4.3 TRANSPORTATION

4.3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes potential impacts to the transportation system in the Planning Area associated with the proposed General Plan Update. The impact analysis examines the vehicular, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and goods movement (by truck) components of the City’s overall transportation system. To provide context for the impact analysis, this chapter begins with a discussion of the environmental setting describing the existing and physical operational conditions for the transportation system. Next, the regulatory framework is described, which provides part of the basis for impact significance thresholds used in the impact analysis. The regulatory framework includes the existing General Plan Transportation Element policies. The chapter concludes with significance criteria, impact analysis findings, an examination of proposed changes to adopted Transportation Element policies, recommended mitigation measures, and the significance conclusion.

The transportation impact analysis relies primarily on the City of Roseville Year 2035 travel demand model. The analysis also makes use of data and information collected and analyzed in the 2016 Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR, which included a comprehensive citywide analysis of roadway network conditions corresponding to approximately 2014 conditions. Projections from that analysis and recent traffic volume counts from several locations throughout the City were utilized to verify reasonableness of the model projections to date and to ensure that the model continues to be appropriate for purposes of the current transportation impact analysis. Changes in baseline conditions since the initial traffic study are accounted for in the current transportation analysis process since impacts are determined based on long-term growth associated with buildout of the General Plan. Hence, impacts are based on the incremental growth from the initial analysis to 2035. Some traffic changes due to population and employment growth have occurred since the initial analysis and are part of the larger increment of growth noted above and are therefore considered in the analysis.

Appendix D presents technical details supporting the transportation analysis, including maps of study intersections, peak hour traffic volumes and lane configurations, summaries of signalized intersection operations, Synchro and SimTraffic intersection analysis reports, and average arterial daily traffic volumes for each scenario.

In response to the notice of preparation (NOP), Caltrans submitted the only transportation-related comment, noting that it anticipates the General Plan analysis will reflect a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric and thresholds, in accordance with Senate Bill (SB) 743. This analysis includes VMT.

4.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This section provides a contextual background to the City’s transportation system. The General Plan addresses the overall planning and development of the circulation system for residents and visitors in a multi-modal framework. The General Plan addresses the correlation between the quality of the transportation network and the quality of life.

The automobile is the most widely used mode of transportation in Roseville. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 2013–2017 American Community Survey, about 87 percent of City of Roseville residents that work commute by car, truck, or van. The share of commuters that walk or bike to work in the City of Roseville is about 2 percent for each mode. Additionally, about 1 percent of commuters use public transportation to get to work.
Data from the 2013–2017 American Community Survey also shows the amount of time commuters take to get to work. Based on the data, about 62 percent of workers living in Roseville traveled to work in 29 minutes or less, 31 percent traveled to work in 30 to 59 minutes, and 7 percent traveled to work in 60 minutes or more. Average travel time to work was estimated to be 26 minutes. Commute times for Roseville workers are similar to the state as a whole, where 58 percent travel to work in 29 minutes or less and the average travel time to work is 29 minutes.

4.3.2.1 STUDY AREA ROADWAYS AND INTERSECTIONS

Roadway System

The City of Roseville uses a functional classification system to describe and plan its roadway system. General Plan Figure III-1 depicts this system. Roseville’s system of arterials, collectors, and local streets connect neighborhoods, employment centers, and other destinations. Descriptions of each roadway classification are provided below.

- **Freeways**: Provide mobility between Roseville and regional destinations. Freeways are access controlled, divided roadways with at least two lanes in each direction. Freeway access is provided by grade-separated interchanges.

- **Arterial Streets**: The primary function of arterial roadways is to move large volumes of traffic through the City to other sections and beyond. In the Specific Plan Areas, the right-of-way (ROW) for arterials generally incorporates four to six travel lanes, bicycle lanes, and a landscaped median or center turn lane. Major arterials are generally six lanes and serve higher volumes of traffic. Minor arterials are generally four lanes and serve lower volumes of traffic. On-street parking on existing arterials in the Specific Plan Areas is prohibited, and access is limited to minimize cross traffic turning movements in order to improve traffic safety and allow for more efficient traffic flow. Outside of the City’s Specific Plan Areas, some roadways function as arterials due to the current high traffic volumes and their key linkages between one section of the City and another. For these roadways, current ROW widths vary, but most contain more than two traffic lanes.

- **Collector Streets**: Collector streets generally link local residential streets and the commercial and office parking areas to the arterials. In the Specific Plan Areas, the ROW for these streets generally contains two traffic lanes and bicycle lanes. Outside the Specific Plan Areas, some roadways function as collector roadways due to moderate traffic volumes and their linkage to the arterial roadway system. The ROW widths for these roadways vary, but most contain two traffic lanes.

- **Local Streets**: Local streets provide direct access to abutting land and access to the collector street system. The motoring public uses these streets for local circulation. These roadways have two travel lanes.

Exhibit 4.3-1 displays the existing number of travel lanes on arterial roadways in the city.
Exhibit 4.3-1

Existing (2020) Number of Travel Lanes

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

Notes:
1. Widened or extended since 2014.
2. Does not include turn lanes and auxiliary lanes.
3. Exhibit only displays number of lanes on arterial streets.
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Roseville is served by an interstate freeway 80 (I-80) and a state highway, State Route 65 (SR 65). This system of freeways handles the bulk of the long-distance trips that cross through the city of Roseville on the way to other destinations, but it also handles large volumes of commute trips between residential neighborhoods and employment centers in Placer County and the Sacramento region.

I-80 is a transcontinental freeway that links Roseville not only to Sacramento and the Bay Area but crosses the Sierra Nevada. It carries commute traffic between Placer and Sacramento counties, as well as interregional and interstate business, freight, tourist, and recreational travel. Roseville is connected to I-80 by five interchanges: Riverside Avenue, Douglas Boulevard, Eureka Road/Atlantic Street, Taylor Road, and SR 65. I-80 has eight general purpose lanes and two High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes through Roseville.

SR 65 is generally a north–south State Route that connects Roseville with the cities of Lincoln and Marysville (via SR 70). Within Roseville, it varies from to a six-lane freeway north of I-80 to a four-lane freeway north of Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Roseville is accessed by three interchanges on SR 65: Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road, Pleasant Grove Boulevard, and Blue Oaks Boulevard.

Traffic Volumes

Existing traffic volumes from the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR were used for the basis of the existing setting. This data includes traffic counts at signalized intersections (in place as of 2014) within the Planning Area.

Exhibit 4.3-2 shows the existing average daily traffic (ADT) volumes for roadways within the City. ADT represents the total volume passing a point or segment of roadway, in both directions, on an average weekday.

Existing Intersection Levels of Service

The evaluation of traffic volumes on the roadway network provides an understanding of the general nature of travel conditions in the City of Roseville. However, traffic volumes do not indicate the quality of service provided by the street facilities or the ability of the street network to carry additional traffic. To accomplish this, the concept of “level of service” (LOS) has been developed.

LOS describes roadway-operating conditions; it is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors, which include speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driving comfort, and convenience. Levels of service are designated “A” through “F,” from best to worst, which covers the entire range of traffic operations that might occur. LOS A through E generally represents traffic volumes at less than roadway capacity, while LOS F represents over capacity and/or forced conditions.

Note that although CEQA no longer includes LOS as a metric to determine significance, the City LOS policy calls for the City to maintain a LOS C standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections in the City during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Therefore, an analysis of this policy is included in this EIR, for informational purposes only. The traffic flow and capacity of Roseville’s arterial/collector system is principally controlled by the capacity of its signalized intersections. Intersection operations were evaluated using procedures described in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), 6th Edition (Transportation Research Board, 2016). By applying a peak hour factor (which is a measure of peaking within the hour), operations during the busiest 15 minutes of the peak hour are reported.
Exhibit 4.3-3 shows the existing signalized study intersections in the City of Roseville as of 2014.

Table 4.3-1 presents the average delay range in seconds at signalized intersections for each LOS category based on HCM procedures along with a definition of each LOS category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Control Delay¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is exceptionally favorable or cycle length is very short. Most vehicles arrive during the green phase and travel through the intersection without stopping.</td>
<td>≤ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is highly favorable or the cycle length is short. More vehicles stop than with LOS A.</td>
<td>&gt;10 to ≤ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Progression is favorable or the cycle length is moderate. Individual cycle failures (i.e., one or more queued vehicles are not able to depart as a result of insufficient capacity during the cycle) may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.</td>
<td>&gt;20 to ≤ 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Volume-to-capacity ratio is high and either progression is ineffective or the cycle length is long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.</td>
<td>&gt;35 to ≤ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Volume-to-capacity ratio is high, progression is unfavorable, and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent.</td>
<td>&gt;55 to ≤ 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Volume-to-capacity ratio is very high, progression is very poor, and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ¹ Average control delay presented in seconds per vehicle.

Table 4.3-2 summarizes the existing level of service results for Roseville signalized intersections, excluding 10 intersections located within the Pedestrian Overlay Districts in the Downtown, Riverside Gateway, and West Roseville Specific Plans. According to this table, 87.3 percent of intersections operate at LOS C or better during the a.m. peak hour and 77.1 percent of intersections operate at LOS C or better during the p.m. peak hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Intersections</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-C</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Analysis conducted using 2014 counts and signals present in 2014.
Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

**Vehicle Miles Traveled**

By definition, one vehicle mile traveled (VMT) occurs when one vehicle is driven on a roadway for one mile. Regardless of how many people are traveling in the vehicle, each vehicle traveling on a roadway generates one VMT for each mile it travels. For the purposes of this EIR, VMT is estimated and projected for a typical weekday. VMT values in this analysis represent the full length of a given trip and are not truncated at jurisdiction boundaries. Additionally, these VMT values are for trips beginning or ending in the City. Trips passing through the City without stopping are not included in these VMT estimates, as the City has little control over such trips.
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VMT is used to measure performance of the existing transportation network and to evaluate potential transportation impacts. VMT is often expressed on a “per resident” (also known as “per capita,” “per employee,” or “per service population”) basis to understand the relative efficiency of a project. Although the absolute amount of VMT is reported, impact analysis is typically based on VMT normalized to population as “per resident” and “per service population” rates. This metric provides a measure of travel efficiency and helps depict whether people are traveling more or less by vehicle over time, across different areas, or across different planning scenarios. A per resident or per service population decline in VMT over a baseline condition indicates that the transportation network is operating more efficiently and that people have more travel choices.

The Roseville travel forecasting model was used to estimate VMT for the City. It is noted that inherent potential limitations exist when using current travel demand models for this purpose as rapid changes in travel behavior and transportation systems occur in response to emerging trends, new technologies, and evolving user preferences. Some of these new travel options and technologies are discussed below. Additionally, information about how technology is affecting travel is accumulating over time. Some of these emergent changes that could influence future travel forecasts include:

- Substitution of internet shopping and home delivery for some shopping or meal-related travel.
- Substitution of telework for commute travel.
- New travel modes and choices. Transportation networking companies (TNCs such as Uber and Lyft), car share, bike share, scooter share, and on-demand micro transit have increased the travel options available to travelers and have contributed to changes in traditional travel demand relationships.
- Automated and connected vehicles.

Like most models, the Roseville travel demand model does not explicitly capture the above-mentioned new modes of travel and emerging trends in travel behavior. Significant uncertainties exist at the present time that prevent explicit modeling of these new modes and emerging trends for the analysis of the General Plan.

The impact of new modes on individual and household travel behavior also is not fully understood and is the subject of ongoing research. Limitations on accessing utilization data directly from TNC vendors, in particular, constrains the ability to fully understand the impact of those services. Regulatory and legislative efforts to address the limits on access are underway in California and elsewhere, but these efforts will take time. Only a few household travel surveys (HTSs), including the 2018 SACOG HTS, have surveyed TNC use in detail, and the e-assist JUMP bikes were introduced partway through the 2018 SACOG HTS. Other major research studies focused on TNC use, and TNC driver behavior, are just being launched in California, and data collection and analysis has not yet started. Until this research is completed, there is no effective way to incorporate even the known new modes into travel demand models.

Two measures of VMT are used in this analysis. Home-based production VMT includes VMT for trips produced by a home’s residents, such as to work, school, or shop, and with one end of the trip at the home. Total VMT includes home-based production VMT plus VMT from all other sources, including trips from homes outside area into the area for work, shopping, or other purposes and trips with neither end at the home (such as from work to shopping). Although the absolute amount of VMT is reported, VMT is also normalized to residents as “per capita” rates, as described above.
VMT estimates for baseline conditions are shown in Table 4.3-3. Total VMT, home-based production VMT and home-based VMT per resident are shown by Specific Plan Area. Note that calculations include full length of trips, so that trips between two different Specific Plan Areas will be counted in each area. Therefore, sum of VMT for each Specific Plan Area does not equal citywide VMT. In contrast, home-based production VMT for all Specific Plans Areas is nearly equal to the citywide total for this metric because home-to-home trips productions are rare. The length of those trips that leave the Planning Area are included in their entirety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Plan Area</th>
<th>Total VMT</th>
<th>Home-Based Production VMT</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Home-Based Production VMT / Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Roseville</td>
<td>5,459,700</td>
<td>1,822,100</td>
<td>120,812</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Webb</td>
<td>85,200</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>109,300</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Reserve North</td>
<td>291,200</td>
<td>56,400</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill</td>
<td>1,713,500</td>
<td>585,100</td>
<td>41,430</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Roseville</td>
<td>769,000</td>
<td>123,100</td>
<td>10,014</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Industrial</td>
<td>531,700</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Roseville</td>
<td>332,000</td>
<td>246,900</td>
<td>12,529</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Roseville</td>
<td>988,700</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Roseville</td>
<td>572,100</td>
<td>363,900</td>
<td>22,929</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Gateway</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Roseville</td>
<td>346,500</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>7,661</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneridge</td>
<td>114,500</td>
<td>77,300</td>
<td>5,425</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Roseville</td>
<td>172,900</td>
<td>140,800</td>
<td>6,122</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Population and travel characteristics as of 2014.
Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

The City’s base year model is comprised of 483 lane-miles within the Planning Area, excluding freeways and local streets. This value generally matches the estimate of 439 lane-miles from the Caltrans’ Highway Performance Monitoring System Public Road Data from 2014.

**Existing Transit Service**

Transit services are provided within the Planning Area, as well as for commuters to downtown Sacramento, by Roseville Transit. The Roseville Transit routes are shown in General Plan Figure III-4. Other transit systems operating adjacent to the City with links to Roseville Transit are Sacramento Regional Transit and Placer County Transit. Other systems that complement the current transit services in Roseville include Health Express for intercity non-emergency medical trips, taxicab services, Greyhound Bus Lines, Capitol Corridor intercity passenger train, and Amtrak. These existing transit services are described below.

**City of Roseville Transit Service**

The City of Roseville operates Roseville Transit, which has a local fixed route service, a peak-hour commuter service, and a dial-a-ride service. General Plan Figure III-4 shows the transit routes within the City.

Roseville Transit’s Commuter Service (commute service) is a fixed-route, weekday commute period service. Currently Roseville Transit operates 10 morning and 10 afternoon commuter routes between Roseville and downtown Sacramento.
Roseville Transit’s Local Service (fixed-route service) has 11 scheduled routes, most of which operate Monday through Friday from 5:45 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and on Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. There are four transfer points: Sierra Gardens, Galleria Mall, Civic Center, and Louis/Orlando. The Roseville Transit system connects to both Placer County Transit (at Galleria Mall and Louis/Orlando) and Sacramento Regional Transit (at Louis/Orlando).

Roseville Transit operates a dial-a-ride system that is available to the general public, while also providing complementary ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) paratransit service. Roseville Transit dial-a-ride services operate Monday through Friday from 5:45 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and on weekends from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Both services provide shared-rides for any purpose within the City limits, with an advance appointment. The general public service is curb-to-curb, while the ADA paratransit service provides origin-to-destination service for individuals with disabilities that prevent them from using the Local Service.

**Placer County Transit Service**

Placer County Transit operates fixed-route, commuter, and dial-a-ride services adjacent to and connecting with Roseville Transit. Placer County Transit is operated by Placer County. Placer County Transit principally serves the I-80, Highway 49, and SR 65 corridors. Placer County Transit has an Auburn to Light Rail express route that stops at the Louis/Orlando transfer point where it connects to Sacramento Regional Transit before proceeding to the Watt/I-80 light rail station. Placer County Transit also has a Lincoln to Galleria to Sierra College route. Placer County also operates a commuter service between Colfax and downtown Sacramento with stops in Rocklin and Roseville (four daily runs Monday through Friday during peak hours).

**Other Transit Service**

Capitol Corridor provides intercity rail links to cities between Auburn and the Bay Area. At present, one round trip train accesses Roseville daily. However, connecting bus service is provided to additional trains in Sacramento. In the City of Roseville, all Capitol Corridor services occur at the City’s inter-modal facility near the intersection of Church Street and Pacific Street, in Downtown Roseville. A project that would add a third track between Roseville and Sacramento is being advanced. This project would increase the number of round-trip trains between these two cities.

Amtrak provides interstate rail service via stations in Roseville, Auburn, and Colfax. Amtrak’s California Zephyr provides east–west service between Chicago and Oakland with one Roseville stop in each direction daily. Other Amtrak trains can be accessed at Sacramento, or by using the Amtrak Thruway Bus Connections to Roseville.

Health Express provides non-emergency medical transportation on an advance reservation, first-come-first-served, and shared-ride basis for residents of Placer County who are either over the age of 60 or disabled. Health Express operates Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 4:30 p.m. Service to Sacramento medical facilities occurs only on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 10:00 am to 2:00 p.m.

Greyhound Bus Lines has a station at the inter-modal facility. Greyhound Bus Lines offers two trips to Sacramento per day. From Sacramento, passengers can continue to destinations in any direction. Taxi service is provided by several private companies.
**Existing Pedestrian Facilities**

The City of Roseville has an extensive network of pedestrian facilities. Most residential streets contain improved sidewalk facilities. Arterial roadways adjacent to existing residential development have wide sidewalks, often flanked by landscaping corridors. At signalized intersections, crosswalks with push-button pedestrian actuation are provided.

**Existing Bicycle Facilities**

The City’s existing bikeways are shown in General Plan Figure III-6. Bikeways are defined as specific routes and classes that meet minimum design standards. Roseville generally follows Caltrans’ design standards for the following classes of bikeways:

- **Class I** bikeways are located within a completely separated ROW designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with cross flows by motorists minimized. Class I bikeways are a minimum of 10 feet wide. A 2-foot graded area should parallel the bikeway on both sides, and the bikeway should be a minimum of 5 feet from an adjacent roadway.

- **Class II** bikeways are frequently referred to as on-street bike lanes. Class II bikeways consist of a restricted ROW designated for the exclusive or semi-exclusive use of bicycles with through travel by motor vehicles or pedestrians prohibited, but with cross-flows by pedestrians and motorists permitted. Class II bikeways are typically 4–6 feet wide in Roseville and separated from vehicle traffic by a solid white stripe.

- **Class III** bikeways consist of on-street ROW designated by signs or permanent markings that is shared with motorists.

Roseville has an additional classification for bikeways; **Class IA** facilities are shared pedestrian and bikeway paths within landscaped corridors along arterial and collector roadways and are separated from the roadway. They are a minimum of eight-feet wide. Caltrans does not consider sidewalk facilities to be Class IA facilities, and does not recommend that they be signed as bicycle routes. However, Class IA facilities are desirable for bicyclists of lower skill levels, such as children, as well as others who are hesitant to use on-street routes.

The City of Roseville has an adopted Bicycle Master Plan, which provides guidelines for the development of a citywide network of Class I, IA, II, and III bicycle facilities and design standards (based on Caltrans standards) for new bicycle facilities within Roseville.

**Truck Routes**

Truck routes within the Planning Area are shown in General Plan Figure III-2. Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) and California Legal approved routes are both shown in this figure.
4.3.3 Regulatory Framework

4.3.3.1 Federal

There are no known federal standards that would directly affect the transportation and circulation aspects of the General Plan. However, federal regulations relating to the Americans with Disabilities Act, Title VI, and Environmental Justice relate to transit service.

4.3.3.2 State

California Department of Transportation

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for planning, designing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the State Highway System (SHS). Federal highway standards are implemented in California by Caltrans. Any improvements or modifications to the SHS would need to be approved by Caltrans.

Caltrans’ Local Development – Intergovernmental Review Program Interim Guidance (Caltrans, November 9, 2016) provides guidance on the evaluation of traffic impacts to State highway facilities. The document recommends that CEQA reviewers comment on VMT, “applying local agency thresholds or absent those, thresholds recommended in adopted CEQA Guidelines or OPR’s approved Technical Advisory.”

Senate Bill 375

SB 375, signed in September 2008 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008), aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets, and land use and housing allocations. SB 375 requires each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to adopt a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) or alternative planning strategy (APS) that will prescribe land use allocation in that MPO’s RTP. As discussed below, the MPO for Roseville is the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). The California Air Resources Board (ARB), in consultation with MPOs, will provide each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in the region for the years 2020 and 2035. These reduction targets will be updated every 8 years, but can be updated every 4 years if advancements in emissions technologies affect the reduction strategies to achieve the targets. ARB is also charged with reviewing each MPO’s SCS or APS for consistency with its assigned targets. Under Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), MPOs such as SACOG are responsible for developing land use and transportation planning scenarios to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light duty trucks (passenger vehicles).

Senate Bill 743

Senate Bill (SB) 743, passed in 2013, resulted in several statewide CEQA changes. It required the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to establish new metrics for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas (TPAs) and allows OPR to extend use of the metrics beyond TPAs. OPR selected VMT as the preferred transportation impact metric and applied their discretion to require its use statewide. This legislation also established that aesthetic and parking effects of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center projects on an infill site within a TPA are not significant impacts on the environment. The revised CEQA Guidelines that implement this legislation became effective on December 28, 2018, and state that vehicle LOS and similar measures related to delay shall not be used as the sole basis for determining the significance of transportation impacts for land use projects, and that as of July 1, 2020, this
requirement shall apply statewide, but that until that date, lead agencies may elect to rely on VMT rather than LOS to analyze transportation impacts.

The OPR *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (December 2018) includes specifications for VMT methodology and recommendations for significance thresholds and mitigation. The *Technical Advisory* recommends that a per capita or per employee VMT that is 15 percent below that of existing development may be a reasonable threshold in order to meet the State’s long-term climate goals (page 10).

**California Air Resources Board**

ARB has specific guidance for VMT thresholds in the ARB *2017 Scoping Plan-Identified VMT Reductions and Relationship to State Climate Goals* (January 2019). This document provides recommendations for VMT reduction thresholds that would be necessary to achieve the state’s GHG reduction goals and acknowledges that the SCS targets alone are not sufficient to meet climate goals. ARB concluded that a 14.3-percent reduction in total VMT per capita and a 16.8 percent reduction in light-duty VMT per capita (over current conditions; 2015–2018) was needed to meet these goals.

**Complete Streets**

In 2008, the State of California enacted Assembly Bill 1358, the Complete Streets Act of 2008. This law requires cities and counties, when updating their general plans, to ensure that local streets and roads meet the needs of all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, children, seniors, persons with disabilities and motorists. The law took effect in January 2011, when the OPR issued new general plan update guidelines that reflect Complete Streets planning principles. As described by OPR, complete streets should be designed and constructed to serve all users of streets, roads, and highways, regardless of their age or ability, or whether they are driving, walking, bicycling, or taking transit.

### 4.3.3.3 REGIONAL AND LOCAL

**Sacramento Council of Governments 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy**

SACOG is responsible for preparing the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) every four years in coordination with the 22 cities and six counties in the greater Sacramento region. The MTP/SCS pro-actively links land use, air quality, and transportation needs. The current adopted 2020 MTP/SCS is for the years 2020 to 2040. Goals of the MTP/SCS are:

- Build vibrant places for today’s and tomorrow’s residents.
- Foster the next generation of mobility solutions.
- Modernize the way we pay for transportation infrastructure.
- Build and maintain a safe, reliable, and multimodal transportation system.

Federal law requires the MTP to conform to air quality goals for the region, satisfy financial constraints such that all proposed projects can be reasonably funded, and undergo extensive public review. State law further requires the MTP process include careful environmental analysis and review.
Under SB 375, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) is responsible for issuing greenhouse gas targets to MPOs that reduce vehicle emissions, consistent with state climate goals, by a future planning horizon compared to an established baseline. For the 2020 MTP/SCS, ARB assigned SACOG a target of 19 percent per-capita GHG emissions reduction, but this will be updated with each update to the MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS indicates that VMT per capita in the SACOG region, which dipped significantly during the Great Recession, has increased starting in 2011. The MTP/SCS projects a 10-percent reduction in VMT per capita by 2040 for the SACOG region. However, this will not be sufficient to meet the statewide goals of a 14.3-percent reduction in total VMT per capita and a 16.8-percent reduction in light-duty VMT per capita from the ARB 2017 Scoping Plan described above.

**Existing City of Roseville General Plan Policies**

The existing General Plan (City of Roseville 2016c) includes the following goals and policies related to transportation and circulation.

**Growth Management Goal 1:** The City shall proactively manage and plan for growth.

**Growth Management Goal 7:** Potential population growth in Roseville must be based on the long-term carrying capacities and limits of the roadway system, sewer and water treatment facilities, and electrical utility service, as defined in the Circulation Element and the Public Facilities Element.

**Functional Classification Goal 1:** Provide guidance to the long-range planning of the City’s roadway system including design standards, right-of-way requirements and coordination with surrounding jurisdictions.

- **Policy 1:** Establish a functional classification system to guide the planning and design of the City’s roadway system.
- **Policy 2:** Coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions to achieve compatible functional classifications for roadways that cross the City’s boundaries.
- **Policy 3:** Establish a comprehensive set of design standards for the City’s roadway system by functional class.
- **Policy 4:** Maintain a system of truck routes to provide for the safe and efficient movement of goods and to avoid impacting residential neighborhoods.

**Level of Service Goal 1:** Maintain an adequate level of transportation service for all of Roseville’s residents and employees through a balanced transportation system, which considers automobiles, transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

- **Policy 1:** Maintain a level of service (LOS) “C” standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections and roadway segments in the City during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to the LOS “C” standard may be considered for intersections where the City finds that the required improvements are unacceptable based on established criteria identified in the implementation measures. In addition, Pedestrian Districts may be exempted from the LOS standard.
► **Policy 2:** Strive to meet the level of service standards through a balanced transportation system that reduces the auto emissions that contribute to climate change by providing alternatives to the automobile and avoiding excessive vehicle congestion through roadway improvements, Intelligent Transportation Systems, and transit improvements.

► **Policy 3:** Work with neighboring jurisdictions to provide acceptable and compatible levels of service on the roadways that cross the City’s boundaries.

► **Policy 4:** Secure adequate funding for all components of the City’s transportation system to ensure level of service policy is maintained.

► **Policy 5:** Enable the City to designate a Pedestrian District over a geographic area for the purpose of implementing measures that promote pedestrian walkability and reduce total vehicle miles traveled and resultant air pollution emissions that contribute to climate change. In these districts, the City recognizes that pedestrian travel takes a higher priority than automobile travel, which could reduce the vehicular level of service.

**Transit Goal 1:** Promote a safe, convenient and efficient mass transit system, utilizing both bus and rail modes, to reduce congestion, reduce auto emissions, including emissions that contribute to climate change, improve the environment, and provide viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through Roseville.

► **Policy 1:** Pursue and support transit services within the community and region and pursue land use, design and other mechanisms that promote the use of such services.

► **Policy 2:** Pursue all available sources of funding for sustainable transit services.

► **Policy 3:** Continue to study options for introducing Bus Rapid Transit or extending light rail service to Roseville.

► **Policy 4:** Support and remain actively involved in planning for the expansion of Capitol Corridor rail service, as well as other regional linkages.

► **Policy 5:** Consider the transit needs of seniors, minorities, low-income persons, persons with disabilities, and other persons who may be transit-dependent when making decisions regarding transit service.

**Transportation Systems Management Goal 1:** Reduce travel demand on the City’s roadway system.

**Transportation Systems Management Goal 2:** Reduce total vehicle emissions in the City of Roseville and the South Placer County region.

► **Policy 1:** Continue to enforce the City’s TSM ordinance and monitor its effectiveness.

► **Policy 2:** Work with appropriate agencies to develop measures to reduce vehicular travel demand and total vehicle miles traveled and meet air quality goals.

**Bikeways/Trails Goal 1:** Increase the percentage of all trips made by bicycles in Roseville.
Bikeways/Trails Goal 2: Establish and maintain a safe, comprehensive and integrated bikeway and trail system that encourages the use of bikes and walking for commuting, recreational and other trips.

Bikeways/Trails Goal 3: Establish education, encouragement and enforcement programs that increase bicyclist and motorist awareness of the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists in order to foster a climate of acceptance for bike riding.

Bikeways/Trails Goal 4: Obtain the Bicycle Friendly Community Designation from the League of American Bicyclists.

► Policy 1: Develop a comprehensive and safe system of recreational and commuter bicycle routes and trails that provides connections between the City’s major employment and housing areas and between its existing and planned bikeways.

► Policy 2: Coordinate Roseville’s bikeway and trail system with those of neighboring jurisdictions to provide both local and regional connections.

► Policy 3: Pursue available sources of funding for bikeways and trails.

► Policy 4: Enhance bicycle education, encouragement and enforcement programs targeted to adult and child bicyclists and motorists.

Placer County Regional Transportation Plan

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) prepared the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is a long-range transportation funding document to help local agencies gain access to federal and state transportation funds. Its purpose is to address existing congestion and improve future mobility given the growth anticipated over the next 20 years. The plan was adopted by the PCTPA Board at their December 4, 2019 meeting. The RTP contains individual chapters pertaining to the regional roadway network, public transit, passenger rail, aviation, goods movement, bicycle, pedestrian and low-speed vehicles, and recreational travel. It also contains chapters related to air quality, climate change, as well as policy and financial elements.

Long Range Transit Master Plan

The City has worked with the PCTPA and surrounding jurisdictions to develop the Transit Master Plan for South Placer County, which is a long-range transit plan, intended to guide the growth of transit services within the city of Roseville and the surrounding jurisdictions in Placer County through the planning horizon of 2030–2040. The PCTPA Board adopted the plan for services outlined as Scenario 2, which highlighted increased services and a new BRT program in response to anticipated development (PCTPA 2007).

Short Range Transit Plan

The Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) is a state and federally mandated planning document that describes the plans, programs, and goals of the transit operator. The SRTP was last adopted in 2018 and it has a 7-year planning horizon. The SRTP focuses on the characteristics of the existing system and addresses operational, capital and financial needs for future transit services during the 7-year planning horizon (PCTPA 2018).
Bicycle Master Plan

The General Plan calls for the development of a comprehensive bikeway system that would provide connections between the City’s major employment and housing areas and between existing and planned bikeways. The Bicycle Master Plan was updated in 2008. It provides guidelines for the development of a citywide network of bicycle facilities and design standards for new bicycle facilities in Roseville.

Pedestrian Master Plan

The City of Roseville Pedestrian Master Plan (2011) was adopted by the City Council to establish policies, projects, and programs that improve the pedestrian system in Roseville and increase walking for transportation, recreation, and health. The Pedestrian Master Plan includes goals, policies, and implementation measures for pedestrian improvements and programs; a recommended pedestrian network; and a CIP that establishes a 20-year framework for improvements to the pedestrian environment.

City of Roseville Design and Construction Standards

The City’s Design and Construction Standards (City of Roseville 2020) provide for coordinated and standardized development of City facilities, including roadways. The Design and Construction Standards apply to, regulate, and guide preparation of traffic impact studies, the design and preparation of plans, and the construction of streets, highways, alleys, drainage, traffic signals, site access, and related public improvements. All public roadway infrastructure improvements must be designed and constructed in accordance with the City’s Design and Construction Standards, Caltrans’ Standard Specifications (Caltrans 2018), and the latest edition of the City’s Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transitions Plan (City of Roseville 2009).

The requirement for traffic impact studies for individual projects is determined by the City. Traffic impact studies must be prepared by a City-authorized traffic consultant and must adequately assess the impacts of a development proposal on the existing and/or planned street system. Section 4 of the Design Standards provides specific guidance on the types of traffic studies, methodologies, contents, and requirements for submittal and review by the City.

The Design Standards also set forth the requirements for project site access and driveway locations (Section 5); traffic signals, signs, and striping (Section 6); street design, including street classes and widths, rights-of-way, pavement engineering, curb and gutters, sidewalks, pedestrian walks and bike paths, intersections, sight distances, and driveway standards (Section 7); traffic noise barriers (Section 12); and bikeway design standards (Section 13).

The Construction Standards regulate construction-area traffic control (Section 12); set forth the developer’s and contractor’s responsibilities (Section 21); specify the details for construction of street improvements including barricades, bikeways, bridges, bollards, curb, curb and gutter, driveways, pavement, curb ramps, sidewalk, survey monuments and tunnels (Section 71); application of traffic stripes and pavement markings (Section 84); installation of pavement markers (Section 85); and installation of traffic signals (Section 86).

Adopted Specific Plans and Mitigation Measures

The City has adopted 14 Specific Plans. A Specific Plan is a comprehensive planning and zoning document that implements the General Plan by providing development and conservation standards for a defined geographic area.
location within the Planning Area. Each Specific Plan has developed guidelines for site, architectural, landscaping, lighting, roadway networks, pedestrian/bicycle paths, open space corridors, parks, and other aspects of design. Each adopted Specific Plan included an EIR, which evaluated potential impacts related to the transportation and circulation system. Where appropriate, mitigation measures were adopted, and these measures are required to be implemented in the respective Specific Plan Areas. Adopted mitigation measures included the payment of fair share fees toward roadway system improvements. Copies of the adopted Specific Plans and their associated EIRs are available upon request from the City of Roseville Development Services Department, Planning Division.

4.3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

4.3.4.1 METHODOLOGY

This proposed General Plan Update does not include any changes to land use designations, expansion of the City’s Planning Area, or other major physical changes to areas planned for development compared to the existing General Plan, but does include changes to goals, policies, and implementation measures, which are analyzed as a part of this EIR. This proposed General Plan Update is compared to existing conditions, which constitute the baseline physical conditions for determining whether potential impacts are significant.

The transportation impact analysis methodology includes a combination of quantitative and qualitative evaluations of the roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit components of the transportation system. All analysis presumes that future background travel options and behaviors remain similar to current conditions and do not explicitly account for potential changes associated with disruptive trends, which have included increased use of TNCs, which include Uber and Lyft; internet shopping; and other internet related activities, and which in the future may include automated vehicles (AVs) and micro-transit services. Because the timing, specific types of disruptors, degree of adoption, and resulting effects of such trends are unknown at this time, any analyses of their effects on the City’s transportation system would be speculative.

The planning horizon of the proposed General Plan Update is the year 2035.

Analysis Scenarios

The following scenarios were analyzed using the Roseville travel demand model: existing baseline conditions, cumulative plus project conditions (financially constrained), and cumulative plus project conditions (financially unconstrained). The project does not include any changes to the City’s cumulative baseline (no land use plan changes are proposed); therefore, a cumulative no project scenario was not prepared, because the cumulative no project and the cumulative plus project are the same. More detailed descriptions of each scenario are included below.

- **Existing Baseline Conditions:** The transportation impact analysis is based on data and information collected for the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR finalized in 2016. The Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan baseline represents baseline conditions for purposes of the General Plan transportation impact analysis. Changes in baseline conditions since that time are accounted for in the transportation analysis process since impacts are determined based on long-term growth associated with buildout of the General Plan, as described in the Introduction.
Proposed General Plan Update Buildout, Financially Constrained Network: Represents the circulation plan from the proposed General Plan Update and buildout of development anticipated under the General Plan, but only includes those regional roadway facilities which are included in the SACOG 2020 MTP/SCS project financially constrained projects list. These are projects with identified funding sources which can reasonably be expected to be implemented by 2035. Exhibit 4.3-4 shows lanes and Exhibit 4.3-5 shows lane additions for this scenario compared to baseline conditions for roadways under the City’s jurisdiction. Under this scenario, the City’s roadway system (excluding freeways and local streets) is expanded from 483 lane-miles (baseline) to 639 lane-miles, a 32-percent increase.

Proposed General Plan Update Buildout, Financially Unconstrained Network: Represents circulation plan from the proposed General Plan Update and buildout of development anticipated under the General Plan, but includes additional regional roadway projects based on the SACOG 2020 MTP/SCS project financially unconstrained projects list. These additional projects include:

- Widening of Baseline Road from four to six lanes from Santucci Boulevard to the Sutter County line
- Managed lanes on I-80 from SR 65 east to SR 49 in Auburn
- Extension of Placer Parkway from Santucci Boulevard west to connect to SR 70/99
- Addition of one general purpose lane on southbound SR 65 from Lincoln Boulevard to Blue Oaks Boulevard and one general purpose lane on northbound SR 65 from north of Galleria Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard

Infill Housing Alternative: Based upon the constrained roadway network scenario, this Alternative includes all development anticipated to occur with buildout of the General Plan, plus an additional 1,382 multi-family housing units allocated to infill locations that can accommodate additional development capacity, and where multi-family development could be feasible. Please see Chapter 6.0 of this EIR for more information about the EIR Alternatives.

Land Use Assumptions

Table 4.3-4 summarizes the changes in major land uses between the existing conditions baseline and General Plan scenarios. This table indicates that residential growth would increase by 56 percent, with the majority of new units being single-family. Greater levels of non-residential growth are expected with the amount of retail, industrial, and high tech industrial square footage assumed to approximately double. An 81-percent increase in office space is predicted.
Exhibit 4.3-4

General Plan Number of Travel Lanes

Total Number of Lanes (Both Directions)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Notes:
1. Does not include turn lanes and auxiliary lanes

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020
Exhibit 4.3-5

General Plan Lane Increases

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

Notes:
1. Shown for arterial streets only.
2. This map represents the number of added lanes over the existing (2020) conditions. Some of the identified road widening/extension were completed between 2014 and 2020.
Table 4.3-4  Land Use Change Under Buildout of the General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Units¹</th>
<th>Existing Baseline</th>
<th>General Plan Buildout ²</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>33,450</td>
<td>50,403</td>
<td>16,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>11,306</td>
<td>20,538</td>
<td>9,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-Restricted</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>9,233</td>
<td>18,666</td>
<td>9,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mall</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>13,152</td>
<td>5,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>13,208</td>
<td>6,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Tech Industrial</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>2,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>22,622</td>
<td>32,422</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. KSF = thousand square feet
2. Unconstrained and constrained scenarios are identical from a land use perspective. The Infill Housing Alternative has 1,382 additional multi-family dwelling units. See Chapter 6.0 of this EIR for more detail regarding the alternatives.
3. Additional hotels may be developed on parcels assumed as generic retail space.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

Reasonably foreseeable development surrounding the Planning Area was assumed for cumulative scenarios modeled as part of this effort. Namely, projects in unincorporated Placer County, such as the Placer Vineyards, Regional University, and Bickford Ranch Specific Plans were assumed. Continued development within the cities of Rocklin and Lincoln, per their zoning maps/land use designations, was also assumed.

Notably, the cumulative scenarios modeled as part of this effort also assumed development of the Placer Ranch Specific Plan, adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in December 2019, and is situated directly north of the City limits. This plan includes approximately 5,800 dwelling units and 6.3 million square feet of non-residential (retail, office, industrial, innovation center, and R&D), and a 32,000-student university. Placer Ranch also includes new roadway connections to existing Roseville streets, including Foothills Boulevard, Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, and Fiddyment Road.

The anticipated effect of the unconstrained scenario on City streets is a reduction in traffic volumes due to less regionally-oriented traffic using City streets to avoid freeway congestion. The development that is assumed outside the City’s Planning Area would directly and indirectly affect the performance of the transportation system within Roseville. Direct effects are seen in vehicle LOS results, since some traffic generated by these developments would use City streets. Indirect effects are seen in VMT, as City residents and businesses may alter their travel destinations in response to convenient and complementary land uses (despite such land uses being located outside the Planning Area).

Intersection Analysis

The traffic flow and capacity of Roseville’s arterial/collector system is principally controlled by the capacity of its signalized intersections. Intersection operations were evaluated using procedures described in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), 6th Edition (Transportation Research Board 2016). By applying a peak hour factor (which is a measure of peaking within the hour), operations during the busiest 15 minutes of the peak hour are reported.
Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis

The Roseville travel forecasting model was used to estimate VMT for the City. As previously stated, two measures of VMT are used in this analysis: per capita (home-based trips) and per service population (all trips). Home-based production VMT includes VMT for trips produced by a home’s residents, such as to work, school, or shop, and with one end of the trip at the home. Per service population VMT includes home-based production VMT plus VMT from all other sources, including trips from homes outside area into the area for work, shopping, or other purposes and trips with neither end at the home (such as from work to shopping).

4.3.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, adoption and/or implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in significant impacts under CEQA, if any of the following would occur.

Roadway System Vehicle Miles Traveled

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the General Plan would result in a significant transportation impact if it would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1), which states that, for land use projects “[v]ehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact.” There are three potentially applicable thresholds: the OPR Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (a 15 percent reduction below existing baseline), the ARB 2017 Scoping Plan-Identified VMT Reductions and Relationship to State Climate Goals (a 14.3 percent reduction in total VMT or a 16.8 percent reduction in passenger vehicle VMT), and the target ARB has assigned to SACOG as part of SB 375 implementation (19 percent reduction below 2016 baseline). The City has selected a threshold of 15 percent reduction below baseline, which is established in the OPR Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, to evaluate significance, for reasons discussed more fully below.

The General Plan would have a significant impact on the roadway system if it would substantially interfere with achievement of VMT reductions consistent with the OPR Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. Therefore, a threshold of 15 percent below baseline VMT per capita, which for the City is 12.8 VMT per capita, was used for this analysis. This threshold is more stringent than the 14.3 percent reduction identified in the ARB 2017 Scoping Plan-Identified VMT Reductions and Relationship to State Climate Goals, and, because data from SACOG indicates that existing household VMT per capita in Roseville is five to 10 percent less than the SACOG regional average (SACOG 2020), is actually more stringent than the SACOG target. That is, because the City’s VMT is already five to 10 percent less than the SACOG regional average, the City would only need to demonstrate an additional 9 to 14 percent reduction in order to demonstrate the City’s VMT is 19 percent below the regional baseline.

Using VMT output from the traffic impact study, both per capita and per service population VMT targets have been developed, as shown in Table 4.3-5. The per-capita methodology is based on home-based production VMT, which includes VMT for trips produced by a home’s residents, such as to work, school, or shop, and with one end of the trip at the home. The per service population methodology includes home-based production VMT and VMT from all other sources, including trips from homes outside area into the area for work, shopping, or other purposes and trips with neither end at the home (such as from work to shopping).
Table 4.3-5  City of Roseville VMT Thresholds Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service Population Methodology</th>
<th>Per Capita Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT Produced</td>
<td>5,459,700</td>
<td>1,822,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Residents</td>
<td>120,812</td>
<td>120,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Employees</td>
<td>69,026</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population</td>
<td>189,838</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline VMT Metric</td>
<td>28.8 VMT/service population</td>
<td>15.1 VMT/capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target VMT Metric</td>
<td>24.5 VMT/service population</td>
<td>12.8 VMT/capita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The City’s threshold is 12.8 VMT/capita. The per service population threshold is included for informational purposes.

The service population analysis is provided for informational purposes, to provide a coarse assessment of non-home-based trips affect reported VMT efficiency. Precise methodologies for calculating this metric in traffic impact studies are still being developed, and are therefore relatively less reliable. The per service population metric includes all home-based trips (which are compared with the per capita metric), but also includes all trips into or out of the City, even if these do not originate from a home in the City. The per-capita metric provides a measure of travel efficiency and helps depict whether people are traveling by vehicle more or less over time, and can also be used to compare the efficiency of different areas.

The **City is adopting a threshold of 12.8 VMT/capita for this EIR.** The per-capita metric is selected because the underlying data is reliable, and because this aligns with SB 375, the MTP/SCS, and the ARB Scoping Plan (which all rely on a per-capita metric).

Future projects consistent with the General Plan will not require further VMT analysis, pursuant to the tiering provisions of CEQA. However, the threshold of 12.8 VMT/capita could be used for analysis of future land use amendments or other projects not within the scope of this EIR analysis. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) allows lead agencies discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(b) allows lead agencies the discretion to select their own thresholds and allow for differences in thresholds based on context. Lead agencies also may need to balance multiple goals, such as accommodation of housing needs, that may also contribute to VMT increases. Adding more impact mitigation costs to housing projects may be counter to land use diversity and adequate/affordable housing goals.

Quantitative analysis would not be required if it can be demonstrated that a project would generate VMT which is equivalent to or less than what was assumed in this General Plan EIR. Examples of such projects include local-serving retail and other local-serving development, which generally reduces existing trip distances by providing services in closer proximity to residential areas, and therefore reduce VMT. Multi-family residences generally have fewer trips per household than single-family residences, and therefore also produce less VMT per unit. Infill projects in developed areas generally have shorter trips, reduced vehicle trips, and therefore less VMT (infill areas are typically low VMT areas, as described in the analysis below). Pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and electric vehicle transportation projects are presumed to be consistent with the VMT analysis, while new vehicular transportation projects not included in the proposed General Plan Update that could induce additional VMT would be presumed to have a conflict and would require quantitative analysis.1 Residential projects in low per-capita household VMT

---

1 As noted in the OPR VMT Technical Advisory, induced travel occurs where roadway capacity is expanded in an area of present or projected future congestion. The effect typically manifests over several years. Lower travel times make the modified facility more
areas and office projects in low per-worker VMT areas (85 percent or less than the regional average) as shown on maps maintained by SACOG would also be presumed not to have a significant effect.2

**Roadway System Level of Service**

The existing General Plan includes a policy within the Transportation Element which requires maintenance of a level of service (LOS) “C” standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections and roadway segments in the City during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Though LOS is no longer a CEQA significance metric, an analysis of LOS has been provided in order to demonstrate consistency with General Plan policy. This analysis is presented in the EIR for informational purposes.

**Hazards**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that impacts may be significant if a project would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). The proposed General Plan Update would have a significant impact on the transportation system if it would increase hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access.

**Transit, Bicycles, and Pedestrians**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that impacts may be significant if a project conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The proposed General Plan Update would have a significant impact on transit, bicycles, or pedestrians if it would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding these systems, or create or exacerbate disruptions to the performance or safety of these systems.

**4.3.4.3 IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**IMPACT**

**4.3-1 VMT Per Capita Exceeds the Threshold of 12.8 VMT Per Capita.** The VMT generated by buildout of the existing General Plan is 15.4 VMT per capita under financially constrained network conditions and 14.9 VMT per capita under financially unconstrained network conditions. This exceeds the significance threshold. This impact is considered **significant**.

---

2 For more detail, please see: [http://sb743-sacog.opendata.arcgis.com/](http://sb743-sacog.opendata.arcgis.com/).
Table 4.3-5 presents the total VMT and total VMT per service population for the City of Roseville for trips beginning or ending in the City. As shown, total VMT is expected to increase by about 88 percent over baseline conditions across all scenarios. This generally matches the growth assumptions of 56 percent more residential, 81 percent more office, and twice as much retail, industrial, and high-tech industrial development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>General Plan Buildout (Constrained)</th>
<th>General Plan Buildout (Unconstrained)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total VMT</td>
<td>5,459,700</td>
<td>10,289,700</td>
<td>10,125,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>120,812</td>
<td>188,968</td>
<td>188,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>69,026</td>
<td>123,050</td>
<td>123,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population</td>
<td>189,838</td>
<td>312,018</td>
<td>312,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total VMT/Service Population</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes full length of all trips with either an origin or destination with the City of Roseville limits.
Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

This table indicates that VMT per service population increases under all 2035 scenarios when compared to baseline conditions. This is caused by two factors. First, as is demonstrated in more detail later, the majority of the residential growth is predicted to occur on the edges of the Planning Area, further away from goods and services than most existing residences. Hence, trip lengths increase for these residents. Second, the percentage of the service population consisting of employees increases from 36 percent under baseline conditions to 39 percent under 2035 conditions. This is important because the incremental addition (using the service population methodology) of one added resident adds about 3.2 daily trips; in contrast, one added office employee adds about 4.4 trips and one added retail employee generates about 12 trips (added trips include trips by the resident/employee, as well as customers and others utilizing the development). When daily trips are then converted into VMT by multiplying by the trip length, the same trend occurs.

Table 4.3-6 presents the home-based production VMT and home-based production VMT per resident for the City of Roseville for trips beginning or ending in the City, also known as a per capita VMT analysis. This table indicates that the two constrained scenarios would exhibit per capita VMT that is two percent above baseline conditions. The unconstrained proposed project scenario would have per capita VMT that is 1.3 percent below baseline conditions. In all likelihood, the constrained scenario is enabling motorists to travel more directly to their destinations (versus seeking less direct, but quicker routes) due to less traffic intrusion from freeways. Although the project results in slightly less VMT per capita than existing conditions, it remains above the significance threshold of 12.8 VMT per capita.

---

3 Calculated as follows:
- Residential: 8.6 daily trips per unit / 2.7 persons per unit = 3.2 trips per person (based on blended average of single-family and multi-family residential trip rates and average HH size)
- Office: 17 daily trips per ksf / 4 employees per ksf = 4.4 trips per employee (City of Roseville model trip rate)
- Retail: 35 daily trips per ksf / 3 employees per ksf = 12 trips per employee (City of Roseville model trip rate).
Table 4.3-6  Home-Based Production Vehicle Miles Traveled: Per Capita Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>General Plan Buildout (Constrained)</th>
<th>General Plan Buildout (Unconstrained)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-Based Production VMT</td>
<td>1,822,100</td>
<td>2,911,300</td>
<td>2,810,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>120,812</td>
<td>188,968</td>
<td>188,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Based Production VMT/Resident</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

A comparison of VMT in Specific Plan Areas is shown in Table 4.3-7. Most residential development will happen in the Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, Sierra Vista, and West Roseville Specific Plan Areas under buildout of the General Plan. These areas, farther away from the core of the city, all have home-based production VMT per resident that is greater than the citywide value. Low-VMT areas—locations which generate VMT at or below the significance threshold—are shaded on the table. Future projects in these areas would generally be assumed to have less than significant VMT impacts.

Table 4.3-7  Vehicle Miles Traveled: Proposed General Plan Constrained Scenario: Per Capita Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Plan Area</th>
<th>Total VMT</th>
<th>Home-Based Production VMT</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Home-Based Production VMT / Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Roseville</td>
<td>10,289,735</td>
<td>2,911,262</td>
<td>188,968</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoruso Ranch</td>
<td>283,015</td>
<td>163,065</td>
<td>7,756</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creekview</td>
<td>154,398</td>
<td>100,956</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Webb</td>
<td>107,243</td>
<td>43,160</td>
<td>4,824</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>259,312</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Reserve North</td>
<td>434,424</td>
<td>57,590</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill</td>
<td>2,237,816</td>
<td>592,717</td>
<td>42,652</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Roseville</td>
<td>1,666,463</td>
<td>131,171</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Industrial</td>
<td>1,381,982</td>
<td>76,957</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Roseville</td>
<td>428,015</td>
<td>230,117</td>
<td>13,844</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Roseville</td>
<td>1,428,255</td>
<td>43,928</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Roseville</td>
<td>628,895</td>
<td>345,484</td>
<td>23,414</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Gateway</td>
<td>66,383</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Vista</td>
<td>932,236</td>
<td>412,300</td>
<td>22,345</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Roseville</td>
<td>466,701</td>
<td>101,830</td>
<td>7,709</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneridge</td>
<td>235,630</td>
<td>101,556</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Roseville</td>
<td>811,396</td>
<td>479,721</td>
<td>26,828</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The summation of VMT for all specific plan areas is greater than for the city as a whole because VMT associated with a trip from one specific plan to another is counted separately for each specific plan, but only once for the city as a whole.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

The following goal and policies related to VMT in Roseville would be revised as a part of the proposed General Plan Update, with additions shown in **bold, underlined text** and deletions shown in strikethrough text:
► Goal CIRC4: Reduce travel demand: vehicle miles traveled on the City's and regional roadway systems, while expanding mobility options for residents, employees, and visitors.

► Transportation Systems Management Goal 2: Reduce total vehicle emissions in the City of Roseville and the South Placer County region.

► Policy CIRC4.1: Continue to enforce the City's TSM ordinance and monitor its effectiveness. The City will review and condition projects, as appropriate, to reduce travel demand per capita and per employee by promoting increased density near transit, improving the quality of non-vehicular transportation options, providing incentives for non-vehicular travel, encouraging the mixing of complementary land uses in proximity to one another, and using other feasible methods.

► Policy CIRC4.2: Work with appropriate agencies to develop implementation measures to reduce vehicular travel demand and total vehicle miles traveled and meet air quality goals.

► Policy CIRC4.3: Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects not included in a Specific Plan shall be evaluated for consistency with the City’s VMT Impact Standards.

► Policy CIRC4.4: If the evaluation required by CIRC4.3 finds a Specific Plan Amendment or land use development project not included in an adopted Specific Plan is inconsistent with thresholds established within the City’s VMT Impact Standards, on-site land use, transportation, and urban design-related VMT-reducing features should be prioritized to demonstrate consistency. If feasible on-site features cannot achieve the VMT threshold, Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects outside Specific Plan Areas may demonstrate equivalent consistency through off-site actions or fair-share fee contributions, or if consistency cannot be achieved, shall implement all feasible measures.

► Policy CIRC4.5: Policy CIRC4.3 does not apply to projects that propose residential or office uses in Transit Priority Areas or low-VMT areas. Low-VMT areas are those shown by the General Plan travel demand model or the SCS travel demand model to have per-capita, per-employee, or per-service-population VMT rates that are at least 15 percent less than the baseline citywide or regional rate.

► Policy CIRC4.6: Promote and incentivize Infill development, particularly affordable housing development, through assistance in obtaining outside grant funding and reductions or deferrals in impact fees.

► Policy CIRC4.7: Continue to educate the public and business community about alternative modes of travel through Safe Routes to School, Transportation Systems Management, and other local and regional programs and events.

The proposed modification to Policy CIRC4.1 describes the City’s TSM program and its intent more fully, instead of merely stating that the City will continue to monitor and enforce the program. This additional clarity provides better direction within the General Plan, but does not change the application of the policy. The proposed change to Policy CIRC4.2 is a minor wording change with no policy implications. Proposed new policies CIRC4.6 and CIRC4.7 incentivize infill development and promote mobility options, respectively, which would not result in any adverse environmental impacts. Proposed Policies CIRC4.3 and 4.4 describe the City’s proposed new VMT policies.
Senate Bill 743 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 have established VMT as a metric for assessing transportation and travel demand management. The existing General Plan does not contain any policy language or guidance related specifically to VMT, in absence of which each project would need to establish and justify a VMT significance threshold—as has been done in this EIR. In establishing Policies CIRC4.3 and 4.4, the City is providing a significance threshold and mitigation guidance for future projects. Because the regulatory and modeling environment related to VMT is continuing to evolve, the City has elected to avoid a policy which states a static threshold specifying an amount per capita to be achieved out of concern it would not remain relevant. Instead, the policy refers back to new VMT Impact Standards. The General Plan Implementation Measures direct preparation of the VMT Impact Standards, describe the threshold (15 percent below baseline) and threshold justification contained within this EIR, and indicates that the threshold will be updated periodically.

The proposed General Plan Update policy changes and the new policies listed above would reduce VMT and associated environmental impacts (air pollutant emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation noise, etc.), promote mobility options, and incentivize infill development, and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

**Conclusion**

The VMT generated by buildout of the existing General Plan is 15.4 VMT per capita under financially constrained network conditions, and 14.9 VMT per capita under financially unconstrained network conditions. This exceeds the significance threshold of 12.8 VMT per capita (i.e., 85 percent of the 15.1 VMT per capita baseline value). The land use plans in the remaining undeveloped areas of the City are approved and Development Agreements in place, and therefore mitigation in the form of fundamental land use changes that will reduce VMT to meet state goals is unachievable.

Some parts of the Planning Area perform better than others and achieve the citywide threshold. Based on Table 4.3-7, these include the Del Webb, Downtown, North Central Roseville, Northeast Roseville, and Riverside Gateway Specific Plan Areas. These Specific Plan Areas are most central to existing development or, in the case of Del Webb, which is age-restricted to residents 55 or older, have lower trip generation.

Implementing proposed General Plan Update Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1, CIRC4.2, CIRC4.3, CIRC4.4, CIRC4.5, CIRC4.6, and CIRC4.7, listed above, will help to reduce VMT, but the City cannot demonstrate definitively at this time that implementation of these policies would achieve VMT reductions to meet the threshold of 12.8 VMT per capita. This impact is significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 – The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:**

**Implementation Measure**

Proposed development projects that could have a potentially significant VMT impact shall consider reasonable and feasible project modifications and other measures during the project design and environmental review stage of project development that would reduce VMT effects in a manner consistent with state guidance on VMT reduction. The below list of potential measures is not intended to be exhaustive, and not all measures may be feasible, reasonable, or applicable to all projects. The purpose
of this list is to identify options for future development proposals, not to constrain projects to this list, or to require that a project examine or include all measures from this list. Potential measures include:

- improve or increase access to transit;
- increase access to common goods and services, such as groceries, schools, and daycare;
- incorporate affordable housing into the project;
- incorporate neighborhood electric vehicle network;
- orient the project toward transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities;
- improve pedestrian or bicycle networks, or transit service;
- provide traffic calming;
- provide bicycle parking;
- unbundle parking costs;
- provide parking cash-out programs;
- implement roadway pricing;
- implement or provide access to a commute reduction program;
- provide car-sharing, bike sharing, and ride-sharing programs;
- provide transit passes;
- shifting single occupancy vehicle trips to carpooling or vanpooling, for example providing ride-matching services;
- providing telework options;
- providing incentives or subsidies that increase the use of modes other than single-occupancy vehicle;
- providing on-site amenities at places of work, such as priority parking for carpools and vanpools, secure bike parking, and showers and locker rooms;
- providing employee transportation coordinators at employment sites;
- providing a guaranteed ride home service to users of non-auto modes;
- locate the project near transit;
- increase project density;
- increase the mix of uses within the project or within the project’s surroundings;
- increase connectivity and/or intersection density on the project site; and/or
- deploy management strategies (e.g., pricing, vehicle occupancy requirements) on roadways or roadway lanes.

The City shall evaluate the feasibility of a local or regional VMT impact bank or exchange. Such an offset program, if determined feasible, would be administered by the City or a City-approved agency, and would offer demonstrated VMT reduction strategies through transportation demand management programs, impact fee programs, mitigation banks or exchange programs, in-lieu fee programs, or other land use project conditions that reduce VMT in a manner consistent with state guidance on VMT reduction. If, through on-site changes, a subject project cannot demonstrate consistency with state guidance on VMT reduction, the project can contribute on a pro-rata basis to a local or regional VMT reduction bank or exchange, as necessary, to reduce net VMT impacts.

**Significance after Mitigation**

Although implementing Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 will achieve meaningful reductions in VMT generated by land uses within the City, the City at this time cannot demonstrate that VMT will be reduced to the degree that it would meet the City’s adopted significance threshold for this EIR. Many Specific Plans in Roseville have development agreements, and the City cannot unilaterally change land use and transportation frameworks of Specific Plans to focus on reducing vehicular travel demand. VMT reduction also depends on factors, such as demographic change, household preferences for housing types and locations, the cost of fuel, and the competitiveness of regional transit relative to driving, which relates to congestion along vehicular commute routes that are not under the City’s jurisdiction, as well as transit provided by agencies other than the City. The feasibility and effectiveness of a local or regional VMT impact bank or exchange is unknown at this time. Therefore, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

**IMPACT**

**4.3-2 Roadway System Level of Service (Informational Analysis).** *Transportation network changes under the proposed General Plan Update and land use change under buildout of the General Plan would not conflict with the City’s policy of at least 70 percent of signalized intersections achieving LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.*

LOS was analyzed for signalized intersections to determine if the proposed General Plan Update would conflict with the City’s policy of at least 70 percent of signalized intersections operating at LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours (tier one analysis). Table 4.3-8 presents these results. As shown, at least 70 percent of intersections would perform at LOS C or better in all scenarios.

---

4 “Travel behavior is influenced by a number of factors including personal income, the costs of owning and operating a vehicle, mobility options, the time cost of travel, urbanization, and highway capacity… Therefore, new mobility pricing policies are necessary to encourage more efficient driving behavior, including legislation to remove barriers for MPOs and locals to implement pricing.” For more information, please see California Air Resources Board (ARB) 2018 (February). SB 375 Target Update Staff Report. Available: [https://www3.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375_target_update_final_staff_report_feb2018.pdf](https://www3.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375_target_update_final_staff_report_feb2018.pdf).

5 The term “IMPACT” is used here for consistency in formatting. Traffic congestion is not an environmental impact under CEQA and this is presented for informational purposes only.
The number of intersections operating at LOS D or worse during the PM peak hour would increase from 23 percent under baseline conditions to 28 percent under the proposed General Plan Constrained scenario (see Appendix D). Most intersections operating worse than LOS C are located in existing developed portions of the Planning Area, not new growth areas. To demonstrate the growth in traffic on these streets, a summary of the ADT on 91 distinct existing arterial segments was made. Under baseline conditions, these 91 segments carried a combined 2.25 million vehicles per day. Under the proposed General Plan Constrained scenario, these 91 segments carried 3.45 million vehicles per day, a 53-percent increase. Although the number of lane-miles in the City under this scenario would increase from 483 to 639, much of those improvements are planned in the new growth areas of the City, thereby not necessarily providing congestion relief in the established parts of the City. Typical capacity enhancements at established intersections are “spot improvements,” such as adding turn lanes. This helps explain why the number of intersections projected to operate at worse than LOS C is greater under the proposed General Plan Update than existing conditions.

Conclusions regarding the proposed General Plan Update’s effects on adjacent jurisdictions are difficult to quantify, because comparisons of traffic volume changes at the City’s borders with other communities are directly affected by the assumed level of development in other communities. Most notably, the proposed General Plan Update analysis assumes more background land development to the north and west of the City due to the need to include reasonably foreseeable land uses, such as the Placer Ranch Specific Plan.

Importantly, the City has a demonstrated record of taking a leadership role to pursue and implement fee programs that help fund regional roadway improvements. Examples include the Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority (which helped fund interchanges along SR 65 at Galleria Boulevard, Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Blue Oaks Boulevard, and Sunset Boulevard), the South Placer Regional Transportation Agency (SPRTA) Tier I and Tier II Fees (which are helping to fund portions of Placer Parkway, SR 65 widening, and I-80/SR 65 interchange improvements), and the Placer County/Roseville joint fee (which is helping to fund the widening of Baseline Road). Additionally, the City is partnering with other jurisdictions in the South Placer region to pursue funding for additional regional roadway improvements via a one-half cent sales tax that would be considered for the November 2020 ballot. Thus, the City has and continues to use regional funding programs (levied upon new development for facilities that would benefit those projects and sales tax initiatives to address existing deficiencies) to help fund needed roadway improvements that would benefit both the City, adjacent jurisdictions, and the State.

The following proposed General Plan Update goals and policies related to the roadway congestion in Roseville are proposed for revision, with additions shown in **bold, underlined text** and deletions shown in **strikethrough text:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>87.3 percent</td>
<td>77.2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed General Plan Constrained</td>
<td>83.9 percent</td>
<td>71.9 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed General Plan Unconstrained</td>
<td>83.9 percent</td>
<td>72.8 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In Pedestrian Overlay Districts, the City prioritizes other modes of transportation, and the LOS C standard does not apply.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020
Policy CIRC1.1: Establish a The functional classification system to shall guide the planning and design of the City’s roadway system.

Policy CIRC1.3: Establish Maintain a comprehensive set of design standards for the City’s roadway system by functional class.

Goal CIRC2: Maintain an adequate appropriate level of transportation service for all of Roseville’s residents and employees through a balanced transportation system which that considers automobiles, transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

Policy CIRC2.1: Maintain a level of service (LOS) "C" standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections and roadway segments in the City during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to the LOS “C” standard may be considered for intersections where the City finds that the required improvements are unacceptable based on established criteria identified in the implementation measures required to achieve the standard would adversely affect pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access, or where feasible LOS improvements and travel-demand-reducing strategies have been exhausted. [In addition, Pedestrian Districts may be exempted from the LOS standard. Moved to CIRC2.5]

Goal CIRC4: Reduce travel demand vehicle miles traveled on the City's and regional roadway systems, while expanding mobility options for residents, employees, and visitors.

Policy CIRC4.1: Continue to enforce the City's TSM ordinance and monitor its effectiveness. The City will review and condition projects, as appropriate, to reduce travel demand per capita and per employee by promoting increased density near transit, improving the quality of non-vehicular transportation options, providing incentives for non-vehicular travel, encouraging the mixing of complementary land uses in proximity to one another, and using other feasible methods.

Policy CIRC4.6: Promote and incentivize Infill development, particularly affordable housing development, through assistance in obtaining outside grant funding and reductions or deferrals in impact fees.

Policy CIRC4.7: Continue to educate the public and business community about alternative modes of travel through Safe Routes to School, Transportation Systems Management, and other local and regional programs and events.

The proposed change to the City’s LOS policy includes language to better describe the reasons an improvement could be deemed unacceptable, but does not change how the policy is implemented. The proposed General Plan Update goal and policy changes and the new policies listed above would help to reduce congestion and accommodate existing and new travel demand.

Conclusion

Existing General Plan Growth Management Goal 7, Functional Classification Goal 1, Level of Service Policies 2, 3, 4, and Bikeways/Trails Goal 2 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal LU8.1, Policies CIRC1.1 and CIRC1.3, Goal CIRC2 and Policy CIRC2.1, and Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1,
CIRC4.6, and CIRC4.7, listed above, are designed to reduce congestion and accommodate existing and new travel demand by appropriately planning for new growth, establishing appropriate design standards for City roadways, providing adequate facilities and services to maintain LOS, and promoting infill development and walking, bicycling, and transit use. Transportation network changes under the proposed General Plan Update and land use change under buildout of the General Plan would not conflict with the City’s policy of at least 70 percent of signalized intersections achieving LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding congestion.

**IMPACT**

4.3-3  **Increase Hazards Due to a Design Feature, Incompatible Uses, or Inadequate Emergency Access.**

The proposed General Plan Update would not increase hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access. All new facilities and facility improvements contained in the Circulation Diagram would be constructed according to the City's Design and Construction Standards, which have been created to ensure a safe and reliable multi-modal network. This impact is **less than significant.**

The land uses and transportation networks have been comprehensively planned through the Specific Plan process to conform to the City’s Design and Construction Standards (City of Roseville 2020). The City’s Design and Construction Standards establish appropriate and safe designs, including minimum signal and driveway spacing, sidewalk and pedestrian crossing designs, bicycle lane designs, and other features which ensure a safe and reliable network. The City also maintains standards requiring minimum roadways widths, turnaround areas, and turning radii to ensure that emergency vehicles maintain access. Finally, the City’s Construction Standards (Section 12) also provide for and regulate the use of temporary traffic controls at construction sites including signage and flaggers, and may also require preparation and implementation of a traffic control plan (at the discretion of the City), for larger projects that require traffic controls over a longer period of time.

The following proposed General Plan Update goals and policies related to design features, compatible roadway uses, and emergency access in Roseville are proposed for revision, with additions shown in **bold, underlined text** and deletions shown in strikethrough text:

- **Policy CIRC1.1:** Establish a **The** functional classification system to **shall** guide the planning and design of the City’s roadway system.

- **Policy CIRC1.3:** Establish **Maintain** a comprehensive set of design standards for the City’s roadway system by functional class.

- **Policy CIRC1.5:** Design intersections and public rights-of-ways in accordance with state and federal accessibility requirements.

**Goal CIRC.3:** Promote **Provide** a safe, convenient, and efficient transit system, utilizing both bus and rail modes, to **to enhance mobility:** reduce congestion; reduce auto emissions, including emissions that contribute to climate change; improve the environment; and provide viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through Roseville.

- **Policy CIRC5.1:** Develop a comprehensive and safe system of recreational and commuter bicycle routes and trails that provides connections between the City's major employment destinations (including employment) and housing areas and between its existing and planned bikeways.
- **Policy CIRC6.1:** Establish and maintain a safe and continuous pedestrian network that provides connections between residential areas and commercial retail and services, employment, public services, parks, and public transit.

- **Policy CIRC6.4:** Sidewalks shall be required in all new Specific Plan Areas with new roadway construction and with roadway expansion.

The proposed General Plan Update goal and policy changes and the new policies listed above would help to promote appropriate design features, promote safety through compatible roadway/bicycle/and pedestrian uses, and would provide for emergency access; these policy changes would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

**Conclusion**

Existing General Plan Functional Classification Goal 1 and Policies 2 and 4, and Bikeways/Trails Goal 2 and Policy 4 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies CIRC1.1, CIRC1.3, CIRC1.5, Goal CIRC3, and Policy CIRC5.1, listed above, in addition to required compliance with the City’s Design and Construction Standards, would ensure that roadway, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities are appropriately designed and constructed, that all roadway/pedestrian/bicycle uses are compatible, and provide for emergency access during construction and operation. The proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. All new facilities and facility improvements shown on the Circulation Diagram would be constructed to applicable design standards that have been created to minimize the potential for conflicts or collisions. This impact is less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**IMPACT 4.3-4** Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities, or Create or Exacerbate Disruptions to the Performance or Safety of these Systems. Land use and transportation network changes could result in conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This impact is less than significant.

The proposed General Plan Update does not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs for transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities nor would it adversely affect performance or safety of such facilities. The General Plan contains provisions that will enhance these modes to encourage greater use of transit and more walking and bicycling in the future. All new facilities and facility improvements contained in the circulation diagram would be constructed to applicable design standards, including the City’s Design and Construction Standards (City of Roseville 2020), which have been created to minimize the potential for conflicts or collisions.

The following proposed General Plan Update goals and policies related to public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities in Roseville are proposed for revision, with additions shown in bold, underlined text and deletions shown in strikethrough text:
Goal CIRC2: Maintain an adequate appropriate level of transportation service for all of Roseville’s residents, and employees, and consumers through a balanced transportation system which that considers automobiles, and transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

- **Policy CIRC2.1:** Maintain a level of service (LOS) "C" standard at a minimum of 70 percent of all signalized intersections and roadway segments in the City during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to the LOS “C” standard may be considered for intersections where the City finds that the required improvements are unacceptable based on established criteria identified in the implementation measures required to achieve the standard would adversely affect pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access, or where feasible LOS improvements and travel-demand-reducing strategies have been exhausted. [In addition, Pedestrian Districts may be exempted from the LOS standard. Moved to CIRC2.5]

- **Policy CIRC2.5:** Enable the City to designate a Pedestrian District over a geographic area for the purpose of implementing measures that promote pedestrian walkability and reduce total vehicle miles traveled and resultant air pollution emissions that contribute to climate change. In these districts, the City recognizes that pedestrian and bicycle travel takes and transit access have a higher priority than automobile travel, which could reduce the vehicular level of service. in the City’s Pedestrian Districts, and development projects in these areas are exempt from the City’s LOS standard.

- **Policy CIRC2.6:** Prioritize investments in pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access in Pedestrian Districts.

Goal CIRC.3: Promote Provide a safe, convenient, and efficient transit system, utilizing both bus and rail modes, to enhance mobility; reduce congestion; reduce auto emissions, including emissions that contribute to climate change; improve the environment; and provide viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through Roseville.

- **Policy CIRC3.1:** Pursue and support transit services within the community and region and pursue land use, design, and other mechanisms that promote the use of such services. Promote transit service that is convenient, cost- effective, and responsive to the challenges and opportunities of serving Roseville and surrounding communities, and explore opportunities for transit innovation and service improvements.

- **Policy CIRC3.3:** Continue to study options for introducing Bus Rapid Transit high quality transit and/or extending other regional transit linkages to Roseville and developing convenient connections to Sacramento Regional Transit light rail service to Roseville.

- **Policy CIRC3.5:** Consider the transit access to health care, community services and employment, and the needs of seniors, minorities, low-income persons, persons with disabilities, and other persons who may be transit-dependent when making decisions regarding transit service.

- **Policy CIRC3.6:** Identify opportunities to increase the number and/or capacity of park-and-ride lots as needed, to increase transit and carpool/vanpool use.

Bikeways/Trails Goal 3: Establish education, encouragement and enforcement programs that increase bicyclist and motorist awareness of the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists in order to foster a climate of acceptance for bike riding.
Goal CIRC5.4: Obtain Maintain the Bicycle Friendly Community Designation from the League of American Bicyclists.

► Policy CIRC5.1: Develop a comprehensive and safe system of recreational and commuter bicycle routes and trails that provides connections between the City's major employment destinations (including employment) and housing areas and between its existing and planned bikeways.

► Policy CIRC5.5: Specific Plans shall incorporate an off-street, Class I bicycle system as part of the comprehensive on-street and off-street bikeway plan.

► Policy CIRC5.6: Establish Educate, encourage, and enforcement programs that increase bicyclist and motorist awareness of the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists in order to foster a climate of acceptance for bike riding. [Moved from the referenced existing policy]

► Level of Service Policy 5: Enable the City to designate a Pedestrian District over a geographic area for the purpose of implementing measures that promote pedestrian walkability and reduce total vehicle miles traveled and resultant air pollution emissions that contribute to climate change. In these districts, the City recognizes that pedestrian travel takes a higher priority than automobile travel, which could reduce the vehicular level of service.

Goal CIRC6.1: Increase the percentage of pedestrian trips in Roseville.

► Policy CIRC6.1: Establish and maintain a safe and continuous pedestrian network that provides connections between residential areas and commercial retail and services, employment, public services, parks, and public transit.

► Policy CIRC6.2: Promote development patterns that encourage people to walk to destinations.

► Policy CIRC6.3: Enhance pedestrian-friendly street environments and design public spaces and destinations in a way that encourages walking.

► Policy CIRC6.4: Sidewalks shall be required in all new Specific Plan Areas with new roadway construction and with roadway expansion.

Existing General Plan Level of Service Policy 5 is proposed for deletion because a new “Pedestrian Access” subsection of the Circulation Element (which incorporates the former LOS Policy 5) is proposed for creation. Existing General Plan Bicycle/Trails Goals 3 is proposed for deletion because it would be converted to a policy (see proposed Policy CIRC5.6). The proposed General Plan Update goal and policy changes and new policies listed above would improve the City’s public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, promote user awareness, and provide for public safety. These policy changes would not result in any adverse environmental impacts

Conclusion

Existing General Plan Level of Service Policy 2, Transit Policies 2 and 4, and Bikeways/Trails Goal 2 and Policies 2, 3, and 4 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal CIRC2 and Policies CIRC2.1, CIRC2.5, and CIRC2.6; Goal CIRC3 and Policies CIRC3.1, CIRC3.3, CIRC3.5, and CIRC3.6; Goal
CIRC5.4, and Policies CIRC5.1, CIRC5.5, and CIRC5.6; and Goal CIRC6.1 and Policies CIRC6.1, CIRC6.2, CIRC6.3, and CIRC6.4, listed above, would encourage greater use of transit and more walking and bicycling in the future. All new facilities and facility improvements shown on the Circulation Diagram are required to be designed and constructed in compliance with the City’s Design and Construction Standards (City of Roseville 2020), which have been created to minimize the potential for conflicts or collisions. Implementation of the proposed project would not disrupt any existing, or interfere with any planned, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities or services. This impact is less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.