6 ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates consideration and analysis of alternatives to the proposed project. According to the CEQA Guidelines, the range of alternatives “shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant impacts” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[c]; see also CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[a]).

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to describe:

“…a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.”

In defining “feasibility,” CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) states, in part:

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives.

The CEQA Guidelines further require that the alternatives be compared to the proposed project’s environmental impacts and that the “no project” alternative be considered (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e]). The CEQA Guidelines provide guidance on defining and analyzing alternatives. Section 15126.6[b] states:

“… the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.”

The environmental impacts of alternatives are required to be compared to the proposed project’s environmental impacts. This process helps decision makers to consider whether a different project design, location, or other variation on the proposed project would have environmentally superior results.
6.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

In determining what alternatives should be considered in the EIR, it is important to analyze the ability of an alternative to achieve most of the basic objectives of the project. These factors are crucial to the development of alternatives that meet the criteria specified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a).

The “project” analyzed in this EIR is the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed General Plan Update does not include any changes to land use designations, expansion of the City’s Planning Area, or other physical changes to areas planned for development compared to the existing General Plan. Rather, this Update consists of revisions to goals policies and implementation measures to comply with recently adopted State law, improve and clarify policy language, replace outdated information, and improve the organization and user friendliness of the document.

In identifying potentially feasible alternatives to the project, the ability of alternatives to meet most of the project’s objectives was considered. As described in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” the project objectives for the proposed General Plan Update are as follows:

- Revise goals and policies, as appropriate, to address recent changes in State law;
- Prepare a detailed estimate of existing and future greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with implementing the General Plan and feasible mitigating policies that would reduce emissions;
- Take advantage of GHG reduction strategies that offer co-benefits, such as more practical bicycle, pedestrian, and transit mobility options; reductions in household and business transportation and utility costs; and improvements to air quality and public health;
- Identify ongoing programs that reduce GHG emissions and incorporate such efforts as policy or implementation measures;
- Prepare estimates of existing and future vehicular travel demand and identify feasible mitigating policies and implementation measures that would reduce vehicular travel demand;
- Revise policies and implementation measures, as appropriate, to ensure an appropriate balance between managing traffic congestion and facilitating infill development, promoting public health through active transportation, and reducing GHG emissions;
- Incorporate changes to the Noise Element that are more appropriate for current and future conditions in Roseville; and
- Integrate the environmental analysis and policy planning process to promote the City’s planning, environmental, economic, and fiscal goals.

As described below, in identifying potentially feasible alternatives to the project, the ability of alternatives to meet most of the project’s objectives was considered.
6.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS IN THIS EIR

6.3.1 GENERAL PLAN SCENARIO: NO GREENFIELD DEVELOPMENT

This alternative would change urban land use designations in new development areas to Urban Reserve and increase allowable density and non-residential development intensity throughout the Infill Area and the Riverside Gateway and Downtown Specific Plan Areas, and other Specific Plan Areas that are already developed.

If only infill areas were provided for development, this would provide an opportunity for approximately 3,200 to 3,800 additional housing units, 3 to 3.6 million square feet of additional non-residential development, and 8,000 to 10,000 new jobs. While this alternative may reduce the level of impacts identified in this EIR, it would not accommodate the population, housing, or employment growth necessary to support the City’s economic development objectives or provide a fair share of the regional housing need. Furthermore, all of the City’s greenfield development areas are within Development Agreements which do not expire until after the General Plan’s 2035 horizon year. Consequently, the City does not have the authority to redesignate any of this land as Urban Reserve; the Development Agreements vest the existing land use designations and development rights within the City’s greenfield areas. Therefore, the No Greenfield Development Alternative was rejected for further analysis because it is infeasible.

6.4 ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE EIR

6.4.1 INFILL HOUSING ALTERNATIVE

The intent of this alternative is to decrease the rate of GHG emissions and VMT and associated adverse physical environmental effects. This alternative would amend the General Plan Land Use Map in the City’s Infill area to allow up to 30 units per acre (a designation of High Density Residential 30) for underutilized multi-family areas which have existing multi-family zoning or land use designations. Underutilized multi-family areas are defined as those that currently have a land use designation of High Density Residential 20 or less (i.e., would allow 20 units per acre or less of residential use). Increasing the allowed densities in these existing multi-family areas would allow redevelopment or intensification, which would result in additional infill and multi-family residential development. This alternative would also involve an additional focus on non-vehicular transportation facility investments in infill locations around the additional multi-family residential development. This may include additional bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities, additional transit routes, types of transit (microtransit and/or on-demand transit options, for example), shorter transit headways, and other improvements that make daily non-vehicular travel more convenient and competitive with driving. This alternative would add approximately 1,400 multi-family dwelling units in the City’s Infill Area, in addition to the development of 20,000 to 25,000 new housing units assumed under the proposed General Plan Update (Exhibit 6-1); this would result in approximately 21,400 to 26,400 total new housing units under this alternative, or approximately 5 to 7 percent more housing units under this alternative than under the proposed General Plan Update. This alternative would maintain development assumptions in other locations within the Planning Area. The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures, as presented in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” would also occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. There would be no additional revisions or new goals, policies, or implementation measures under this alternative that are not identified as part of the proposed General Plan Update. The only exception to this would be that, under the Infill Housing Alternative, the
General Plan would be revised to allow for the introduction of additional infill, multi-family housing development. This alternative meets the basic project objectives.

### 6.4.2 **Reduced Growth Alternative**

The intent of this alternative is to decrease the rate of GHG emissions and VMT and associated adverse physical environmental effects, and biological resources and cultural resources impacts associated with conversion of open space to developed use.

This alternative would reduce 2035 buildout to the amounts identified by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for Roseville in the *2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (2020 MTP/SCS). Under this alternative the City would add 17,460 housing units and 20,680 jobs by 2035.

Instead of assuming that the General Plan would be built out by the General Plan horizon year of 2035, the Planning Area would experience development in areas with existing infrastructure (roadways, sewer, water, drainage, etc.), and areas without existing infrastructure would develop after 2035. Under this alternative, the land use change that would occur by 2035 would focus on existing developed areas, including the “Center and Corridor” and “Established” Community types identified in the MTP/SCS – for employment, 92 percent of the new jobs would be in Center and Corridor and Established Communities and 60 percent of the new dwelling units added by 2035 would be in Center and Corridor and Established Communities (see Exhibit 6-2).

Instead of the additional 20,000 to 25,000 housing units and 38,000 to 68,000 new jobs under the proposed General Plan Update assumed to occur by 2035, this alternative would result in an approximate 21 percent reduction in housing units and a 46 to 70 percent reduction in new jobs by 2035 (i.e., there would be 4,500 fewer housing units and 17,320–47,320 fewer jobs).

The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies and implementation measures, as presented in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” would also occur under this alternative. There would be no additional revisions or new goals, policies, or implementation measures under this alternative that are not identified as part of the proposed General Plan Update. This alternative meets the basic project objectives.

### 6.4.3 **No Project Alternative**

The purpose of this alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[e]) requires consideration of a No Project Alternative that represents the existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. When a project involves the revision of an existing plan, the No Project Alternative should reflect continuation of the existing plan.
The City has a General Plan, which was last amended in 2016, and which has been used to guide development and conservation efforts since that time. Most of the new development in the City would be guided by Specific Plans, most of which are the subject of adopted development agreements. The No Project Alternative would consist of the continuation of the existing General Plan with no revisions. The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update. However, under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures, all of which have been developed under the proposed General Plan Update to help reduce VMT, provide more detailed and updated implementation measures that can reduce potential impacts, comply with State law changes, provide additional clarity in General Plan language, and make other changes detailed in Chapter 2 of this EIR. There would be no revisions to policies that would help to facilitate infill development, such as Policies LU2.3, LU2.5, LU3.1, LU3.3, LU3.4, AQ1.13, PR 1.5, PR1.6, and PF.23.

6.5 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

This section provides an analysis of the potential impacts from implementation of the Infill Housing Alternative, Reduced Growth Alternative, and No Project Alternative, and compares the potential impacts of each alternative to impacts of implementing the proposed General Plan Update. Table 6-1 below provides a summary comparison of the environmental impacts of the proposed General Plan Update and each alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-1 Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Divide an Established Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy or Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with Existing Agricultural Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induce Substantial Unplanned Population Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displace a Substantial Number of Existing People or Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Design Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit, Bicycles, and Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction-related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants / Conflicts with Air Quality Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants / Conflicts with Air Quality Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Hotspots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odorous Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise and Vibration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Seismic Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable and Expansive Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Paleontological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special-Status Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special-Status Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Habitat/Sensitive Natural Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Other Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Movement Corridor/Nursery Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Biological Preservation Ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-1  Comparison of Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Proposed General Plan Update</th>
<th>Infill Housing Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Growth Alternative</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use, Transport, Disposal, and Accidental Spills</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Slightly Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials Within One-Quarter Mile of a School</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Slightly Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials Sites</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Wildland Fires</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services and Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements or Conflict with a Water Quality Control Plan</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Recharge / Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of Drainages – Erosion</td>
<td>See “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources – Soil Erosion”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of Drainages – Runoff, Pollutants, and Flooding</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of Pollutants in Flood Hazard Zones</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Vistas</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Character and Quality</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Reduced: Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light and Glare</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Slightly Greater</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with Energy Plans</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2020
6.5.1 LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE

6.5.1.1 PHYSICALLY DIVIDE AN ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in the construction of an additional 1,400 housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The additional infill housing would be located along major urban corridors and would not physically divide an established community. Implementing existing General Plan Community Form – General Policy 6 and Growth Management – General Policy 3, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies LU2.5, LU2.6, and LU 4.1 would require new development areas and associated community-wide facilities to be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community through road networks, public transit systems, open space systems, bikeway and pedestrian systems, and other physical connections and encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same goals and policies as identified in the General Plan Update. Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, the Infill Housing Alternative does not include new investment in infrastructure or development that would physically divide existing communities. The impact related to physically dividing an established community for the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. Implementing existing and revised proposed General Plan Update policies would require new development areas and associated community-wide facilities to be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community through road networks, public transit systems, open space systems, bikeway and pedestrian systems, and other physical connections and encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City. The Reduced Growth Alternative would implement the same goals and policies as identified in the General Plan Update. Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, the Reduced Growth Alternative does not include new investment in infrastructure or development that would physically divide existing communities. The impact related to physically dividing an established community for the Reduced Growth Alternative would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same level of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Similar to the General Plan Update, the No Project Alternative would not change land use designations. The City’s land use designations and roadway locations were planned comprehensively and determined through the Specific Plan process to provide connected communities. The No Project Alternative would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, the impact related to physically dividing an established community for the No Project Alternative would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.1, would remain less than significant.
6.5.1.2 CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE LAND USE PLAN, POLICY, OR REGULATION

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in the construction of an additional 1,400 housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The intent of this alternative is to decrease the rate of GHG emissions and VMT and associated adverse physical environmental effects. The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures would also occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. This alternative would amend the General Plan Land Use Map in the City’s Infill area to allow up to 30 units per acre (a designation of High Density Residential 30) for underutilized multi-family areas which have existing multi-family zoning or land use designations but would maintain development assumptions in other locations within the Planning Area, including development assumptions identified in the City’s 14 Specific Plan Areas. There would be no additional revisions or new goals, policies, or implementation measures under this alternative that are not identified as part of the proposed General Plan Update. The only exception to this would be that, under the Infill Housing Alternative, the General Plan allowable densities would be increased to allow for the introduction of proposed infill housing development and the City’s Zoning Ordinance would be amended to ensure consistency between the General Plan Update and Zoning Ordinance. As with the proposed General Plan Update, the Infill Housing Alternative would be consistent with other relevant plans, programs, and regulations that were developed to reduce or avoid environmental impacts as discussed in Section 4.1. The impact related to conflicts with policies, plans, and regulations for the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and for the reasons described in Section 4.1, would be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. The intent of this alternative is to decrease the rate of GHG emissions and VMT and associated adverse physical environmental effects, and biological resources and cultural resources impacts associated with conversion of open space to developed use. Focusing development in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities would support the 2020 MTP/SCS land use strategy to improve mobility and reduce travel demand from passenger vehicles by prioritizing compact and transit-oriented development. The Reduced Growth Alternative development assumptions would be more consistent with SACOG’s 2020 MTP/SCS land use scenario, in terms of the total development forecast to occur in the Planning Area by 2035.

The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures would also occur under the Reduced Growth Alternative. There would be no additional revisions or new goals, policies, or implementation measures under this alternative that are not identified as part of the proposed General Plan Update. As with the proposed General Plan Update, the Reduced Growth Alternative would be consistent with other relevant plans, programs, and regulations that were developed to reduce or avoid environmental impacts as discussed in Chapter 4.0 of this Draft EIR and throughout this chapter (for the Reduced Growth Alternative). The impact related to conflicts with policies, plans, and regulations for the Reduced Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.1, would be less than significant.
No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. Similar to the General Plan Update, the No Project Alternative would not change land use designations. The adverse physical environmental effects of the No Project Alternative are similar to those described for the General Plan Update described throughout Chapter 4.0 of this EIR. New development under the No Project Alternative would be consistent with all plans, policies, and regulations identified in Section 4.1, including the SACOG MTP/SCS, SACOG Region Blueprint, and City/County Memorandum of Understanding. Because the No Project Alternative would not have policy updates to comply with recent changes to State law, the No Project Alternative could be viewed as having a greater impact – particularly with respect to the policy changes that encourage infill development and reduce VMT and environmental effects associated with VMT, such as air pollutant emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation noise. The impact related to conflicts with policies, plans, and regulations for the No Project Alternative would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.1, less than significant.

6.5.1.3 CONFLICT WITH EXISTING AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS

Infill Housing Alternative

As described in Section 4.1 of this EIR, “Land Use Planning and Agricultural Resources,” buildout of the General Plan would locate urban land uses adjacent to existing off-site grazing lands along the northwestern, western, and southern boundaries of the Planning Area, which could potentially result in conflicts with adjacent grazing operations. Conflicts between proposed urban development with adjacent grazing activities were addressed in the West Roseville Specific Plan EIR, Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR and the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR and the environmental impacts of locating urban development adjacent to grazing lands were analyzed in those CEQA documents (City of Roseville 2004, 2010, 2016). Consistent with the City’s General Plan policy to provide separation between City and County uses, proposed development would be separated by open space or road rights-of-way. While the Infill Housing Alternative would result in the development of 1,400 additional multi-family residential units when compared to the proposed General Plan Update, these would be located in areas identified in the General Plan for infill housing, which are not near agricultural operations. Therefore, the additional housing included in this Alternative does not increase impacts on agricultural operations when compared with the proposed General Plan Update. The impact related to conflicts with agricultural operations for the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.1, would be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

As described in the Infill Housing Alternative discussion above, buildout of the General Plan would locate urban land uses adjacent to existing off-site grazing lands along the northwestern, western, and southern boundaries of the Planning Area, which could potentially result in conflicts with adjacent grazing operations. However, proposed development would be separated by open space or road rights-of-way. Under the Reduced Growth
Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. The Reduced Growth Alternative would reduce the amount of development on the western and northwestern side of the Planning Area, and focus development in areas where there is less interface with existing agricultural operations. Therefore, the impact related to conflicts with agricultural operations for the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update. The impact of this alternative would be the same as the proposed General Plan Update impact, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.1, would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no updates to comply with State law changes, but none of these changes relate to agricultural buffers at the boundaries of the Planning Area. The impact related to conflicts agricultural operations for the No Project Alternative would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.1, impacts would be less than significant.

6.5.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING

6.5.2.1 INDUCE SUBSTANTIAL UNPLANNED POPULATION GROWTH

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in development of 1,400 additional multi-family residential units in the City’s Infill Area, in addition to the development of 20,000 to 25,000 new housing units assumed under the proposed General Plan Update. Similar to the General Plan Update, the Infill Housing Alternative would provide 120,000 to 150,000 local jobs. Buildout of this Alternative could generate a total population of 200,815 residents in the City compared to the estimate for the General Plan Update of 198,000 residents (2,815 more residents than the General Plan Update) (see Table 4.2-2 in Section 4.2, “Population and Housing”). However, the predicted jobs-housing balance would remain the same for this alternative as for the proposed General Plan Update: 1.6 to 2.0.

Similar to the General Plan Update, employees from outside of the Planning Area may come from existing communities which have more housing than available jobs (“housing rich”), but a jobs rich community can also be driver of growth in surrounding areas. However, in the cumulative context most of the land adjacent to the City’s existing boundaries are already planned to be converted to urban uses as a result of approved development in the County. The Placer Ranch Specific Plan lies along the City’s northern boundary, and abuts the City’s Amorosu Ranch Specific Plan; Placer Vineyards is located along the City’s southern boundary; and the Curry Creek and Regional University Specific Plans are located along the City’s western boundary. The nearby areas where the City’s higher jobs-housing balance has the greatest potential to induce growth are already planned for growth. While employees may come from outside of the Planning Area, they are most likely to be from existing communities or adopted planned development areas which will be built in the future; therefore, the Infill Housing
Alternative will not indirectly induce substantial unplanned growth. Therefore, impacts from substantial unplanned population growth under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the reasons described in Section 4.2, the impact would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, approximately 4,500 fewer housing units would be constructed and 17,320–47,320 fewer jobs would be created, as compared General Plan Update. Buildout of this Alternative could generate a total population of 141,863 residents in the City compared to the estimate for the General Plan Update of 198,000 residents (56,137 fewer residents than the General Plan Update) (see Table 4.2-2 in Section 4.2). Approximately 92 percent of the new jobs would be in Center and Corridor and Established Communities and 60 percent of the new dwelling units added by 2035 would be in Center and Corridor and Established Communities. These reductions would result in a jobs-housing balance of 1.5 to 1.9 for the Reduced Growth Alternative. However, this remains similar to the predicted jobs-housing balance of the proposed General Plan Update of 1.6 to 2.0.

Similar to the General Plan Update, employees from outside of the Planning Area may come from existing communities which have more housing than available jobs ("housing rich"), but a jobs rich community can also be driver of growth in surrounding areas. However, in the cumulative context most of the land adjacent to the City’s existing boundaries are already planned to be converted to urban uses as a result of approved development in the County. The Placer Ranch Specific Plan lies along the City’s northern boundary, and abuts the City’s Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan; Placer Vineyards is located along the City’s southern boundary; and the Curry Creek and Regional University Specific Plans are located along the City’s western boundary. The nearby areas where the City’s higher jobs-housing balance has the greatest potential to induce growth are already planned for growth. While employees may come from outside of the Planning Area, they are most likely to be from existing communities or adopted planned development areas which will be built in the future; therefore, the Reduced Growth Alternative will not indirectly induce substantial unplanned growth. Impacts from substantial unplanned population growth under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be less than the proposed General Plan Update because there would be less population and employment growth, but would remain similar. For the reasons described in Section 4.2, the impact would still be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, a similar amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for substantial unplanned population growth would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. The No Project Alternative would result in the same population and employment projections as the proposed General Plan Update. The impacts from substantial unplanned population growth under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the reasons described in Section 4.2, the impact would still be less than significant.
6.5.2.2 Displacement of a Substantial Number of Existing People or Housing

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would add approximately 1,400 multi-family dwelling units in the City’s Infill Area, in addition to the development of 20,000 to 25,000 new housing units assumed under the proposed General Plan; this would result in approximately 21,400 to 26,400 total new housing units under this alternative, or approximately 5 to 7 percent more housing units under this alternative than under the proposed General Plan Update. Redevelopment under the Infill Housing Alternative could result in the removal of individual residences; however, the Infill Housing Alternative would not convert established residential areas to a nonresidential land use. Even if unanticipated displacement of people or housing were to occur, buildout of the Infill Housing Alternative would allow substantial opportunity for housing development that could provide housing for any displaced residents.

Implementation of existing General Plan Community Form Goal 4 and General Policy 4, Community Form – Downtown Neighborhoods Policies 4 and 7 as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goals LU3.2, LU5.1, and Policies LU3.3 and LU3.4, and compliance with the 2013–2021 General Plan Housing Element polices would ensure that new development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would not displace substantial numbers of people. These polices encourage preservation of the existing housing stock and neighborhoods, along with revitalization of downtown, neighborhoods in the Infill Area, and mixed-use corridors. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same goals and policies as identified in the General Plan Update. Therefore, impacts from displacement of substantial numbers of housing or people under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.2, would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, approximately 4,500 fewer housing units would be constructed, as compared General Plan Update. Approximately 60 percent of the new dwelling units added by 2035 would be in Center and Corridor and Established Communities. Similar to the General Plan Update, the Reduced Growth Alternative does not convert established residential areas to a nonresidential land use, or redeveloping existing residential areas with new residences by removing existing dwelling units. If unanticipated displacement of people or housing were to occur, construction of 17,460 residential dwelling units under the Reduced Growth Alternative would provide housing for any displaced residents. Implementation of existing and revised proposed General Plan Update goals and policies and compliance with the 2013–2021 General Plan Housing Element polices would ensure that new development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would not displace substantial numbers of people. These polices encourage preservation of the existing housing stock and neighborhoods, along with revitalization of downtown, neighborhoods in the Infill Area, and mixed-use corridors. Therefore, impacts from displacement of substantial numbers of housing or people under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be similar to compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.2, would still be less than significant.
No Project Alternative

The buildout assumptions for the No Project Alternative are the same as the assumptions for the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, the No Project and the proposed General Plan Update project have the same potential for displacement of substantial numbers of housing or people. The impact analysis described in Draft EIR Section 4.2 for the proposed General Plan Update applies to the No Project Alternative. Neither the proposed General Plan Update nor the No Project Alternative would involve converting established residential areas to a nonresidential land use or redeveloping existing residential areas with new residences by removing existing dwelling units and would not displace substantial numbers of housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. If unanticipated displacement of people or housing were to occur, construction of 20,000 to 25,000 residential dwelling units under the No Project Alternative would provide housing for any displaced residents. Implementation of existing General Plan Community Form Goal 4 and General Policy 4, Community Form – Downtown Neighborhoods Policies 4 and 7 and compliance with the 2013-2021 General Plan Housing Element and existing General Plan policies would ensure that new development would not displace substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts from substantial unplanned population growth under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the reasons described in Section 4.2, would still be less than significant.

6.5.3 TRANSPORTATION

6.5.3.1 VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT Per Capita Exceeds the Threshold of 15 Percent Below the City Baseline)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased development of 1,400 additional residential units in the City’s Infill Area, in addition to the development of 20,000 to 25,000 new housing units assumed under the proposed General Plan Update; this would result in approximately 21,400 to 26,400 total new housing units under this alternative, or approximately 5 to 7 percent more housing units under this alternative than under the proposed General Plan Update. As described in Section 4.3 of this EIR, “Transportation,” modeling was conducted to determine the total VMT for the project. This modeling was also completed for the Infill Housing Alternative, and the analysis determined that total VMT, VMT per service population, and VMT per capita would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update (see Table 6.5-1 and 6.5-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposed General Plan (Constrained)</th>
<th>Proposed General Plan (Unconstrained)</th>
<th>General Plan Infill Housing Alternative (Constrained)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total VMT</td>
<td>10,289,700</td>
<td>10,125,800</td>
<td>10,306,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population</td>
<td>312,018</td>
<td>312,018</td>
<td>315,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total VMT/ Service Population</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes full length of all trips with either an origin or destination with the City of Roseville limits.
VMT = vehicle miles traveled
A comparison of VMT in Specific Plan Areas, as shown in Table 6.5-3, shows that home-based production VMT per resident in the Infill area is less than the citywide value, while Specific Plan areas further from the existing development typically have home-based production VMT per resident that is greater than the citywide value. The Infill Alternative targets an additional 1,400 units within the City’s Infill area, which is in an area generated lower VMT than the Citywide average (13.9 VMT per capita, versus 15.4 VMT per capita). However, targeting additional development in an area of lower VMT production does not change the citywide average VMT per capita for multiple reasons.

The modeling used to forecast travel demand for the General Plan Update and this alternative may not fully account for VMT reductions associated with increased infill and density, particularly increases in density under the General Plan Update and this alternative in areas served by transit – both existing transit service and planned transit service. The analysis of VMT can be considered “conservative” in that it may overestimate travel demand relative to what actually may occur. In addition, the 1,400 units of this Alternative is—at most—seven percent of the overall growth, and therefore the lower VMT associated with this small number of units may not have a large enough influence to lower the citywide average.

Table 6.5-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposed General Plan (Constrained)</th>
<th>Proposed General Plan (Unconstrained)</th>
<th>General Plan Infill Housing Alternative (Constrained)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-Based Production VMT Residents</td>
<td>2,911,300</td>
<td>2,810,400</td>
<td>2,959,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-Based Production VMT/ Resident</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers 2020

Table 6.5-3

<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
As demonstrated by Table 6.5-3, VMT performance can vary greatly even within an individual city. The degree to which the Infill Housing Alternative produces VMT reductions depends on a number of factors, including the demographics and job locations of the households that occupy the additional multi-family dwellings, the extent to which funding is available to improve non-vehicular transportation options for these future households, the future cost of vehicular travel compared to other transportation options, the development of complementary land uses in close proximity to future multi-family development, whether the additional multi-family development can supplant housing demand that would otherwise be met in relatively higher VMT areas, such as the Amoroso Ranch, Creekview, Sierra Vista, and West Roseville Specific Plan Areas, and other factors. Demand for housing, in turn, will depend on demographic changes and emerging household preferences, and the way they express themselves in housing demand for different housing types and locations. However, there is evidence of preferences for housing locations close to work that enable short commutes; preferences for walkability and access to shopping, services, and transit; demand for a mix of housing types and attached products in suburbs; increasing numbers of small households, creating a market for smaller homes; and the need for greater market diversity.¹

VMT performance of the General Plan, whether under this alternative or the proposed General Plan Update, also depends on the extent to which development is allocated to the Placer High Frequency Transit Areas. These are areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, streetcar, or train station) or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor included in the SACOG MTP/SCS and would contribute to increased transit ridership, thereby reducing VMT. The Placer High Frequency Transit Areas include portions of the Downtown and Riverside Gateway Specific Plan Areas, as well as extensive portions of the Sierra Vista, Del Webb, West Roseville, North Roseville, Northeast Roseville, Stoneridge, and Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Areas, and portions of the Infill Area, although the locations where this concept could be implemented could shift.²

To the extent that the City can influence whether the Infill Housing Alternative (or the proposed General Plan Update) will reduce VMT, will depend on planning that reduces 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 other feasible methods.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1 through CIRC4.7, which would help to reduce VMT. Policy CIRC4.1 would specifically address several of the factors noted above which influence the degree to which the Infill Housing Alternative would produce VMT reductions. In addition, new Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 of the proposed General Plan Update would also be implemented under the Infill Housing Alternative, requiring a new implementation measure to achieve VMT reduction. The additional housing units that would be developed under this alternative would be built within the low-VMT areas of the city, and would presumably result in lower VMT per resident than the citywide average. However, as shown in Tables 6.5-1 and 6.5-2, total and per capita VMT under the Infill Development Alternative would be similar to that under the proposed General Plan Update and would exceed the significance threshold of 12.8 VMT per capita. While the proposed General Plan Update

² Please see SACOG’s MTP/SCS for more detail, particularly Appendix D, pages 26 and 27: https://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/appendix_d_-_land_use_documentation_0.pdf?1573685694.
policies will help reduce VMT and could generate even greater reductions under this alternative, the City cannot demonstrate definitively at this time that implementation of these policies would achieve VMT reductions to meet the threshold. Therefore, this impact would be similar to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and would be still be significant and unavoidable.

Reduced Growth Alternative

The Reduced Growth Alternative contemplates reduced levels of development that would result in approximately 4,500 fewer housing units and 17,320–47,320 fewer jobs, when compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Land use changes under this alternative would reduce 2035 buildout to the amounts identified by the SACOG for Roseville in the 2020 MTP/SCS, The focus for development between present and 2035 under this alternative would be areas that have access to existing infrastructure and the “Center and Corridor” and “Established” Community types identified in the MTP/SCS – for employment, 92 percent of the new jobs would be in Center and Corridor and Established Communities and 60 percent of the new dwelling units added by 2035 would be in Center and Corridor and Established Communities. As shown in Table 6.5-3, these areas tend to have lower rates of VMT than the citywide average and the more outlying and undeveloped areas of the city. For example, the lowest per-capita, home-based VMT production areas are the Downtown, Riverside Gateway, North Central Roseville, and Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Areas, and areas with relatively high VMT include outer areas not anticipated to develop as extensively under this alternative, including the Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, Sierra Vista, and West Roseville Specific Plan Areas.3

By reducing housing development by approximately 21 percent and new jobs by 46 to 70 percent compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and focusing development within low-VMT areas, there would be reduced overall travel demand. In addition, the Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1 through CIRC4.7, which would help to reduce VMT. Policy CIRC4.1 would specifically address several of the factors noted above which influence the degree to which the Reduce Growth Alternative would produce VMT reductions. In addition, new Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 of the proposed General Plan Update would also be implemented under the Reduced Growth Alternative, requiring a new implementation measure to achieve VMT reduction. However, 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. Therefore, VMT impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be significant and unavoidable.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, and policies, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. While the existing General Plan includes Travel Demand Management Goals 1 and 2 to reduce travel demand on the City’s roadway systems and reduce total vehicle emissions in the City of Roseville and the South Placer County region, these goals and related policies would be revised under the proposed General Plan Update to more specifically identify measures that would result in reduced VMT and to require that Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects not

---

3 Not including the Dell Webb Specific Plan Area, where it is demographics, rather than location or design that holds down vehicular travel demand.
included in an adopted Specific Plan shall demonstrate consistency with the VMT rate included in the SACOG SCS for the SCS planning horizon year (for example, proposed General Plan Update Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1, CIRC4.2, CIRC4.3, CIRC4.4, CIRC4.5, CIRC4.6, and CIRC4.7). Without these goal and policy revisions, the No Project Alternative may not achieve the same level of increased VMT efficiency that would be achieved by future development under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, VMT impacts would be greater under this alternative compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and still significant and unavoidable.

6.5.3.2 LEVEL OF SERVICE (Informational Only)

Level of Service (LOS), which describes roadway-operating conditions and can be used to represent whether traffic volumes in a roadway segment or intersection are less than, equal to or greater than roadway capacity. LOS was analyzed for signalized intersections within the Planning Area for roadway conditions with implementation of the proposed General Plan Update. As described in Section 4.3 of this EIR, “Transportation,” under Impact 4.3-2, more than 70 percent of intersections would perform at LOS C or better with implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, which is consistent with the City’s policy of at least 70 percent of signalized intersections operating at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours.

Infill Housing Alternative

While the Infill Housing Alternative would result in the development of additional multi-family residential units when compared to the proposed General Plan Update, these would be in areas identified in the General Plan for infill housing, as shown in Exhibit 6-1. As explained in Section 6.5.2.1 above regarding VMT, although the additional housing would lead to slightly increased total VMT, the proposed infill housing areas are typically low-VMT areas (see Table 6.5-3 above) and VMT per resident under this alternative would be the same as under the proposed General Plan Update constrained transportation scenario (see Table 6.5-2 above).

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, 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 alternative modes of travel. Therefore, the additional housing included in this alternative does not result in an increased degradation of LOS when compared with the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore the growth proposed in the Infill Housing Alternative would result in similar LOS operations to the proposed General Plan Update.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and the development that would occur would be in the areas of existing development that have access to existing infrastructure and the “Center and Corridor” and “Established” Community Types identified in the MTP/SCS. As explained in the SACOG MTP/SCS 2020 EIR, housing developed within the Center and Corridor Community type takes advantage of existing transportation infrastructure and provides more opportunities for shorter trips by non-automobile modes of travel. In addition, improvement projects in these areas
would be encouraged to concentrate on alleviating major bottlenecks and congestion points (SACOG 2019). The Center and Corridor Community Type, as shown in Exhibit 6-1, would also overlap with the Pedestrian Districts developed under the proposed General Plan Update (see III Circulation Element, Figure III-3, of the proposed General Plan Update). In Pedestrian Districts, special design consideration will be given to sidewalk widths, planter strips, street furniture, automobile travel lane widths, curb radii, and other enhancements that improve the pedestrian experience. It is understood that the establishment of a Pedestrian District and the implementation of these design features may reduce vehicle LOS, though the City’s LOS policy does not apply to projects proposed within these areas.

However, it should also be noted, that most intersections operating worse than LOS C under the proposed General Plan Update are located in established areas of the City, versus new growth areas. Therefore, although the focus of development within the Center and Corridor areas and Pedestrian Districts would likely reduce VMT, this trend in LOS in the established areas of the City indicates that focusing development in these areas under the Reduced Growth Alternative as opposed to the new growth areas of the City could lead to a decrease (worsening) of LOS or no tangible change compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and polices as the proposed General Plan Update, including 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 alternative modes of travel. Therefore, the reduced growth between present and 2035 as proposed under this alternative would result in similar LOS operations to the proposed General Plan Update.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, and policies, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. The existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update both contain the policy to provide a LOS of C or better at a minimum of 70 percent of the signalized intersections during the AM and PM peak hours and use of the City’s Intelligent Transportation System, which provide improved level of service, would occur under the No Project Alternative as well as the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, LOS operations would be similar under this alternative compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

**6.5.3.3 ROADWAY DESIGN HAZARDS (Increase Hazards Due to a Design Feature, Incompatible Uses, or Inadequate Emergency Access)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would involve development of additional housing units as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in Section 4.3 of this EIR, all new facilities and facility
improvements contained in the Circulation Diagram of the proposed General Plan Update would be constructed to applicable design standards that have been created to minimize the potential for conflicts or collisions, and these same requirements would apply to this alternative. The land uses and transportation networks have been comprehensively planned through the Specific Plan process to conform to the City’s Improvement Standards, which 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, and reviews projects for consistency with, its Design and Construction Standards requiring minimum roadways widths, turnaround areas, and turning radii to ensure that emergency vehicle access is maintained. These standards and the City’s review process would be maintained and enforced in the same manner under the Infill Housing Alternative as would be experienced under the proposed General Plan Update.

Furthermore, all the goals and policies in the proposed General Plan Update are designed to provide for a safe and efficient transportation network, and this alternative would include all these goals and policies as in the proposed General Plan Update. The additional multi-family housing development proposed under this alternative compared to development under the proposed General Plan Update would have no bearing on the potential hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access. Therefore, impacts from increases in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would be still be less than significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in Section 4.3 of this EIR, “Transportation,” all new facilities and facility improvements contained in the Circulation Diagram of the proposed General Plan Update would be constructed to applicable design standards that have been created to minimize the potential for conflicts or collisions, and these same standards would apply to this alternative. The land uses and transportation networks have been comprehensively planned through the Specific Plan process to conform to the City’s Improvement Standards, which 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, and reviews projects for consistency with, its Design and Construction Standards requiring minimum roadways widths, turnaround areas, and turning radii to ensure that emergency vehicle access is maintained. These standards and the City’s review process would be maintained and enforced in the same manner under the Reduced Growth Alternative as under the proposed General Plan Update. Furthermore, the goals and policies in the proposed General Plan Update are designed to provide for a safe and efficient transportation network, and this alternative would include these same goals and policies. In addition, as described in the Circulation Element of the proposed General Plan Update and detailed in Pedestrian Access Goal CIRC6.1 and Policies 6.1 through 6.5, within Pedestrian Districts, one area in which development under this alternative would be focused (as shown in Exhibit 6-2), the City places a particular emphasis on pedestrian activity and safety, and special design considerations will be given to sidewalk widths, planter strips, street furniture, automobile travel lane widths, curb radii, and other enhancements that improve the pedestrian experience. The phased development proposed under this alternative compared to development under the proposed General Plan Update would have no bearing on the potential hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access. Therefore, impacts from increases in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would be still be less than significant.
No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for roadway design hazards would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals and policies. However, the policy revisions included as part of the proposed General Plan Update do not focus specifically on traffic hazards, and all new facilities and facility improvements contained in the circulation diagram of the existing General Plan would be constructed to applicable design standards that have been created to minimize the potential for conflicts or collisions. Furthermore, all the goals and policies in the proposed General Plan Update are designed to provide for a safe and efficient transportation network. Site-specific development projects would be reviewed by the City at the permitting stage for compliance with the City’s (2019) Design and Construction Standards, which require proper street design and ingress and egress for emergency vehicles. Therefore, impacts from increases in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.3, would be also be less than significant.

6.5.3.4 TRANSIT, BICYCLES, AND PEDESTRIANS (Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycles, or PEDESTRIAN Facilities, or Create or Exacerbate Disruptions to the Performance or Safety of These Systems)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would involve development of additional housing units as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and polices as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Functional Classification Goal 1 and Policies 2 and 4, and Bikeways/Trails Goal 2 and Policy 4 (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. As discussed in Section 4.3 of this EIR, “Transportation,” the proposed General Plan Update these goals and policies, in addition to required compliance with the City’s Design and Construction Standards are designed to accommodate new travel demand by providing adequate public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and services including complete streets. Placing the additional infill housing under this alternative in existing developed neighborhoods, as shown in Exhibit 6-1, helps to place residents closer to destination uses and offers greater opportunity for implementation of the aforementioned proposed General Plan Update goals and policies, thereby reducing VMT because new residents have greater opportunities to use public transport and to walk or bicycle to and from work. The impacts of the Infill Housing Alternative related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would be reduced as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and polices as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Functional Classification Goal 1 and Policies 2 and 4, and Bikeways/Trails Goal 2 and Policy 4 (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. As discussed on in Section 4.3 of this EIR, the proposed these goals and policies, in additional to required compliance with the City’s Design and Construction Standards, are designed to accommodate new travel demand by providing adequate public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and services including complete streets. These same goals and policies would apply to this alternative. Therefore, the impacts of the Reduced Development Alternative related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures that can reduce potential impacts, and no updates to comply with State law changes, would occur. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented, including those that are designed to accommodate new travel demand by providing adequate public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and services including complete streets. Therefore, the impacts of the No Project Alternative related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.3, would be also be less than significant.

6.5.4 AIR QUALITY

6.5.4.1 CONSTRUCTION-RELATED EMISSIONS OF CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS/CONFLICTS WITH AIR QUALITY PLANS (Generation of Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors That Would Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Any Criteria Pollutant for which the Project Region is in Nonattainment, and Conflict with or Obstruct an Air Quality Plan)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased development for additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As described in Impact 4.4-1 of Section 4.4 of this EIR, “Air Quality,” this would result in an increased generation of short-term construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants (e.g., particulate matter [PM_{10}, PM_{2.5}] and carbon monoxide [CO]) and ozone precursors (e.g., reactive organic gasses [ROG] and nitrogen oxides [NOX]) from ground disturbing activities; exhaust emissions from use of off-road equipment, material delivery, and construction worker commutes; building construction; asphalt paving; and application of architectural coatings.

Modeling performed for the proposed General Plan Update determined that maximum daily construction-related emission of ROG, NOX and PM_{10} would exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) thresholds of significance. Because the Infill Development Alternative includes slightly more construction than under the proposed General Plan Update, additional emissions over the PCAPCD thresholds would be generated.
The Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Air Quality Goal AQ1.1 and Policy AQ1.3. Proposed General Plan Update Policy AQ1.3 requires new development to implement applicable emissions control measures recommended by the PCAPCD to reduce the emission of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. The PCAPCD provides recommended construction mitigation measures as guidance for the types of measures that could potentially be implemented for development projects. Selection of the appropriate measures is based on the site-specific and project-specific aspects of any given project. The effectiveness of these measures would depend on the number and extent of strategies feasible to incorporate in any given project.

As discussed in Impact 4.4-1 of Section 4.4, existing laws and regulations, including PCAPCD rules and regulations, combined with existing and proposed General Plan policies, would reduce these impacts. However, because the exact buildout schedule of the proposed land uses cannot be determined, identifying which of the PCAPCD potential mitigation measures would be applicable and the level of effectiveness is not possible at this time. Construction-related emissions could still exceed significance thresholds. Such emissions could exceed or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, these emissions could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Since development would be increased, impacts from construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and conflicts with an applicable air quality plan under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than under the proposed General Plan Update, and remain significant and unavoidable.

### Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a lower level of criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emissions from short-term construction-related activities would be generated.

The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Air Quality Goal AQ1.1 and Policy AQ1.3, which requires new development to minimize air pollutant emissions and implement applicable construction emissions control measures recommended by the PCAPCD to reduce the emission of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. As with development under the proposed General Plan Update, the effectiveness of these measures would depend on the number and extent of strategies feasible to incorporate in any given project. As discussed in Impact 4.4-1 of Section 4.4, existing laws and regulations, including PCAPCD rules and regulations, combined with existing and proposed General Plan policies, would help reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions. However, because the exact buildout schedule of the proposed land uses cannot be determined, identifying which of the PCAPCD potential mitigation measures would be applicable and the level of effectiveness is not possible at this time. Construction-related emissions could still exceed significance thresholds. Such emissions could exceed or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, these emissions could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Therefore, impacts from construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and conflicts with an applicable air quality plan under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be significant and unavoidable.
No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of construction-related criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emissions would be generated. However, under the No Project Alternative, the goal and policy revisions and additions under the proposed General Plan Update would not be implemented. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, no updates to the General Plan to provide more detailed and updated implementation measures that can reduce potential impacts, and no updates to comply with State law changes, would occur. However, the existing General Plan does contain policies that are designed to reduce the emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, and these policies would continue to be implemented. For example, the existing General Plan does include Air Quality General Policy 2 to requiring coordination with PCAPCD to monitor air pollutants of concern on a continuous basis. However, this is less specific with regard to minimizing air pollutant emissions than the revised goals and policies within the proposed General Plan Update. Proposed Goal AQ1.1 and Policy 1.3, which more specifically require the reduction of local air pollutant emissions to assist with meeting and maintaining ambient air quality standards and implementing applicable emission control measures such as the PCAPCD recommended construction mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions and avoid significant air quality impacts, would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. However, existing laws and regulations, including PCAPCD rules and regulations, as well as review of proposed development projects by PCAPCD, would apply to the No Project Alternative in the same manner as under the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, the level of construction-related emissions under the No Project Alternative would be similar to that under the proposed General Plan Update and could still exceed significance thresholds. Such emissions could exceed or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, these emissions could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Therefore, impacts from construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and conflicts with an applicable air quality plan under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

6.5.4.2 OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS OF CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS/CONFLICTS WITH AIR QUALITY PLANS (Generation of Long-Term Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors That Would Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Any Criteria Pollutant for Which the Project Region is in Nonattainment, and Conflict With or Obstruct an Air Quality Plan)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased development for additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As described in Impact 4.4-1 of Section 4.4, “Air Quality,” of this EIR, this would result in an increased generation of long-term criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions from mobile, energy, and area sources such as vehicle trips, natural gas combustion for water and space heating, landscape maintenance equipment, hearth (fireplace) operation, and periodic application of architectural coatings for building maintenance. Operational emissions have greater potential to affect the attainment status of an air basin, particularly as a result of increased traffic and energy demands from additional development.

Modeling performed for the proposed General Plan Update determined that maximum daily operation-related emission of ROG, NOX and PM10 would exceed PCAPCD thresholds of significance. Because the Infill Housing
Alternative includes more development than the proposed General Plan Update, additional emissions over the PCAPCD thresholds would be generated.

The rules and regulations described in Impact 4.4-2 in Section 4.4 would apply to the Infill Housing Alternative in the same manner as the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, the Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goals AQ1.1-1.7 and Policies AQ1.1-1.3, AQ1.12-1.18, AQ1.22; Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC3.6, CIRC4.1–4.6, CIRC5.1, CIRC6.1-6.3; Policies LU2.1-2.6 and LU3.4, which would help to reduce emissions by promoting energy-efficient building design, and reducing emissions from vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and would be applied to this alternative. Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a would require a new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measure that requires future projects to implement applicable PCAPCD standard operational mitigation measures or those design features determined to be as effective. New proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b would require a new General Plan Implementation Measure such that if operational emissions would still exceed PCAPCD-recommended thresholds of significance after implementation of applicable PCAPCD standard operational mitigation measures and other feasible design features, the site-specific project would be required to offset remaining project emissions in excess of thresholds by establishing off-site mitigation or participation in PCAPCD’s Offsite Mitigation Program. However, because all the specific development projects within the Planning Area cannot be defined at the time of this analysis, identifying which of the PCAPCD potential mitigation measures would be applicable and the level of effectiveness is not possible at this time.

Operational emissions could still exceed significance thresholds. Such emissions could exceed or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, these emissions could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Because development would be increased under this alternative, impacts from operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and conflicts with an applicable air quality plan under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and remain significant and unavoidable.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a lower level of criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emissions from long-term operational activities would be generated. Operational emissions have greater potential to affect the attainment status of an air basin, particularly as a result of increased traffic and energy demands from additional development.

As discussed in Impact 4.4-2 of Section 4.4 of this EIR, PCAPCD enforcement of rules and regulations that would reduce the long-term operational impacts would apply to the Reduced Growth Alternative in the same manner as under the proposed General Plan Update. =In addition, the Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goals AQ1.1-1.7 and Policies AQ1.1-1.3, AQ1.12-1.18, AQ1.22; Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC3.6, CIRC4.1–4.6, CIRC5.1, CIRC6.1-6.3; Policies LU2.1-2.6 and LU3.4, which would help to reduce operational air pollutant emissions. The proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a would require a new General Plan Implementation Measure that requires future projects to implement applicable PCAPCD standard operational mitigation measures or those design features determined to be as effective. New proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b would
require a new General Plan Implementation Measure such that if operational emissions would still exceed PCAPCD-recommended thresholds of significance after implementation of applicable PCAPCD standard operational mitigation measures and other feasible design features, the site-specific project would be required to offset remaining project emissions in excess of thresholds by establishing off-site mitigation or participation in PCAPCD’s Offsite Mitigation Program. However, because all the specific future development projects cannot be determined, identifying which of the PCAPCD potential mitigation measures would be applicable and the level of effectiveness is not possible at this time.

Operational emissions could still exceed significance thresholds. Such emissions could exceed or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, these emissions could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Therefore, impacts from operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and conflicts with an applicable air quality plan under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be significant and unavoidable.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar sources of operational criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emissions. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan contains goals and policies would continue to be implemented. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, no updates to the General Plan to provide more detailed and updated implementation measures that can reduce potential impacts, and no updates to comply with State law changes, would occur. For example, Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a and 4.4-2b requiring new General Plan Implementation Measures that require projects to implement PCAPCD standard operational measures to reduce emissions, and to offset remaining project emissions in excess of thresholds by establishing off-site mitigation or participation in PCAPCD’s Offsite Mitigation Program, would not be implemented. In addition, the existing General Plan does contain policies that are designed to reduce the emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, and these policies would continue to be implemented, the existing policies are not as specific as those included as part of the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed General Plan Update Goals AQ1.1-1.7 and Policies AQ1.1-1.3, AQ1.12-1.18, AQ1.22; Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC3.6, CIRC4.1-4.6, CIRC5.1, CIRC6.1-6.3; Policies LU2.1-2.6 and LU3.4 include revisions from the existing General Plan that would help further reduce emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. Without the goal and policy revisions of the proposed General Plan Update, the No Project Alternative may not achieve the same reduction of criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor emission reductions. Modeling performed for the proposed General Plan Update determined that maximum daily operation-related emission of ROG, NO\textsubscript{X} and PM\textsubscript{10} would exceed PCAPCD thresholds of significance. Because the No Project Alternative would not likely achieve the same level of emissions reductions as would be achieved due to goal and policy revisions in the proposed General Plan Update, additional emissions would be generated and operational emissions could still exceed significance thresholds. Such emissions could exceed or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, these emissions could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Without the additional and revised policies and implementation measures included in the proposed General Plan Update,
impacts from operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and conflicts with an applicable air quality plan under the No Project Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

6.5.4.3 EMISSIONS OF TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS (Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations)

Infill Housing Alternative

Construction

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased development for additional residential units, and therefore would result in increased generation of short-term construction-related air pollutant emissions, including diesel PM (DPM) from heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, on-site generator, and construction worker vehicle exhaust. The additional development would be focused in infill areas, as shown in Exhibit 6-1. These areas are in closer proximity to existing development, including sensitive land uses. The increased DPM emissions and proximity to existing development could expose more sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Residential areas are considered sensitive to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to pollutants that may be present. As described in Impact 4.4-3 of Section 4.4. of this EIR, because the use of off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment would be temporary and intermittent, and because of the highly dispersive properties of diesel PM (concentrations lower extremely quickly over distance; Zhu et al. 2002), construction-related TAC emissions associated with typical construction activities are not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of TACs, and implementation of existing rules and regulations aimed at reducing emissions standards for heavy-duty diesel engines over time will continue to reduce total emissions from operation of construction equipment and vehicles throughout the buildout period of the General Plan.

The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures, including Goal AQ1.1, which aims to minimize public exposure to toxic or hazardous air pollutants, and Policy AQ3.1, which requires projects that could generate or expose sensitive uses to substantial pollutant concentrations to incorporate strategies to reduce exposure to such emissions. All future development within the Planning Area that could generate substantial emissions will incorporate strategies to reduce emissions, pursuant to General Plan policy. In addition, adherence to all applicable laws, rules and regulations, including California state law to limit idling and PCAPCD rules to limit construction-related DPM and ROG emissions would further reduce potential TAC emissions from the additional construction-related activities that would occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. With implementation of these emissions reduction measures, and because the City does not anticipate the scale of infill development adjacent to sensitive receptors that would result in any potentially significant impact Therefore, for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from construction-related activities under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to that which be experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.
Operations

Within or adjacent to the Planning Area, there are two freeways (Interstate 80 and Highway 65), several distribution centers, a rail yard, dry cleaning operations, and gas stations, but there are no existing chrome platers. Areas with a land use designation of General Industrial on the City’s General Plan Land Use Map allow heavy industrial uses such as chrome platers, so there is the potential for such a use to be proposed in the future. The Infill Housing Alternative includes additional infill housing in proximity to the Roseville Rail Yard, where increased emissions of TACs are present due to the operation of locomotive engines. ARB implements several statewide diesel-related programs and strategies designed to reduce diesel PM and TAC emissions and subsequent exposure. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has adopted regulations to improve emissions standards for existing and remanufactured locomotives, and sets higher exhaust emission standards for newly built locomotives. Existing General Plan Air Quality Policy 4 and 8 (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 AQ1.2, 1.3, AQ1.12, AQ1.13, AQ1.14, AQ1.16, and AQ1.22, would help to reduce operational TAC emissions. The proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a would reduce air pollutant emissions during short-term construction and long-term operational activities that could occur in proximity to sensitive receptors. General Plan Update Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 would further reduce potential risk of exposure by sensitive receptors to remaining toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions by establishing a buffer distance between construction-related emission sources of TACs and potential sensitive receptors. If the recommended buffer distances cannot be achieved, proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measures 4.4-3a would reduce exposure to TACs by future sensitive receptors along high-volume roadways within the Planning Area by requiring the implementation of feasible design features identified by ARB as potential strategies to reduce exposure to TACs along high-volume roadways, such as Interstate 80 and State Route 65, as well as near the Roseville Rail Yard. While these measures would reduce potential likelihood of exposure to sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, because all of the specific development projects under this alternative cannot be defined at the time of this analysis, the precise effectiveness of these measures cannot be determined and the potential for sensitive receptors to be exposed to TACs is still considered significant. Therefore, because the Infill Housing Alternative includes more residential development in areas more likely to result in exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions than under the proposed General Plan Update, impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Construction

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore would result in reduced generation of short-term construction-related air pollutant emissions, including DPM from heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, on-site generator, and construction worker vehicle exhaust. However, the development that does occur would be focused in existing developed areas, which tend to be those that are closer to existing and future sources of substantial pollutant concentrations than new development on the edges of the city. While there would be less development under the Reduced Growth Alternative, because the development that would occur would be in areas more likely to be in proximity to existing and future sources of substantial pollutant concentrations, the potential for exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with the Reduced Growth Alternative would be comparable to that described under the Infill Housing Alternative above.
As described in Impact 4.4-3 of Section 4.4 of this EIR, because the use of off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment would be temporary and intermittent, and because of the highly dispersive properties of diesel PM (concentrations lower extremely quickly over distance; Zhu et al. 2002), construction-related TAC emissions associated with typical construction activities are not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of TACs, and implementation of existing rules and regulations aimed at reducing emissions standards for heavy-duty diesel engines over time will continue to reduce total emissions from operation of construction equipment and vehicles throughout the buildout period of the General Plan. In addition, the Reduced Growth Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures, including Goal AQ1.1, which aims to minimize public exposure to toxic or hazardous air pollutants, and Policy AQ3.1, which requires projects that could generate or expose sensitive uses to substantial pollutant concentrations to incorporate strategies to reduce exposure to such emissions.

All future development within the Planning Area that could generate substantial emissions will incorporate strategies to reduce emissions, per General Plan policy. In addition, adherence to all applicable laws, rules and regulations, including California state law to limit idling and PCAPCD rules to limit construction-related DPM and ROG emissions would further reduce potential TAC emissions from the additional construction-related activities that would occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. With implementation of these emissions reduction measures, and because the City does not anticipate the scale of development adjacent to sensitive receptors that would result in any potentially significant impact. Therefore, impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from construction-related activities under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.

**Operations**

Within or adjacent to the Planning Area, there are two freeways (Interstate 80 and Highway 65), several distribution centers, a rail yard, dry cleaning operations, and gas stations, but there are no existing chrome platers. Areas with a land use designation of General Industrial on the City’s General Plan Land Use Map allow heavy industrial uses such as chrome platers, so there is the potential for such a use to be proposed in the future. While there would be less development under the Reduced Growth Alternative, because the development that would occur would be in areas more likely to be in proximity to existing and future sources of substantial pollutant concentrations, such as commercial and industrial land uses, the potential for exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with the Reduced Growth Alternative would be comparable to that described under the Infill Housing Alternative, above.

As discussed in Impact 4.4-3 in Section 4.4 of this EIR, ARB implements several statewide diesel-related programs and strategies designed to reduce diesel PM and TAC emissions and subsequent exposure. USEPA has also adopted regulations to improve emissions standards for existing and remanufactured locomotives, and sets higher exhaust emission standards for newly built locomotives. The proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a and 4.4-3 would require proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measures that would reduce potential likelihood of exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. However, because all the specific development projects under the Reduced Growth Alternative cannot be defined at the time of this analysis, the precise effectiveness of these measures cannot be determined and the potential for sensitive receptors to be exposed to TACs is still considered significant. Therefore, because the Reduced Growth Alternative includes more focused development in areas more likely to result in exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions than under the proposed General Plan Update, impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to
substantial pollutant concentrations under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be **slightly greater than** the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

**No Project Alternative**

**Construction**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. For example, revisions to Goal AQ1.1 and new Policy AQ1.3 under the proposed General Plan Update would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. Goal AQ1.1 includes clarifying language to focus on the reduction of local air pollutant emissions. Policy AQ1.3 calls for implementation of strategies to reduce exposure of sensitive uses to substantial pollutant concentrations to avoid significant air quality impacts. Similarly, new Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 under the proposed General Plan Update, which requires new General Plan Implementation Measure that would reduce potential likelihood of exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from construction-related activities, would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. However, compliance with California state laws that limit the idling of heavy-duty vehicles and equipment and with PCAPCD Rules and Regulations that limit construction-related emissions would apply to the No Project Alternative in the same manner as would be experienced under the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, the City does not anticipate the scale of infill development adjacent to sensitive receptors that would result in any potentially significant impact. Therefore, impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from construction-related activities under the No Project Alternative would be **slightly greater than** the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be **less than significant**.

**Operations**

Land uses under the No Project Alternative that may potentially include stationary sources of TACs, and potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, would be similar to those under the proposed General Plan Update. However, revisions to Policy AQ1.2 and new Policies AQ1.3, and 1.22 under the Proposed General Plan Update are specifically focused on minimizing emissions from stationary sources, reducing potential exposure of sensitive uses to substantial air pollutant concentrations, and reducing harmful emissions at the Rail Yard, all of which would reduce TAC emissions; these policy revisions would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. In addition, new Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a and 4.4-3, which require new General Plan Implementation Measures that would reduce potential likelihood of exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, would not be implemented. The existing General Plan does contain policies that are designed to reduce the emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, and these policies would continue to be implemented, but they do not provide the specific guidance that the new proposed Implementation Measures would. Therefore, impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to long-term substantial pollutant concentrations under the No Project Alternative would be **greater than** the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain **significant and unavoidable**.
6.5.4.4  CO HOTSPOTS (Result in Concentrated Carbon Monoxide Levels [“hotspots”])

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional development of residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Because CO hotspots are typically associated with high-volume roadway segments and intersections, particularly those operating at an unacceptable LOS, increasing residential density in a focused area of development could have the potential to increase congestion in and around that area as well. However, as described above in Section 6.5.3.2, “Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Congestion,” the areas proposed under this alternative for additional residential development are areas of typically low VMT per resident and the additional housing included in this alternative does not increase impacts on LOS when compared to the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, the Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Level of Service Goal CIRC2 and Policies CIRC 2.1 through 2.4, all of which would facilitate a balanced transportation system, travel-demand-reducing strategies, and securing funding to all components of the City’s transportation system, including automobile, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes of transportation, in order to ensure the City’s level of service policy is maintained. Revised Policy LU3.4 under the proposed General Plan Update also specifically encourages infill development that is accomplished in a manner that enhances the mix of land uses in proximity to one another so that more households can access services, recreation, and jobs without the use of a car, and facilitates pedestrian activity and public transit use, thereby allowing for increased residential density without having an equivalent impact on roadway travel demand. The City of Roseville ITS also serves to improve traffic flow, avoid excessive congestion and improves the operational performance of the City’s roadway system, thereby reducing the likelihood for and extent of delays at intersections.

Analysis of Impact 4.4-4 in Section 4.4 of this EIR found that the level of traffic on the roadways within the Planning Area would not reach a level that would generate a quantity of CO emissions from local mobile sources that would result in or substantially contribute to a CO hotspot. As explained above, the Infill Housing Alternative would not increase impacts on LOS when compared to the General Plan Update and proposed General Plan Update policies would specifically address travel demand reducing strategies within infill areas. Therefore, the impact related to CO hotspots for the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons as described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, would remain less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore fewer people would be exposed to emissions. Specifically, new development would be focused in existing developed areas and the “Center and Corridor” and “Established” Community Types, as shown in Exhibit 6-2. Reduced development, and thereby reduced total VMT (as explained in Section 6.5.3.2) could reduce congestion on the roadways. Likewise, focusing development in existing developed as opposed to undeveloped areas could have the potential to increase congestion as well. However, as explained above in Section 6.5.3.2, “Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Congestion,” focusing development in these areas under the Reduced Growth Alternative as opposed to the undeveloped areas of the City could lead to a decrease (worsening) of LOS or no tangible change compared to the proposed General Plan Update.
The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Level of Service Goal CIRC2 and Policies CIRC 2.1 through 2.4, all of which would facilitate a balanced transportation system, travel-demand-reducing strategies, and securing funding to all components of the City’s transportation system, including automobile, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes of transportation, in order to ensure the City’s level of service policy is maintained. Proposed General Plan Update Policies AQ1.12 through 1.16 and CIRC2.5 and 2.6 would also help to reduce CO hotspots throughout the Planning Area. The City of Roseville ITS also serves to improve traffic flow, avoid excessive congestion and improves the operational performance of the City’s roadway system, thereby reducing the likelihood for and extent of delays at intersections.

Analysis of Impact 4.4-4 in Section 4.4 of this EIR found that the level of traffic on the roadways within the Planning Area would not reach a level that would generate a quantity of CO emissions from local mobile sources that would result in or substantially contribute to a CO hotspot. As explained above, the Reduced Growth Alternative would reduce overall VMT in the Planning Area, but also result in more focused areas of development. Therefore, the impact related to CO hotspots for the Reduced Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons as described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, would remain less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same level of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of travel demand on the roadways would occur. Analysis of Impact 4.4-4 in Section 4.4 of this EIR found that the level of traffic on the roadways within the Planning Area would not reach a level that would generate a quantity of CO emissions from local mobile sources that would result in or substantially contribute to a CO hotspot. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. As described above within Section 6.5.3.2, the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update both contain the policy to provide a LOS of C or better at a minimum of 70 percent of the signalized intersections during the AM and PM peak hours and use of the City’s Intelligent Transportation System, which provide improved level of service, would occur under the No Project Alternative as well as the proposed General Plan Update. As LOS is a key indicator for CO hotspots, and the level of development would be equivalent under the No Project Alternative as under the proposed General Plan Alternative, the impacts related to CO hotspots for the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons as described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.4, would remain less than significant.

6.5.4.5 ODOROUS EMISSIONS (Result in Other Emissions [such as those leading to odors] Adversely Affecting a Substantial Number of People)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional development of residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As described in Impact 4.4-5 in Section 4.4 of this EIR, proposed development of the Planning Area would include multiple land use types and could result in the siting of sensitive receptors that would be exposed to potential odor sources. New development under the Infill Housing Alternative would include infill development that is located toward the center of the city, as shown in Exhibit 6-1. This development would
be farther from most of the potential odor sources described in Section 4.4, including industrial sources such as the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL), Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), City of Roseville Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP), the Rio Bravo Rocklin biomass power facility, Mallard Creek composting facility, Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant; dairy and chicken farms (dispersed throughout the region surrounding the western and northern boundaries of the Planning Area); and other agricultural uses in each direction that can generate odors from a variety of processes, such as agricultural burning, livestock pens, fertilization, and composting, among others. However, the additional infill development would be in the vicinity of Interstate 80 and the Roseville Rail Yard, which represent sources of substantial diesel exhaust emissions that can also result in odorous emissions. It cannot be known at this time what specific development would be implemented and if any development would generate objectionable odors. In addition, unless the additional development under the Infill Housing Alternative would supplant development in the outskirts of the Planning Area, the potential impacts associated with the proposed General Plan Update, as described in Impact 4.4-5 in Section 4.4 of this EIR, would still occur under the Infill Housing Alternative.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed General Plan Update Air Quality Goal AQ1.1 aims to reduce future exposure to odors emitted by facilities, such as chemical manufacturing facilities, sanitary landfills, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, transfer stations, painting/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), composting facilities, food processing facilities, restaurants, confined animal facilities, asphalt batch plants, rendering plants, metal smelting plants, and coffee roasters. The proposed General Plan Update Policy AQ1.22 could reduce potential exposure by nearby sensitive receptors to odor emissions from the Roseville Rail Yard. With proper disposal containers and regular trash collection services, odors from residential and commercial dumpsters are typically minimized. Construction-related activities would generate odors from the use of diesel-powered equipment and from paving and architectural coating activities. However, these odorous emissions would be temporary and disperse rapidly with distance from the source.

The proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measure 4.4-5 requires a new Implementation Measure that requires future site-specific projects to implement a variety of strategies to avoid exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions, including a buffer distance depending on the type of land use and the odor source. In addition, proposed General Plan Update Mitigation Measure 4.4-3a to reduce indoor exposure to TACs would also result in a reduction in the intensity of offensive odors from surrounding odor sources. However, because the Infill Development Alternative would include the siting of additional sensitive receptors within proximity to potential odor sources as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and because buffer distances and implementation of specific technology- and design-based measures cannot be known at this time, it is conservatively assumed that sensitive receptors could experience some increased exposure to substantial odor-generating emissions. Therefore, impacts from exposure to odorous emissions under the Infill Housing Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur by 2035 as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore fewer people would be exposed to odorous emissions. Specifically, new development would be focused in existing developed areas and the “Center and Corridor” and “Established” Community Types, as shown in Exhibit 6-2. This development would be farther from potential odor sources.
described in Section 4.4, including the WRSL, MRF, City of Roseville PGWWTP, the Rio Bravo Rocklin biomass power facility, Mallard Creek composting facility, Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant, dairy and chicken farms, and other agricultural uses. While development under this alternative would include development in proximity to Interstate 80 and the Rail Yard, which represent sources of substantial diesel exhaust emissions that can also result in odorous emissions, this development would also occur under the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, it cannot be known at this time what specific development would be implemented and if any development would generate objectionable odors.

The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed General Plan Update Air Quality Goal AQ1.1, Policy AQ1.22, and Mitigation Measures 4.4-3a and 4.4-5 would reduce exposure to TACs that could generate odors, and would require future site-specific projects to implement a variety of strategies to avoid exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions, including a buffer distance depending on the type of land use and the odor source. However, while the Reduced Growth Alternative would include less new development as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, because buffer distances and implementation of specific technology- and design-based measures cannot be known at this time, it is conservatively assumed that sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial odor-generating emissions. Therefore, impacts from exposure to odorous emissions under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would remain significant and unavoidable.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same level of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar number of sensitive receptors would be exposed to odorous emissions. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. For example, proposed General Plan Update Goal AQ1.1 and Policy AQ1.22, which would reduce potential operational exposure to odor sources, and new Mitigation Measures 4.4-3a and 4.4-5, which require new General Plan Implementation Measures that would reduce potential likelihood of exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, impacts from exposure to odorous emissions under the No Project Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

6.5.5 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

6.5.5.1 GENERATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional development of multi-family residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. This would result in an increased short-term generation of GHG emissions from construction-related activities and long-term operations of mobile, energy, water, and waste GHG emissions sources, as compared to under the proposed General Plan Update. Modeling performed for the proposed General Plan Update determined that GHG emissions associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would exceed the GHG emissions efficiency thresholds of significance. However, since multi-family residential development is relatively more efficient in GHG emissions for mobile and energy sources
compared to lower-density development, and because this alternative would be expected to include the renovation and redevelopment of older, energy-inefficient housing stock, the rate of GHG emissions under this alternative would be somewhat lower than under the proposed General Plan Update.

The degree to which the Infill Housing Alternative could further reduce GHG emissions or improves GHG emissions efficiency compared to the proposed General Plan Update depends on whether the additional multi-family development can supplant housing demand that would otherwise be met in relatively higher VMT areas, such as the Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, Sierra Vista, and West Roseville Specific Plan Areas, and other factors. Demand for housing, in turn, will depend on demographic changes and emerging household preferences and the way they express themselves in housing demand for different housing types and locations. However, there is evidence of preferences for housing locations close to work that enable short commutes; preferences for walkability and access to shopping, services, and transit; demand for a mix of housing types and attached products in suburbs; increasing numbers of small households, creating a market for smaller homes; and the need for greater market diversity.4 Therefore, while the degree to which this demand is realized in the Planning Area is dependent upon many factors, including some outside the City’s direct influence, the Infill Housing Alternative has the potential to direct more of the City’s growth toward more efficient infill areas of the City compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, many of which, as identified in Section 4.5, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” focus on land use and transportation planning that promotes access to alternative modes of transportation, services, recreation, and jobs without the use of a car or with reduced travel distances, as well as promotes efficiency in building energy use and resource conservation. Many of these policies would be directly applicable to the additional development under this alternative and generate GHG efficiencies specific to this alternative. However, while these policies would likely reduce per capita GHG emissions under the Infill Housing Alternative compared to the proposed General Plan Update, emissions from implementation of the Infill Housing Alternative could still result in a net increase of GHG emissions that could exceed the local GHG emissions efficiency threshold. Therefore, the generation of GHG emissions resulting from implementation of the Infill Housing Alternative and the potential to conflict with applicable State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a lower level of emissions would be generated by construction and operational activities. Land use changes under this alternative would reduce 2035 development to the amounts identified by SACOG for Roseville in the 2020 MTP/SCS. The focus for development between present and 2035 under this alternative would be areas that have access to existing infrastructure and the “Center and Corridor” and “Established” Community Types identified in the MTP/SCS. In general, these areas tend to have lower rates of VMT. For example, as shown in Table 6-3 above, in Section 6.5.3, “Transportation,” the lowest per-capita, home-based VMT production areas are the Downtown, Riverside Gateway, North Central Roseville, and Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Areas, and areas with relatively high VMT include outer areas of the Planning Area,

which are not anticipated to develop as extensively under this alternative, including the Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, Sierra Vista, and West Roseville Specific Plan Areas. In addition, the Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, many of which, as identified in Section 4.5, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” promote land use and transportation strategies that would reduce total and the rate of VMT. Since mobile source emissions are the biggest overall source of GHG emissions, placing more development in lower-VMT areas under the Reduced Growth Alternative would reduce GHG emissions overall and improve the efficiency of GHG emissions compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be significant and unavoidable.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, a similar amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of construction-related and operational emissions would occur as under the proposed General Plan Update. However, under the No Project Alternative, the goal and policy revisions and additions under the proposed General Plan Update would not be implemented. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, no updates to the General Plan to provide more detailed and updated implementation measures that can reduce potential impacts, and no updates to comply with State law changes, would occur. While, the existing General Plan contains policies that are designed to accommodate new travel demand by providing adequate public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and services including complete streets, they are not as specific as those included as a part of the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed General Plan Update Goals AQ1.3–1.8 and Policies AQ1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9–1.19 and 1.22; Goal CIRC3 and Policies 3.1, and 3.6; Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1–4.6; Goal CIRC5.1 and Policy CIRC5.1; Goal CIRC6.1 and Policies CIRC6.1 and 6.2; Policies LU2.1–2.6, 3.4, 7.2, and 8.10; Policy PF4.6; Goals PF9.1 and 9.2 and Policies PF9.1, 9.4, 9.5, 9.8, and 9.9, listed in Section 4.5, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” include revisions from the existing General Plan that would reduce GHG emissions. For example, Policies AQ1.11 and 1.15 are new proposed policies that would provide focused policy language promotes the increase of electric vehicles within the Planning Area and, therefore, would result in reduced GHG emissions associated with VMT. Similarly, while the existing General Plan includes Travel Demand Management Goals 1 and 2 to reduce travel demand on the City’s roadway systems and reduce total vehicle emissions in the City of Roseville and the South Placer County region, these goals and related policies would be revised under the proposed General Plan Update to more specifically identify measures that would result in reduced VMT and to require that Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects not included in an adopted Specific Plan shall demonstrate consistency with the VMT rate included in the SACOG SCS for the SCS planning horizon year. Without the goal and policy revisions of the proposed General Plan Update, the No Project Alternative may not achieve the same level of in increased GHG efficiency that would be achieved by future development under the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, the impacts of the No Project Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would be still be significant and unavoidable.

---

5 Not including the Dell Webb Specific Plan Area, where it is demographics, rather than location or design that holds down vehicular travel demand.
6.5.6 NOISE AND VIBRATION

6.5.6.1 CONSTRUCTION NOISE (Potential for Substantial Temporary, Short-Term Exposure to Construction Noise)

Infill Housing Alternative

The additional housing units planned under the Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased noise generated by construction equipment such as bulldozers, excavators, compactors, and, potentially pile-driving equipment, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in Impact 4.6-1 of Section 4.6 of this EIR, “Noise and Vibration,” most of the new development under the General Plan Update would occur on vacant land in the western and northwestern portions of the Planning Area. However, some infill development opportunities would involve properties that are near existing noise-sensitive uses, such as residences and schools, as well as properties that may be developed in phases, with noise-sensitive residential uses included in earlier phases. It is possible, depending on the specifics of how this alternative is implemented, that this alternative could place more sensitive receptors in areas with relatively high levels of noise, and could generate additional noise in areas with existing or future noise-sensitive uses.

The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures. The proposed General Plan Update revised Policy N1.9 regulates noise from new development consistent with the City’s noise ordinance. The noise ordinance states that noise associated with construction between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday–Friday, and between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays, is exempt from noise standards during daytime hours, provided that all construction equipment is fitted with factory installed muffling devices and maintained in good working order. Required compliance with the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code, State Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24), Community Design Guidelines, the adopted Specific Plans and their design guidelines, and the California Vehicle Code would all serve to help reduce the level of noise generated by construction equipment.

There could be a noticeable temporary increase in noise levels for noise-sensitive uses that are adjacent to construction sites, and no feasible mitigation measures are available. Nonetheless, impacts under the Infill Housing Alternative from generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the noise ordinance would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore less overall construction noise would be generated. However, most new development that would occur under the Reduced Growth Alternative would occur in existing developed areas, when compared to the General Plan Update. It is possible, depending on the specifics of how this alternative is implemented, that this alternative could place more sensitive receptors in areas with relatively high levels of noise, and could generate additional noise in areas with existing or future noise-sensitive uses. The Reduced Growth Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures, including proposed General Plan Update revised Policy N1.9, which regulates noise from new development consistent with the City’s noise ordinance. For the same reasons discussed in Impact 4.6-1 of
Section 4.6 of this EIR, the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code, State Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24), Community Design Guidelines, the adopted Specific Plans and their design guidelines, and the California Vehicle Code would all serve to help reduce the level of noise generated by construction equipment, including that experienced under this alternative. There could still be a noticeable temporary increase in noise levels for noise-sensitive uses that are adjacent to construction sites. Therefore, impacts from generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be significant and unavoidable.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, a similar amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar number of people would be exposed to construction-generated noise. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented, including Policy N1.9, as currently written in the existing General Plan, which does require construction-related noise to be consistent with the City’s Noise Ordinance. In addition, compliance with the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code, State Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24), Community Design Guidelines, and the California Vehicle Code would all serve to help reduce the level of noise generated by construction equipment. Furthermore, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to reduce construction and operational source noise in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. There could still be a noticeable temporary increase in noise levels for noise-sensitive uses that are adjacent to construction sites. Therefore, impacts from generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

**6.5.6.2 OPERATIONAL NOISE (Potential for Long-Term Noise Exposure)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative includes development of additional housing units as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and these would be focused within the infill areas of the Planning Area, as shown in Exhibit 6-1. Therefore, future development of noise-sensitive residential uses would occur in areas that either are currently exposed to or would be exposed to future traffic or railroad noise levels, or other stationary-source noise levels from maintenance activities, music, mechanical equipment, loading docks, parking lots, and garbage collection, and other operational activities.

As discussed in Impact 4.6-2 of Section 4.6 of this EIR, noise from these and other sources could exceed the City’s noise standards. The City’s Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code, State Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24), Community Design Guidelines, the adopted specific plans and their design guidelines, and the California Vehicle Code would all serve to help reduce the level of noise generated by operational noise sources. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures. The proposed General Plan Update Goal
N1.1 and Policies N1.1–1.8 are designed to help reduce operational noise levels, and to ensure compliance of future noise-generating sources in proximity to noise-sensitive land uses. Despite noise reductions that would be achieved by proposed General Play Policies N1.1–N1.9, noise-sensitive uses could be still exposed to operational noise in exceedance of the City’s standards. In addition, it is possible, depending on the specifics of how this alternative is implemented, that this alternative could place more sensitive receptors in areas with relatively high levels of noise, and could generate additional noise in areas with existing or future noise-sensitive uses. Therefore, impacts from generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the City’s noise ordinance under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore less overall operational noise would be generated. However, most new development that would occur under the Reduced Growth Alternative would occur in existing developed areas, when compared to the General Plan Update. Therefore, noise-sensitive receptors would still be subject to operation-related noise from new and infill development, including an increase in vehicular traffic noise.

For the same reasons discussed in Impact 4.6-2 in Section 4.6 of this EIR, the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code, State Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24), Community Design Guidelines, the adopted Specific Plans and their design guidelines, and the California Vehicle Code would all serve to help reduce the level of noise generated by operational sources. The Reduced Growth Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures. The proposed General Plan Update Goal N1.1 and Policies N1.1–1.8 are designed to help reduce operational noise levels, and to ensure compliance of future noise-generating sources in proximity to noise-sensitive land uses. Despite reduced development under this alternative and noise reductions that would be achieved by proposed General Plan Policies N1.1–N1.9, there could still be a noticeable permanent increase in noise levels for noise-sensitive uses that are adjacent to operational noise sources, noise-sensitive uses could be still exposed to operational noise in exceedance of the City’s standards. Therefore, impacts from generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be significant and unavoidable.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar number of people would have the potential to be exposed to operation-related noise. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. In addition, compliance with the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code, State Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24), Community Design Guidelines, and the California Vehicle Code would all serve to help reduce the level of noise generated by construction equipment. Furthermore, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to reduce construction and operational source noise in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Finally, all new development would still be subject to compliance
with the existing General Plan Noise Level Performance Standards. There could still be a noticeable permanent increase in noise levels for noise-sensitive uses that are adjacent to operational noise sources.

The proposed General Plan Update policy changes, which provide protection for Roseville citizens from operational-source noise, are intended to clarify and provide additional specificity for the City’s noise policies. Overall, the proposed changes to the City’s noise standards will result in less community exposure to noise, because standards are being established for uses which previously had no exterior standard, a maximum allowable noise standard is being applied where previously no maximum was stated, and in some cases the maximum standard is a lower volume than the existing standard. Under the No Project Alternative these changes will not be made. Furthermore, acknowledging the importance of encouraging development in infill development opportunities, the proposed General Plan Update provides additional guiding policy language to allow for case-by-case determinations that can factor in other economic, environmental, and social goals of the City. Part of the City’s intent is to promote infill development, and recognize that, while exterior noise levels may be somewhat higher, development in infill development areas has the potential to provide more pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use opportunities, to reduce air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, to focus development in areas already served with existing infrastructure, to promote economic development and affordable housing objectives, and provide other benefits.

The noise impacts of the No Project could be increased compared to the proposed project, because certain uses would not have applicable noise standards, or the maximum allowable noise standards would be higher. Therefore, impacts from generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

6.5.6.3 VIBRATION (Increases in Vibration Levels)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative includes development of additional housing units as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, which would subject more people to potential sleep disruption and annoyance from vibration. New or infill development close to high-volume roadways and rail lines could expose new sensitive receptors to higher levels of vibration generated by these sources. In a similar manner as would be experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, the generation of construction vibration under the Infill Housing Alternative could expose existing and planned vibration-sensitive uses to adverse, temporary construction-related vibration. However, this vibration would be temporary, and the City does not anticipate very large-scale projects with extensive excavation and pile driving that would occur directly adjacent vibration-sensitive uses that would result in substantial disturbance or damage to adjacent structures. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures, including Policy N1.10, which requires all feasible measures necessary, as a part of proposed development and public infrastructure projects to avoid structural damage to adjacent structures and avoid substantial annoyance for adjacent vibration-sensitive uses, consistent with California Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Agency guidance – guidance that is specifically designed to avoid annoyance to vibration-sensitive uses and structure damage. In addition, it is possible, depending on the specifics of how this alternative is implemented, that this alternative could place more sensitive receptors in areas with relatively high levels of vibration (such as the Rail Yard). Because more vibration-sensitive development could potentially occur in areas with sources of
vibration, the impacts from exposure to increases in vibration levels under the Infill Housing Alternative would be **greater than** the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be **less than significant**.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore less exposure to construction-related vibration would occur. However, vibration-sensitive receptors would still be subject to construction and operation-related vibration, particularly where infill development would be located in proximity to high-volume roadways and rail lines. In a similar manner as would be experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, the generation of construction vibration under the Reduced Growth Alternative could expose existing and planned vibration-sensitive uses to adverse, temporary construction-related vibration. However, this vibration would be temporary, and the City does not anticipate very large-scale projects with extensive excavation and pile driving that would occur directly adjacent vibration-sensitive uses that would result in substantial disturbance or damage to adjacent structures. The Reduced Growth Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures, including Policy N1.10, which requires all feasible measures necessary, as a part of proposed development and public infrastructure projects to avoid structural damage to adjacent structures and avoid substantial annoyance for adjacent vibration-sensitive uses, consistent with California Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Agency guidance – guidance that is specifically designed to avoid annoyance to vibration-sensitive uses and structure damage. Therefore, the impacts from exposure to increases in vibration levels under the Reduced Growth Alternative. Therefore, the impacts from exposure to excessive increases in vibration levels under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be **similar to** the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be **less than significant**.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar number of people would be exposed to construction- and operation-related vibration. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals and policies. The No Project Alternative would not include proposed General Plan Update Policy N1.10, which is a new policy under the proposed General Plan Update. This policy requires all feasible measures necessary, as a part of proposed development and public infrastructure projects to avoid structural damage to adjacent structures and avoid substantial annoyance for adjacent vibration-sensitive uses, consistent with California Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Agency guidance. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to reduce vibration in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. However, new and infill development in other portions of the Planning Area may not receive protection from vibration-caused disturbance because the existing General Plan does not contain goals or policies that would require evaluation or mitigation of impacts from vibration that are caused by future development projects in the City. Therefore, the No Project Alternative could result in **greater** impacts from increases in vibration levels as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and those impacts would be **significant and unavoidable**.
6.5.7 GEOLGY, SOILS, AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

6.5.7.1 SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE IMPACTS RELATED TO STRONG SEISMIC GROUND SHAKING

Infill Housing Alternative

The additional housing units planned under the Infill Housing Alternative could lead to an increased number of people and structures exposed to hazards associated with seismic ground shaking from regional faults, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in detail in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-1 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), given the distance of the Planning Area from active faults, the estimated peak ground acceleration is very low (0.14–0.16) indicating that strong seismic ground shaking is unlikely to occur. There are no existing General Plan goals or policies related to risks from seismic ground shaking that are proposed for revision as part of the proposed General Plan Update. However, existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards Goal 1 and Policies 1, 2, and 4 would reduce the potential for adverse impacts to people or structures related to seismic shaking. Implementation of these existing General Plan goals and policies, in combination with compliance with the geologic and seismic regulations and policies contained in the CBC (which the City has adopted), and the City’s site-specific Design Review process (as set forth in the City’s [2019] Design and Construction Standards Section 2, “General Requirements”), would reduce the potential for adverse impacts to people or structures related to seismic shaking because building plans would be reviewed by City engineers to ensure that structures are consistent with standard engineering practices and requirements contained in the CBC, which are specifically designed to prevent the collapse of structures to the maximum extent practicable during seismic ground shaking. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking under the Infill Housing Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore fewer people and structures would be subject to hazards from strong seismic ground shaking. However, as noted above, given the distance of the Planning Area from active faults and low projected peak ground acceleration, strong seismic ground shaking is unlikely. There are no existing General Plan goals or policies related to risks from seismic ground shaking that are proposed for revision as part of the proposed General Plan Update. However, existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards Goal 1 and Policies 1, 2, and 4 would reduce the potential for adverse impacts to people or structures related to seismic shaking. For the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-1 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), compliance with existing General Plan policies, the requirements of the CBC, and the City’s (2019) Design and Construction Standards would still result in less-than-significant impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking under the Reduced Growth Alternative, and a reduced level of impact would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar number of people and structures would be subject to hazards from strong seismic ground shaking. As noted above, given the distance of the Planning Area from active faults and the low projected peak ground acceleration, strong seismic ground shaking is unlikely. The existing General Plan contains
policies that are designed to reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-1 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), all construction in the City would still be required by law to comply with the requirements of the CBC, which are specifically designed to prevent the collapse of structures to the maximum extent practicable during seismic ground shaking. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.7.2 SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE IMPACTS RELATED TO SOIL EROSION

Infill Housing Alternative

The additional housing units planned under the Infill Housing Alternative (along with construction of public facilities required to support this development, such as road improvements), would involve additional grading, excavation, and earth-moving activities associated with construction of infrastructure and building and road foundations, all of which would result in increased potential for erosion and on-site and off-site sediment transport, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in detail in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-2 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), compliance with existing stormwater, grading, and erosion control regulations would reduce the impact by requiring applicants to develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required by the State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB 2012) Construction General Permit, implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) based on the City’s Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for Construction (City of Roseville 2011a), comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance, comply with the City’s (2019) Design and Construction Standards, and comply with the avoidance and minimization measures contained in the Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan (OSPOMP) (City of Roseville 2011b), all of which are specifically designed to minimize construction-related soil erosion and degradation of water quality to the maximum extent feasible. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy SAFE1.3 (which is proposed for modification to clarify that the compatibility of adjacent land uses does not relate to soil erosion). In addition, existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards Goal 1 and Policies 3, 5, and 6, Vegetation and Wildlife Policy 4, and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Goal 1 and Policy 2 would still be implemented, which would reduce soil erosion by requiring preservation of creek corridors and streambeds, consideration of appropriate land uses on slopes, use of the appropriate construction techniques to stabilize slopes, and the use of contour grading. With the additional development anticipated under this alternative, impacts related to soil erosion under the Infill Housing Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a reduced level of soil erosion would occur. However, the same types of impacts would still occur. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy SAFE1.3, along with existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards Goal 1 and Policies 3, 5, and 6, Vegetation and Wildlife Policy 4, and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Goal 1 and Policy 2, and these existing goals and policies would continue to be implemented. For the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-2 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), compliance with existing and proposed General Plan Update policies, the City’s Grading Ordinance, the
SWRCB’s (2012) Construction General Permit (including the requirements to prepare and implement a SWPPP and associated BMPs), the City’s (2019) Design and Construction Standards, and the OSPOMP (City of Roseville 2011b), would still result in less-than-significant impacts related to soil erosion under the Reduced Growth Alternative, and a reduced level of impact would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of soil erosion would occur. Existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards Goal 1 and Policies 3, 5, and 6, Vegetation and Wildlife Policy 4, and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Goal 1 and Policy 2 are designed to reduce soil erosion, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-2 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), all construction in the City would still be required by law to comply with the SWRCB’s (2012) Construction General Permit (including the requirements to prepare and implement a SWPPP and associated BMPs), to comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance, and to implement requirements in the City’s (2019) Design and Construction Standards and the measures included in the OSPOMP (City of Roseville 2011b). Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

**6.5.7.3 GEOLOGIC HAZARDS RELATED TO UNSTABLE AND EXPANSIVE SOILS**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The additional housing units planned under the Infill Housing Alternative would result in the placement of additional buildings and infrastructure in areas of unstable soils, and soils with high a shrink-swell potential, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-3 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), there are no existing General Plan goals or policies related to construction in unstable or expansive soils that are proposed for revision. However, existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards Goal 1 and Policies 2, 5, and 6 would still be implemented, which require compliance with current laws and regulations, including the CBC and Section 111 (Grading) of the City’s Construction Standards related to soil testing for earthwork and backfill, would address issues related to unstable and expansive soils by requiring new construction to prepare site-specific geotechnical reports to identify areas of unstable soil and shrink-swell potential, and to follow design specifications contained in the CBC and standard engineering practices to prevent adverse impacts associated with these limitations. With the additional development anticipated under this alternative, impacts related to unstable and expansive soil under the Infill Housing Alternative would slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a reduced level of hazards from placement of buildings and infrastructure in areas of unstable soils, and soils with high a shrink-swell potential, would occur. However, the same types of impacts would still occur. There are no existing General Plan goals or policies related to construction in unstable or expansive soils that are proposed for revision. However, existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards
Goal 1 and Policies 2, 5, and 6 would still be implemented, and these goals and policies would help to reduce impacts related to construction in unstable and expansive soils. For the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-3 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), all development is required to comply with the CBC and the City’s Design and Construction Standards, and therefore impacts related to unstable and expansive soil under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of hazards from placement of buildings and infrastructure in areas of unstable soils, and soils with high a shrink-swell potential, would occur. Existing General Plan Seismic and Geologic Hazards Goal 1 and Policies 2, 5, and 6 are designed to reduce hazards from unstable and expansive soils, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-3 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), all construction in the City would still be required to comply with the requirements of the CBC and to implement the City’s Design and Construction Standards. Therefore, impacts related to unstable and expansive soil under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.7.4 UNIQUE PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (DAMAGE OR DESTRUCTION OF PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES DURING EARTHMOVING ACTIVITIES)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities in paleontologically sensitive rock formations, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional housing units would be constructed in areas that have been previously disturbed for existing development and supporting infrastructure. Therefore, assuming that excavation for redevelopment activities occurred at the same depth as the existing development, the potential to encounter unique paleontological resources from the additional housing units would be lower as compared to new development on vacant land. However, the Infill Housing Alternative also includes all of the new development envisioned under the proposed General Plan update throughout the Planning Area. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect paleontological resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal OS4.1, which is proposed for modification to clarify that it includes protection for paleontological resources. Furthermore, for the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-4 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), the Infill Housing Alternative would implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 contained in the proposed General Plan Update, which requires the addition of new Policy OS4.11 that would implement construction worker personnel education related to fossils prior to the start of site-specific earthmoving activities, and would require obtaining the services of a qualified paleontologist and implementing the paleontologist’s site-specific recommendations if fossils were encountered. Therefore, impacts related to unique paleontological resources under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.
**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential to encounter and potentially damage or destroy unique paleontological resources. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal OS4.1, which is proposed for modification to clarify that it includes protection for paleontological resources. Furthermore, for the reasons as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.7-4 (Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources”), the Reduced Growth Alternative would implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 contained in the proposed General Plan Update, which requires the addition of new Policy OS4.11 that would implement construction worker personnel education related to fossils prior to the start of site-specific earthmoving activities, and would require obtaining the services of a qualified paleontologist and implementing the paleontologist’s site-specific recommendations if fossils were encountered. Therefore, impacts related to unique paleontological resources under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be **reduced** as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be **less than significant with mitigation**.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential damage to unique paleontological resources could occur. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect paleontological resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. However, new and infill development in other portions of the Planning Area would not receive such protection because the existing General Plan does not contain goals or policies that would require evaluation or mitigation of impacts to unique paleontological resources from future development projects in the City. Under the No Project Alternative, existing General Plan goals and policies would not be updated to include protection for paleontological resources. Furthermore, there are no state or federal laws or regulations that require evaluation or protection of paleontological resources on private land, except as part of discretionary projects subject to CEQA or NEPA review. Therefore, the No Project Alternative could result in **greater**, and **significant** impacts to unique paleontological resources as compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

**6.5.8 Biological Resources**

**6.5.8.1 Special-Status Plants (Loss and Degradation of Special-Status Plant Habitat and Potential Loss of Special-Status Plants)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities and development of additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional units would be constructed in previously disturbed areas that are already developed (see Exhibit 6-1). As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-1 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), over 4,800 acres of habitat that may be suitable for special-status plant species would be lost from proposed development in the Planning Area, including annual grassland, oak woodland/savannah, riparian woodland/wetlands, vernal pool complexes, and open water, which could result in loss of special-status plants either through direct removal or through habitat degradation. Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop and dwarf downingia are known to occur in the Planning Area in vernal pool habitats, and along the edges
of marshes within riparian woodland/wetland habitat. In addition, other special-status plants, including Sanford’s arrowhead, big-scale balsamroot, Ahart’s dwarf rush, legenere, and pincushion navarretia, could be present at previously undiscovered locations in annual grassland, vernal pool, and wetland habitat in the Planning Area that may be developed. As noted above, the additional housing units that would be implemented under the Infill Housing Alternative would be located in existing developed areas, and therefore no vernal pool or wetland habitat would be lost for the additional housing units, and it unlikely that annual grassland habitat would be lost for the additional housing units. Furthermore, compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) would reduce impacts on Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop because this would require that this species be avoided or that any loss of this species be fully mitigated as a condition of permit approvals, including take authorization from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The City and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have already entered into Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) for the previously adopted Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, which include land use plans and mitigation strategies for ESA compliance. Consistent with the USFWS Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005), the City of Roseville has set aside numerous vernal pool preservation areas within the Planning Area. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect special-status species in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Much of the sensitive habitat in the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 4, 5, 11; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policy 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies require consistency with the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan for dedication and management of on-site wetlands, preservation and restoration of riparian habitat and streambed corridors, considering the use of City property for habitat preservation and mitigation requirements, and limiting access to wetlands to preserve species. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 contained in the proposed General Plan Update, which requires the addition of a new General Plan Implementation Measure that requires site-specific field surveys for special-status plants and habitats, along with mitigation measures designed to protect them (such as habitat preservation). Therefore, impacts to special-status plant species and habitat under the Infill Housing Alternative would similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction and development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential to destroy special-status plants and their habitat. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-1 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), consistent with the USFWS Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005), the City of Roseville has set aside numerous vernal pool preservation areas within the Planning Area. Much of the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 4, 5, 11; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policy 3 would still be
implemented. These goals and policies require consistency with the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan for dedication and management of on-site wetlands, preservation and restoration of riparian habitat and streambed corridors, considering the use of City property for habitat preservation and mitigation requirements, and limiting access to wetlands to preserve species. The Reduced Growth Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 contained in the 2035 General Plan Update, which requires a new General Plan Implementation Measure that requires site-specific field surveys for special-status plants and habitats, along with mitigation measures designed to protect them (such as habitat preservation), for all future CEQA projects. Furthermore, most of the habitat that would be disturbed under the proposed General Plan Update consists of undeveloped land in the western portion of the Planning Area, which would not be developed under the Reduced Growth Alternative. Therefore, impacts related to special-status plants and habitat under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential direct and indirect losses of special-status plants and their habitat could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12 would not be updated to provide more detailed protection for special-status plants and habitat. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 requiring a new General Plan Implementation Measure to further protect special-status plants and their habitat, would not be implemented. However, the existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 4, 5, 11; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policy 3 would still be implemented, and these goals and policies are designed to reduce the loss of special-status plants and habitat. The City and USFWS have already entered into MOUs for the previously adopted Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, which include land use plans and mitigation strategies for ESA compliance. Consistent with the USFWS Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005), the City of Roseville has set aside numerous vernal pool preservation areas within the Planning Area. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect special-status species in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Much of the sensitive habitat in the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. Finally, impacts to ESA and CESA-listed species must be avoided or fully mitigated as a condition of permit approvals, including take authorizations from USFWS and CDFW. Therefore, impacts related to special-status plants and habitat under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.8.2 SPECIAL-STATUS WILDLIFE (LOSS AND DEGRADATION OF HABITAT FOR SPECIAL-STATUS WILDLIFE SPECIES AND POTENTIAL DIRECT TAKE OF INDIVIDUALS)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities and development of additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional units would be constructed in previously disturbed areas that are already developed (see Exhibit 6-1). As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-2 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), over 6,300 acres of habitat that may be suitable for special-status wildlife species would be lost from proposed development in the Planning Area, including annual
grassland, oak woodland/savannah, riparian woodland/wetlands, vernal pool complexes, and open water, which could result in loss of special-status wildlife either through direct mortality or through habitat degradation. These species, which are known to be present in the Planning Area, include vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, steelhead, tricolored blackbird, Swainson’s hawk, California black rail, white-tailed kite, along with 12 additional special-status wildlife species that are not officially listed under ESA or CESA. Pallid bat and Townsend’s big-eared bat habitat could be removed. Additional special-status and/or migratory bird species in the Planning Area include Cooper’s hawk, ferruginous hawk, loggerhead shrike, burrowing owl, tricolored blackbird, northern harrier, long-billed curlew, grasshopper sparrow, and purple martin.

Most of the new development would occur in the western portions of the Planning Area that surround Pleasant Grove Creek and Curry Creek, neither of which are part of the Dry Creek stream system and do not support populations of special-status fish (PCCP 2018). However, the Infill Housing Alternative would allow for some new development in the vicinity of Dry Creek, Antelope Creek, Linda Creek, Secret Ravine, and Miners Ravine. This would increase the density of development surrounding the Dry Creek stream system that could degrade water quality and negatively affect habitat for special-status fish (i.e., Central Valley DPS of steelhead and the fall/late fall run ESU of chinook salmon). Compliance with ESA and CESA would reduce some of the potential impacts because it would require that State and/or federally listed species be avoided or that any loss of these species be fully mitigated as a condition of take authorization. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect special-status species in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. The City and USFWS have already entered into MOUs for the previously adopted Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, which include land use plans and mitigation strategies for ESA compliance. Consistent with the USFWS Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005), the City of Roseville has set aside numerous vernal pool preservation areas within the Planning Area. Much of the sensitive habitat in the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policy 3, which would still be implemented. These goals and policies require consistency with the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan for dedication and management of on-site wetland mitigation, provide for protection and enhancement of native fishery resources, take into account natural habitat areas when designating access to and preserving open space areas, and incorporate existing trees into development projects. These goals and policies would help to protect special-status species and habitats. The Infill Housing Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-2, which requires a new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measure that requires site-specific field surveys for special-status wildlife and habitats, along with mitigation measures designed to protect them (such as habitat preservation), for all future CEQA projects. Therefore, impacts to special-status wildlife species under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction and development would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for direct mortality of
special-status wildlife and indirect loss or degradation of habitat. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-2 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), consistent with the USFWS Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005), the City of Roseville has set aside numerous vernal pool preservation areas within the Planning Area. Much of the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. Compliance with ESA and CESA would reduce some of the potential impacts because it would require that State and/or federally listed species be avoided or that any loss of these species be fully mitigated as a condition of take authorization. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policy 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies require consistency with the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan for dedication and management of on-site wetland mitigation, provide for protection and enhancement of native fishery resources, take into account natural habitat areas when designating access to and preserving open space areas, and incorporate existing trees into development projects. These goals and policies would help to protect special-status species and habitats. The Reduced Growth Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 contained in the proposed General Plan Update, which requires a new General Plan Implementation Measure that requires site-specific field surveys for special-status wildlife and habitats, along with mitigation measures designed to protect them (such as habitat preservation), for all future CEQA projects. Furthermore, most of the habitat that would be disturbed under the proposed General Plan Update consists of undeveloped land in the western portion of the Planning Area, which would not be developed under the Reduced Growth Alternative. Therefore, impacts related to special-status wildlife and associated habitat under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential direct and indirect losses of special-status wildlife and associated habitat could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12 would not be updated to provide more detailed protection for special-status wildlife and habitat. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 requiring a new General Plan Implementation Measure to further protect special-status wildlife and associated habitat, would not be implemented. However, the existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policy 3 are designed to reduce the loss of special-status wildlife and habitat, and these goals and policies would continue to be implemented. The City and USFWS have already entered into MOUs for the previously adopted Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, which include land use plans and mitigation strategies for ESA compliance. Consistent with the USFWS Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005), the City of Roseville has set aside numerous vernal pool preservation areas within the Planning Area. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect special-status species in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Much of the sensitive habitat in the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. Finally, impacts to ESA and CESA-listed species must be avoided or fully mitigated as a condition of permit approvals, including take authorizations from USFWS and CDFW. Therefore, impacts related to special-status wildlife and loss or
degradation of habitat under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.8.3 RIPARIAN HABITAT/SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES (LOSS AND DEGRADATION OF RIPARIAN HABITAT OR OTHER SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities and development of additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional housing units would be constructed in previously disturbed areas that are already developed and are surrounded by existing urban development (see Exhibit 6-1). Therefore, although the proposed General Plan Update could potentially result in the conversion of up to 251 acres of riparian woodland/wetlands and 141 acres of oak woodland/savannah to urban development, it is unlikely that the Infill Housing Alternative would result conversion of additional substantial areas of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-3 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), compliance with Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code would reduce potential impacts on riparian habitat because it would require project applicants to obtain a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (if applicable) that includes measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for adverse effects to riparian habitat that must be implemented as a condition of the agreement. Furthermore, City floodplain development regulations limit the type of activities that could occur within the riparian zone and the Roseville Creek and Riparian Management and Restoration Plan provides standards for riparian area management and enhancement. The City’s Tree Ordinance protects oak trees, and BMPs associated with NPDES permits would protect riparian zones by prohibiting fill or degradation to vegetation that could impede water quality and vegetation. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies require consistency with the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan for dedication and management of on-site wetland mitigation, provide for protection and enhancement of native fishery resources, take into account natural habitat areas when designating access to and preserving open space areas, and incorporate existing trees into development projects. These goals and policies would help to protect riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. The Infill Housing Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3, which requires a new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measure that requires project applicants to obtain a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW if projects would result in fill or alteration of a waterway or any body of water supporting riparian forest habitat, and to implement measures for riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities protection such as establishing a buffer zone between adjacent land uses and riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities; protecting and preserving riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities to the extent feasible; and compensating for loss of riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities by creating, restoring, or preserving off-site habitat in coordination with the applicable resource agencies. Mitigation Measures 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 described previously above would also be implemented, and would also help to reduce impacts to riparian habitat.
and other sensitive natural communities. Therefore, impacts related to loss or conversion of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction and development would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for loss or conversion of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-3 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), much of the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies require consistency with the City of Roseville Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan for dedication and management of on-site wetland mitigation, provide for protection and enhancement of native fishery resources, take into account natural habitat areas when designating access to and preserving open space areas, and incorporate existing trees into development projects. These goals and policies would help to protect riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. The Reduced Growth Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 from the proposed General Plan Update, which requires a new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measure that requires project applicants to obtain a Lake and Streamed Alteration Agreement from CDFW if projects would result in fill or alteration of a waterway or any body of water supporting riparian forest habitat, and to implement measures for riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities protection contained in the agreement. Mitigation Measures 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 described previously above would also be implemented under the Reduced Growth Alternative, and would also help to reduce impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities.

Furthermore, most of the habitat that would be disturbed under the proposed General Plan Update consists of undeveloped land in the western portion of the Planning Area, which would not be developed under the Reduced Growth Alternative. Therefore, impacts related to loss or conversion of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development that would occur as under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential for loss or conversion of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.7, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS1.12 would not be updated to provide addition protection for riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 requiring a new General Plan Implementation Measure to further protect riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, would not be implemented. However, the existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 are designed to reduce the loss of riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, future project applicants are required by law to consult with CDFW and obtain a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW if
projects would result in fill or alteration of a waterway or any body of water supporting riparian forest habitat, and to implement measures for riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities protection contained in the agreement. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect special-status species in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Much of the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, impacts related to loss or conversion of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.8.4 LOSS AND DEGRADATION OF WETLANDS AND OTHER WATERS

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities and development of additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional housing units would be constructed in previously disturbed areas that are already developed and are surrounded by existing urban development (see Exhibit 6-1). As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-4 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), land conversion could result in direct fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States and/or waters of the state. Indirect impacts could result from adjacent development that leads to habitat modifications, such as changes in hydrology and reduction in water quality caused by urban runoff, erosion, and siltation. Project applicants must obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for any activity resulting in fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States, and a wetland mitigation plan that satisfies USACE requirements is required as part of the permit application. Any wetlands or other waters disclaimed by the USACE would still be subject to regulation by Central Valley RWQCB as waters of the state and impacts on waters of the state would require mitigation. However, as shown in Exhibit 4.8-4, much of the open water/creeks and vernal pool complexes in the Planning Area is designated for Open Space and would therefore be protected from direct removal, reducing the potential impact. The City and USFWS have already entered into MOUs for the previously adopted Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, which include land use plans and mitigation strategies for ESA compliance, including avoidance, minimization, and preservation of wetland resources, specifically vernal pools, riparian areas, and other sensitive wetland habitat.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS2.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies provide for preservation of natural habitat, creeks, riparian and seasonal wetland areas, and water quality. The Infill Housing Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 from the proposed General Plan Update, which would require a new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measure that requires project applicants to complete a delineation of waters of the United States according to USACE methods, and to submit the completed delineation to the USACE for jurisdictional determination. If the project would result in fill of wetlands or other waters of the United States, the City will require project proponent/s to obtain a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit and a water quality certification from the Central Valley RWQCB pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Mitigation Measures 4.8-1, 4.8-2, and 4.8-3 described previously above would also be implemented under this alternative, and would also help to reduce impacts to wetlands and other waters. Because the additional housing units would be constructed in
previously disturbed areas that are already developed and are surrounded by existing urban development, impacts related to fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction and development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-4 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), much of the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS2.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. The Reduced Growth Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 contained in the proposed General Plan Update, which requires a new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measure that requires project applicants to complete a delineation of waters of the United States, obtain all appropriate permits, and implement the terms and conditions of the permits in order to mitigate for fill of wetlands. Furthermore, most of the wetlands that could be filled or indirectly affected under the proposed General Plan Update are located within undeveloped land in the western portion of the Planning Area, which would not be developed under the Reduced Growth Alternative. Mitigation Measures 4.8-1, 4.8-2, and 4.8-3 described previously above would also be implemented under the Reduced Growth Alternative, and would also help to reduce impacts to wetlands and other waters. Therefore, impacts related to fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur as under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential for fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS2.12 would not be updated to provide improved protection for wetlands and other waters. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 requiring a new General Plan Implementation Measure that requires project applicants to complete a delineation of waters of the United States, obtain all appropriate permits, and implement the terms and conditions of the permits in order to mitigate for fill of wetlands, would not be implemented. However, the existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 are designed to reduce the loss of wetlands and other waters and to preserve habitat, and these goals and policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, future project applicants are required by law to consult with USACE and prepare a wetland delineation that includes a mitigation plan if projects would result in fill of water of the United States. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect waters of the United States in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoroso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Much of the Planning Area is designated as Open Space that would be maintained as part of the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, impacts related to
fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.8.5 **SUBSTANTIAL INTERFERENCE WITH WILDLIFE MOVEMENT CORRIDORS AND NURSERY SITES**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities and development of additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional housing units would be constructed in previously disturbed areas that are already developed and are surrounded by existing urban development (see Exhibit 6-1). As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-5 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), the Planning Area does not currently provide an important connection between any areas of natural habitat that would otherwise be isolated. The Planning Area is not located within any of the ecological corridors identified in the draft *Western Placer County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan* (PCCP 2018) as important to maintaining connectivity between communities, habitat patches, species populations, or the proposed conservation plant reserve system. The only wildlife nursery site identified in the Planning Area is a nesting colony of purple martin in the State Route 65 overpass. No change to the State Route 65 overpass is proposed as part of the proposed General Plan Update. The City’s Floodplain Development Regulations and NPDES permit requirements would reduce impacts associated with floodplains, stream channels, and natural protective barriers. Most of the stream channels in the Planning Area would remain as open space, which would preserve movement corridors in the Planning Area. Also, much of the vernal pool complexes in the Planning Area would be preserved and provide linkages for movement of animals. In addition, if there are activities in the Planning Area that could affect stream corridors, this would require a Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. Specific measures would be developed during discussions with CDFW, but may include avoidance and minimization measures, use of erosion control and bank stabilization measures, and restoration of stream corridor habitat that has been damaged during the construction of the proposed General Plan Update. The Infill Housing Alternative would increase the density of development surrounding the Dry Creek stream system, which serves as habitat for migratory salmonids. However, implementation of BMPs associated with NPDES permits for construction activities, and compliance with the City’s MS4 permit, would reduce the potential for additional pollutants to be transported in stormwater into Dry Creek, Antelope Creek, Linda Creek, Secret Ravine, and Miners Ravine. The City and USFWS have already entered into MOUs for the previously adopted Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, which include land use plans and mitigation strategies for ESA compliance.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9 and OS2.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, and 11; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies provide for preservation and restoration of continuous riparian corridors and adjacent habitat along the City’s creeks and waterways, protection and enhancement of native fishery resources, and implementation of erosion control and topsoil conservation measures to limit sediments within watercourses. Existing and proposed General Plan Update policies that require protection of special-status species and their habitats also protect riparian areas, wetlands, and drainages that can be used as wildlife corridors. The Infill Housing Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measures 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-3, and 4.8-4 contained in
the proposed General Plan Update, which would require new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measures that requires site-specific field surveys for special-status plants, wildlife and habitats, riparian and sensitive natural communities, and wetlands, along with mitigation measures designed to protect them (such as preservation). Therefore, impacts related to interference with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction and development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential interference with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-5 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), compliance with the City’s Floodplain Development Regulations and NPDES permit requirements would reduce impacts associated with floodplains, stream channels, and natural protective barriers. Most of the stream channels in the Planning Area would remain as open space, which would preserve movement corridors in the Planning Area. Also, much of the vernal pool complexes in the Planning Area would be preserved and provide linkages for movement of animals. In addition, if there are activities in the Planning Area that could affect stream corridors, this would require a Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. Implementation of BMPs associated with NPDES permits for construction activities, and compliance with the City’s MS4 permit, would reduce the potential for additional pollutants to be transported in stormwater into the Dry Creek System, which would in turn reduce potential impacts on migratory salmonids. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9 and OS2.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, and 11; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies provide for preservation and restoration of continuous riparian corridors and adjacent habitat along the City’s creeks and waterways, protection and enhancement of native fishery resources, and implementation of erosion control and topsoil conservation measures to limit sediments within watercourses. Existing and proposed General Plan Update policies that require protection of special-status species and their habitats also protect riparian areas, wetlands, and drainages that can be used as wildlife corridors. The Reduced Growth Alternative would also implement Mitigation Measures 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-3, and 4.8-4 contained in the proposed General Plan Update, which would require new proposed General Plan Update Implementation Measures that requires site-specific field surveys for special-status plants, wildlife and habitats, riparian and sensitive natural communities, and wetlands, along with mitigation measures designed to protect them (such as preservation). Therefore, impacts related to interference with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant with mitigation.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of interference with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites would occur. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-5 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), the Planning Area does not currently provide an important connection between any areas of natural habitat that would otherwise be isolated. The Planning Area is not located within any of the ecological corridors identified in the draft Western
Placer County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (PCCP 2018) as important to maintaining connectivity between communities, habitat patches, species populations, or the proposed conservation plant reserve system. The only wildlife nursery site identified in the Planning Area is a nesting colony of purple martin in the State Route 65 overpass. No change to the State Route 65 overpass is proposed as part of the proposed General Plan Update. Under the No Project Alternative, Policy OS1.6; and Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.1, OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9 and OS2.12 would not be updated to provide additional protection for wildlife migration corridors and nursery sites. Furthermore, Mitigation Measures 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-3, and 4.8-4 requiring new General Plan Update Implementation Measures to further protect special-status wildlife, habitat, riparian communities, and wetlands, which would in turn protect wildlife migration corridors and nursery sites, would not be implemented. However, existing General Plan Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, and 11; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented, and these goals and policies would help to protect wildlife migration corridors. Furthermore, the City’s Floodplain Development Regulations and NPDES permit requirements would reduce impacts associated with floodplains, stream channels, and natural protective barriers. Most of the stream channels in the Planning Area would remain as open space, which would preserve movement corridors in the Planning Area. Also, much of the vernal pool complexes in the Planning Area would be preserved and provide linkages for movement of animals. In addition, if there are activities in the Planning Area that could affect stream corridors, this would require a Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. Specific measures would be developed during discussions with CDFW, but may include avoidance and minimization measures, use of erosion control and bank stabilization measures, and restoration of stream corridor habitat that has been damaged during the construction of the proposed General Plan Update. Implementation of BMPs associated with NPDES permits for construction activities, and compliance with the City’s MS4 permit, would reduce the potential for additional pollutants to be transported in stormwater into the Dry Creek System, which would in turn reduce potential impacts on migratory salmonids. The City and USFWS have already entered into MOUs for the previously adopted Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, which include land use plans and mitigation strategies for ESA compliance. Therefore, interference with wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.8.6 CONFLICT WITH LOCAL ORDINANCES PROTECTING BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities and development of additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore an increased potential for conflicts with the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 19.66) could occur. However, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-6 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), applications for Tree Permits for regulated activities associated with a discretionary project must be included as part of the land use permit and/or subdivision application for each discretionary project. The Tree Preservation Ordinance requires individual project applicants inventory all trees on their project sites, prepare a program for the preservation of protected trees during and after completion of the project, and replace any protected trees that must be removed.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies OS2.1 and OS2.2, as well as existing General Plan Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policy 11. These goals and policies require that existing trees be incorporated into development projects, and where
preservation is not feasible, mitigation for the loss of removed trees must be provided by individual project applicants. These policies also require the preservation and restoration of continuous riparian corridors and adjacent habitat along the City’s creeks, which would also preserve trees. With the additional development anticipated, impacts related to conflicts with local biological preservation ordinances under the Infill Housing Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction and development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for conflicts with the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-6 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), applications for Tree Permits (which must include a program for tree preservation and/or tree replacement) for regulated activities associated with a discretionary project must be included as part of the land use permit and/or subdivision application for each discretionary project. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies OS2.1 and OS2.2, as well as existing General Plan Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policy 11. These goals and policies require that existing trees be incorporated into development projects, and where preservation is not feasible, mitigation for the loss of removed trees must be provided by individual project applicants. These policies also require the preservation and restoration of continuous riparian corridors and adjacent habitat along the City’s creeks, which would also preserve trees. Impacts related to conflicts with local biological preservation ordinances under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential conflicts with the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, Policies OS2.1 and OS2.2 would not be updated. However, the existing General Plan Vegetation and Wildlife Policy 1 requires that existing trees be incorporated into development projects, and where preservation is not feasible, mitigation for the loss of removed trees must be provided by individual project applicants. Furthermore, existing General Plan Vegetation and Wildlife Policy 2 also requires the preservation of continuous riparian corridors and adjacent habitat along the City’s creeks, which would also preserve trees. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with local biological preservation ordinances under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

**6.5.8.7 HABITAT CONSERVATION PLANS (CONFLICT WITH PROVISIONS OF AN ADOPTED HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN, NATURAL CONSERVATION COMMUNITY PLAN, OR OTHER APPROVED CONSERVATION PLAN)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in increased earthmoving activities and development of additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional units would be constructed in previously disturbed areas that are already developed (see Exhibit 6-1). As discussed in Draft EIR
Impact 4.8-7 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), there is no adopted habitat conservation plan (HCP), natural community conservation plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or State HCP that applies to the Planning Area. The County is currently preparing the Western Placer County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (PCCP 2018); however, this plan is in draft form and has not been adopted. For the Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, the City entered into MOUs with USFWS to prepare an HCP or equivalent. The City worked with the USFWS to assess the status of remaining vernal pool resources within the City. This included several mapping efforts to identify current development trends and remaining vernal pool resources. The USFWS concurred that nearly all remaining undeveloped land containing vernal pools had received federal permits for development through the Clean Water Act 404 process and, therefore, preparation of an HCP or equivalent to address remaining development would not be necessary. The USFWS further determined that the conservation strategy could be developed and approved through Section 7 consultation process in the context of permitting pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS2.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies provide for the preservation of natural habitat and the protection of special-status species habitat and water quality, including biological resources associated with the proposed Western Placer County HCP/NCCP, if and when it is adopted. Therefore, impacts related to potential conflicts with HCPs under the Infill Development Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction and development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for conflicts with an adopted HCP. However, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-7 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), there is no adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State HCP that applies to the Planning Area. The Western Placer County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (PCCP 2018) is in draft form and has not been adopted. Furthermore, most of the habitat that would be lost under the proposed General Plan Update consists of undeveloped land in the western portion of the Planning Area, which would not be developed under the Reduced Growth Alternative. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS2.12. In addition, existing General Plan Open Space System Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies provide for the preservation of natural habitat and the protection of special-status species habitat and water quality, including biological resources associated with the proposed Western Placer County HCP/NCCP, if and when it is adopted. Therefore, impacts related to potential conflicts with HCPs under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.
No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level potential for conflicts with adopted HCPs could occur. However, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.8-7 (Section 4.8, “Biological Resources”), there is no adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State HCP that applies to the Planning Area. The Western Placer County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (PCCP 2018) is in draft form and has not been adopted. For the Sierra Vista, West Roseville, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans, the City entered into MOUs with USFWS to prepare an HCP or equivalent. The USFWS concurred that nearly all remaining undeveloped land containing vernal pools had received federal permits for development through the Clean Water Act 404 process and, therefore, preparation of an HCP or equivalent to address remaining development would not be necessary. The USFWS further determined that the conservation strategy could be developed and approved through Section 7 consultation process in the context of permitting pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Under the No Project Alternative, revisions to Goal OS2.2 and Policies OS2.2, OS2.6, OS2.7, OS2.8, OS2.9, OS2.10, and OS2.12 would not be implemented to provide improved protection to biological resources. However, the existing General Plan Open Space System Policy 7; Vegetation and Wildlife Goals 1 and 3 and Policies 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13; and Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Policies 2 and 3 would still be implemented. These goals and policies provide for the preservation of natural habitat and the protection of special-status species habitat and water quality, including biological resources associated with the proposed Western Placer County HCP/NCCP, if and when it is adopted. Therefore, impacts related to potential conflicts with HCPs under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.9 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

6.5.9.1 HISTORIC RESOURCES

Infill Housing Alternative

Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, the Infill Housing Alternative would have significant impacts related to substantial adverse changes in the significance of a historical resource. The Infill Housing Alternative would add approximately 1,400 multi-family dwelling units in the City’s Infill Area that could result in demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.9, “Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources,” a total of 25 historical resources have been specifically identified in the Planning Area and numerous historic-era sites have been identified as part of investigations conducted for specific plans. Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1, OS4.6, OS4.7, and OS4.10 would protect historical resources. In addition, Chapter 19.61 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance protects “Significant Buildings” that have historic, cultural, or aesthetic interest, which may have significant value to the community, and Chapter 19.12 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance protects the designated Old Town Historic District. The City of Roseville’s 2009 Downtown Specific Plan, where additional housing under the Infill Housing Alternative could occur, includes policies and strategies for identification and treatment of historic buildings within the Downtown Specific Plan Area. In addition, all future projects subject to CEQA are required to evaluate and provide appropriate mitigation for historic resources as part of future CEQA documents. Finally, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect historic resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans.
The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures; comply with the City’s Zoning Ordinance; and implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a presented in Section 4.9 for the proposed General Plan Update. Although implementation of the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update goals, policies, implementation measures and Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a would reduce the potential impacts on historic resources associated with development in the General Plan Planning Area, significant impacts may still occur. The impact would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be significant and unavoidable.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. Because a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, there would be a reduced potential to encounter and potentially damage or destroy historic resources. For the same reasons as discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.9, project under the Reduced Growth Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures; comply with the City’s Zoning Ordinance; comply with 2009 Downtown Specific Plan policies and strategies; and implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a. Despite implementation of the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update goals, policies, implementation measures and Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a, it may not be possible to entirely avoid impacts related to demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources during buildout of the projects in the Planning Area. The impact to historic resources under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would still be significant and unavoidable.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential damage to historic resources could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. The existing General Plan contains goals and policies designed to reduce impacts to historic resources would continue to be implemented. However, Mitigation Measures 4.9-1a requiring new General Plan implementation measures that would protect historic resources would not be implemented.

All construction under the No Project Alternative in the City would still be required to comply with Chapter 19.61 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance. Furthermore, a variety of state laws require consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and proper evaluation and treatment of historic resources. In addition, all future projects subject to CEQA are required to evaluate and provide appropriate mitigation for historic resources as part of future CEQA documents.

Finally, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect historic resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Impacts to historic resources under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update because a similar level of development would occur, and for the same reasons.
described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be **significant and unavoidable**.

### 6.5.9.2 **ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, the Infill Housing Alternative would have significant impacts related to substantial adverse changes in the significance of an archeological resource. The Infill Housing Alternative would add approximately 1,400 multi-family dwelling units in the City’s Infill Area and require additional ground-disturbing activities, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional 1,400 housing units would be constructed in already developed areas that have been previously disturbed for existing residential development and supporting infrastructure. Therefore, assuming that excavation for redevelopment activities occurred at the same depth as the existing development, the potential to encounter archaeological resources from development of an additional 1,400 housing units would be less as compared to new development on vacant land.

As discussed in Section 4.9, numerous historic-era and prehistoric archaeological sites have been identified as part of investigations conducted for the City’s Specific Plans. Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1, OS4.4, OS4.6, OS4.7, OS4.9, and OS4.10 would protect archaeological resources. In addition, the existing General Plan contains implementation measures to protect and preserve archaeological resources. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures and implement Mitigation Measures 4.9-2a and 4.9-2b presented in Section 4.9 for the proposed General Plan Update. Finally, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect historic resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans.

Because prehistoric and historic-era archaeological sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation, it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts during buildout of the Planning Area under the Infill Housing Alternative, despite implementation of existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update goals, policies, implementation measures and Mitigation Measures 4.9-2a and 4.9-2b. If unknown archaeological resources are encountered during construction without prior discovery, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. This impact would be **similar to** the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be **significant and unavoidable**.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. Because a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, there would be a reduced potential to encounter and potentially damage or destroy archaeological resources.
Projects implemented under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be required to comply with goals and policies contained in the proposed General Plan Update. As stated previously, prehistoric and historic-era archaeological sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation. Despite implementation of the goals, policies, and implementation measures in the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update, it may not be possible to entirely avoid impacts to archaeological resources during buildout of the Reduced Growth Alternative. No other feasible mitigation measures are available. The Reduced Growth Alternative would not avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to archaeological resources that could occur under the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, impacts to archaeological resources under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update because of less development in the western portion of the City, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would still be significant and unavoidable.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential damage to archaeological resources could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. The existing General Plan contains goals and policies designed to reduce impacts to archaeological resources would continue to be implemented. However, Mitigation Measures 4.9-2a and 4.9-2b requiring new General Plan implementation measures that would protect archaeological resources would not be implemented.

All construction under the No Project Alternative in the City would still be required to comply with Chapter 19.61 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance. Furthermore, a variety of state laws require consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and proper evaluation and treatment of archaeological resources. In addition, all future projects subject to CEQA are required to evaluate and provide appropriate mitigation for archaeological resources as part of future CEQA documents.

Finally, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect archaeological resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Despite implementation of the existing General Plan goals, policies, implementation measures and project-specific mitigation measures, it may not be possible to entirely avoid impacts to archaeological resources during buildout of the Planning Area. Because prehistoric and historic-era archaeological sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation, it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts during buildout of the No Project Alternative, despite implementation of existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. If unknown archaeological resources are encountered during construction without prior discovery, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. Impacts to archaeological resources under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update because a similar level of development would occur, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be significant and unavoidable.
6.5.9.3 HUMAN REMAINS

Infill Housing Alternative

Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, the Infill Housing Alternative would have significant impacts related to disturbance of human remains. The Infill Housing Alternative would add approximately 1,400 multi-family dwelling units in the City’s Infill Area and require additional ground-disturbing activities, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional 1,400 housing units would be constructed in already developed areas that have been previously disturbed for existing residential development and supporting infrastructure. Therefore, assuming that excavation for redevelopment activities occurred at the same depth as the existing development, the potential to encounter human remains from development of an additional 1,400 housing units would be less as compared to new development on vacant land.

As discussed in Section 4.9, some burial ground locations (generally from the historic-era) are known but there is the possibility that ground-disturbing activities in the Planning Area could encounter prehistoric or historic-era human remains. Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1 and OS4.4, would protect cultural resources, including human remains. In addition, the existing General Plan contains implementation measures to protect and preserve human remains. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures and implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 presented in Section 4.9 for the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, all future projects subject to CEQA are required to evaluate and provide appropriate mitigation for human remains as part of future CEQA documents. Finally, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to avoid disturbance of human remains in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans.

Because prehistoric and historic archaeological sites that contain human remains can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation, it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts to interred human remains during buildout of the Planning Area under the Infill Housing Alternative, despite implementation of existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update goals, policies, implementation measures and Mitigation Measure 4.9-3. If unanticipated buried human remains are encountered during construction, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. This impact would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be significant and unavoidable.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. Because a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, there would be a reduced potential to disturb human remains.

Projects implemented under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be required to comply with goals and policies contained in the proposed General Plan Update. As stated previously, prehistoric and historic archaeological sites that contain human remains can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation. If unanticipated buried human remains are encountered during construction, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed.
This impact would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be significant and unavoidable.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential damage to disturb human remains could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. The existing General Plan contains goals and policies designed to reduce impacts to human remains would continue to be implemented. However, Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 requiring new General Plan implementation measures that would protect disturbance of human remains would not be implemented.

All construction under the No Project Alternative in the City would still be required to comply with Chapter 19.61 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance. New development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect human remains in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoroso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Despite implementation of the existing General Plan goals, policies, implementation measures and project-specific mitigation measures, it may not be possible to entirely avoid impacts to human remains during buildout of the Planning Area.

As stated previously, prehistoric and historic-era archaeological sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation and it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts during buildout of the No Project Alternative, despite implementation of existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. If disturbance of human remains occurs during construction without prior discovery, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. Impacts to human remains under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update because a similar level of development would occur, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be significant and unavoidable.

**6.5.9.4 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, the Infill Housing Alternative would have significant impacts related to substantial adverse changes in the significance of tribal cultural resources. The Infill Housing Alternative would add approximately 1,400 multi-family dwelling units in the City’s Infill Area and require additional ground-disturbing activities, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the additional 1,400 housing units would be constructed in already developed areas that have been previously disturbed for existing residential development and supporting infrastructure. Therefore, assuming that excavation for redevelopment activities occurred at the same depth as the existing development, the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources from development of an additional 1,400 housing units would be less as compared to new development on vacant land.

As discussed in Section 4.9, numerous prehistoric archaeological sites have been identified as part of investigations conducted for Specific Plans in the city, including the Maidu Indian Sites. Prehistoric resources also may be considered tribal cultural resources and can include sites, features, and objects that are CRHR-listed,
eligible to be listed, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1, OS4.4, OS4.9, and OS4.10 would help to protect tribal cultural resources. In addition, the existing General Plan contains implementation measures to protect and preserve tribal cultural resources. The Infill Housing Alternative would implement the same proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies and implementation measures and implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 presented in Section 4.9 for the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, all future projects subject to CEQA are required to evaluate and provide appropriate mitigation for tribal cultural resources as part of future CEQA documents. Finally, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect tribal cultural resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans.

Because tribal cultural resources sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation, it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts during buildout of the Planning Area under the Infill Housing Alternative, despite implementation of existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update goals, policies, implementation measures and Mitigation Measure 4.9-3. If unknown tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction without prior discovery, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. This impact would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be significant and unavoidable.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. Because a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, there would be a reduced potential to encounter and potentially damage or destroy tribal cultural resources.

Projects implemented under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be required to comply with goals and policies contained in the proposed General Plan Update. As stated previously, tribal cultural sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation. Despite implementation of the goals, policies, and implementation measures in the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update, it may not be possible to entirely avoid impacts to tribal cultural resources during buildout of the Reduced Growth Alternative. No other feasible mitigation measures are available. The Reduced Growth Alternative would not avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to tribal cultural resources that could occur under the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, impacts to tribal cultural resources under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update because there would be less development in the western portion of the City, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would still be significant and unavoidable.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential damage to tribal cultural resources could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. The existing
General Plan contains goals and policies designed to reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources would continue to be implemented. However, Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 requiring new General Plan implementation measures that would protect tribal cultural resources would not be implemented.

All construction under the No Project Alternative in the City would still be required to comply with Chapter 19.61 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance. Furthermore, a variety of state laws require consultation and proper evaluation and treatment of tribal cultural resources. In addition, all future projects subject to CEQA are required to evaluate and provide appropriate mitigation for historic resources as part of future CEQA documents.

Finally, new development in the western portion of the Planning Area would be subject to mitigation measures designed to protect tribal cultural resources in the previously adopted Sierra Vista, Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, and West Roseville Specific Plans. Despite implementation of the existing General Plan goals, policies, implementation measures and project-specific mitigation measures, it may not be possible to entirely avoid impacts to tribal cultural resources during buildout of the Planning Area. Because tribal cultural resources sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation, it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts during buildout of the No Project Alternative, despite implementation of existing General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. If unknown tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction without prior discovery, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. Impacts to tribal cultural resources under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update because a similar level of development would occur, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.9, would be significant and unavoidable.

6.5.10 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

6.5.10.1 USE, TRANSPORT, DISPOSAL, AND ACCIDENTAL SPILLS (CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD THROUGH ROUTINE TRANSPORT, USE, OR DISPOSAL OR POSSIBLE RELEASE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FROM UPSET OR ACCIDENT CONDITIONS)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional construction to support the proposed additional 1,400 housing units. Therefore, the Infill Housing Alternative would result in an increased use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials (such as fuels and oils during the construction phase), and an increased potential for accidental spills during the construction phase, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-1 (Section 4.10, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials”), the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to numerous regulations at the local, state, and federal level that are designed to protect the public health. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies SAFE5.1, SAFE5.3, and AQ1.21, which require the disclosure, use, and storage of hazardous materials in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. In addition, existing General Plan Hazardous Materials Goal 1 and Policy 2 require consideration of hazardous materials issues in the land use planning process. Implementation of current state and federal regulations, as well as the policies of the proposed General Plan Update may not prevent all potential releases of hazardous materials, but would serve to minimize both the frequency and the magnitude, if such a release occurs, and would reduce the potential impacts of the routine transportation of hazardous materials in the City. Therefore, because there would be increased use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials under the Infill Housing Alternative, related impacts and the
potential for accidental spills of hazardous materials under the Infill Housing Alternative would be **slightly greater than** the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be **less than significant**.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be reduced use, transport, disposal, and possible release of hazardous materials. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and polices as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies SAFE5.1, SAFE5.3, and AQ1.21, as well as existing General Plan Hazardous Material Goal 1 and Policy 2, which require consideration of hazardous materials issues in the land use planning process and require the use, disposal, storage, and transport of hazardous materials in compliance with local, state, and federal safety requirements. Because there would be reduced use, transport, disposal, and possible release of hazardous materials, a **reduced** level of impact would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-1, compliance with local, state, and federal regulations governing the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, as well the proposed General Plan Update policies, would result in **less-than-significant** impacts related to the use, transport, disposal, and accidental spills of hazardous materials under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of potential use, transport, disposal, and exposure to spills of hazardous materials, could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals and policies. For example, revisions to Policies SAFE5.1, SAFE5.3, and AQ1.21 provide clarity in the policy language under the proposed General Plan Update and these revisions would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented and these existing policies require consideration of hazardous materials issues in the land use planning process. Furthermore, all projects in the City would be required by law to comply with local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to the use, transport, disposal, and cleanup of hazardous materials spills. Therefore, impacts related to the use, transport, disposal, and accidental spills of hazardous materials under the No Project Alternative would be **similar to** the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-1, would remain **less than significant**.

**6.5.10.2 Hazardous Materials Within One-Quarter Mile of a School (Emission or Handling of Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within One-Quarter Mile of an Existing or Proposed School)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional construction to support the proposed additional 1,400 housing units. This construction would be focused within the infill areas, as identified in Exhibit 6-1, which include existing schools. Therefore, the Infill Housing Alternative could result in the increased handling of hazardous materials (such as fuels and oils during the construction phase) within 0.25 mile of a school, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-2 (Section 4.10, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials”), the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to numerous
regulations at the local, state, and federal level that are designed to protect the public health. The Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including those that would address hazardous near schools. existing General Plan Hazardous Materials Goal 1 and Hazardous Materials Policy 2, Air Quality Goal 2, Air Quality Policies 8 and 11, Schools Goal 1, and Schools Policy 7 (which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies SAFE5.1 and SAFE 5.3, Goal AQ1.1 and Policies AQ1.3 and 1.21, and Schools Policy PF.4, which ensure that consideration is made of land uses potentially handling hazardous materials, and thereby, would further ensure that such land uses are not developed in proximity to schools. Furthermore, the Infill Housing Alternative would not increase the number of commercial or industrial land uses that could handle hazardous materials on an operational basis. Therefore, impacts from emission or handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for hazardous materials to be emitted or handled within 0.25 mile of a school. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including those listed above regarding the Infill Housing Alternative that would ensure that consideration is made of land uses potentially handling hazardous materials, and thereby, would further ensure that such land uses are not developed in proximity to schools. For the same reasons discussed in Impact 4.10-2 of the Draft EIR, compliance with local, state, and federal regulations governing the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, as well the proposed General Plan Update policies that regulate development near schools, would prevent future conflicts between hazardous materials handling and emissions and schools. Therefore, impacts from emission or handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for hazardous materials to be emitted or handled within 0.25 mile of a school could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals and policies. For example, Policies SAFE5.1 and SAFE 5.3, Goal AQ1.1 and Policies AQ1.3 and 1.21, and Schools Policy PF.4, would not be revised to include revisions that would result in improved protection for school children and employees, along with general public citizens in Roseville related to hazardous materials. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented, including those that require consideration of hazardous materials issues in the land use planning process, along with Schools Policy 8, which states that, where feasible, schools shall be located away from hazards. Therefore, for the reasons same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-2, impacts related to the emission or handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.
6.5.10.3 **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITES (Public Health Hazards from Locating Project Development on a Known Hazardous Materials Site Compiled Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional construction to support the proposed additional 1,400 housing units within infill areas, as identified in Exhibit 6-1. There are approximately 70 known active hazardous materials sites in the City, most of which have been remediated and are closed. There are 10 open, active sites which are undergoing remedial action under the jurisdiction of DTSC and/or the Central Valley RWQCB; the largest of these sites is located at the Union Pacific Railyards, where some additional housing could be developed under the Infill Housing Alternative. Therefore, ground disturbance associated with the Infill Housing Alternative has a greater potential to occur at known hazardous materials sites on the Cortese List, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, older buildings may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint, and major fuel pipelines cross through the city and could be encountered by excavation activities, which could result in human and environmental hazards during the demolition and excavation processes; the additional development under the Infill Housing Alternative would more likely be redevelopment or retrofit of existing structures than new construction in undeveloped areas. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Hazardous Materials Goal 1 and Hazardous Materials Policy 2 (which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies SAFE5.1 and SAFE 5.3, and Policies AQ1.21 and AQ1.22, which would ensure cooperation with agencies such as DTSC and SWRCB to reduce harmful emissions at the Rail Yard. In addition, the City would continue to require Hazardous Materials Management Plans, and all projects would comply with local, state, and federal regulations associated with potential and known hazardous materials sites. Standard construction contracts require construction contractors for projects to locate buried underground pipelines prior to the start of earth-moving activities, by consulting plans on file with the City, Placer County, DigAlert, and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Therefore, because ground disturbance associated with the Infill Housing Alternative has a greater potential to occur at known hazardous materials sites on the Cortese List, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, impacts from construction in hazardous materials sites under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but, for the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-3, would still be less than significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for construction in hazardous materials sites. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Hazardous Materials Goal 1 and Hazardous Materials Policy 2 (which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies SAFE5.1 and SAFE 5.3, and Policies AQ1.21 and AQ1.22, which would ensure cooperation with agencies, such as DTSC and SWRCB to reduce risk from known hazardous material sites and respond to any hazardous materials releases, and reduce harmful emissions at the Rail Yard. Because there would be a reduced potential for construction in hazardous materials sites, a reduced level of impact would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-3, site-specific
hazardous materials investigations, and compliance with local, state, and federal regulations governing hazardous materials remediation and abatement, as well the proposed General Plan Update policies, would result in **less-than-significant** impacts related to construction in a hazardous materials site under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for construction in hazardous materials sites could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals and policies. For example, Policies SAFE5.1 and SAFE 5.3, and Policies AQ1.21 and AQ1.22 would not be revised to ensure cooperation with agencies, such as DTSC and SWRCB to reduce risk from known hazardous material sites and respond to any hazardous materials releases, and reduce harmful emissions at the Rail Yard. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented, including those that require consideration of hazardous materials issues in the land use planning process. In addition, Chapter 9.60 of the Roseville Municipal Code establishes regulations for the identification and disclosure of hazardous materials use and management that are applicable to all development in the City. The City’s Emergency Operations Plan describes organizational and operational responsibilities in the event of an emergency, including hazardous materials emergencies and clean up and de-contamination procedures. Finally, remediation of known hazardous materials sites on the Cortese List is ongoing, as regulated by SWRCB and/or the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the local Certified Unified Program Agency. Therefore, impacts related to construction in a hazardous materials site under the No Project Alternative would be **similar to** the proposed General Plan Update, and for the reasons same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-3 would be **less than significant**.

**6.5.10.4 EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND EVACUATION PLANS (Impair Implementation of or Physical Interference with an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or an Emergency Evacuation Plan)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

Implementation of the Infill Housing Alternative would develop 1,400 new residential units requiring evacuation in case of an emergency and resulting in additional travel demand on the roadways. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-4 (Section 4.10, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials”), an efficient roadway and circulation system is vital for the evacuation of residents and the mobility of fire suppression, emergency response, and law enforcement vehicles. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Circulation-Functional Classification Goal 1, and Fire Protection Goal 2 and Policy 9 (which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as proposed General Plan Update revised Policy CIRC1.5, which requires appropriate design of roadways and intersections and updates to the Roseville Emergency Operations Plan and the City’s Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The City also maintains, and reviews projects for consistency with, its *Design and Construction Standards* requiring minimum roadways widths, turnaround areas, and turning radii to ensure that emergency vehicle access is maintained. These standards and the City’s review process would be maintained and enforced in the same manner under the Infill Housing Alternative as would be experienced under the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, because additional residential units under this alternative would require evacuation in case of an emergency and result in additional travel demand on the roadways, future development associated with the Infill...
Housing Alternative would result in impacts from potential interference with emergency response and evaluation plans which would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be fewer individuals and locations requiring evacuation in case of an emergency and a reduced potential for interference with an adopted emergency response and/or evacuation plan. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Circulation-Functional Classification Goal 1, and Fire Protection Goal 2 and Policy 9 (which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as proposed General Plan Update revised Policy CIRC1.5, which requires appropriate design of roadways and intersections and updates to the Roseville Emergency Operations Plan and the City’s Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. Because there would be fewer individuals and locations requiring evacuation in the case of an emergency, the Reduced Growth Alternative would result in a reduced level of impact compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-4, compliance with the City’s Design and Construction Standards and the proposed General Plan Update policies, along with regular updates to the Roseville Emergency Operations Plan and the City’s Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, would result in less-than-significant impacts related to interference with emergency response or evacuation plans under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for interference with emergency response or evacuation plans could occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no updates to the General Plan to provide more detailed and updated implementation measures that can reduce potential impact. For example, revised Policy CIRC1.5 would not be revised to require appropriate design of roadways and intersections. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented, including Circulation-Functional Classification Goal 1, and Fire Protection Goal 2 and Policy 9 (which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update) which require appropriate design of roadways and intersections and updates to the Roseville Emergency Operations Plan and the City’s Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. In addition, compliance with the City’s Design and Construction Standards is required for all development in the City, and implementation of the Roseville Emergency Operations Plan and the City’s Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan would continue to occur under the existing General Plan. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-4, impacts related to interference with emergency response or evacuation plans under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.

**6.5.10.5 URBAN AND WILDLAND FIRES (Exposure of People and Structures to Significant Risk of Urban and Wildland Fires)**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, resulting in additional services population that could be at risk of exposure to urban and wildland fires. However, as described in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-5 (Section 4.10, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials”), the Planning Area is not located in or near state responsibility areas or land classified as very high
fire hazard severity zones. The Planning Area is designated by CAL FIRE (2008) as a Local Responsibility Area, and there are no Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in or adjacent to the Planning Area. Therefore, the wildfire hazard area for the City is considered low. Fire protection services are provided by the Roseville Fire Department. All development is required to comply with the City’s Fire Code, City Design and Construction Standards, and with state requirements for defensible space surrounding rural properties and water for adequate fire flows. In addition, the Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Circulation-Functional Classification Goal 1, Fire Protection Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9, and Privately-Owned Utilities Policy 2 (which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policy CIRC1.5, which would address fire risks for existing and new development in the City. Therefore, irrespective of the additional residential development under this alternative, impacts from exposure of people or structures to urban and wildland fires under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and, for the same reasons described in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-5, would also be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for exposure to urban and wildland fires. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and polices as the proposed General Plan Update, including existing General Plan Circulation-Functional Classification Goal 1, Fire Protection Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9, and Privately-Owned Utilities Policy 2, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policy CIRC1.5, which would address fire risks for existing and new development in the City. Because there would be a lesser amount of new construction which could be exposed to urban and wildland fires, the Reduce Growth Alternative would result in a reduced level of impact compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-5, compliance City’s Fire Code, City Design and Construction Standards, proposed General Plan Update policies, and with state requirements for defensible space surrounding rural properties and water for adequate fire flows would result in less-than-significant impacts related to exposure to urban and wildland fires under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the same amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for exposure to urban and wildland fires could occur. The existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. In addition, all development is required to comply with the City’s Fire Code, City Design and Construction Standards, and with state requirements for defensible space surrounding rural properties and water for adequate fire flows. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.10-5, impacts related to increased risk of exposure to urban and wildland fires under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would remain less than significant.
6.5.11 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

6.5.11.1 POLICE PROTECTION

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, which would, in turn, result in an increase in the need for police protection services. Similar to the General Plan Update, new development under the Infill Housing Alternative would not result in a need for new police protection facilities. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.11, “Public Services and Recreation”, the City’s General Fund, primarily supported by sales tax and property tax revenues, funds Roseville Police Department services and staffing. Additional development within the City will also generate additional tax revenue to support the hiring of the necessary additional personnel. Analyses conducted for the adopted Specific Plans within the City found that sufficient additional physical facilities would be provided within each Specific Plan Area, as necessary, to support adequate law enforcement services in the City.

The General Plan Update contains policies related to police protection services (Police Services Goal 1 and Policies 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8) that would ensure adequate police protection services would meet the needs of increasing population and non-residential development. These policies emphasize the use of modern technology and adequate training to maximize effective law enforcement services for the community. Community-based service and education programs would be designed to prevent crime and emphasize citizen protection and involvement that allow citizens to monitor their communities for criminal activity. In addition, the Roseville Police Department staff will review all development proposals to ensure crime prevention considerations are addressed. The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures would also occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. Therefore, the increase in the need for police protection services under the Infill Development Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. The Reduced Growth Alternative could result in less potential for increased police protection personnel. Thus, the necessary level of new police protection services would be reduced. Because there would be less need for increased police protection personnel, the Reduced Growth Alternative would result in a reduced level of impact compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons as discussed in Section 4.11, police protection policies contained in the General Plan Update and review of new development plans by police department personnel at the permitting stage would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the increased need for fire and police services under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for increased police protection services would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the
existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. All development is required to comply with the City’s Fire Code and City Design and Construction Standards. In addition, the existing General Plan contains policies related to planning for and provision of police services, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Impacts related to the increased need for police protection services under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would be less than significant.

6.5.11.2 FIRE PROTECTION

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, which would in turn result in an increase in the need for fire protection services. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.11, new fire stations have been planned for the North Industrial Area (Station No. 8), the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area (Station No. 10), and the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan area (Station No. 11) to meet new demands for fire suppression and maintain adequate response times. Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, development under the Infill Housing Alternative would require those new fire stations to meet new demands. All new fire protection facilities would be constructed within the Planning Area. The locations of Station No. 8, Station No. 10, and Station No. 11 were identified in the Campus Oaks Master Plan Addendum and Initial Study, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR, and the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR, respectively.

Existing General Plan Circulation–Functional Classification Goal 1, Fire Protection Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policy CIRC1.5 would ensure adequate fire protection services would meet the needs of increasing population and non-residential development. The General Plan Update goals and policies are also intended to protect against the loss of life, property, and the environment by providing emergency access, promoting fire prevention programs and standards, monitoring department service levels, providing highly trained personnel to ensure effective suppression of fires, and phasing the timing of the construction of fire stations to be available to serve the surrounding service area. In addition, the Roseville Fire Department staff will review all development proposals to ensure development plans comply with California Fire Code and City Design and Construction Standards. Incorporation of all California Fire Code and City Design and Construction Standards into new development would reduce the dependence on fire department equipment and personnel by reducing fire hazards.

The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies and implementation measures would also occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. The physical environmental effects associated with construction and operation of new fire protection facilities under the Infill Development Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. The Reduced Growth Alternative could result in less potential for increased fire protection services, and two (Sierra Vista and Amoruso Ranch stations) of the three fire stations identified to serve new
development would likely not be built during the General Plan horizon year of 2035. Thus, the necessary level of new fire protection services and facilities would be reduced, and this would result in a reduced level of impact as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons as discussed in Section 4.11, fire policies contained in the General Plan Update, review of new development plans by fire and police department personnel at the permitting stage and compliance with the California Fire Code and City Design and Construction Standards, would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the increased need for fire services under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for increased fire protection services would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. All development is required to comply with the City’s Fire Code and City Design and Construction Standards. In addition, the existing General Plan contains policies related to planning for and provision of fire services, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Impacts related to the increased need for fire protection services under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would be less than significant.

**6.5.11.3 SCHOOLS**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units that would generate additional students. As discussed in Section 4.11, new schools are planned by the Roseville City School District (in the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Area, West Roseville Specific Plan Area, Creekview Specific Plan Area, and Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area), by the Roseville Joint Union High School District (in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area), and by the Center Joint Unified School District (in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area) to meet future growth in the City under the General Plan Update. Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, development under the Infill Housing Alternative would require those new schools to meet new demands, and the additional students generated by the Infill Housing Alternative could require school facilities and services in one or more of the existing school districts (depending on the ultimate location of the additional housing units). New development would pay the State-mandated school impact fees that are being levied at the time of development in accordance with Senate Bill (SB) 50. To ensure adequate funding for new school facilities the City Council adopted Ordinance 2434 (School Facilities Mitigation Plan) in February 1991. This ordinance encourages the payment of fees, participation in a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District, and school facility mitigation plans for new development proposed within over-crowded districts. With the enactment of SB 50, Ordinance 2434 cannot be made mandatory, but can be negotiated as part of the development agreement process. With voluntary participation by the applicants, however, the funding sources encouraged by Ordinance 2434 may be greater than the state-mandated fees.

The environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the planned school facilities noted above were analyzed in CEQA documents prepared for those Specific Plans. The focus of the existing General Plan School Services Goal 3 and Policies 3 and 6, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal PF3.1 and Policies
PF3.1–3.5 is on financing, timing, and siting of school facilities. The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures would also occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. The California Legislature has declared that payment of the State-mandated school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation for school facilities and services under CEQA (California Government Code Section 65996). Impacts related to the increased need for school services and facilities under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would still be less than significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update and most of this development would occur in the Center and Corridor and Established Communities. Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new residential construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus the necessary level of new school services and facilities would be reduced. The Reduced Growth Alternative would generate fewer new students, and new schools identified to serve development in the western portion of the Planning Area would likely not be built during the General Plan horizon year of 2035; therefore, a reduced level of impact would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons as discussed in Section 4.11, school policies contained in the General Plan Update, and payment of the State-mandated school impact fee, would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the increased need for school services and facilities under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

**No Project Alternative**

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and a similar amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, a similar potential for increased school services facilities would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. All development is required to pay the State-mandated school impact fee or comply with City Ordinance 2434. In addition, the existing General Plan contains policies related to planning for and provision of school services and facilities, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Therefore, impacts related to the increased need for school services and facilities under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would be less than significant.

**6.5.11.4 PARKS**

**Infill Housing Alternative**

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units, which would add new population and increase the demand for new and existing parks and recreation facilities, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, this additional population would be likely to use existing park facilities potentially resulting in a greater accelerated physical deterioration of existing facilities, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As described in Section 4.11, the General Plan Update could accommodate additional acres of developed parkland, the construction of which could result in adverse impacts on the physical environment. Furthermore, Existing General Plan Parks and Recreation Policies 4 and 5, as well as revised
proposed General Plan Update Goals PR1.1 and 1.2 and Policies PR1.1–1.7, 1.12 and 1.14 establish the overall parkland standard as nine acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and provide flexibility in applying parks standards, in terms of size, facilities, and service areas, so that existing and future needs can be met. The proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies and implementation measures would also occur under the Infill Housing Alternative. As a method to achieve the City’s parkland standards, alternative land dedications may be considered for lands that provide active and passive recreational value. In addition, payment of in-lieu fees could also be used by the City to improve, expand, and maintain existing City parks to ensure that accelerated deterioration does not occur. Impacts related to the increased need or deterioration of park facilities under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, there would be 4,500 fewer housing units than proposed under the General Plan Update, and thus the necessary amount of new park facilities and the deterioration of existing park facilities would be reduced; therefore, a reduced level of impact would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons as discussed in Section 4.11, environmental review of proposed new park facilities in this EIR, alternative land dedications, payments of in-lieu fees, and compliance with park policies contained in the General Plan Update, would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the increased need or deterioration of park facilities under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and a similar amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, a similar potential for increased park facilities or the deterioration of existing park facilities would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. All development is required to comply with City Municipal Code Chapter 4.37, “Neighborhood Park Fee,” and Chapter 4.28, “Citywide Park Fee,” which ensure compliance with the applicable zoning ordinance and general plan requirements for the neighborhood and citywide park and recreation infrastructure funding. These fees are collected from all new residential dwelling units within the City limits and are adjusted each July 1st based on the inflation rate for construction costs from the previous year. In addition, the existing General Plan contains goals and policies related to the provision of park facilities (including the requirement for nine acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents), and these policies would continue to be implemented. Therefore, impacts related to the increased need or deterioration of park facilities under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would be less than significant.
6.5.12 PUBLIC UTILITIES

6.5.12.1 WATER SUPPLY

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units, which would result in an increased demand for additional water supply, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Based on per capita water demand per person, at buildout of the Infill Alternative the water demand would be 37,184 acre-feet per year (afy) (assuming the relationship between residential and non-residential water demand does not change between present and buildout of the General Plan). Overall, the Infill Housing Alternative would increase water supply demand by 554 afy.

As described in Draft EIR Section 4.12, “Utilities and Service Systems,” the City’s water supply consists of surface water, groundwater in dry years or in times of emergencies, and recycled water for irrigation. The City’s Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) accounted for existing and future land uses in Roseville and its planning area (West Yost 2016). Water supply is projected to be sufficient in normal water years over the UWMP’s 20-year planning period (i.e., 2015 to 2035). The UWMP noted that in single-dry years, and in certain multiple dry years, a water supply deficit may occur. However, the City has identified two strategies to ensure an adequate supply of water in the single-dry and multiple-dry years: water conservation, and groundwater injection and recovery wells. The City has determined that assuming a 20 percent of normal water year demand, water conservation would alleviate potential water supply deficits (West Yost 2016). The City’s existing groundwater wells serve as a back-up water supply and to improve water supply reliability during drought and emergency conditions. The City intends to construct additional groundwater wells over the next 15 years for a total of 10 new wells. State law requires demonstration of adequate long-term water supply for large development as defined by SB 610 (i.e., more than 500 dwelling units or nonresidential equivalent) through preparation of a Water Supply Assessment; therefore, individual development projects, including those entitled under this alternative, would not be able to obtain a building permit until it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City via the SB 610 process that a sufficient water supply is available to serve each individual development project in normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years.

Existing General Plan Water System Goal 2 and Water and Energy Conservation Policy 3, and Extension of City Services – New Development, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal PF6.1, PF6.4, PF6.5 and Policies PF6.1, PF6.2, PF6.4, PF6.5, PF6.8, PF6.10, and PF6.11; Goals PF9.1 and PF9.2 and Policies PF9.1, PF9.4, and PF.5 require the City to pursue adequate water supplies to serve existing and projected growth, develop and expand alternatives to continue conjunctive use of water with neighboring agencies, implement water efficiency standards, and continue the management and expansion of the ASR program to increase resiliency and reliability of water supply during all supply conditions. The General Plan Update Water and Energy Efficiency Goal and the 2019 CALGreen Code would encourage water conservation, promote public education for water conservation, and continue the City’s drought-tolerant landscape ordinance. The Infill Housing Alternative would comply with proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies and implementation measures and comply with existing and future local and state laws and regulations, as identified under the proposed General Plan Update. Impacts related to the need for additional water supplies under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.12, would still be less than significant.
Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, approximately 4,500 fewer housing units would be constructed and 17,320–47,320 fewer jobs would be created. Based on per-capita water demand per person, at buildout of the Reduced Growth Alternative the water demand would be 26,268 afy (assuming the relationship between residential and non-residential water demand does not change between present and buildout of the General Plan). Overall, the Reduced Growth Alternative would decrease water supply demand by 10,362 afy. Therefore, the water deficiencies identified in the UWMP for the proposed General Plan Update in single-dry years, and in certain multiple dry years, would not occur. As described on Draft EIR Section 4.12, the proposed General Plan Update contains goals and policies that promote water conservation, promote public education, continue the City’s drought-tolerant landscape ordinance, and require the City to pursue adequate water supplies to serve existing and projected growth, develop and expand alternatives to continue conjunctive use of water with neighboring agencies, implement water efficiency standards, and continue the management and expansion of the ground water and ASR program. Furthermore, State law requires demonstration of adequate long-term water supply for large development as defined by SB 610 (i.e., more than 500 dwelling units or nonresidential equivalent) through preparation of a Water Supply Assessment. Because sufficient water supplies would be available in all water year types to serve the projected development, and because this alternative would reduce demand, the impact related to demand for new water supplies would be reduced under the Reduced Growth Alternative compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and this impact would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and a similar potential for increased water supply would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, existing General Plan contains goals and would continue to be implemented the existing General Plan contains policies related to development of new water supplies and implementing water conservation, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, all new development would be subject to the requirements of SB 610 to demonstrate that sufficient water supplies exist to serve individual site-specific development projects. Finally, the City would continue to pursue its ASR program to develop additional groundwater injection wells (would also be used as a replacement for surface water in dry years), and the City would continue to implement water conservation measures. Therefore, impacts related to the need for additional water supplies under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.12, would be less than significant.

6.5.12.2 WASTEWATER

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units, which would result in an increase in demand for wastewater treatment capacity, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Overall, the Infill Housing Alternative would increase wastewater flow by 0.23 million gallons per day (mgd).

Wastewater from the City is currently treated at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and the Pleasant Grove WWTP. As described in Draft EIR Section 4.12, the Pleasant Grove WWTP would have adequate...
capacity to serve demand from buildout of the General Plan demand in addition to existing commitments. In the future, the Dry Creek WWTP could require upgrades to provide adequate capacity to serve demand from buildout of the 2035 General Plan in addition to existing commitments. The proposed General Plan Update Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Goals PF.1 and PF.2 and Policies PF.2, 3, and 4 ensure that wastewater treatment capacity is available for proposed development and intensification and that wastewater generation is minimized and require the City to initiate expansion studies to determine necessary improvements to meet projected wastewater treatment demands upon 75 percent utilization of treatment plant capacity, and these policies would apply to the Infill Housing Alternative, as well. Implementation Measures in the General Plan require any development proposal that has an impact on the wastewater submit project plans to the Environmental Utilities Department for review and comment, and projects are required to identify wastewater treatment plant capacity and potential alternatives to treatment and discharge. Specific Plans are required to specify total projected wastewater generation, impacts, and treated wastewater use potential based on land use designations within their plan area, and through development agreements, identify the provision of expanded wastewater treatment capacity. Therefore, the City would ensure sufficient long-term wastewater treatment is available to treat wastewater flows generated at buildout of its service area, including flows generated by the Infill Housing Alternative. Impacts related to the increased demand for wastewater treatment capacity under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.11, would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, approximately 4,500 fewer housing units, which would result in a decrease in demand for wastewater treatment capacity, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Overall, the Reduced Growth Alternative would decrease wastewater flow by 0.86 mgd.

As described on Draft EIR Section 4.12, the proposed General Plan Update contains goals and policies that ensure that wastewater treatment capacity is available for proposed development and intensification and that wastewater generation is minimized and require the City to initiate expansion studies to determine necessary improvements to meet projected wastewater treatment demands upon 75 percent utilization of treatment plant capacity. Furthermore, Implementation Measures in the General Plan require any development proposal that has an impact on the wastewater submit project plans to the Environmental Utilities Department for review and comment, and projects are required to identify wastewater treatment plant capacity and potential alternatives to treatment and discharge. Specific Plans are required to specify total projected wastewater generation, impacts, and treated wastewater use potential based on land use designations within their plan area, and through development agreements, identify the provision of expanded wastewater treatment capacity. Because sufficient long-term wastewater treatment is available to treat wastewater flows generated at buildout of its service area, including flows generated by the Reduced Growth Alternative, the impact related to increased demand for wastewater treatment capacity would be reduced under the Reduced Growth Alternative compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.12, this impact would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and a similar potential for increased wastewater generation would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no updates to the General Plan to provide more detailed and updated implementation
measures that can reduce potential impacts. There would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. However, the existing General Plan goals and policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, implementation measures in the General Plan require projects to submit project plans to the Environmental Utilities Department for review and comment, and projects are required to identify wastewater treatment plant capacity and potential alternatives to treatment and discharge. Specific Plans are required to specify total projected wastewater generation, impacts, and treated wastewater use potential based on land use designations within their plan area, and through development agreements, identify the provision of expanded wastewater treatment capacity. Therefore, impacts related to increased demand for wastewater treatment capacity under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.12, would be less than significant.

6.5.12.3 SOLID WASTE

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in an additional 1,400 housing units, which would result in an increased generation of solid waste, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Buildout of the Infill Alternative could generate an additional 312 to 435 tons of solid waste per day (tpd) (156 tpd per person plus 156 to 279 tpd per employee), or 7 tpd more than the proposed General Plan Update (305 to 428 tpd).6, 7

As discussed on Draft EIR Section 4.12, all future development in the City is required to comply with a variety of state and local regulations and statutes related to reducing solid waste, including the 2019 CALGreen Code, AB 341, AB 1826, and the City’s Construction and Demolition and Recycling Ordinance. Existing General Plan Solid Waste, Source Reduction & Recycling Goals 1, 2, and 3 and Policies 1, 4, as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies PF8.2, PF8.3, and PF8.5 would reduce solid waste through compliance with the source reduction and recycling standards mandated by the state by reducing the projected quantity of solid waste disposed at the regional landfill, by requiring a waste characterization profile for proposed large-scale commercial and industrial development projects, and by developing public education and recycling programs. The Infill Housing Alternative would comply with proposed General Plan Update new and revised goals, policies, and implementation measures and comply with existing and future local and state laws and regulations, as identified under the General Plan Update. In addition, implementation measures in the proposed General Plan Update require Specific Plans to identify solid waste generation, impacts on the regional landfill, and opportunities for source reduction and recycling. Furthermore, the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL) has capacity to accommodate solid waste generated by both the proposed General Plan Update and the additional 1,400 housing units proposed under the Infill Housing Alternative. Therefore, impacts related to the increased generation of solid waste under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but for the same reasons described in the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update in Section 4.12, would still be less than significant.

6 Based on CalRecycle’s estimated 2018 annual per capita disposal rate of 4.8 pounds per resident per day, the estimated increase in population (65,059 persons) would generate approximately 312,283 pound per day of solid waste, which equates to 156.1 tpd (CalRecycle 2018).

7 Based on CalRecycle’s estimated 2018 annual per capita disposal rate of 8.2 pounds per employee per day and an estimated increase of between 38,000 and 68,000 employees, approximately 311,600 to 557,600 pound per day of solid waste would be generated per day, which equates to 155.8 to 278.8 tpd (CalRecycle 2018).
Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, approximately 4,500 fewer housing units would be constructed and 17,320–47,320 fewer jobs would be created. Buildout of the Reduced Growth Alternative could generate an additional 232 tpd (147 tpd per person plus 85 tpd per employee), or between 73 tpd and 196 tpd less than the proposed General Plan Update (305 to 428 tpd)\(^8\),\(^9\); therefore, a reduced level of impact would occur compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

For the same reasons as discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.12, compliance with state and local standards that require a reduction in solid waste, compliance with policies related to solid waste contained in the proposed General Plan Update, and considering the WRSL has capacity to accommodate the additional solid waste, would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the increased generation of solid waste under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and a similar potential for increased generation of solid waste would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures, and no new General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures. The existing General Plan contains goals and policies related solid waste reduction, and these policies would continue to be implemented. All development is required to comply with state and local standards that require a reduction in solid waste, and the WRSL has capacity to accommodate the additional solid waste from projected new development. Therefore, impacts related to increased generation of solid waste under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would be less than significant.

6.5.13 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

6.5.13.1 VIOLATION OF WATER QUALITY STANDARDS OR WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS OR CONFLICT WITH A WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Infill Housing Alternative

The additional housing units planned under the Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional construction-related earthmoving activities that could increase erosion and sedimentation in stormwater runoff and could affect long-term water quality by adding impervious surfaces and increasing urban stormwater runoff potentially contaminated with pollutants, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, groundwater quality could be degraded by construction-related dewatering activities and through percolation of polluted surface water runoff into the aquifer from operation of proposed urban land uses. However, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-1 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), all new and infill development envisioned under the proposed General Plan Update would be required to comply with the provisions of the City’s Municipal Code.

---

\(^8\) Based on CalRecycle’s estimated 2018 annual per capita disposal rate of 4.8 pounds per resident per day, the estimated increase in population (6,107 persons) would generate approximately 293,136 pound per day of solid waste, which equates to 146.6 tpd (CalRecycle 2018).

\(^9\) Based on CalRecycle’s estimated 2018 annual per capita disposal rate of 8.2 pounds per employee per day and an estimated increase of 20,680 employees, approximately 169,576 pound per day of solid waste would be generated per day, which equates to 84.8 tpd (CalRecycle 2018).
requiring proper drainage and erosion control, as well as the SWRCB’s Construction General Permit, *West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual* (cbec eco engineering, inc. and CDM Smith 2018), *Stormwater Quality BMP Guidance Manual for Construction* (City of Roseville 2011a), and the City of Roseville *Stormwater Management Program* (2004) to reduce post-construction runoff in through the incorporation of BMPs, low impact development (LID), and hydromodification management techniques as part of the City’s MS4 permit. Earthmoving activities that could encounter groundwater are issued WDRs by the Central Valley RWQCB through the project-specific permitting process; the WDRs contain provisions that are specifically intended to protect groundwater quality. Protection of groundwater quality from stormwater percolation is accomplished through implementation of the City’s MS4 permit.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies OS2.2 and OS3.1 along with existing General Plan Flood Protection Goal 2 and Policy 7, Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policies 3 and 6, Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 2, 3, and 4, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1. All of these existing and proposed General Plan Update goals and policies would serve to minimize long-term water quality impacts associated with increased urbanization. The goal of these policies as they relate to stormwater runoff, and surface and groundwater quality, is to provide for adequate water quality protection during construction and operation of projects developed under the General Plan (and this alternative). The goal of the proposed General Plan Update policies as they relate to stormwater management is to provide flood protection, enhance water quality, prevent infrastructure deterioration, and facilitate compliance with state and federal laws. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policies would avoid, minimize, or compensate for potential water quality impacts by requiring projects to reduce pollution and runoff through implementation of LID technologies, BMPs, pretreatment, and upgrades to stormwater and wastewater treatment capacity, as needed. These measures would protect water quality as required by the *Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (Central Valley RWQCB 2018). Therefore, impacts from degradation of water quality and conflicts with implementation of a water quality control plan under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less significant.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore the risks of surface water and groundwater quality degradation and conflicts with the water quality control plan would be lower. However, the same types of impacts would still occur. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies OS2.2 and OS3.1, along with existing General Plan Flood Protection Goal 2 and Policy 7, Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policies 3 and 6, Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 2, 3, and 4, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1. All of these existing and proposed General Plan Update goals and policies are designed to provide for adequate water quality protection during site-specific project construction and operation. Furthermore, for the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-1 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), all new projects are required to comply with the SWRCB’s Construction General Permit, which requires applicants to prepare and implement a SWPPP with associated BMPs designed to reduce erosion and protect water quality by reducing stormwater runoff. All projects are also required to comply with the City’s MS4 permit implemented through the *City of Roseville Stormwater Management Program* (2004) to reduce post-construction runoff in through the incorporation of BMPs, LID, and hydromodification management techniques. These measures would protect water quality as required by the *Water
Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (Central Valley RWQCB 2018). Therefore, impacts from degradation of water quality and conflicts with implementation of a water quality control plan under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore the risks of water quality pollution and conflicts with the water quality control plan would be similar. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals and policies. For example, proposed General Plan Update Policies OS2.2 and OS3.1 would not be revised to provide examples of BMPs that could be implemented, such as low impact development and naturalized stormwater management features, to reduce stormwater runoff.

However, existing General Plan Flood Protection Goal 2 and Policy 7, Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policies 3 and 6, Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 1, 2, 3, and 4, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 would continue to be implemented, and they are all designed to provide for adequate water quality protection during site-specific project construction and operation. Furthermore, for the same reasons discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-1 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), all development is required to comply with state and local standards to prevent water quality degradation, including compliance with the SWRCB’s Construction General Permit to reduce construction-related runoff, and with the City’s MS4 permit implemented through the City of Roseville Stormwater Management Program (2004) to reduce post-construction runoff in through the incorporation of BMPs, LID, and hydromodification management techniques. In addition, the existing General Plan contains goals and policies related to the protection of water quality, and these policies would continue to be implemented. All of these measures would protect water quality as required by the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (Central Valley RWQCB 2018). Therefore, impacts from degradation of water quality and conflicts with implementation of a water quality control plan under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.13.2 Groundwater Recharge/Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan (Substantial Interference with Groundwater Recharge or Substantial Depletion of Groundwater Supplies that would Impede Implementation of a Groundwater Sustainable Plan)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in the construction of additional housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The additional infill housing would be located along major urban corridors (as shown in Exhibit 6-1) and because (1) these areas are already developed and covered with existing impervious surfaces which already prevent groundwater recharge, and (2) no parks, golf courses, or other areas designed as open space that currently provide direct groundwater recharge would be converted for the additional housing units, the additional infill residential units would result in only a slightly greater reduction in permeability than the proposed General Plan Update. However, the Infill Housing Alternative also includes all of the development proposed in the proposed General Plan Update, much of which would occur on land that is currently undeveloped. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-2 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), the Western Placer County Groundwater Management Plan (Montgomery Watson Harza 2007) currently provides planned and
coordinated monitoring, operation, and administration of groundwater basins in the project area with the goal of long-term groundwater resource sustainability. Development of the groundwater sustainability plan (GSP) for the North American basin (where the Planning Area is located) as required by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, is a coordinated effort among five groundwater sustainability agencies (i.e., West Placer, Sacramento, South Sutter, Sutter County, and Recreation District 1001), and preparation of the GSP is in process. The North American basin is not a critically overdrafted basin. New urban infrastructure with impervious surfaces (e.g., buildings, roads, parking areas) can result in a reduction in rainfall that would otherwise percolate through the soil and result in groundwater recharge. However, as discussed in the Evaluation of Potential Groundwater Recharge Areas in West Placer County, California (Placer County 2017), most of the direct recharge through soil occurs in the eastern half of the planning area; direct recharge in the western Planning Area (where most of the new development is projected to occur), is extremely limited due the low permeability of surface soils, the presence of a cemented hardpan beneath the surface, and the lack of direct connectivity with the groundwater aquifer in this area. Direct groundwater recharge in the western Planning Area occurs primarily through existing stream channels. The City’s ongoing ASR program includes new groundwater wells that are designed to inject and store surplus drinking water in the underlying groundwater aquifer during periods of normal and above normal precipitation. This stored drinking water would be extracted and used to meet peak demands during dry years. The ongoing ASR program is part of the Western Placer County Groundwater Management Plan (Montgomery Watson Harza 2007) and will be included in the GSP.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies OS2.2 and OS3.1, Goal PF9.1 and Policies PF9.1, PF9.3, PF9.4, PF9.5, and Goal PF6.4 and Policies PF6.10 and 6.11. These policies would be updated to reflect current actions within the City to protect groundwater supply and recharge (such as the City’s ASR program), and include future specific actions, such as state and local water efficiency standards and LID techniques that would help conserve water supplies. In addition, existing General Plan Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 2 and Policies 2–6, Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Goal 3 and Policy 1, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 would continue to be implemented. All of these existing and proposed General Plan Update goals and policies would promote groundwater recharge, enhance the quality of surface water that percolates through to the aquifer, pursue the use of recycled water to reduce reliance on surface and groundwater supplies, and continue to implement the City’s ASR program for injection and recovery of water. Implementation of these policies, along with compliance with the City of Roseville Stormwater Management Program (2004), would help preserve the groundwater recharge potential of the currently undeveloped portions of the Planning Area through the implementation of LID features, preservation of existing stream channels, and would encourage water conservation/demand management. Therefore, impacts from substantial reduction in groundwater recharge and potential conflicts with a sustainable groundwater management plan under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore fewer impermeable surfaces would be constructed that could reduce the potential for direct groundwater recharge. However, the same types of impacts would still occur. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies OS2.2 and OS3.1, Goal PF9.1 and Policies PF9.1, PF9.3, PF9.4, PF9.5, and Goal PF6.4 and Policies PF6.10 and 6.11, along with existing General Plan Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 2 and Policies
2–6, Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Goal 3 and Policy 1, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1. These goals and policies are designed to promote groundwater recharge and conservation of water resources. For the same reasons as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-2 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), implementation of these goals and policies in addition to compliance with the City of Roseville Stormwater Management Program (2004) would help preserve the groundwater recharge potential of the currently undeveloped portions of the Planning Area through the required implementation of LID features in new development, preservation of existing stream channels, and would encourage water conservation/demand management. Furthermore, the North American basin is not a critically overdrafted basin, and the City’s ongoing ASR program is part of the Western Placer County Groundwater Management Plan (Montgomery Watson Harza 2007), which administers groundwater basins in the project area with the goal of long-term groundwater resource sustainability; the ongoing ASR program will be included in the GSP. Therefore, impacts from substantial reduction in groundwater recharge and potential conflicts with a sustainable groundwater management plan under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore the potential for interference with groundwater recharge would be similar. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals and policies. For example, Goal PF9.1 and Policies PF9.1, PF9.3, PF9.4, PF9.5, and Goal PF6.4 and Policies PF6.10 and 6.11 would not be updated to reflect current actions within the City to protect groundwater supply and recharge (such as the City’s ASR program), or to include future specific actions such as state and local water efficiency standards and LID techniques that would help conserve water supplies. However, existing General Plan Flood Protection Goal 2 and Policy 7, Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policies 3 and 6, Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 1, 2, 3, and 4, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 are all designed to provide for adequate water quality protection during site-specific project construction and operation, and these goals and policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-2 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), all new development is required to comply with the City of Roseville Stormwater Management Program (2004), which requires implementation of LID features at each project site that would continue to allow some groundwater recharge to occur. In addition, the existing General Plan contains goals and policies requiring the preservation of existing stream channels, promoting groundwater recharge, and encouraging water conservation/demand management, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Finally, the City’s ongoing ASR program would continue to be implemented as part of the Western Placer County Groundwater Management Plan (Montgomery Watson Harza 2007), and will be included in the GSP. Therefore, impacts from substantial reduction in groundwater recharge and potential conflicts with a sustainable groundwater management plan under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.13.3 ALTERATION OF DRAINAGES – EROSION (SUBSTANTIAL ALTERATION OF DRAINAGE PATTERNS RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL EROSION OR SILTATION)

Please see subsection 6.4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources,” above, under the heading “Soil Erosion” for the discussion of impacts that could occur under the Infill Housing, Reduced Development, and No Project Alternatives related to increased erosion from construction-related alteration of drainages.
6.5.13.4 Alteration of Drainages – Runoff, Pollutants, and Flooding (Substantial Alteration of Drainage Patterns Resulting in Runoff that Would Exceed the Capacity of Stormwater Drainage Systems and/or Cause an Increase in Flooding or Provide Additional Sources of Polluted Runoff)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would include additional housing units. However, as described above, additional infill housing would be located along major urban corridors (as shown in Exhibit 6-1) and because these areas are already developed and covered with existing impervious surfaces, the additional infill residential units would result in only a minor increase in impervious surfaces as compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-4 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), additional impervious surfaces would increase the rate and amount of stormwater runoff, which could exceed drainage system capacities and result in erosion, sedimentation, and flooding. However, all projects in the Planning Area are required to comply with the *West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual* (cebc and CDM Smith 2018) to reduce post-construction runoff and control urban runoff pollution in compliance with the City's Phase II MS4 permit through the incorporation of BMPs, LID, and hydromodification management techniques. Hydromodification management requires regulated projects to slow and minimize the amount of runoff so that there is no net-increase in post-construction runoff flow rate as compared to the pre-construction value. The City’s Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (Municipal Code, Title 14, Chapter 14.20) requires that all projects design and implement a stormwater management plan that implements methodologies contained in the *West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual* (cebc eco engineering and CDM Smith 2018). The City’s *Design and Construction Standards* (City of Roseville 2019), Section 10 Drainage, address development in or adjacent to the City’s Regulatory Floodplain, drainage diversion, drainage capacity and design, peak design calculations and methods, hydraulic standards for drainage systems, inlet and outlet structures, pumps, design of channels and outfalls, culverts and bridges, detention and retention basins, and maintenance access requirements. The Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan (City of Roseville 2011b) includes specific requirements and adopted mitigation measures related to open space management, maintenance, and monitoring that are related to drainage, flooding, and water quality.

The City’s Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (Title 9, Chapter 9.8) sets standards to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions. All new development in the Planning Area is reviewed by the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to ensure it meets District standards. In addition, the City has established a flood mitigation fee program for the construction of a regional retention basin flood control project at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area, in the northwestern portion of the Planning Area. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including SAFE1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.8; and OS2.2 and 3.1. These policies would be updated to require new development to evaluate flood hazards, implement LID techniques to slow the rate of runoff and provide stormwater quality pretreatment, pay flood assessment district fees towards construction of the regional flood control project, and preserve and maintain habitat along creek corridors (which would reduce erosion). In addition, existing General Plan Flood Protection Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 4, 5, 7, and 9, Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 10, Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policies 3 and 4, Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 1 and Policies 2–4, and Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy 6 would continue to be implemented. All of these existing and proposed General Plan Update goals and policies are designed to preserve open space including stream and creek corridors, maintain and improve the City’s storm drainage system, and prevent an increase in flood hazards.
from new development. Therefore, impacts from alteration of drainages that would result in increased flooding and exceedance of the City’s storm drainage system under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but still would be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore fewer impermeable surfaces would be constructed that could result in flooding and exceedance of the City’s storm drainage system. However, the same types of impacts would still occur. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including SAFE1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.8; and OS2.2 and 3.1, along with existing General Plan Protection Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 4, 5, 7, and 9, Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 10, Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policies 3 and 4, Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 1 and Policies 2–4, and Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy 6, all of which are designed to preserve open space including stream and creek corridors, maintain and improve the City’s storm drainage system, and prevent an increase in flood hazards from new development. For the same reasons as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13–4 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), implementing the above-listed existing and proposed policies and compliance with the City’s MS4 Permit, the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, the City’s Design and Construction Standards, the City’s Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance and the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance would require proper design of drainage from future projects, as well as hydromodification management techniques to slow and minimize the amount of runoff so that there is no net-increase in post-construction runoff flow rate as compared to the pre-construction value. Furthermore, the detention basins at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area that are necessary to reduce downstream flood flows from increased City of Roseville development would still be implemented. Therefore, impacts from alteration of drainages that would result in increased flooding and exceedance of the City’s storm drainage system under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development that would result in new impermeable surfaces as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore the potential for increased flooding and exceedance of the City’s storm drainage system would be similar. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no content revisions to the existing General Plan goals and policies, and no new General Plan goals and policies. For example, policies SAFE1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, and 2.8 would not be updated to specify additional detailed actions that would help to prevent flooding, prevent exceedance of existing drainage capacity, and prevent downstream pollutant transport. However, existing General Plan Protection Goals 1 and 2 and Policies 4, 5, 7, and 9, Open Space System Goal 1 and Policy 10, Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policies 3 and 4, Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 1 and Policies 2–4, and Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy 6 are designed to preserve open space including stream and creek corridors (to help prevent erosion), maintain and improve the City’s storm drainage system, and prevent an increase in flood hazards from new development, and these goals and policies would continue to be implemented. Furthermore, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13–4 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), all new development is required to comply with the City’s MS4 Permit, the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual, the City’s Design and Construction Standards, the City’s Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control Ordinance and the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, which require proper design of drainage from future projects, as well as hydromodification...
management techniques to slow and minimize the amount of runoff so that there is no net-increase in post-construction runoff flow rate as compared to the pre-construction value. In addition, the existing General Plan contains goals and policies that are designed to preserve open space including stream and creek corridors, maintain and improve the City’s storm drainage system, and prevent an increase in flood hazards from new development, and these policies would continue to be implemented. Finally, the detention basins at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area that are necessary to reduce downstream flood flows from increased City of Roseville development would still be implemented. Therefore, impacts from alteration of drainages that would result in increased flooding and exceedance of the City’s storm drainage system under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.13.5 RELEASE OF POLLUTANTS IN FLOOD HAZARD, TSUNAMI, OR SEICHE ZONES

Infill Housing Alternative

Because of the Planning Area’s distance from the Pacific Ocean, tsunamis would not affect the City. There are no waterbodies in the Planning Area that are large enough to result in seiche hazards; furthermore, active seismic sources are more than 30 miles away. Therefore, tsunami and seiche hazards are discussed further in this alternatives analysis.

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in the construction of additional housing units, which could result in increased potential for short-term, temporary storage of materials in flood hazard zones, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, as described in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-5 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), the City of Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19, Section 19.18.040 prohibits the stockpiling or storage of any materials in a designated flood zone unless a flood encroachment permit is issued. Flood encroachment permits contain specific terms and conditions that must be implemented by the permit applicant, including a prohibition on storage of materials that are buoyant, flammable, toxic, explosive, or could be injurious to human, animal, or plant life during a flood; the materials and/or equipment must not be subject to major damage from a flood and must be readily removable from the area if a flood warning is issued; and all materials or equipment must be kept anchored or otherwise restrained to prevent them from being carried downstream by floodwaters. Compliance with the terms of the flood encroachment permit would ensure that any materials or equipment that are temporarily stored in a flood hazard zone would not result in a release of pollutants during a flood. There are no proposed General Plan Update goals or policies related to transport of pollutants in flood hazard zones that are proposed for revision. However, existing General Plan Flood Protection Goal 2 and Policy 9, and Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 1 and Policy 2 are designed to protect water quality in floodplains, and require new projects to implement erosion control and topsoil conservation measures to limit sediments within watercourses. Impacts from release of pollutants in a flood hazard zone under the Infill Housing Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be lower potential for temporary, short-term storage of equipment and materials in flood hazard zones; therefore, a reduced level of impact would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update For the same reasons as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-5 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), the City of Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19, Section 19.18.040 prohibits the stockpiling or storage of any materials in a designated flood zone unless a flood encroachment permit is issued.
Compliance with the terms and conditions contained in the flood encroachment permit, along with implementation of existing General Plan Flood Protection Goal 2 and Policy 9, and Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 1 and Policy 2 (which are designed to protect water quality in floodplains), would still result in less-than-significant impacts from release of pollutants stored in a flood hazard zone under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development as would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be similar potential for temporary, short-term storage of equipment and materials in flood hazard zones. There are no existing goals or policies related to transport of pollutants in flood hazard zones that are proposed for revision as part of the General Plan Update. However, existing General Plan Flood Protection Goal 2 and Policy 9, and Water Quality and Groundwater Recharge Goal 1 and Policy 2, are designed to protect water quality in floodplains, and require new projects to implement erosion control and topsoil conservation measures to limit sediments within watercourses. Furthermore, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.13-5 (Section 4.13, “Hydrology and Water Quality”), City of Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19, Section 19.18.040 prohibits the stockpiling or storage of any materials in a designated flood zone unless a flood encroachment permit is issued, and compliance with the terms and conditions contained in the flood encroachment permit would prevent pollution from materials temporarily stored in a flood zone. Therefore, the impact from potential release of pollutants stored in a flood hazard zone under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.14 AESTHETICS

6.5.14.1 SCENIC VISTAS (SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON A SCENIC VISTA)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As shown in Exhibit 6-1, the additional infill housing would be located within existing developed areas of the City. However, the Infill Housing Alternative also includes all of the development envisioned under the proposed General Plan Update. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-1 (Section 4.14, “Aesthetics”), existing views in the Planning Area consist mainly of developed, urban land with associated open space and parks. At the western and northwestern edges of the Planning Area, views of flat, open farmland to the west and north can been seen from some adjacent properties in the built environment at the urban edge. However, there are no scenic vistas within the Planning Area, nor is the Planning Area visible from any designated scenic viewpoint. The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal LU7.3 and Policies LU8.7, LU9.9, OS2.1, and OS2.2, which contain minor edits that are proposed for clarity. In addition, existing General Plan Community Design Policies 6 and 8, Growth Management Goal 13 and Policy 8, Growth Management-Growth Areas Policy 6, Open Space Goal 1 and Policy 1, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 would still be implemented, and these goals and policies are designed to continue to (1) apply design standards that promote the use of high-quality building materials, architectural and site designs, landscaping, signage, and amenities through the design process, and (2) preserve, protect, and enhance a significant system of interconnected natural habitat areas, including creek and riparian corridors, oak woodlands, wetlands, and adjacent grassland areas. Furthermore, all development must be consistent with the City’s (2008) Community Design Standards, which is reviewed during the permitting process. Therefore, the impacts of the
Infill Housing Alternative on scenic vistas would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. As shown in Exhibit 6-2, the lack of additional development in the western and northwestern edges of the Planning Area under the Reduced Growth Alternative would result in preservation of existing views of undeveloped agricultural land from residences at the edge of the urban fringe, at least in the short term. However, as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-1 (Section 4.14, “Aesthetics”), there are no scenic vistas within the Planning Area, nor is the Planning Area visible from any designated scenic viewpoint; therefore, a similar level of impact would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Goal LU7.3 and Policies LU8.7, LU9.9, OS2.1, and OS2.2, which contain minor edits that are proposed for clarity. In addition, existing General Plan Community Design Policies 6 and 8, Growth Management Goal 13 and Policy 8, Growth Management-Growth Areas Policy 6, Open Space Goal 1 and Policy 1, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 would still be implemented, and these goals and policies require the application of design standards that promote high-quality development, and require the preservation of a significant system of interconnected natural habitat areas. Furthermore, all development must be consistent with the City’s (2008) Community Design Standards, which is reviewed during the permitting process. Therefore, the Reduced Growth Alternative would still result in less-than-significant impacts related to scenic vistas.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development that would occur under the proposed General Plan Update. For the same reasons as discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-1 (Section 4.14, “Aesthetics”), there are no scenic vistas within the Planning Area, nor is the Planning Area visible from any designated scenic viewpoint. Under the No Project Alternative, proposed updates to Goal LU7.3 and Policies LU8.7, LU9.9, OS2.1, and OS2.2 would not occur; however, the proposed changes consist solely of minor edits that are proposed for clarity. Existing General Plan Community Design Policies 6 and 8, Growth Management Goal 13 and Policy 8, Growth Management-Growth Areas Policy 6, Open Space Goal 1 and Policy 1, and Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 would continue to be implemented, and these goals and policies require the application of design standards that promote high-quality development, and require the preservation of a significant system of interconnected natural habitat areas. Furthermore, all development must be consistent with the City’s (2008) Community Design Standards, which is reviewed during the permitting process. Finally, there are no scenic vistas within the Planning Area. Therefore, impacts related to scenic vistas under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be less than significant.

6.5.14.2 VISUAL CHARACTER AND QUALITY (IN A NON-URBANIZED AREA, SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE THE EXISTING VISUAL CHARACTER OR QUALITY OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS, AND IN AN URBANIZED AREA, CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE ZONING AND OTHER REGULATIONS GOVERNING SCENIC QUALITY)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. In the infill areas (shown in Exhibit 6-1), buildout of the General Plan would not result in substantive
changes to the visual character because the area is already fully developed. However, the Infill Housing Alternative also includes all of the new urban development envisioned under the proposed General Plan Update in the currently undeveloped western and northwestern portions of the Planning Area. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-2 (Section 4.14, “Aesthetics”), the western and northwestern areas of the City have been in the process of developing, and therefore some areas already contain newer residences, commercial developments, and public infrastructure and facilities oriented around a curvilinear street network and an interconnected system of open space adjoining the creeks that flow through the area. The new development that could occur through buildout of the General Plan would be of a similar type and mass and consistent with City design guidelines and standards, and would be similarly oriented around an interconnected system of open space. Furthermore, all projects are required to comply with the City’s Community Design Standards, which address a variety of topics related to design, including site planning and architectural design standards; landscaping and screening techniques to preserve and enhance the visual quality; signage; streetscape improvements such as street trees, landscaped medians, and street furnishings; and lighting design.

State law requires the City’s Zoning Code to be consistent with the General Plan. The Zoning Ordinance establishes specific, enforceable standards with which development must comply such as minimum lot size, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and a list of allowable uses. Zoning applies lot-by-lot, whereas the General Plan has a community-wide perspective. The City’s Zoning Ordinance includes various zones for residential, commercial, industrial, open space, and agricultural uses, as well as several overlay zones that apply to specific conditions (e.g. floodplain overlay). Provisions pertaining to visual resources such as site-specific design standards, preservation of open space, landscaping, street trees, grading on steep slopes, and signs, are covered in separate sections.

The Infill Housing Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies LU3.4, Goal LU7.3, and Policies LU7.2 and 7.7, LU8.7, LU8.11, LU9.5, LU9.6, LU9.9, Goal OS1.2, OS1.3, Policies OS1.4, OS 1.12, OS2.1, OS2.2, OS4.16, and Goal PR1.2, all of which are designed to promote the integration of open space and natural resources, as well as compatibility within and between the natural and the urban environments in the land use planning process. In addition, existing General Plan Community Form Goal 1 and Policies 1 and 2; Community Design Goals 1, 2, and 4 and Policies 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Growth Management Goal 13 and Policies 8 and 9; Growth Management-Growth Areas Policy 6; Open Space Goal 1 and Policy 1; Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policy 4; Open Space Goal 1 and Policies 1, 2, and 9; Privately-Owned Utilities Policy 2; Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy 6; and Flood Protection Policy 9, would continue to be implemented, and would promote high-quality development, require the preservation of historic buildings, require contour grading, require the installation of underground (instead of overhead) power and communication lines, require development in Specific Plan Areas to be designed around a unified architectural theme that integrates open space, and require the preservation of a significant system of interconnected natural habitat areas and maintain the existing natural stream courses (which in turn promotes high-quality visual character and quality).

Because all site-specific development in the City is required to (1) comply with existing and proposed General Plan Update policies specifically designed to provide for high-quality design, (2) implement design standards contained in the City’s (2008) Community Design Standards (required during the City’s design review process prior to the issuance of a building permit), (3) continue to preserve significant amounts of open space and native vegetation, particularly along stream corridors, and (4) implement site-specific adopted Specific Plans and Municipal Code requirements related to aesthetics and design—all of which are specifically designed to ensure
the continuation of high-quality design and the preservation of visual character and quality—a conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, would not occur under this alternative.

However, the northwest and western portions of the Planning Area are not yet urbanized. The visual character in these portions of the Planning Area would change from existing undeveloped open space and agricultural land to urban development as a result of the site-specific project developments envisioned under the Infill Housing Alternative. Therefore, impacts from degradation of visual character and quality under the Infill Housing Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

**Reduced Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Most of the new development would occur in existing urbanized portions of the Planning Area (see Exhibit 6-2). As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-2 (Section 4.14, “Aesthetics”), development under the Reduced Growth Alternative would be of a similar type and mass and consistent with City design guidelines and standards, and would be similarly oriented around an interconnected system of open space. Furthermore, all projects are required to comply with the City’s Community Design Standards, which address a variety of topics related to design and visual character.

The Reduced Growth Alternative includes all of the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies LU3.4, Goal LU7.3, and Policies LU7.2 and 7.7, LU8.7, LU8.11, LU9.5, LU9.6, LU9.9, Goal OS1.2, OS1.3, Policies OS1.4, OS 1.12, OS2.1, OS2.2, OS4.16, and Goal PR1.2, all of which are designed to promote the integration of open space and natural resources, as well as compatibility within and between the natural and the urban environments in the land use planning process. In addition, existing General Plan Community Form Goal 1 and Policies 1 and 2; Community Design Goals 1, 2, and 4 and Policies 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Growth Management Goal 13 and Policies 8 and 9; Growth Management-Growth Areas Policy 6; Open Space Goal 1 and Policy 1; Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policy 4; Open Space Goal 1 and Policies 1, 2, and 9; Privately-Owned Utilities Policy 2; Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy 6; and Flood Protection Policy 9, would continue to be implemented, and would promote high-quality development, require the preservation of historic buildings, require contour grading, require the installation of underground (instead of overhead) power and communication lines, require development in specific plan areas to be designed around a unified architectural theme that integrates open space, and require the preservation of a significant system of interconnected natural habitat areas and maintain the existing natural stream courses (which in turn promotes high-quality visual character and quality).

State law requires the City’s Zoning Code to be consistent with the General Plan, and the existing and proposed General Plan Update policies would prevent a conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Furthermore, new residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center projects under the Reduced Growth Alternative that are located within a transit priority area would not result in significant aesthetic impacts (Public Resources Code Section 21099[d][1]). Finally, because the Reduced Growth Alternative would not allow new development in the non-urbanized northern and western portions of the Planning Area, the visual character in these areas would not change. Therefore, the Reduced Growth Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact that would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and would result in less-than-significant impacts from degradation of visual character and quality.
No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development that would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and the new development would occur in the same locations as the proposed General Plan Update, including the currently undeveloped northern and western portions of the Planning Area. Therefore, a similar potential for degradation of visual character and quality would occur. Under the No Project Alternative, Proposed updates to Policies LU3.4, Goal LU7.3, and Policies LU7.2 and 7.7, LU8.7, LU8.11, LU9.5, LU9.6, LU9.9, Goal OS1.2, OS1.3, Policies OS1.4, OS 1.12, OS2.1, OS2.2, OS4.16, and Goal PR1.2 would not occur. However, the existing General Plan Community Form Goal 1 and Policies 1 and 2; Community Design Goals 1, 2, and 4 and Policies 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Growth Management Goal 13 and Policies 8 and 9; Growth Management-Growth Areas Policy 6; Open Space Goal 1 and Policy 1; Vegetation and Wildlife Goal 1 and Policy 4; Open Space Goal 1 and Policies 1, 2, and 9; Privately-Owned Utilities Policy 2; Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy 6; and Flood Protection Policy 9, would continue to be implemented, and would promote high-quality development, require the preservation of historic buildings, require contour grading, require the installation of underground (instead of overhead) power and communication lines, require development in Specific Plan Areas to be designed around a unified architectural theme that integrates open space, and require the preservation of a significant system of interconnected natural habitat areas including existing streambeds and watercourses (which in turn promotes high-quality visual character and quality).

State law requires the City’s Zoning Code to be consistent with the General Plan, and the existing General Plan policies would prevent a conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. However, the northwest and western portions of the Planning Area are not yet urbanized. The visual character in these portions of the Planning Area would change from existing undeveloped open space and agricultural land to urban development as a result of the site-specific project developments under the existing General Plan. Therefore, impacts from degradation of visual character and quality under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

6.5.14.3 Light and Glare (Create a New Source of Substantial Light or Glare That Would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in additional housing units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The additional infill housing would be located in existing developed areas, as shown in Exhibit 6-1. These areas are already urbanized, and therefore already generate sources of light and glare. However, the Infill Housing Alternative also includes all of the new development in the non-urbanized western and northern portions of the Planning Area that is envisioned under the proposed General Plan. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-3 (Section 4.14, “Aesthetics”), most residential buildings produce limited light during the night, generally from low-level outdoor security lighting and light that emanates from unscreened windows. Lighting from nighttime outdoor sporting events and streetlights is of higher candlepower and can result in skyglow and nighttime glare effects. New and redeveloped buildings could also result in increased glare from roofing materials and architectural coatings. The City’s (2008) Community Design Guidelines include lighting standards for all types of land uses, such as the requirements that pole-mounted lights be no taller than 25 feet, a preference for “pedestrian style” lighting (less than 10 feet tall), and the requirement that lighting sources must have cut off lenses and should be located to avoid light spillage and glare on adjacent properties and in private spaces. However, there are no General Plan goals or policies related to lighting or glare. The proposed General Plan Update includes new
Policy LU7.9 to control artificial lighting to avoid spill-over lighting, and the use of anti-reflective architectural materials and coatings to prevent glare. However, it is not feasible to mitigate the new light and glare impacts completely without prohibiting the use of light in new development. No other feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, the impact from creation of new sources of nighttime light and glare under the Infill Housing Alternative would be slightly greater than the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, a lesser amount of new construction would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and thus there would be a reduced potential for new sources of light and glare. Furthermore, the new development would primarily be located in existing urban areas (as shown in Exhibit 6-2), which already generate nighttime light and glare. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-3 (Section 4.13, “Aesthetics”), the City’s Community Design Guidelines include lighting standards for new and existing development. Because the Reduced Growth Alternative would result in a substantially reduced level of new residential and commercial development (as well as new streets with overhead light standards that would not be installed because development outside of existing areas generally would not occur) as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, the level of new nighttime light and glare as compared to the proposed General Plan Update would be substantially lower. The existing General Plan does not contain goals or policies related to light and glare. The proposed General Plan Update includes new Policy LU7.9, to control artificial lighting to avoid spill-over lighting, and the use of anti-reflective architectural materials and coatings to prevent glare. However, it is not feasible to mitigate the new light and glare impacts completely without prohibiting the use of light in new development. Therefore, the impact from creation of new sources of nighttime light and glare under the Reduced Development Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be significant and unavoidable.

No Project Alternative

The existing General Plan includes the same level of development that would occur under the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar potential for generation of new nighttime light and glare would occur. As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 4.14-3 (Section 4.13, “Aesthetics”), lighting standards contained in the City’s (2008) Community Design Guidelines would be implemented. However, there are no existing General Plan goals or policies that related to lighting or glare, and under the No Project Alternative, new Policy LU7.9, to control artificial lighting to avoid spill-over lighting, and the use of anti-reflective architectural materials and coatings to prevent glare), would not be implemented. Therefore, impacts from creation of new sources of nighttime light and glare under the No Project Alternative would be greater as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and would still be significant and unavoidable.

6.5.15 ENERGY

6.5.15.1 ENERGY CONSUMPTION (Significant Environmental Impacts Due to the Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in development of 1,400 additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. This would result in an increased energy demand compared to the General
Plan Update for construction and operation of the additional dwelling units. The extent to which the Infill Housing Alternative would improve energy efficiency related to transportation energy consumption compared to the proposed General Plan Update depends on the demographics and job locations of the households that occupy the additional multi-family dwellings, the extent to which funding is available to improve non-vehicular transportation options for these future households, the future cost of vehicular travel compared to other transportation options, the development of complementary land uses in close proximity to future multi-family development, and other factors. However, there is evidence of preferences for housing locations close to work that enable short commutes; preferences for walkability and access to shopping, services, and transit; demand for a mix of housing types and attached products in suburbs; increasing numbers of small households, creating a market for smaller homes; and the need for greater market diversity.\(^{10}\) In addition, multi-family units are more energy efficient compared to lower-density, single-family dwelling units – both with respect to the largest statewide energy demand sector, transportation, as well as building energy. As explained above in Section 6.5.3, “Transportation,” the additional development under this alternative would be focused within areas where VMT per service population is typically lower than the citywide average (see Exhibit 6-2 for areas of development and Table 6.3-3 for relative comparison of VMT per service population in Specific Plan Areas throughout the city). Transportation is the largest energy consuming sector in California and focusing development in these areas will help achieve transportation-related energy efficiencies beyond those which would be achieved under the proposed General Plan Update. Furthermore, if the multi-family housing added in infill areas would supplant housing demand at the fringes, this Infill Housing Alternative could further improve energy efficiencies as compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

In addition, the Infill Housing Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, many of which, as identified in Section 4.15, “Energy,” promote promote energy efficiency and reduce peak energy demand in new development and promote increased energy efficiencies in existing development through behavioral changes and physical retrofits of existing structures. Many of these policies would be directly applicable to the additional development under this alternative and generate energy efficiencies specific to this alternative.

Impacts related to extension of energy-related infrastructure are analyzed in the utilities section of this EIR and considered in the environmental topic-specific sections of this EIR (air quality, biological resources, etc.) and there are no additional impacts that have not already been considered in detail.

While the Infill Housing Alternative has the potential to achieve additional transportation and building energy efficiencies compared to the proposed General Plan Update, because there are many important factors about the character and location of future development, and the demographic characteristics of future households and employees within the Planning Area, the overall competitiveness of transit compared to driving throughout the region, the cost of fuel, and other factors, the degree to which this alternative would increase energy efficiency is currently unknown. Overall, the energy consumption associated with implementation of the Infill Housing Alternative would be \textit{similar} to that experienced under the proposed General Plan Update, and this impact would still be \textit{less than significant}.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore, there would be reduced energy demands associated with both construction and operational phases. Under this alternative, development would be focused in areas with access to existing infrastructure, which would reduce the need for energy in major infrastructure expansion and extension relative to the proposed General Plan Update. In addition, under this alternative, development would be focused in areas that tend to have lower rates of VMT (see Exhibit 6-2 for areas of development and Table 6.3-3 for relative comparison of VMT per service population in Specific Plan Areas throughout the city). Since transportation is the largest energy consuming sector, placing more development in lower-VMT areas would substantially reduce energy demand and improve energy efficiency compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

In addition, the Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, many of which, as identified in Section 4.15, “Energy,” promote energy efficiency and reduce peak energy demand in new development and promote increased energy efficiencies in existing development through behavioral changes and physical retrofits of existing structures. Many of these policies would be directly applicable to the additional development under this alternative.

Impacts related to extension of energy-related infrastructure are analyzed in the utilities section of this EIR and considered in the environmental topic-specific sections of this EIR (air quality, biological resources, etc.) and there are no additional impacts that have not already been considered in detail. Overall, the energy consumption associated with implementation of the Reduced Growth Alternative would be reduced under this alternative compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and this impact would still be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, a similar amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of construction-related and operational energy demands would occur. However, under the No Project Alternative, the goal and policy revisions and additional under the proposed General Plan Update would not be implemented. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, no updates to the General Plan to provide more detailed and updated implementation measures that can reduce potential impacts, and no updates to comply with State law changes, would occur. Many of the detailed implementation measures added and policies to comply with State law changes would reduce vehicular transportation demand and associated energy demand.

While the existing General Plan contains policies such as the Plan Community Form – Downtown Neighborhoods Policy 2, Community Form - Relationship to Transit, Pedestrian, Air Quality (RTPAQ) Policy 1, Bikeways/Trails Goal 1 and Policy 2, and Air Quality General Policy 4 that are designed reduce transportation-related energy demand, the proposed General Plan Update Goals AQ1.3–1.8 and Policies AQ1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9–1.19 and 1.22; Goal CIRC3 and Policies 3.1, and 3.6; Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1–4.6; Goal CIRC5.1 and Policy CIRC5.1; Goal CIRC6.1 and Policies CIRC6.1 and 6.2; Policies LU2.1–2.6, 3.4, 7.2, and 8.10; Policy PF4.6; Goals PF9.1 and 9.2 and Policies PF9.1, 9.4, 9.5, 9.8, and 9.9, listed in Section 4.15, “Energy,” include revisions to the existing General Plan that would further promote energy efficiency in land use and transportation planning and building design. Without the goal and policy revisions of the proposed General Plan Update, the No Project Alternative may not achieve the same level of in energy efficiency that would be achieved by future development under the proposed General Plan.
Impacts related to extension of energy-related infrastructure are analyzed in the utilities section of this EIR and considered in the environmental topic-specific sections of this EIR (air quality, biological resources, etc.) and there are no additional impacts that have not already been considered in detail. Overall, the energy consumption associated with implementation of the No Project Alternative would be greater than the proposed General Plan Update, but would still be less than significant.

6.5.15.2 CONFLICT WITH ENERGY PLANS (Conflict with or Obstruct a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency)

Infill Housing Alternative

The Infill Housing Alternative would result in development of 1,400 additional residential units, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. This would result in an increased energy demand compared to the General Plan Update for construction and operation of the additional dwelling units.

The Infill Housing Alternative would incorporate the same revisions included in the proposed General Plan Update, including Policies LU7.2, PF4.4, PF4.6, PF9.1, PF9.4, PF9.5, PF9.8, PF9.9, AQ1.15, AQ1.17, AQ1.18, and AQ1.19, which would improve energy efficiency within the Planning Area by encouraging energy efficient design standards and transportation systems, promoting energy efficiency retrofits of existing structures, promoting energy efficiency and conservation programs associated with utilities, and requiring compliance with federal, state, and local energy-related regulations.

In addition, this alternative would incorporate state plans and policies for renewable energy and energy efficiency include the California Energy Code and California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen). Development under the proposed General Plan Update would be required to comply with these policies per the California Code of Regulations. Locally, project designs would be subject to review with consideration for the City of Roseville’s Community Design Guidelines.

While the Infill Housing Alternative has the potential to achieve additional transportation and building energy efficiencies compared to the proposed General Plan Update, this alternative would be required to comply with all state-mandated energy efficiency requirements, and would not conflict with any state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plan. Overall, the impact would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and this impact would still be less than significant.

Reduced Growth Alternative

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, less new development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore, there would be reduced energy demands associated with both construction and operational phases. In addition, the Reduced Growth Alternative includes all the same goals and policies as the proposed General Plan Update, many of which, as identified in Section 4.15, “Energy,” would encourage energy efficient design standards and transportation systems, promote energy efficiency retrofits of existing structures, and promote energy efficiency and conservation programs associated with utilities.

As with the Infill Housing Alternative, this alternative would incorporate state plans and policies for renewable energy and energy efficiency include the California Energy Code and California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen). Development under the proposed General Plan Update would be required to comply with these...
policies per the California Code of Regulations. Locally, project designs would be subject to review with consideration for the City of Roseville’s Community Design Guidelines.

While the Reduced Growth Alternative would reduce energy demand compared to the proposed General Plan Update, this is not necessarily relevant to conflicts with renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. This alternative would be required to comply with all state-mandated energy efficiency requirements, and would not conflict with any state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plan. Overall, the impact would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and this impact would still be less than significant.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, a similar amount of development would occur as compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and therefore a similar level of construction-related and operational energy demands would occur. However, under the No Project Alternative, the goal and policy revisions and additional under the proposed General Plan Update would not be implemented. For example, the No Project Alternative would not include revisions that promote energy efficiency, such as proposed General Plan Update Goals AQ1.3–1.8 and Policies AQ1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9–1.19 and 1.22; Goal CIRC3 and Policies 3.1, and 3.6; Goal CIRC4 and Policies CIRC4.1–4.6; Goal CIRC5.1 and Policy CIRC5.1; Goal CIRC6.1 and Policies CIRC6.1 and 6.2; Policies LU2.1–2.6, 3.4, 7.2, and 8.10; Policy PF4.6; Goals PF9.1 and 9.2 and Policies PF9.1, 9.4, 9.5, 9.8, and 9.9.

However, design and construction of new and retrofit buildings would be required to comply with the most recently adopted California Energy Code and California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen), which are expected to become increasingly more stringent over time to further the State’s renewable energy and GHG reduction goals. In addition, design of new and retrofit construction within the Planning Area would be reviewed by the City of Roseville for consistency with the City’s Community Design Guidelines, which includes requirements for consideration of energy efficiency measures and incorporation of renewable energy production features in the design of projects. While the No Project Alternative may not achieve the same energy efficiency as the proposed General Plan Update, this is not necessarily relevant to conflicts with renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. This alternative would be required to comply with all state-mandated energy efficiency requirements, and would not conflict with any state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plan. Overall, the impact would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update, and this impact would still be less than significant.

### 6.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 6-1, shown at the introduction to the alternatives analysis in Section 6.5 above, provides a summary comparison of the environmental impacts of the Infill Housing Alternative, the Reduced Growth Alternative, and the No Project Alternative to the environmental impacts of the proposed General Plan Update based on the detailed analysis presented throughout this Chapter. As shown, the Infill Housing Alternative has one reduced impact compared to the proposed General Plan Update and 24 increased impacts, the Reduced Growth Alternative has 40 reduced impacts and one increased impact, and the No Project Alternative has no reduced impacts and 10 increased impacts.

CEQA requires that, among the alternatives, an “environmentally superior” alternative be identified and that the reasons for such selection be disclosed. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would
generate the fewest or least severe adverse impacts. Therefore, the Reduced Growth Alternative is environmentally superior.
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