Plan. Finally, the 57 acre reduction in commercial/office development would equate to approximately \$1,913,770 annually in sales tax revenue that would not be generated by the project. Due to the loss in projected annual revenues, Alternative 3 would be less fiscally viable and would rely significantly on other revenue sources in order to achieve Project Objective 19. (PBS&J Memorandum, pp. 8-9; DEIR, p. 6-41.)

For all of the foregoing reasons, and for any of them individually, the City Council finds that Alternative 3 is not feasible and is hereby rejected.

ALTERNATIVE 4 (Same Project Footprint, Reduced Density Alternative)

1. Description

Under the Same Footprint/Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 4), open space acreage would be the same as the Project, but residential densities would be lower within the same development footprint as the Project. (See DEIR, p. 6-42, Figure 6-4, "Alternative 4.") With the reduction of residential densities by approximately 26 percent, the residential component of this alternative would include a high number of low density residential units (over 75 percent) and no medium density units. The square footage for commercial and office uses would remain identical to the Project.

2. Analysis of Alternative 4's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

a. Land Use and Agricultural Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable land use compatibility impacts from overflight operations at McClelland Airfield. The Project would also result in significant land use compatibility significant impacts from agricultural uses located adjacent to sensitive uses, increased noise levels due to temporary construction activities, and conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce the significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Under Alternative 4, a mix of residential land use would be developed at lower densities to lessen some of the impacts of the Project. The mix of residential units would be 77 percent low-density residential, no medium-density residential, and 18 percent high-density residential. The acreage of parks and commercial uses would be the same as in the Project.

Land use compatibility impacts and the loss of agricultural land would be the same as the Project. These would remain as significant impacts. Potential conflicts with agricultural practices and future development of the Urban Reserve areas also would be the same as the Project, and would remain a significant impact. The potential impacts on sensitive uses due to overflights from McClellan Airport also would remain the same as the Project, although a smaller population would be exposed to overflights. This would remain a significant and unavoidable impact.

Like the Project, Alternative 4 would be required to comply with all applicable plans and policies. This would be a less-than-significant impact. However, this alternative would be less consistent with the SACOG Blueprint than the Project. Lower density development would make it more difficult for residents to walk or bike to services. Fewer uses would be located proximate to each other. The Blueprint Preferred Land Use Map accommodates projected regional growth, but Alternative 4, compared to the Project, would divert development to other locations in the region or away from the existing urban footprint, which would create additional environmental impacts, including increased long-term per capita consumption of land, water, electricity, natural gas, and vehicle fuels; increased per capita wastewater generation; and increased per capita air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. (DEIR, pp. 6-41 to 6-44.)

b. Population, Employment and Housing

The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact from substantial population growth spurred by the increased residential, commercial, and business professional opportunities created by the proposed project. While mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce the significant impact, no mitigation is available to lessen the significant and unavoidable impact.

Like the Project, under Alternative 4 ten percent of residential units would be made affordable, which would be consistent with City policy. However, Alternative 4 would make it nearly impossible for the City to meet its RHNA obligations. HCD recognizes parcels that are zoned high-density residential (over 20 dwelling units per acre (“du/ac”)) as able to fulfill the City’s affordable housing obligations. Under this alternative, HDR parcels would have a density of greater than 13 units per acre; therefore, it could not be guaranteed that a developer would propose a density of greater than 20 du/ac. Even if the City were to get credit for the high density residential parcels proposed in Alternative 4, it would only provide 930 units, which is not enough to meet projected RHNA obligations. This is a significant impact.

Alternative 4 would have approximately 26 percent less residential development than the Project. This decrease would correspondingly decrease the amount of population growth from development. However, the reduction in population growth would still constitute a substantial increase in growth. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, pp. 6-44 to 6-45.)

c. Transportation and Circulation

The Project would contribute to increased traffic volumes on the City, Sutter County, Sacramento County, Placer County, and the State roadway intersections and segments. The Project would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact from short-term construction-related traffic and long-term operational impacts associated with construction of new traffic improvements. The Project would result in significant or potentially significant impacts from increased peak hour traffic volumes in the City and increased demand for bicycle facilities in the project area.

DKS Associates prepared a quantitative analysis of traffic impacts for Alternative 4. (See DEIR Appendix D, "Traffic Analysis.") To provide a comparison under worst-case conditions, this analysis was based on 2025 cumulative conditions, rather than existing conditions. As discussed in Chapter 4.3 of the DEIR, the 2025 Capital Improvement Program Update, with minor modifications, forms the basis for this analysis.

Alternative 4 would have a significant impact at the following intersections: Baseline Road/Fiddymont Road; Galleria/Roseville Parkway; Pleasant Grove/Washington Boulevard; and, Westside Drive/Baseline Road. Compared to the Project, Alternative 4 would result in two intersections improving to an acceptable level of service (Junction/Baseline and Roseville Parkway/Sierra College Boulevard), and level of service conditions at three intersections (Baseline Road/Fiddymont Road, Galleria/Roseville Parkway, and Westside Drive /Baseline Road) would deteriorate. (See Table 6-16, "Intersections with Significant LOS Changes.") The intersection of Pleasant Grove and Washington Boulevard would remain at LOS D. This alternative would result in changes in trip distribution due to lower density residential uses. Residents would be less likely to walk to adjacent services because land uses are more spread out, and would be expected to rely more heavily automobiles. Therefore, this alternative would result in greater traffic impacts. (DEIR, pp. 6-45 to 6-46.)

d. Air Quality

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions that could contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation and expose sensitive receptors to pollutants. The Project would result in a significant impact due to the fact that the project is not accounted for in the State Implementation Plan, which would hinder PCAPCD's ability to bring the region into attainment. The Project would also result in a potential exposure of toxic air contaminants to sensitive receptors. With respect to the significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Emissions of all pollutants would continue to exceed PCAPCD thresholds under Alternative 4, but the amount of emissions would be reduced compared to the proposed project. (See DEIR Table 6-17, "Comparison of Criteria Pollutant Emissions Generated by Alternative 4.") Alternative 4 would result in similar PM10 and PM 2.5 emissions compared to the Project. However, because it would have fewer residential units, construction emissions of ROG and NOx would be lower than for the Project. Nevertheless, construction air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable under this alternative. Additionally, Alternative 4 would

result in a significant impact because emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10 would exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds. Implementation of the identified mitigation measure would reduce emissions, but those emissions would still exceed PCAPCD's thresholds. Moreover, operational emissions associated with Alternative 4 would be higher than for the Project because less dense development would occur, which would require a greater number of vehicle miles traveled due to inefficient land use patterns and a reduction in the ability to walk or use alternative modes of transportation. This would still result in a significant unavoidable impact. (DEIR, pp. 6-46 to 6-48.)

e. Climate Change

The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact from increases in short-term construction-related and long-term operational emissions of greenhouse gases, predominantly in the form of CO₂. GHG emissions associated with Alternative 4 would be slightly lower than for the Project; however, it would result in inefficient travel because of the lower density of uses and the increase in individual vehicle miles traveled compared to the Project. This alternative is less Blueprint-friendly because it is lower in density and has fewer opportunities to provide connectivity by locating residences adjacent to services. The contribution to greenhouse gas emission would be significant and unavoidable with this alternative. (DEIR, p. 6-48.)

f. Noise

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to short-term construction activities and the exposure of sensitive land uses to overflight noise from McClellan Airfield. Significant and unavoidable impacts would result from increased traffic generated noise levels in the SVSP area under Existing Plus Project conditions, and for the Project site as a whole under Year 2025 conditions. The Project would add to the existing noise levels on roadway segments, which are projected in 2025 to exceed the City's General Plan noise standard of 60 Ldn on the Project site and in the vicinity, with or without the Project. Significant impacts would result from increased stationary source noise associated with proposed land uses and park activities. With respect to the significant and potentially significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

As with the Project, construction activities could occur in proximity to sensitive receptors, primarily residences under Alternative 4. However, less construction activity would occur and fewer residents would be exposed to construction noise under Alternative 4. This alternative would have a significant construction noise impact.

Under Alternative 4, the Project site would still have a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, and parks. Similar to the Project, noise levels associated with commercial uses could exceed City standards at some residences; however, because fewer people would reside on the Project site under Alternative 4, the impact would be less severe, and the impact would be less-than-significant with mitigation. Additionally, school related noise impacts would be less-than-significant similar what is expected under the Project. Schools would be constructed within the project area, similar to what would occur under the Project. With respect to park-related noise, this would remain a significant impact under this alternative. It is expected that a citywide

signature park would be located within Alternative 4; therefore, the noise impact from this facility would be similar to that of the Project.

Under Alternative 4, less traffic would be generated than under the Project, but greater vehicle miles would be traveled because of the lower density uses due to the less efficient land use pattern. Traffic-generated noise levels would still be expected to exceed 60 Ldn along some roadways. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Development of Alternative 4 would increase traffic noise on roadways outside of the project area. This impact would be similar but less severe than under the Project because there would be less traffic. (DEIR, p. 6-49.)

g. Geology, Soils and Paleontological Resources

Both the Project and Alternative 4 would result in no significant impacts. Impacts associated with development of the Project, or Alternative 4, and exposure of people and structures to seismic hazards are considered less-than-significant and no mitigation is required.

h. Vegetation and Wildlife

The Project would result in significant impacts from the loss, disturbance, or degradation of wetlands, “other waters” of the United States, vernal pool habitat, habitat for Western Spadefoot, rare plant populations, legally protected raptors, riparian habitat and stream corridors along Curry Creek and other drainages, and special status species. The Project would interfere with the movement of resident and migratory bird species and would convert grassland habitat to urban uses. In the SVSP area, development would have a significant impact on California black rail marsh habitat. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Impacts to wetlands would be similar to those of the Project under Alternative 4, because the amount of open space would be the same as the Project. This would be a significant impact that would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation.

Under Alternative 4, the impacts on nesting raptors, annual grassland habitat, and wildlife movement corridors would be similar to those of the Project, because construction activity would still occur. Because grassland foraging habitat would be removed, impacts would be similar under Alternative 4 to the Project. At lower densities, there may be some increased opportunity to save more onsite habitat, but not a substantially greater amount than the Project. This would be a significant impact. With respect to grasslands, Alternative 4 would result in the same loss of annual grasslands as the Project, which would be a significant impact. At lower densities there may be opportunity to provide a little more grassland avoidance, but not substantially greater than the Project. Finally, Alternative 4 would have a similar effect on migratory corridors to the Project because there would be the same number of creek crossings. This would be a significant impact.

Offsite infrastructure would be required for Alternative 4, but the improvements would be scaled down to reflect the decrease in development. Nonetheless, roadway and water and sewer lines would need to be extended. Thus, this would be a significant impact. (DEIR, pp. 6-50 to 6-51.)

i. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from subsurface construction activities that could uncover previously unidentified archaeological or historical resources and construction of off-site infrastructure that could damage historical resources. The Project would also result in significant impacts from construction activities that may disturb unknown paleontological resources, and construction of off-site infrastructure that could damage archaeological and paleontological resources. However, with respect to these significant impacts mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Under Alternative 4, the amount of land to be disturbed would be similar to the Project, but reduced slightly. As discussed in Impact 4.8-1, subsurface historic or prehistoric resources potentially could be uncovered during construction activities. Under Alternative 4, less residential development is proposed; therefore, there is a lesser potential for uncovering paleontological resources. However, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 6-51.)

j. Hazardous Materials and Public Safety

The Project would result in a significant impact from exposure to soil or groundwater contamination associated with past use of rural residential parcels. However, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. Additionally, PG&E is proposing to construct and operate a natural gas transmission pipeline along Baseline Road as part of a larger project that spans Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento and Placer Counties. Project construction would involve a combination of trenching, horizontal directional drilling, and conventional boring. Hazards related to natural gas pipelines generally include ruptures, leaks, and explosions. However, because of design elements, surveying, and an operations and maintenance plan, any impacts from construction of or exposure to the proposed pipe would be less-than-significant.

Development of Alternative 4 would result in the same impacts as those identified for the Project related to the routine use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials within the SVSP, use of recycled water in areas accessible to the public, and location of residents and schools in proximity of sources of power and gas lines. This impact would be significant. (FEIR, p. 6-51 through 6-54)

k. Public Services

The Project would result in a potentially significant impact associated with development of the SVSP area, and future development of the Urban Reserve area, due to the increased demand for elementary, middle, and high school services. The Project would also result in a significant impact on fire protection and emergency medical services. However, these impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Alternative 4 would generate additional students who would attend the Roseville City School District and Center Unified School District schools. The two elementary schools and one middle

school would be adequate to serve these students. The potential impacts of construction of new school facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be substantially similar to those of the Project, because the same number of new schools would be required, although the student population generated would be less. This is a less-than-significant impact.

Similar to the Project, the existing Fire Station #5 on Pleasant Grove Boulevard would serve the project area until other stations are constructed under this alternative. The Fire Department has identified the need to construct a new fire station in the first phase of development. Once constructed, the SVSP station would serve the project area and the four-minute response time standard still could be met. Therefore, the physical impacts of construction of a new fire station would be identical to the Project. This is a less-than-significant impact. Additionally, with respect to law enforcement, the impacts of Alternative 4 would be less-than-significant. Alternative 4 would result in the need for fewer additional sworn staff, other law enforcement staff and equipment compared to the Project. Under both Alternative 4 and the Project, no new or expanded law enforcement facilities would be required.

Under Alternative 4, there would be approximately 12,600 new residents in the SVSP area. Because the City's standard for libraries is one new branch for every 20,000 residents, a new library branch or expansion of existing branches would not be warranted. The impact on libraries under Alternative 4 would be less severe than the Project, because there would be approximately 4,239 fewer residents. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

With respect to parks, Alternative 4 would require 152 acres of new parks in total, with 50 acres each of Neighborhood/Community Park, Citywide Park/Community and Open Space/Passive parks to serve the new population. Alternative 4 would provide 40 acres of Neighborhood Park, 39 acres of citywide park and 257 acres of Open Space. Similar to the proposed SVSP, this alternative would be required to dedicate additional park land and contribute to in-lieu fees to meet City park standards. This is a less-than-significant impact. (DEIR, pp. 6-51 to 6-53.)

I. Public Utilities

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to an increased demand for solid waste services and the resulting need to expand landfill capacity. The Project would also result in significant impacts due to the required expansion of the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant because of increased demand for wastewater facilities, water quality impacts from wastewater discharges outside of the South Place Wastewater Authority's service area boundary, and from the disposal of construction debris. In the Urban Reserve area, significant impacts would result from the need for adequate water supply during wet and dry years as well as the need to extend potable water distribution infrastructure (such as pipelines, storage tanks, and wells) to the area. With respect to the significant impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The amount of surface water supply required under Alternative 4 would be 277 AFY less than is required for the Project. (See Table 6-19, "Water Supply.") Impacts on water supply would be less-than-significant. Water supply needs for Alternative 4 would be met in the same manner as proposed for the Project. Hence, water would be supplied to Alternative 4 from a combination of surface water supply from Folsom Lake and recycled water supplies during wet / normal years,

with the addition of increased water conservation and groundwater during dry and driest years. Because water supply needs are less for Alternative 4 than for the Project, the use of water treatment, storage and conveyance facilities would be less than for the Project. Consequently, the associated environmental impacts for Alternative 4 would be somewhat less than, but substantially the same as, the Project. Groundwater recharge impacts would be the same as the Project, because the same amount of land would be left as open space, although there would likely be a reduced amount of impervious surfaces with lower density development. This is a less-than-significant impact.

The impacts on recycled water would be less-than-significant under Alternative 4 because there would be adequate recycled water capacity to serve alternative. The demand for recycled water would be less under Alternative 4 than for the Project, because the number of single family residential uses would be greater and they would not use the recycled water. Because recycled water use is a benefit from a water resources perspective, this alternative would be less beneficial than the Project.

Development under Alternative 4 would require expansion of the PGWWTP. This is a significant impact. Because less development is proposed under Alternative 4 than the Project, there would be a corresponding reduction in the demand for wastewater treatment. (See DEIR Table 6-20, "Wastewater Flows," for a comparison of the Average Dry Weather Flow in million gallons per day between the Project and Alternative 4.) It is anticipated that a sewer lift station would still be required under this alternative. While the wastewater flow demands for this alternative are less than for the Project, the associated environmental impacts for Alternative 4 would be the same because an expanded WWTP would still be required.

With respect to solid waste, development under Alternative 4 would be significant and unavoidable because it would reduce the capacity of the landfill similar to what is expected under the Project. Solid waste generation under Alternative 4 would be approximately 6,459 tons per year less than for the Project, resulting in a decreased impact compared to the Project. However, this alternative would still decrease the life of the landfill, which would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

Finally, electric demand would be less-than-significant for Alternative 4, because adequate capacity to serve the alternative and the Project exists. This alternative would result in an approximately 26 percent reduction in the level of development compared to the Project, thus there would be a corresponding reduction in the demand for electricity and natural gas. Although this alternative would create a reduced demand compared to the Project, this alternative would still result in similar impacts as the Project. (DEIR, pp. 6-53 to 6-55.)

m. Hydrology and Water Quality

The Project would result in significant impacts from increased stormwater runoff entering Curry Creek as a result of increased impervious surfaces. Significant impacts would result from erosion and runoff from construction sites containing materials that could degrade water quality in local streams as well as impacts from the change in types and amounts of pollutants discharged due to conversion of land to urban uses. In the Urban Reserve area, significant impacts would occur from the increase of stormwater runoff from urban uses as well as the reduced capacity of Curry

Creek to handle flows due to the placement of fill or structures in the floodplain. However, all impacts from the Project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after implementation of mitigation.

Under Alternative 4, the same amount of land would be designated as open space as in the Project. However, because the residential densities would be less, a smaller area of impervious surfaces would be constructed. As a result, the rate and amount of storm water discharged to the drainage sheds would be proportionately reduced because more storm water would percolate into the soil instead of running off the surface. While the volume of storm water discharge would be proportionately reduced compared to the Project, runoff water would still need to be directed to and stored in the planned regional retention basin on the Reason Farms property to the northwest. This would be a significant impact. Alternative 4 would result in new impervious surfaces and would require construction and post-development urban runoff water quality measures. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. (DEIR, p. 6-56.)

n. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from the change in the existing visual character of the Project site and vicinity due to the conversion of over 1,600 acres of currently undeveloped grassland to urban uses, and due to the introduction of new sources of light. Significant and unavoidable impacts would also result from blocking views of the Sierras and surrounding areas with urban development. Even with mitigation, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Like the Project, development of Alternative 4 would be an extension of the urban edge that exists east of the Project site. Under Alternative 4, the types of development would be similar to those of the Project, but the extent would be reduced slightly. However, this would be a significant unavoidable impact. Additionally, Alternative 4 would have fewer multi-story residential buildings than the Project because a majority of the plan area would be constructed with low density uses. Mitigation is not available to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Although Alternative 4 would reduce the amount of development compared to the Project, this alternative would still result in a substantial change in the amount of light generated on the site and would alter nighttime views of the site. Impacts from light and glare from Alternative 4 would be somewhat reduced in comparison to the Project because fewer multi-story, higher density residential uses would be built. Mitigation would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR, p. 6-56.)

3. Feasibility of Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would be environmentally superior to the Project because fewer residential units would be developed. Every impact would remain the same as the Project or would be reduced to some degree, with the exception of impacts to air quality and traffic. With respect to air quality, operational emissions would be higher than for the Project because less development would occur. Residents would be less likely to walk to adjacent services and would be more likely to rely on automobiles because of the lower density pattern of development and less efficient

circulation. Hence, this alternative would result in changes in trip distribution due to lower density residential uses. Thus, this alternative would result in greater traffic impacts than would the Project, which would incorporate the Blueprint implementation strategies to encourage shorter trip distances and more transit choices beyond the automobile. (DEIR, pp. 6-45, 6-47 to 6-48.)

When viewed in isolation, less intense development under this alternative would be environmentally superior in the short-term. However, Alternative 4 would likely be environmentally inferior to the Project in the long-term as measured against a future baseline condition of all assumed 2050 regional growth anticipated by SACOG. Although an EIR normally is required to compare the proposed project to the existing physical conditions as a baseline for analyzing impacts, nothing in CEQA precludes a decision-making body from considering long-term environmental benefits and risks in assessing the ultimately desirability and feasibility of a proposed alternative. Under this alternative, fewer uses would be located proximate to each other. In the long term, then, Alternative 4 would have the practical effect of diverting future development to other locations in the region or away from the existing urban footprint compared to the Project. As a result, Alternative 4 would create additional environmental impacts, including increased long term per capita consumption of land, water electricity, natural gas, and vehicle fuels, increased per capita wastewater generation, and increased per capita air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. Thus, Alternative 4 would not provide for efficient use of land in the long term. (DEIR, pp. 6-45, 6-57.)

Although the City Council could reject Alternative 4 solely on these environmental grounds, the City Council also finds other reasons for rejecting the Alternative 4 as infeasible. These include some of the economic/policy considerations discussed in the Al Johnson Report. The Al Johnson Report concluded that Alternative 4 would provide an increase in project revenues by \$1.7 million a year at buildout, which would be used to compensate for the shortfall of \$270,000 to construct and equip the Fire Station. However, because the residential component of this alternative proposes mostly low-density residential units, approximately \$11.3 million in backbone infrastructure costs would be redistributed to other residential and non-residential uses. Redistribution of costs would increase infrastructure costs by 12 to 13 percent for these land uses. In particular, this alternative would add \$20,000 per acre of costs to non-residential uses; however, any shift of additional costs to non-residential units would place these land uses at a competitive disadvantage in the region. Additionally, annual maintenance charges would increase approximately 10 percent for residential uses and 21 percent for non-residential uses. (Al Johnson Report, pp. 32-39.)

Further, as the Draft EIR and the PBS&J Memorandum concluded, Alternative 4 would not meet some of the project objectives. First, the reduction of residential units under Alternative 4 would significantly impact the City's ability to provide opportunities to develop new residential units to meet SACOG's housing allocation requirements. The reduction of units compared to the Project would also shift this demand to other land areas adjacent to the City. As a result, this alternative would be inconsistent with Project Objectives 1 and 8, which call for orderly growth and meeting the City's obligation to accommodate regional population growth. Second, the elimination of approximately 1,665 residential units would create a disproportionate mixture of unit types within the Project, which would be inconsistent with the goal of creating a balanced community under Project Objective 2. As noted earlier, the remaining housing stock would consist of over

75 percent low-density residential units while eliminating medium-density units. Third, with the lower densities of Alternative 4, residential neighborhoods cannot be designed with a more compact development pattern as called for in the City Blueprint Implementation Strategies and SACOG's Preferred Development Scenario, which would be inconsistent with Project Objective 4. Fourth, because this alternative would significantly alter the mix of residential unit types, the imbalance essentially eliminates the ability to provide a plan-wide mixture of residential unit types needed to support all market segments, which would be inconsistent with Project Objective 7. Finally, Alternative 4 would significantly reduce the development intensity along the Santucci Boulevard and Baseline Road corridors, which would be inconsistent with Project Objective 12. This change would eliminate the ability to concentrate more of the project's high-density residential areas in proximity to transit, which would result in higher vehicle miles traveled, as well as likely increases in air quality issues and adverse climate change effects. (DEIR, p. 6-57; PBS&J Memorandum, pp. 9-10.)

For all of the foregoing reasons, and for any of them individually, the City Council finds that Alternative 4 is not feasible and is hereby rejected.

C. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The City Council finds that Alternative 3, the Increased Avoidance, Same Density Alternative, is the "environmentally superior alternative" for purposes of CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(d)(2), because it would result in the fewest impacts compared to the Project and the other alternatives with respect to wetlands and grasslands; construction and operational air quality emissions; contribution to global warming; public services; public utilities; transportation; construction and operational noise; and conversion of agricultural lands (see DEIR, pp. 6-57 to 6-58). However, Alternative 3 would fail to meet most of the project objectives, including enabling the City to meet its regional housing needs obligations, and consistency with the SACOG Preferred Blueprint Scenario, including SACOG's projected 2050 future condition long-term benefits of reducing per capita consumption of land, water electricity, natural gas, vehicle fuels, and reducing long-term per capita generation of wastewater, air pollution, and greenhouse gases.

XI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City Council has balanced the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the Project, and has determined that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. The reasons set forth below are based on the EIR and other information in the record. As set forth in the preceding sections, approving the Project will result in several significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level, even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures. (See section IX.B, *supra*.) As determined above, however, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures, nor are there feasible alternatives, that would mitigate or substantially lessen the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, despite these significant environmental effects, the City Council, in accordance with Public Resources Code Sections 21001, 21002.1(c), 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, chooses to approve

the Project because, in its judgment, the following economic, social, and other benefits that the Project will produce will render the significant effects acceptable.

Substantial evidence supporting the benefits cited in this Statement of Overriding Considerations can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section, and in the documents found in the record of proceedings, as defined in section IV, above. Any one of the following reasons is sufficient to demonstrate that the benefits of the project outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects, thereby justifying approval of the Project.

- 1) **The Sierra Vista Specific Plan is the most fiscally sound and feasible plan for development of the south County.** The Project is the plan most likely to provide a strong and self-sustaining tax base. This plan will enable the area to provide and maintain infrastructure and community services on a sustainable basis. While the Project will lead to a number of unavoidable, significant impacts identified in the EIR, it will also generate increased tax revenue to pay for public services. (See also the findings in Section X, above, regarding the feasibility of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.)
- 2) **The Sierra Vista Specific Plan will concentrate development in an area designated by Placer County for agricultural and rural residential uses.** The Project site has been designated for agricultural and rural residential uses, and historically has been used for these purposes. At present, the project site is largely undeveloped and it is assumed that the existing uses will continue into the future. The Project has major potential as a tax-generating industrial and commercial area. Thus, the Project will provide economically beneficial uses on the site.
- 3) **The Sierra Vista Specific Plan will create diverse employment opportunities for local and future residents.** The Project will also have a positive impact on job creation in the City. The Project will generate diversity in employment opportunities, both temporary construction jobs and permanent full-time and part-time jobs. The Project would accommodate approximately 3.4 million square feet of retail and office uses, and would provide in excess of 7,500 jobs. Consequently, it is reasonably expected that the City and its residents will enjoy the economic and social benefits from added employment opportunities offered by the Project.
- 4) **The Sierra Vista Specific Plan provides for the best possible jobs-housing balance for the Project site.** The Project is best able to balance the objectives of maximizing employment while, in the long term, minimizing environmental impacts associated with air quality, transportation and greenhouse gas emissions due to the feasible, optimal mix of residential, commercial and office uses proposed for the Project site. The Specific Plan area would be expected to house approximately 8,379 workers, based on 1.26 workers per housing unit. As of March 2009, 46,620 dwelling units existed in the City and approximately 58,740 workers could be housed, assuming a worker per household ratio of 1.26. With buildout of the SVSP, there would be more than 81,500 jobs in the City as a whole. Because the SVSP would take a number of years to build out, short-term jobs-housing imbalances could occur, especially if commercial uses do not develop as quickly as residential uses. However, the Specific Plan area is projected to add more housing than jobs, which will decrease the City's overall jobs-housing ratio and provide additional

housing opportunities through multiple housing unit types. The same result is projected for the Urban Reserve area even though no specific development is proposed at this time.

- 5) **The Sierra Vista Specific Plan provides for a livable, sustainable community that is consistent with SACOG's Blueprint.** The Project provides for development that meets the nine Blueprint Implementation strategies adopted by the City Council in 2005 to achieve the Blueprint Objectives. These implementation strategies give the City a means to implement the "smart growth" principles derived via SACOG's Blueprint effort into this newly developing area. The Project specifically meets the Blueprint Objectives by providing for the creation of higher-density neighborhoods with a mix of uses in village nodes, fostering transportation choices, and promoting more compact development that will offer a variety of housing choices. Additionally, the project area is in an area identified for future growth on the SACOG Preferred Scenario land use map.

As explained earlier, the City Council has balanced these benefits and considerations against the significant unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the Project. The City Council hereby concludes that those impacts are outweighed by these benefits, among others. After balancing the environmental risks against Project benefits, the City concludes that the benefits the City's community, economy, and tax and revenue base will derive from the Project outweigh the risks. The City believes that the Project benefits outlined above outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental costs associated with the Project.

XII.

RECIRCULATION NOT REQUIRED

No significant new information was added to the Draft EIR as a result of the public comment process. The Final EIR responds to comments, and clarifies, amplifies and makes insignificant modifications to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR does not identify any new significant effects on the environment or a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact requiring major revisions to the EIR. Therefore, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

XIII.

SUMMARY

A. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, the City Council has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to each of the significant environmental effects of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Project:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

2. To the extent that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the City, those changes or alterations have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

B. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, it is determined that:

1. All significant effects on the environment due to the approval of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

2. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section XI, above.