CHAPTER 6
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

"An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would 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. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6, subd. (a). "[T]he discussion … shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly" (*Id*., subd. (b).). The feasibility of an alternative may be determined based on a variety of factors, including, but not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and site accessibility and control (*Id*., subd. (f)(1)). An EIR need not evaluate the environmental effects of alternatives in the same level of detail as the proposed project, but must include enough information to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.

Alternatives in an EIR must be *potentially* feasible (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(a)). Agency decision makers ultimately decide what is "actually feasible." (*California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 957, 981 (*CNPS*).) Under CEQA, "feasible" is defined as 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, Section 15364). 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. (*Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509; *CNPS*, *supra*, 177 Cal. App. 4th at p. 1001; *In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166.) 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.)

The lead agency's decision making body, in this case the Roseville City Council, has the discretion to select a project alternative in lieu of the project. If this were to occur, the City Council would need to ensure that the level of detail included in the alternatives analysis is

adequate and that there would not be any new or significant impacts. The required Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring Plan would need to be prepared that identifies the alternative as the project selected for approval. It is anticipated that if any of the project alternatives is selected, the mitigation measures identified for the project would not change and would still be required.

This chapter identifies the proposed project objectives, describes the project alternatives, and evaluates the comparative effects of the alternatives relative to the proposed project. As required under Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines, the environmentally superior alternative is identified and included at the end of this chapter.

6.1.1 Project Objectives

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15124(b), a clear statement of project objectives is required. The project includes the following project objectives.

- Develop the City's first four star, approximately 250-room, upscale full service hotel and an approximately 35,000 sf conference center facility to serve the lodging, conference, and meeting space needs of the City of Roseville and surrounding region which have no comparable facilities.
- Advance local economic development and fiscal objectives by providing much-needed facilities for conferences, trade shows, social gatherings, and other large scale events beneficial to the City of Roseville and the surrounding region.
- Develop a commercially viable project that complements surrounding commercial development and existing lodging facilities throughout the City.
- Establish a link to the historical nature of the City, concurrent with a commercial link to the City's historic downtown area.
- Design an energy-efficient facility that promotes water and energy conservation measures consistent with the Air Quality and Climate Change Element of the City's General Plan and the City's Water-Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
- Create a project that contributes to a land use pattern that integrates hospitality and assembly uses in close proximity to commercial land uses, such that hotel guests and/or conference attendees may easily walk or bike to shopping, services, and leisure activities consistent with the Blueprint Implementation Strategies as administered by the City.

6.1.2 Alternatives Evaluated but Dismissed

As noted previously, the purpose of an alternatives analysis is to develop alternatives to the proposed project that substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects

identified as a result of the project, while still meeting most, if not all, of the basic project objectives. Project alternatives that would reduce the size of development on the site or change the mix of uses that would lessen the severity of impacts identified under the project are addressed later in this chapter.

The City has determined that a site adjacent to or near easy access to a freeway is required for this type of regional project. City staff evaluated other parcels of land within the City that could support the project and determined that there are no other parcels of undeveloped land of similar size close to freeway access that could support the project and for which the site has previously been graded, is designated and zoned for commercial uses, does not contain any (or has minimal) biological resources, and provides adequate site accessibility. Because staff was unable to find a suitable site that could meet these requirements as well as meet the project objectives, an off-site or alternate project location was dismissed from further evaluation. A suitable site was not identified within the City that would eliminate environmental effects and/or would be potentially feasible.

The City also evaluated developing only the conference center without the hotel, but this was determined not to be feasible based on the economic analysis prepared for the project. Therefore, this option was dismissed from further evaluation.

CEQA requires the evaluation of the comparative impacts of the "No Project" alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(1)). The No Project Alternative "shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the [NOP] is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services" (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(2)). "The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project" (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(1)).

For this EIR, Alternative 1 evaluates the No Project/No Development as well as a No Project/Existing Zoning scenario; which considers other uses that could be developed under the existing land use designation and zoning if the site were developed by an entity other than the City.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED

This section provides a description of the alternatives to the proposed project analyzed in this Draft EIR and evaluates how specific impacts differ in severity from those associated with the project. The potentially significant impacts identified under the alternatives analysis can be fully mitigated through compliance with mitigation measures identified in Sections 4.1 through 4.6 included in Chapter 4, which contains the environmental analysis of the proposed project.

The project alternatives identified herein address the significant impacts (before mitigation) identified for the project, including traffic and air emissions associated with project construction and operation. Thus, the alternatives developed for the project contemplate a smaller project footprint to address these impacts. In many instances, the majority of impacts (e.g., land disturbance) are virtually identical to, or very similar to, the proposed project and are described as such.

This Draft EIR has incorporated a reasonable range of project alternatives that attain a majority of the project objectives in a reasonable manner while reducing the severity of the significant impacts (before mitigation) identified under the proposed project.

The alternatives to the proposed project analyzed in this Draft EIR are:

Alternative 1a: No Project/No Development

Alternative 1b: No Project/Existing Zoning

Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint

Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel

6.2.1 Alternative 1a: No Project/No Development Alternative

Description

The No Project/No Development Alternative considers the effects of forgoing the project entirely, and leaving the project site in its current, vacant condition. The No Project/No Development Alternative thus allows decision-makers to compare the impacts of the proposed project to retaining the existing condition of the site. The No Project/No Development Alternative describes the environmental conditions that exist at the time that the environmental analysis commences (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (e)(2)).

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

The No Project/No Development Alternative would produce no changes on the project site, because the site would remain in its current condition, effectively eliminating those project impacts discussed in this Draft EIR. There would be no air emissions associated with project construction and no potential disturbance to any nesting birds in trees adjacent to the site. There would be no potential to unearth any unknown subsurface cultural or historic resources and there would be no increase in the number of vehicles accessing the site and on area roadways and intersections. There would be no operational impacts on the surrounding roadway network.

Relationship to Proposed Project Objectives

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives because it would not develop the site with any hotel or conference center facilities, support the City's goals of economic development and developing an energy-efficient project, or create a project that is consistent with SACOG's Blueprint Implementation strategies.

6.2.2 Alternative 1b: No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative

Description

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative assumes if the project is not approved the land could be developed with retail and office uses under the existing land use designation and zoning. The 11-acre site would be developed with 115,000 sf of retail and 76,660 sf of office uses, which assumes a 40% FAR with the site developed with 60% retail and 40% office. The NCRSP permits not more than 60% of Parcel 40 be developed with retail uses.

Based on the City's zoning ordinance (four spaces per thousand square feet), a total of 767 parking spaces would be required. It is anticipated this alternative would not meet the City's parking ordinance and would require a parking variance. The bridge to the adjacent Galleria retail center and the multi-use trail would still be constructed under this alternative. The digital billboard would not be constructed under this alternative.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would generate air emissions associated with project construction and would potentially disturb any nesting birds in trees adjacent to the site, requiring mitigation the same as the project. There would also be the potential to unearth unknown subsurface cultural or historic resources so mitigation the same as the project would be required. Under this alternative there would be an increase in the number of vehicles accessing the site and on area roadways and intersections; however, fewer vehicle trips would be required.

Impacts Identified as Being the Same as or Similar to those of the Proposed Project

Overall impacts associated with project construction and site disturbance would be similar to those of the proposed project. It is assumed under this alternative that roughly the entire site would be disturbed to accommodate project development. Therefore, effects associated with air emissions due to project construction would generally be the same and mitigation would still be required (Mitigation Measure 4.2-2), the same as the project. Potential impacts to nesting birds that could be disturbed by construction activities would be the same as those of the project, and Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would still be required. The same is true for the potential to disturb

subsurface cultural resources, which could also still occur, requiring the same mitigation as the project (Mitigation Measure 4.4-1).

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than those of the Proposed Project

Demand for water and wastewater treatment would be less under this alternative compared to the proposed project, as shown in Tables 6-1 and 6-2. The amount of solid waste generated by this alternative would be slightly less than the proposed project, as shown in Table 6-3.

Using trip rates from the City's travel demand model, this alternative would generate 436 PM peak hour trips, which is 132 fewer trips (a 23% reduction) when compared to the proposed project Scenario 1 (Average Large Event). Moreover, this project alternative would have a more balanced flow of inbound versus outbound trips, whereas 82% of the proposed project Scenario 1 PM peak hour trips are outbound. As a consequence, this alternative is likely to have less severe effects along Roseville Parkway when compared to the proposed project.

Under this alternative the digital billboard would not be included as a component of the project. No adverse impacts associated with this component of the project were identified; however, because this part of the project would not be included there would be a slight reduction in the overall project footprint and light generated by the project compared to the proposed project.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than those of the Proposed Project

Under this alternative there are no impacts that would be considered more severe than the proposed project.

Relationship to Proposed Project Objectives

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would not achieve many of the project objectives because it would not develop the site with a hotel or conference center, nor would this alternative support the City's goal of providing a facility for conferences and trade shows and other large scale events, or creating a project that is consistent with SACOG's Blueprint Implementation strategies. It is assumed this alternative would generally meet the fifth objective by incorporating water and energy conservation measures consistent with the City's General Plan and Water-Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

Table 6-1
Water Demand Comparison – Project Alternatives

Proposed Use	Demand Factor (gpd)	Demand (AFY)	Demand (AFY)	Demand (AFY)	Demand (AFY)
	Proposed Project		*Alt 1b*	*Alt 2*	*Alt 3*
Hotel	27,750	24.87	N/A	24.87	18.63
Conference Center	6,000	.96	N/A	.66	.28
Restaurant	6,080	6.81	N/A	6.81	6.81
Retail/Office	2,678	N/A	13.21	N/A	N/A
Landscaping	2,988 gpd/ac	8.28	8.28	8.28	8.28
	Total	**40.92**	**21.49**	**40.62**	**34.00**

Source: Dudek 2014
Note: Alternative 1a, No Project/No Development, would not generate water demand. Alternative 1b demand factor for commercial/office is 2,678 gpd/acre at .4 FAR.

Table 6-2
Wastewater Generation – Project Alternatives

Proposed Use	Demand Factor	Average Waste-water (gpd)							
		Proposed Project		*Alternative 1b*		*Alternative 2*		*Alternative 3*	
Hotel	95 gpd/room	250 rooms	23,750	N/A	N/A	250 rooms	23,750	175 rooms	16,625
Conference Center	5 gpd/ occupant	1,200 people	6,000	N/A	N/A	828 people	4,140	350 people	1,750
Restaurant	1 ESD/500 sf[1]	7,600 sf	2,888	N/A	N/A	7,600 sf	2,888	7,600 sf	2,888
Retail/Office	850 gpd/acre[2]	N/A	N/A	115,000 sf of retail; 76,660 sf of office	9,350	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Total	**32,638**		**9,350**		**30,778**		**21,263**

Source: Dudek 2014
Note:
1 ESD= 190 gpd.
2 For a conservative assessment the total 11 acre project site is assumed.

Table 6-3
Solid Waste Generation – Project Alternatives

Proposed Use	Demand Factor	Average Solid Waste (lbs/day)							
		Proposed Project		*Alternative 1b*		*Alternative 2*		*Alternative 3*	
Hotel[1]	2.5 lbs/ 100/sf	190,000 sf	4,750	N/A	N/A	190,000 sf	4,750	133,000 sf	3,325
Conference Center[2]		35,000 sf	875	N/A	N/A	24,150 sf	604	10,000 sf	250
Restaurant[3]		7,600 sf	190	N/A	N/A	7,600 sf	190	7,600 sf	190

Table 6-3
Solid Waste Generation – Project Alternatives

Proposed Use	Demand Factor	Average Solid Waste (lbs/day)							
		Proposed Project		*Alternative 1b*		*Alternative 2*		*Alternative 3*	
Retail/Office[4]		N/A	N/A	115,000 sf of retail; 76,660 sf of office	4,792	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Total	**5,815 lbs/day (924 tons/yr)**		**4,792 lbs/day (750 tons/yr)**		**5,544 lbs/day (917 tons/yr)**		**3,765 lbs/day 648 tons/yr)**

Source: Dudek 2014
Notes:
1. Hotel – Assumes 365 days
2. Conference Center – Assumes an average of 1 conference/week or 52 weeks
3. Restaurant – Assumes 360 days
4. Retail/Office – Assumes 313) days (average 6 days/week)

6.2.3 Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint

Description

Under the Reduced Footprint Alternative the conference center is reduced to 24,150 sf and would accommodate a maximum of 828 attendees, which is a 31% reduction from a 1,200 maximum event under the proposed project. Under this alternative the 250-room hotel would remain as would 530 parking spaces and all the other components of the project including the digital billboard, multi-use trail, and bridge to the adjacent Galleria retail center.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

Impacts under the Reduced Footprint Alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project, but overall less intense because it would generate a decrease in vehicle trips compared to the proposed project. Impacts associated with construction and site disturbance (i.e., air quality, biological resources, cultural resources) would essentially be the same as the proposed project because the entire site would still require site clearing, grading, and construction of new buildings and associated parking, as well as the bridge to the adjacent Galleria retail center. It is assumed the hotel and conference center would be located in a similar location on the site as the proposed project with vehicular access provided from Conference Center Drive, the same as the project. Surface parking is assumed would be provided around the buildings in the same configuration as the project.

Impacts Identified as Being the Same as or Similar to those of the Proposed Project

Overall impacts associated with project construction and site disturbance would be essentially the same as the project. It is assumed under this alternative that roughly the entire site would be disturbed to accommodate project development. Therefore, effects associated with air emissions due to project construction would be the same and mitigation would be required (Mitigation Measure 4.2-2). Potential impacts to nesting birds that could be disturbed by construction activities would be the same as those of the project, and Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would still be required. The same is true for subsurface cultural resources, which could also still occur, requiring the same mitigation as the project (Mitigation Measure 4.4-1).

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than those of the Proposed Project

Under this alternative, traffic impacts that would be less severe than the proposed project. Specifically, under Existing Plus Project conditions under a maximum event scenario of 828 people the level of service (LOS) at the Roseville Parkway/Reserve Drive intersection would be restored to LOS D condition, and the LOS at the Roseville Parkway/Galleria Mall West intersection would be restored to LOS C condition after implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-1. Impacts to SR 65 would still occur and the impact, even with mitigation (Mitigation Measure 4.6-2), would remain significant and unavoidable the same as the project.

The demand for water generated by this alternative and increase in wastewater treatment would essentially be the same as for the proposed project although slightly less, as shown in Tables 6-1 and 6-2.

In addition, the amount of solid waste generated would be less severe than the proposed project, as shown in Table 6-3.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than those of the Proposed Project

Under this alternative there are no impacts that would be considered more severe than the proposed project.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Generally under this alternative, all of the project objectives would be met, though in one instance to a lesser degree. The hotel would still be developed so it would meet the first objective. This alternative would also provide a conference center for a variety of events that would be an economic benefit to the city, but because the facility is smaller and would host smaller events it would not generate as much revenue for the City, thus, not meeting the full intent of the second objective. This alternative would complement the surrounding commercial

and hotel facilities in the area, the same as the project, per the third objective. An energy efficient and water-efficient facility would still be developed, consistent with the sixth objective. Lastly, this alternative would also contribute to a land use pattern that is consistent with the concepts of the SACOG Blueprint, per the last objective.

6.2.4 Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel

Description

The Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel Alternative consists of a 175-room hotel and a 10,000 sf conference facility. This alternative reduces the size of the conference center to accommodate no more than 350 attendees (a 70 % reduction from a 1,200 maximum event under the proposed project). Under this alternative the other project components would remain the same with the exception of reducing the number of surface parking spaces and slightly redesigning the parking layout. It is assumed the digital billboard, multi-use trail, and bridge to the adjacent Galleria retail center would still be constructed.

Comparative Analysis of Environmental Effects

Impacts under the Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel Alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project, but less intense because it would generate a reduction in vehicle trips and would disturb a smaller project footprint. Impacts associated with site disturbance would be similar to the proposed project because it is assumed the entire site would still require site clearing and grading however, construction would be limited to the hotel, conference center, surface parking, and the bridge to the adjacent Galleria retail center. The conference center would occupy a smaller footprint than the proposed project, but would still be a two-story structure designed similar to the proposed project. The hotel would be only 7 stories tall, but would occupy essentially the same footprint as the proposed project. It is assumed the parking would be redesigned to occupy only the front of the buildings leaving more open space in the rear.

Impacts Identified as Being the Same as or Similar to those of the Proposed Project

Overall impacts associated with project construction and site disturbance would be essentially the same as the project. It is assumed under this alternative that roughly the entire site would be graded and cleared to accommodate project development. However, effects associated with air emissions due to project construction would be slightly less than the proposed project because smaller buildings would be constructed reducing the overall construction schedule. However, it is anticipated Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 would still be required for air quality, but may be modified depending on the extent of construction emissions and the length of project construction. Potential impacts to nesting birds that could be disturbed by construction activities would be the same as the project and Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would still be required. The same

is true for the potential disturbance to subsurface cultural resources, which could also still occur under this alternative requiring the same mitigation as the project (Mitigation Measure 4.4-1).

Impacts Identified as Being Less Severe than those of the Proposed Project

Under this alternative traffic impacts would be less severe than the proposed project. Using the same analysis methods as applied in the transportation impact study, this project alternative would generate 350 PM peak hour trips, which is 218 fewer trips (a 38% reduction) when compared to proposed project Scenario 1 (Average Large Event). As a consequence, this project alternative is likely to have less severe effects along Roseville Parkway when compared to the proposed project.

This alternative would likely cause the Roseville Parkway/Reserve intersection to worsen to LOS E. Thus, the mitigation measure at Roseville Parkway/Galleria Boulevard identified for the proposed project would still be needed (Mitigation Measure 4.6-1). The impact at Roseville Parkway/Galleria Mall West would not occur. However, mitigation identified for the proposed project called for the improvement at the Roseville Parkway/Galleria Boulevard intersection. In summary, impacts of this alternative are less severe than the proposed project. However, impacts to SR 65 would still occur under this alternative and the impact, even with mitigation (Mitigation Measure 4.6-2), would remain significant and unavoidable the same as the project.

In addition, the overall size of the buildings, change in visual character of the site, and project lighting would be less severe under this alternative because smaller buildings would be constructed. Because the hotel would be smaller under this alternative the increase in demand for water supply and wastewater treatment as well as solid waste disposal would be less than the proposed project, as shown in Tables 6-1, 6-2, and 6-3. In addition, because a smaller project would be developed and the number of vehicle trips is reduced compared to the project, air emissions associated with project construction and operation would be less than the proposed project, including the contribution to greenhouse gases.

Impacts Identified as Being More Severe than those of the Proposed Project

Under this alternative there are no impacts that would be considered more severe than the proposed project.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Under this alternative some of the project objectives would be met, but not all. The hotel would still be developed, but would be 175 rooms instead of 250-rooms and the conference center would be only 10,000 sf so it would not fully meet the first objective. This alternative would generally meet the second objective because a conference center would still be constructed but

the economic and fiscal benefit to the city would be less than under the proposed project. Because this alternative contemplates a smaller hotel and conference center it would not bring in as much revenue into the City and would meet this objective but to a lesser degree than the proposed project. This alternative would complement the surrounding commercial and hotel facilities in the area and it is assumed the project would develop an energy efficient and water-efficient, consistent with the City's General Plan and Water-Efficient Landscape Ordinance, per the sixth objective. Lastly, this alternative would also contribute to a land use pattern that is consistent with the concepts of the SACOG Blueprint.

6.2.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be designated and states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the "No Project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

From the alternatives evaluated for the project, shown in Table 6-4, the environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative 1, the No Project/No Development Alternative. This alternative would avoid all significant impacts associated with the proposed project because it would not require any site disturbance, project construction, or an increase in vehicle trips or demand for public utilities.

Based on a review of the remaining project alternatives, Alternative 3, the Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative would not avoid all impacts associated with the proposed project, but would reduce the severity of the impacts associated with project-related traffic, air emissions associated with project operation and contribution of greenhouse gases, demand for water, wastewater conveyance and generation of solid, and overall site disturbance.

Table 6-4
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1a: No Project/No Development	Alternative 1b: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel
Aesthetics					
4.1-1: Degradation of the Visual Character of the Project Site	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS-
4.1-2: Introduction of Uses that are Visually Incompatible with Existing or Planned Uses in the Area	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS-
4.1-3: Introduction of New Sources of Light and Glare	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS-
4.1-4: Contribution to Cumulative Changes in the Existing Visual Character	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS-
4.1-5: Contribution to a Cumulative Increase in Light and Glare	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS-
Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases					
4.2-1: Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-2: Violate the Placer County Air Pollution Control District standards for air quality	LS/MM	NI	LS/MM	LS/MM	LS/MM-
4.2-3: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollution Concentrations	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-4: Create Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-5 Generate a Substantial Contribution to GHG Emissions that Conflicts with an Applicable Plan or Policy	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.2-6: Result in the Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
Biological Resources					
4.3-1: Substantial Adverse Effect on Species Identified As A Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status or Substantially Reduce the Habitat of a Fish or Wildlife Species, or Substantially Reduce the Number or	LS/MM	NI	LS/MM	LS/MM	LS/MM

Table 6-4
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1a: No Project/No Development	Alternative 1b: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel
Restrict the Range of an Endangered, Rare or Threatened Species					
4.3-2: Substantial Adverse Effect on Riparian Habitat, Sensitive Natural Community, Wetlands	LS/MM	NI	LS/MM	LS/MM	LS/MM
4.3-3: Interfere Substantially with Wildlife Movement or Native Wildlife Nursery Sites	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.3-4: Conflict with Any Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.3-5: Contribute to a Cumulative Impact on Biological Resources	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
Cultural Resources					
4.4-1: Disturb, Damage or Destroy Unidentified Subsurface Archaeological or Historical Resources or Human Remains during Project Construction	LS/MM	NI	LS/MM	LS/MM	LS/MM-
4.4-2: Disturb Unknown Paleontological Resources During Site Preparation	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.4-3: Contribute to the Cumulative Loss of Cultural Resources	LS/MM	NI	LS/MM	LS/MM	LS/MM-
Utilities					
4.5-1: Availability of Water Supplies to Meet Project Demand in Wet/Dry Years	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
4.5-2: Construct or Expand Water Treatment, Conveyance, and/or Storage Facilities to Accommodate the Project	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
4.5-3: Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.5-4: Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Collection or Treatment Facilities	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-

Table 6-4
Evaluation of Alternatives by Impact Area

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1a: No Project/No Development	Alternative 1b: No Project/Existing Zoning	Alternative 2: Reduced Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint/Smaller Hotel
4.5-5: Capacity at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant to Serve the Project	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
4.5-6: Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
4.5-7: Exceed Capacity for Solid Waste Disposal at the Materials Recovery Facility or Western Regional Sanitary Landfill	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
4.5-8: Exceed Federal, State, and Local Statutes and Regulations Related to Solid Waste	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.5-9: Cumulative Increase in Demand for Water Supply and Treatment Capacity	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
4.5-10: Cumulative Increase in Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Plant Capacity	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
4.5-11: Cumulative Increase in Solid Waste	LS	NI	LS-	LS-	LS-
Transportation					
4.6-1: Change in LOS at signalized intersections in the City of Roseville	SU/MM	NI	LS/MM-	LS/MM-	LS/MM-
4.6-2: Add Traffic to Caltrans Freeway Ramps	SU/MM	NI	SU/MM	SU/MM	SU/MM
4.6-3: Impacts to Bicycle Facilities or Network	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.6-4: Impacts to Pedestrian Access	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.6-5: Increased Demand for Transit	LS	NI	LS	LS	LS
4.6-6: Add Traffic to Freeway Off-Ramps under 2025 Conditions	SU/MM	NI	SU/MM	SU/MM	SU/MM

Notes:
LS = impacts less than significant
NI = No impact
LS/MM = Impacts less than significant after mitigation
SU = Impacts significant and unavoidable
SU/M = Impacts significant even with mitigation
"+" indicates the impact is more severe than the project impact
"-" indicates that the impact is similar to the project impact but less severe
No "+" or "-" indicates the impact would be similar to the project impact.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK