

CHAPTER 12 CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

12.1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines, this chapter identifies the following:

- ❖ Significant environmental effects of the proposed project;
- ❖ Significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented;
- ❖ Significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the proposed project;
- ❖ Growth inducing impacts of the proposed project; and
- ❖ Alternatives to the proposed project.

CHAPTER 11 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS evaluates the degree to which the project would contribute to significant impacts in the project region under the cumulative development scenario.

12.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

CHAPTER 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY and Chapters 4 through 11 of this EIR provide a comprehensive identification and evaluation of the proposed project's environmental impacts, including significance determinations for each impact both before and after mitigation is implemented. These chapters also include mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for environmental impacts.

12.3 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. The significant environmental impacts of this project are discussed in detail in Chapters 4 through 11 of this EIR, and mitigation measures identified for each significant impact when feasible. Impacts that remain Significant and Unavoidable are:

Transportation and Circulation

Impact 5.4: Increased Traffic Volumes through Intersections Within the City of Rocklin under Existing Plus Project Conditions

Impact 5.5: Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways within Placer County under Existing Plus Project Conditions

Impact 5.6: Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways within Placer County under Existing Plus Project Conditions

Impact 5.8: Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways Within Sacramento County Under Existing Plus Project Conditions

Impact 5.9: Increased Traffic Volumes through Intersections Within Sutter County Under Existing Plus Project Conditions

Impact 5.12: Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways Under Existing Plus Project Conditions

Impact 5.13: Increased Traffic Volumes through City of Roseville Intersections under 2025 CIP Plus Project Conditions

Impact 5.17: Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways under 2025 CIP Plus Project Conditions

Impact 11.8: Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Air Quality

Impact 7.1: Generate Construction Related Emissions That Conflict with the Air Quality Plan or Violate Air Quality Standards

Impact 7.2: Generate Emissions During Project Operation That Conflict with the Air Quality Plan or Violate Air Quality Standards

Impact 11.10: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard

Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply

Impact 11.12: Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Demands for Potable Water

Public Utilities – Wastewater Treatment

Impact 11.13: Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Demands for Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance

12.4 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines mandates a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental effects that would be caused by the proposed project. Specifically, this section states:

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

To summarize, a project could result in significant irreversible environmental changes if:

- ❖ The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- ❖ The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;

- ❖ The project involves uses that could increase the potential for environmental accidents which could result in irreversible damage; and
- ❖ The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (i.e., the project involves wasteful use of energy).

The proposed project is an amendment to the previously adopted West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP). Through the WRSP, the project area is already committed to urban development. The proposed Fiddymment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) 3 project would intensify the amount of urban development within the same development footprint planned under the WRSP. Thus the proposed project would not increase the amount of land committed to urban development. The WRSP EIR found that the WRSP would result in permanent and continual consumption of resources, including “water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels; however, the amount and rate of consumption of these resources would not result in the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources.” The proposed project would increase the rate of consumption of these resources, but the proposed project also includes additional resource conservation strategies which would ensure that the project does not result in the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources.

As determined in the Initial Study for the proposed Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project, the proposed project would not alter the WRSP EIR conclusion that the project would result in the use, transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes but that all activities would comply with applicable state and federal laws which would significant reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents (such as a release of hazardous materials) that could result in irreversible environmental damage.

12.5 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to evaluate indirect or secondary effects of a project, which may include growth-inducing effects and consideration of characteristics of the project that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment. Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a project could be considered growth-inducing if it would “foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.” A development project may have growth-inducing potential if, for example, it extends infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, roads) to undeveloped areas or increases the capacity of existing infrastructure; promotes similar development to occur on adjacent parcels; increases the area’s housing supply; or introduces new employment to an area.

The framework for analysis of the potential extent to which growth could be induced, accelerated, intensified, or shifted as a result of developing the proposed project includes contemplation of the following questions:

- ❖ Would the project remove obstacles to population growth?
- ❖ Would the project tax existing community facilities to the point of requiring construction of new facilities (construction of which may adversely impact the environment)?
- ❖ Would the project foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing?

- ❖ Would the project encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively?

Current Physical Growth Constraints

Limitations in public infrastructure, such as roads, water distribution lines, and treatment plant capacity, constrain opportunities for additional population growth. Conversely, increasing capacity or availability of public infrastructure can accommodate additional growth. The primary physical constraints to growth in the project vicinity consist of limited capacity for serving the western portion of the City of Roseville in the following systems: potable water, recycled water, wastewater, and electric distribution. Pipelines for the potable water, recycled water and wastewater systems exist within Fiddymment Road and Blue Oaks Boulevard, but do not currently extend throughout Phases 2 and 3 of Fiddymment Ranch.

At the time that the WRSP EIR was prepared, constraints in the local roadway network were also considered a constraint to development in the area. However, Fiddymment Road, which provides the primary north-south vehicle access through the western portion of the City, was recently realigned and widened, increasing capacity along this roadway. Additionally, Blue Oaks Boulevard, which provides the primary east-west movement in the area, was extended west of Fiddymment Road.

Removal of Physical Growth Constraints

The proposed project includes extension of pipelines to provide potable water and recycled water service as well as wastewater collection to all portions of Fiddymment Ranch. Expansion of the wastewater treatment plant capacity is not included in the proposed project and is not required to provide service to the proposed project. The project would not extend any public infrastructure to property that is not within the WRSP boundaries. Extension of infrastructure to the adjacent Creekview Specific Plan area will occur as development occurs in that plan area; however this would occur regardless of whether the proposed Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project is approved.

Economic Effects

Under the proposed Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project, the majority of the Fiddymment Ranch area would be developed with low density residential land uses, a total of 3,240 dwelling units. The Fiddymment Ranch area would also support 740 medium density residential units and 1,888 high density residential units. Of these residential units, the previously approved WRSP provides for development of 2,660 low density units, 131 medium density units, and 1,416 high density units, for a total of 4,207 units. The proposed project provides for development of an additional 1,661 units - 580 low density, 609 medium density, and 472 high density. The residential population of the Fiddymment Ranch area would generate general economic activity in the City of Roseville, including increased demand for services (such as banking, medical, car maintenance, dry cleaning), shopping, and entertainment. Demand for in-home or on-site services such as landscape maintenance and house cleaning would also increase. Development of the high density residential areas would likely include rental communities that would create jobs associated with property management. Additionally, under the proposed project, the Fiddymment Ranch area would support a total of 46.27 acres of community commercial land uses. Of this amount, 38.97 acres are included in the previously approved WRSP and 7.3 acres are included in the proposed project. Development of the community commercial land uses

would provide a total of approximately 1,439 jobs, assuming a Floor-Area-Ratio of 0.25 and that one job would be supported in every 350 square feet of building space. Of this total amount of employment, the proposed 7.3 additional acres of community commercial would support approximately 227 new jobs, representing a minor increase in the City's commercial activity.

In addition to the employment generated by the uses within Fiddymment Ranch, other increases in local employment could be generated through what is commonly referred to as the multiplier effect, which considers the effect that spending from employees of commercial areas within the project site could have on employment outside of the project site. There are two types of additional employment – indirect employment refers to jobs created in the local economy as a result of spending from project site employees and induced employment refers to jobs created in the regional economy as a result of the activity needed to support the spending from project site employees. As a simple example, when an employee from the project site goes out to lunch, the person who serves lunch to the project employee holds a job that was indirectly caused by the proposed project. When the server then goes out and spends money in the economy, or when the restaurant orders supplies from a vendor in the region, the jobs generated by these third-tier effects are considered induced employment.

As reported in the WRSP EIR, the indirect employment factor for commercial land uses is 0.07, indicating that the proposed project would contribute indirectly to creation of 15.82 new jobs, and the induced employment factor for commercial land uses is 2.56. Applying the induced employment factor to the indirect employment total, the proposed project is expected to contribute to inducing the creation of 40.5 new jobs. Based on these factors and the job creation estimate for the project site of 227 direct employees, the proposed project could result in a total of 282 new jobs within the regional economy. While increased future employment generated by resident and employee spending ultimately results in physical development of space to accommodate those employees, given the high unemployment rate locally and statewide, the creation of 55 new jobs outside of the project boundaries is not expected to generate substantial amounts of growth in the region. Further the physical environmental effects of this type of economic growth are too speculative to predict or evaluate, because they can be spread throughout the Sacramento metropolitan region and beyond.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project, the population and employment growth that would be supported by the proposed project is generally consistent with the growth projections and associated environmental effects evaluated in the WRSP EIR. While the project would accommodate larger amounts of population and employment growth, the project would maintain an acceptable jobs-to-housing ratio and provide the required amounts of affordable housing.

Impacts of Induced Growth

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

residential development in the region could lead to the need for construction of additional facilities for provision of public and governmental services.

As discussed in CHAPTER 4 LAND USE, the WRSP and the proposed Fiddymnt Ranch SPA 3 project is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Preferred Blueprint Scenario and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. These documents outline regional land use plans to accommodate projected growth and integrate land use planning, transportation planning, and efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The SACOG regional plans promote compact, mixed-use development, a greater range of housing products, reinvestment in already developed areas, and protection of natural-resource areas from urbanization. By intensifying land uses within an area already planned for urban development, the proposed project supports these goals. In the absence of the proposed project, it could be assumed that at least some of the 1,661 additional residential units included in the proposed project would be developed in more remote locations and locations that are not already planned for development. This could increase regional environmental impacts such as traffic congestion, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and loss of agricultural, cultural and biological resources.

12.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(a), an EIR shall describe “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The evaluation of alternatives shall explain why the proposed project was selected over other development scenarios, including the “no project” alternative and alternatives that would eliminate or reduce significant adverse environmental impacts. Less detailed discussion may occur where an alternative causes one or more significant impacts in addition to those described for the proposed project.

The range of alternatives is limited by the “rule of reason,” and the EIR should discuss the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be evaluated. The “rule of reason” is described in CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f):

Rule of reason. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

In accordance with these guidelines, this discussion focuses on alternatives that would avoid or lessen significant impacts and could attain the basic objectives of the proposed project. As described below, this chapter considers three alternatives to the proposed project. Following the analysis, *Table 12.4* summarizes the relative impacts of Alternatives A, B, and C compared

with the impacts of the proposed project. In addition, the alternatives analysis is used to identify the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative Selection Process

The process of selecting alternatives to be evaluated includes considering the Project Objectives, reviewing the significant impacts of the project, and identifying ways to avoid or reduce those impacts. Alternatives were selected based on potential feasibility and ability to meet basic project objectives; however, no project alternatives were rejected based on the likelihood that they would slightly impede the attainment of the project objectives or result in higher costs than the proposed project.

Objectives of the Proposed Project

The project applicant has identified the following objectives for the proposed Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project.

- ❖ Introduce a variety of housing types to Phases 2 and 3, similar to the diverse housing mix contained in Phase 1. This would be accomplished by adding pods of Medium Density and High Density Residential uses, as well as varying the density of the remaining Low Density Residential areas.
- ❖ Aid the City in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation obligations as identified in the current 2013-2021 Housing Element of the General Plan by increasing the amount of High Density Residential dwelling units.
- ❖ Aid the City in meeting the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint Preferred Growth scenario, the City's Blueprint Implementation Strategies, and the SACOG Sustainable Communities Strategy (required as part of meeting state-mandated regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets) by increasing the diversity of housing choices within the City, particularly by increasing residential density generally and providing more medium and high density residential units.
- ❖ Introduce a Community Commercial parcel in the northwest portion of Phase 3, providing for a centrally located small-scale commercial use that would promote pedestrian and bicycle access.
- ❖ Given limited services on the western side of the city, change the designation of a two-acre parcel in the northeast portion of Phase 2, at the corner of Angus Road and Fiddymment Road from residential to Community Commercial in order to provide neighborhood services proximate to planned residential uses.
- ❖ Add further definition to the circulation system by establishing two east/west streets that will intersect both Hayden Parkway and Fiddymment Road. These two streets, Holt Parkway and Crawford Parkway, will provide multiple points of ingress and egress from the Phases 2 and 3 planning areas, improving local circulation opportunities and easing the traffic load on Hayden Parkway.
- ❖ Reconfigure and refine the paseo parcels to connect the open spaces, parks, schools, and residential neighborhoods within the northern portion of Fiddymment Ranch.

- ❖ Reconfigure the F-51 park site and F-71 school site to improve vehicular circulation and pedestrian safety to and from these sites and provide an attractive park frontage along Hayden Parkway for the added benefit of visual open space.
- ❖ Modify the street configuration and Class I bicycle system to provide access to the future planning area to the west of the Fiddymment Ranch development.

Impacts of the Proposed Project

This EIR has identified significant and potentially significant impacts in several resource areas including Land Use, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, Air Quality, Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment, Public Services, and Cumulative Impacts. Most impacts of the proposed Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation measures identified in this EIR, except for the impacts listed in Section 12.3, which were determined to be Significant and Unavoidable.

Alternatives Selected for Analysis

Alternative A – No Project (No Development)

Contrary to the approved WRSP, this alternative would consider that no development occurs within Fiddymment Ranch other than the areas not affected by the proposed Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project and areas within Fiddymment Ranch that have already been developed.

Alternative B – No Project (Buildout under WRSP)

This alternative would consider development consistent with the approved WRSP as previously amended. This alternative would provide for development of 4,207 residential units, 38.97 acres of community commercial land uses, and open space, parks, and public land uses. The analysis of this alternative considers only the topics covered in this EIR as the goal of the alternatives analysis is to identify project alternatives that may reduce the significant impacts of the project. The proposed project is an amendment to the approved WRSP, and this Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR focuses on only those impacts of the proposed project that would be greater than the impacts previously identified for the WRSP. As determined in the Initial Study for this project, any impacts of the proposed project that are not evaluated in this EIR would be the same or less than the impacts of the WRSP as currently approved.

Alternative C – Reduced Development

This alternative would increase development compared to the approved WRSP, but to a lesser degree than under the proposed Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project. This Alternative would develop 20 percent fewer additional units than proposed. The amount of community commercial, parks, open space, and public land uses would be the same as under the proposed project. *Table 12.1* summarizes the number of residential units in each land use designation that would be developed under Alternative C. To accomplish this 20 percent reduction in residential units, densities within each parcel would be reduced but the overall Conceptual Land Use Plan would remain the same as proposed.

Table 12.1
Alternative C – Reduced Development

Land Use	Additional Development (compared to approved WRSP)	
	Proposed Additional Units	20 Percent Reduction Additional Units
LDR	580 units	464 units
MDR	609 units	487 units
HDR	472 units	378 units
<i>Total Additional Units</i>	1,661	1,329

Under this alternative, the Fiddymment Ranch site would support a total of 5,537 residential units. The Conceptual Land Use Plan would include the following land uses:

- ❖ 756.4 acres of LDR at a density of 4.1 units per acre (acreage does not include LDR pocket parks);
- ❖ 73.3 acres of MDR at a density of 8.4 units per acre;
- ❖ 86 acres of HDR at a density of 20.86 units per acre;
- ❖ 46.1 acres of community commercial;
- ❖ 19.1 acres of elementary school;
- ❖ 52.9 acres of high school;
- ❖ 4.5 acres of public/quasi-public;
- ❖ 216.5 acres of park (including LDR pocket parks);
- ❖ 6.7 acres of paseo;
- ❖ 340.2 acres of open space; and
- ❖ 75.8 acres of right of way

Alternatives Considered But Rejected from Further Analysis

Consideration was given to evaluating an offsite alternative to the proposed project. However, the project proposes to amend an existing specific plan to increase density within an area already planned for development. Relocating the proposed additional dwelling units and commercial land uses outside of the WRSP would not avoid the significant environmental impacts that would occur with buildout of the WRSP land uses. Further, the majority of large parcels of undeveloped land within the City of Roseville are located in the western portion of the City; therefore an offsite alternative location that could support a similar type of project would also be located in western portion of the City. Shifting the land use intensification proposed with the Fiddymment Ranch SPA 3 project to one of the other specific plan areas in the western portion of the city would not substantially lessen or avoid the project's significant effects. Therefore, no offsite alternative was selected for further analysis in this Recirculated Draft Subsequent EIR.

Summary of Impacts From the Proposed Project

Land Use: As evaluated in CHAPTER 4 LAND USE, the proposed project would have less than significant Land Use impacts. Mitigation measures identified throughout chapters 5 through 11 would be necessary to ensure that the proposed project would not conflict with local and/or regional land use plans and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Transportation and Circulation: The proposed project would increase traffic and demand for transit services and bicycle facilities in the City of Roseville and would contribute to increased traffic volumes within the City of Roseville, City of Rocklin, Placer County, Sutter County, and on Sacramento County roadways. The project would also increase traffic volumes at State highway interchanges and on State highways. Increased traffic volumes associated with the proposed project would result in several Significant and Unavoidable transportation and circulation impacts under existing conditions and one Significant and Unavoidable impact in the cumulative condition as a result of adding traffic to state highway facilities that are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service.

Noise: The proposed project would expose existing and future sensitive receptors within the project site to increased noise levels associated with traffic, noise generated by the Roseville Energy Park, and aviation-related noise levels. The analysis in the EIR determined that noise exposure related to the Roseville Energy Park and aviation activities would be less than significant and that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts related to increased traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Air Quality: The proposed project would generate air pollutant emissions during construction and project operation that would result in Significant and Unavoidable impacts related to conflict with the regional Air Quality Attainment Plan and the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and violation of air quality standards set by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD).

Climate Change: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. With implementation of mitigation measures, the project's contribution to climate change would be less than significant. Additionally, the proposed project would be subject to some of the effects associated with climate change, but these impacts would be less than significant.

Public Utilities - Potable Water Supply: The proposed project would increase demand for potable water, increase the use of existing surface water supply entitlements, increase the use of groundwater in the years that groundwater pumping is required to meet the City's water demands, and increase demand for potable water treatment capacity. Impacts associated with providing the proposed project with potable water supply would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required for these impacts. However, in the cumulative scenario, the water demand associated with the proposed project and other development in the region would

contribute to the need to develop new surface water supplies for the City of Roseville, which could result in Significant and Unavoidable environmental impacts.

Public Utilities - Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: The proposed project would increase demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities. The analysis in this EIR found that project-generated wastewater would be accommodated under existing projections and plans for treatment capacity expansion and would have less than significant impacts associated with water quality impairment associated with wastewater discharges. The analysis further determined that wastewater from the project would be accommodated by existing sewer trunk lines and impacts from constructing appropriate wastewater collection and conveyance facilities would be less than significant. Mitigation is required to ensure that impacts from constructing expanded wastewater treatment facilities to serve the project would be less than significant.

Public Utilities - Recycled Water: The increased demand for recycled water associated with the proposed project does not require construction of any new recycled water storage facilities to provide sufficient capacity to meet peak day demands within the WRSP. Impacts related to providing recycled water distribution infrastructure for the project would be less than significant.

Public Services: The proposed project would increase demand for public services, including fire and police protection, library services, school services and facilities, and park facilities. The increased demand for these services would be accommodated by existing facilities or facilities planned under the WRSP, through payment of required fees, and implementation of mitigation. Impacts related to the provision of public services to the proposed project would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts: Under the cumulative development scenario, the proposed project would result in Significant and Unavoidable impacts to Transportation and Circulation, Noise, Air Quality, and Public Services - Water Supply.

Alternatives Analysis

Alternative A – No Project (No Development)

Land Use: The No Project (No Development) alternative would leave the project site vacant. It would not allow for completion of buildout of the approved WRSP. This would be a significant conflict with existing land use plans. It would leave a large portion of the Fiddymont Ranch area in open space, which would isolate the residential areas within Fiddymont Ranch that are already constructed or currently under construction. In addition, with approval of the Sierra Vista and Creekview specific plans, Alternative A would result in leap-frog development patterns and inefficient use of land and other resources. This would conflict with policies of the City of Roseville General Plan calling for compact development and efficient use of space. Alternative A would have greater Land Use impacts than the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation: The No Project (No Development) alternative would avoid all increases in traffic volumes and avoid all projected transportation and circulation

impacts of the proposed project. Alternative A would result in reduced Transportation and Circulation impacts compared to the proposed project.

Noise: The No Project (No Development) alternative would not increase noise levels in the project area and would not expose residents to traffic noises, noises from the Roseville Energy Park, or noises associated with aviation activities. Alternative A would result in reduced Noise impacts compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality: There would be no air pollutant emissions associated with the No Project (No Development) alternative. Alternative A would result in reduced Air Quality impacts compared to the proposed project.

Climate Change: The No Project (No Development) alternative would not generate any new GHG emissions, increase the potential effects of climate change, or expose new residents to the potential effects of climate change. Alternative A would result in reduced Climate Change impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Potable Water Supply: The No Project (No Development) alternative would avoid all impacts related to providing potable water to new development and would decrease the overall City water demands by precluding development that is already planned under the WRSP. Alternative A would result in reduced Public Utilities - Potable Water Supply impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: The No Project (No Development) alternative would avoid all impacts related to wastewater conveyance and treatment and would decrease the overall City wastewater treatment demands by precluding development that is already planned under the WRSP. Alternative A would result in reduced Public Utilities - Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Recycled Water: The No Project (No Development) alternative would avoid all impacts related to provision of recycled water and would decrease the overall City recycled water demands by precluding development that is already planned under the WRSP. Alternative A would result in reduced Public Utilities - Recycled Water impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Services: The No Project (No Development) alternative would avoid all increases in demands for public services. It would also decrease the overall demands for public services by precluding development that is already planned under the WRSP. Currently planned public facilities that would not be developed under Alternative A includes one elementary school site, the 29.76-acre regional park south of Blue Oaks Boulevard, and an 8.9-acre neighborhood park. Under the WRSP and the proposed project, the elementary school and neighborhood park would serve residents of the Fiddymment Ranch Phase 3 area, which would not be developed under Alternative A. Therefore, the removal of these facilities from the City's land use development plans would not have a significant impact on the availability of schools and parks for city residents. However, the regional park is expected to serve a much larger area and precluding development of this park would have a significant impact on the

availability of park facilities for city residents. Therefore, Alternative A would result in increased Public Services impacts compared to the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts: The No Project (No Development) alternative would avoid each of the proposed project's Cumulative impacts. Alternative A would result in fewer Cumulative impacts than the proposed project.

Alternative B – No Project (Buildout under WRSP)

Land Use: Under the No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative, the project site would be developed consistent with the adopted WRSP. Alternative B would result in no impacts related to inconsistencies with adopted land use or zoning designations. Under Alternative B, land use intensity and residential and commercial development density would be lower than under the proposed project, but would be similar in nature and would occupy the same area as the proposed project. Land use impacts under both the proposed project and the No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Alternative B would result in no change in Land Use impacts compared to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation: The No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would construct 1,661 fewer residential units and 7.3 fewer acres of commercial land uses in the Fiddymment Ranch portion of the plan area, resulting in a substantial reduction in traffic volume and a slight decrease in trips generated from parks compared to the proposed project. Other changes proposed to the land uses within the Fiddymment Ranch project area include minor adjustments in acreage for open space, public/quasi-public, and roadway rights-of-way. Alternative B would generate less than half as many daily trip ends as the proposed project, reducing traffic volume generation under all scenarios. The impacts that would occur under Alternative B are reflected in the No Project Level of Service (LOS) analysis under 2025 CIP conditions presented in Appendix B3. This analysis found that Alternative B would avoid each of the project's Significant and Unavoidable impacts in the 2025 CIP Plus Project scenario. Alternative B would result in reduced impacts related to vehicle traffic compared to the proposed project. However, buildout of the WRSP would increase traffic on roadway facilities outside of the City of Roseville and it may not be feasible to mitigate all traffic impacts in some of these locations. While the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to transit and bicycle facilities, Alternative B would introduce fewer residents and workers into the project area resulting in a lower demand for transit services and bicycle facilities. However both the proposed project and Alternative B would provide transit and bicycle facilities commensurate with the demand and impacts would be less than significant under each scenario. Alternative B would decrease the severity of Transportation and Circulation impacts than the proposed project under existing plus project conditions; however, it is likely that some Transportation and Circulation impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Noise: Under the No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative, land use intensity and residential and commercial development density would be lower than under the

proposed project, which would result in reduced traffic volumes. This would reduce traffic-generated noise levels in the area. Noise impacts under Alternative B would be the same as were evaluated in the WRSP EIR, which found that mitigation would be required to reduce onsite traffic noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative B would result in no change in Noise impacts compared to the proposed project, which would also have less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures.

Air Quality: The No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would generate emissions that have already been incorporated into the regional Air Quality Attainment Plan and the SIP, and would result in no impacts related to inconsistencies with these adopted plans. Alternative B would generate lower emissions associated with residential development, but would still result in Significant and Unavoidable impacts related to generation of emissions exceeding Placer County APCD thresholds of significance, as identified in the WRSP EIR. Alternative B would decrease the severity of Air Quality impacts compared to the proposed project and would avoid the Significant and Unavoidable impacts related to inconsistencies with adopted air quality plans; however, air quality impacts related to exceeding the Placer County APCD thresholds would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Climate Change: The No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would construct fewer homes and would reduce traffic volumes compared to the proposed project, and would therefore generate a lower total volume of GHG emissions than the proposed project. Mitigation similar to that required for the proposed project would be necessary to reduce emissions to a less than significant level. Mitigation required for the proposed project includes substantial design and construction measures to increase the energy-efficiency and water-efficiency of individual residential units. These measures are not included in the WRSP and would not be required under Alternative B. Thus it is likely that the emission rate of buildout of the WRSP would not meet the City's threshold of reducing emissions by at least 21% compared with emissions from a Business As Usual (BAU) scenario, resulting in a Significant and Unavoidable impact. Alternative B would result in increased climate change impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Potable Water Supply: Based on the City's water demand land use factors, the No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would require 202 acre-feet per year (AFY) less water than the proposed project, as shown in Table 9A-3. While the total water demand would be slightly less under Alternative B compared to the proposed project, both the proposed project and Alternative B would result in less than significant impacts related to potable water supply. Therefore, Alternative B would result in no change in Public Utilities - Potable Water Supply impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: While Alternative B would generate less demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment than the proposed project; both the proposed project and Alternative B would contribute to the need for upgrades or expansion of existing conveyance and treatment facilities. Under either

the proposed project or Alternative B, mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure that impacts from construction of the treatment plan upgrades and/or expansion would remain less than significant. Alternative B would result in no change in Public Utilities - Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Recycled Water: The proposed project would implement a water conservation plan, which would decrease the project's demands for recycled water. Development under the approved WRSP would result in a higher overall demand for recycled water. However, under both the proposed project and Alternative B the City's recycled water supply and conveyance infrastructure would be sufficient to serve the Fiddymment Ranch project site and impacts would remain less than significant. Alternative B would result in no change in Public Utilities - Recycled Water impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Services: Alternative B would decrease demand for public services compared to the proposed project by resulting in a lower total population at buildout of the Fiddymment Ranch project site. However, under both the proposed project and Alternative B the City's public services would be sufficient to serve the Fiddymment Ranch project site and impacts would remain less than significant. Alternative B would result in no change in Public Services impacts compared to the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts: The No Project (WRSP Buildout) alternative would develop the site at a lower intensity and density compared to the proposed project, which would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts in transportation and circulation, noise, air quality and public services - water supply.

As discussed above, Alternative B would reduce traffic volumes in the project area compared to the proposed project. However, the WRSP EIR found that buildout of the WRSP would result in a Significant and Unavoidable contribution to cumulative traffic volumes and would require improvements to roadway facilities outside of the City of Roseville. Both the proposed project and Alternative B would add traffic to state highway facilities that are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS and where mitigation is not currently available to reduce the impact or improve traffic operations. Therefore both the proposed project and Alternative B would result in a Significant and Unavoidable cumulative transportation and circulation impacts. Alternative B would decrease the severity of this impact compared to the proposed project however the impact would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

As discussed above, Alternative B would reduce traffic-generated noise levels in the area compared to the proposed project. However, the WRSP EIR found that buildout of the WRSP would result in a Significant and Unavoidable contribution to cumulative noise volumes. Alternative B would decrease the severity of Cumulative - Noise impacts compared to the proposed project however these impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

As discussed above, Alternative B would generate fewer air pollutant emissions associated with residential development than the proposed project, but would still result in Significant and Unavoidable impacts related to generation of emissions exceeding Placer County APCD thresholds of significance, as identified in the WRSP EIR. Alternative B would decrease the severity of Cumulative - Air Quality impacts compared to the proposed project however these impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

As discussed above, Alternative B would generate a lower demand for potable water compared to the proposed project. However, both Alternative B and the proposed project would contribute to regional demands for potable water, and the need for the City of Roseville to obtain a new source of potable water supply. Developing a new water supply would likely have significant and unavoidable environmental effects, to which either the proposed project or Alternative B would contribute, resulting in a Significant and Unavoidable cumulative impact.

Alternative C – Reduced Development

Land Use: The Reduced Development alternative would develop the project site with a total of 5,537 residential units. This is 332 fewer units compared to the proposed project. Alternative C would not change the location of land uses shown on the proposed project's Conceptual Land Use plan, but would reduce density within each residential area. Alternative C would require the same General Plan, Specific Plan, and Zoning designation amendments as the proposed project. With approval of those amendments, the Reduced Development alternative would have no impact related to consistency with those designations. Land use impacts under both the proposed project and the Reduced Development alternative would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Alternative C would result in no change in Land Use impacts compared to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation: The Reduced Development alternative would construct 332 fewer residential units than the proposed project, resulting in a slight reduction in traffic volume. Alternative C would generate approximately 1,795 fewer daily trip ends than the proposed project, providing a slight reduction in traffic congestion under all scenarios. As shown in Impact 5.12, the proposed project would result in a 4% increase in the v/c ratio at the intersection of Baseline Road and Fiddymont Road, resulting in a change in LOS from D to E. It is likely that under Alternative C the increase in the v/c ratio would be less but would not avoid the degradation in LOS. Additionally Alternative C would add traffic to state highway facilities, some segments of which are already operating or are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS. Therefore, Alternative C would not avoid the project's Significant and Unavoidable impacts in the 2025 CIP Plus Project scenario or the 2025 Cumulative Plus Project scenario.

The proposed project would have a less than significant impact to transit and bicycle facilities. Alternative C would introduce fewer residents and workers into the project area, resulting in a slightly lower demand for transit services and bicycle facilities. Under both the proposed project and Alternative C, the transit and bicycle facilities

needs of the residents at the project site would be met and impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative C would decrease the severity of some Transportation and Circulation impacts compared to the proposed project under existing plus project conditions however it is likely that some Transportation and Circulation impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Noise: Under the Reduced Development alternative, the reduced number of daily vehicle trips would result in slightly lower traffic noise volumes. It is expected that noise impacts under Alternative C would be approximately the same as for the proposed project, requiring mitigation to ensure that onsite traffic noise levels are reduced to acceptable levels. Alternative C would not be expected to change noise levels associated with the Roseville Energy Park or aviation-related activities. Alternative C would result in no change in Noise impacts compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality: By developing more dwelling units than are assumed for the project site under the WRSP and the Air Quality Attainment Plan and the SIP, Alternative C would generate air pollutant emissions that have not already been accounted for in these air quality plans. These additional emissions would be inconsistent with the adopted air quality plans, and Alternative C would have Significant and Unavoidable impacts related to conflicts with these plans. Compared to the proposed project, Alternative C would reduce construction and operational emissions, but would still result in Significant and Unavoidable impacts as a result of emissions that would exceed air quality standards set by the Placer County APCD.

Climate Change: The Reduced Development alternative would construct fewer homes and would reduce traffic volumes compared to the proposed project, and thereby emit a lower total volume of GHGs. It is assumed that the energy-efficiency and water-efficiency standards incorporated into the proposed project would also be incorporated into development under Alternative C to ensure a less than significant contribution to climate change impacts by achieving a 21% reduction in GHG emissions compared to the BAU scenario. Alternative C would result in no change in Climate Change impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Potable Water Supply: Alternative C would result in slightly lower demands for potable water than the proposed project, but would increase total Citywide water demands in the existing plus project and City-buildout plus project conditions. Under both the proposed project and the Reduced Development alternative, impacts related to potable water supply would be less than significant. Alternative C would result in no change in Public Utilities - Potable Water Supply impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: Although Alternative C would result in slightly lower demands for wastewater conveyance and treatment than the proposed project; both the proposed project and Alternative C would increase wastewater generation and contribute to the need for future upgrades and/or expansion of existing facilities. Under both the proposed project and the Reduced

Development alternative impacts related to wastewater conveyance and treatment would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. Alternative C would result in no change in Public Utilities - Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities - Recycled Water: The proposed project would implement a water conservation plan, which would decrease the project's demands for recycled water. It is assumed that Alternative C would implement the same water conservation plan. Although fewer residential units would develop, the area where recycled water would be used would remain unchanged. Therefore, recycled water demands under Alternative C are expected to remain the same as compared to recycled water demands for the proposed project. Under both the proposed project and Alternative C the City's recycled water supply and conveyance infrastructure would be sufficient to serve the Fiddymont Ranch project site and impacts would remain less than significant. Alternative C would result in no change in Public Utilities - Recycled Water impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Services: Alternative C would increase demand for public services relative to public service demands anticipated under the City's existing General Plan, but would result in a lower demand than the proposed project. Under both the proposed project and Alternative C, the City's public services would be sufficient to serve the Fiddymont Ranch project site and impacts would remain less than significant. Alternative C would result in no change in Public Services impacts compared to the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts: The Reduced Development alternative would develop the site at a lower intensity and density than the proposed project, which would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts in transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, and public services -water supply.

As discussed above, Alternative C would reduce traffic volumes in the project area compared to the proposed project. However, the traffic generated by the land uses at the project site would result in a Significant and Unavoidable contribution to cumulative traffic volumes and would require improvements to roadway facilities outside of the City of Roseville. Both the proposed project and Alternative C would add traffic to state highway facilities that are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS and where mitigation is not currently available to reduce the impact or improve traffic operations. Therefore both the proposed project and Alternative C would result in a Significant and Unavoidable cumulative transportation and circulation impacts. Alternative C would decrease the severity of this impact compared to the proposed project however the impact would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

As discussed above, Alternative C would slightly reduce traffic-generated noise levels in the area compared to the proposed project. However, development under Alternative C would result in a Significant and Unavoidable contribution to cumulative noise volumes. Alternative C would slightly decrease the severity of Cumulative - Noise impacts compared to the proposed project however these impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

As discussed above, Alternative C would generate slightly lower air pollutant emissions associated with residential development than the proposed project, but would still result in Significant and Unavoidable impacts related to generation of emissions exceeding Placer County APCD thresholds of significance. Alternative C would slightly decrease the severity of Cumulative - Air Quality impacts compared to the proposed project however these impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

As discussed above, Alternative C would generate a lower demand for potable water compared to the proposed project. However, both Alternative C and the proposed project would contribute to regional demands for potable water, and the need for the City of Roseville to obtain a new source of potable water supply. Developing a new water supply would likely have significant and unavoidable environmental effects, to which either the proposed project or Alternative C would contribute, resulting in a Significant and Unavoidable cumulative impact.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

According to CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(b), an EIR must identify the Environmentally Superior alternative other than the No-Project Alternative and explain why alternatives other than the proposed project were not determined to be the Environmentally Superior. Based on the analysis presented above and summarized below, the proposed project is the Environmentally Superior alternative.

The project would intensify planned land uses at the project site. However, compared to existing conditions, buildout of the planned land uses (Alternative B) would result in significant impacts. Between the proposed project, Alternative B, and Alternative C, impacts would be similar, although they would generally increase in severity with the increase in development proposed. Mitigation would be implemented under each scenario to reduce most impacts to a less than significant level, while some impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable. The proposed project and Alternative C would incorporate a Water Conservation Plan and greenhouse gas reduction measures that are not required under the WRSP (Alternative B).

Alternative A – As noted above, it is not required that the No-Project Alternative be included in the discussion of the Environmentally Superior Alternative. In addition, for this project, Alternative A, the No Project (No Development) Alternative, could increase some of the proposed project's environmental effects, particularly the Land Use and Public Services impacts. By precluding development of portions of the WRSP as approved, Alternative A would violate the City's General Plan and would result in severe land use impacts in the West Roseville area.

Alternative B – Alternative B, the No Project (Buildout of the WRSP) Alternative is rejected because it would not result in a substantial improvement in environmental impacts compared to the proposed project. It would reduce impacts in some areas but would not avoid most of the Significant and Unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. Further it would increase climate change impacts compared to the proposed project.

Alternative C - Alternative C, the Reduced Development Alternative is rejected because it would not result in a substantial improvement in environmental impacts compared to the proposed project. It would reduce impacts in some areas but would not avoid most of the Significant and Unavoidable impacts of the proposed project.

Table 12.2
Analysis Summary for Alternatives A, B, and C

Resource Area	Proposed Project	No Project/No Development (Alternative A)	No Project/Buildout Under WRSP (Alternative B)	Reduced Development (Alternative C)
Land Use	Less than Significant	Increased Impacts	No Change	No Change
Transportation and Circulation	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced Impacts	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Noise	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced Impacts	No Change	No Change
Air Quality	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced Impacts	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Climate Change	Less than Significant	Reduced Impacts	Increased Impacts	No Change
Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply	Less than Significant	Reduced Impacts	No Change	No Change
Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Reduced Impacts	No Change	No Change
Public Utilities – Recycled Water	Less than Significant	Reduced Impacts	No Change	No Change
Public Services	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Increased Impacts	No Change	No Change
Cumulative Impacts – Traffic	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced Impacts but still Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced Impacts but still Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced Impacts but still Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts – Noise	Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced Impacts	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts – Air Quality	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced Impacts	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable

This page intentionally left blank.