CHAPTER 12 CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

12.1 INTRODUCTION

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

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

The cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would contribute are evaluated in Chapter 11.

12.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

12.3 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Transportation and Circulation

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

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

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

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

Impact 5.11: Increased Traffic Volumes at State Highway Interchanges Under Existing Plus Project Conditions

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

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

Impact 5.18: Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways under 2025 CIP Plus Project Conditions

Impact 11.8: Increased traffic volumes on State Highways under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Impact 11.8: Increased traffic volumes on State Highways under 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Air Quality

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

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

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

Noise

Impact 11.9: Contribute to Cumulative Increases in Noise Levels

Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply

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

Public Utilities – Wastewater Treatment

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

12.4 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible, since a large commitment of such resources makes the removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary

impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

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

- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential accidents associated with the project; and
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (i.e., the project involves wasteful use of energy).

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

As determined in the Initial Study for the proposed Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 project, the proposed project would not alter the WRSP EIR conclusion that the project would result in the use, transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes but that all activities would comply with applicable state and federal laws which would significant reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible environmental damage.

12.5 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

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

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate the extent to which growth could be induced, accelerated, intensified, or shifted as a result of developing the proposed project. The framework for analysis of these potential growth-inducing impacts includes contemplation of the following questions:

- Would the project remove obstacles to population growth?
- Would the project tax existing community facilities to the point of requiring construction of new facilities (construction of which may adversely impact the environment)?
- Would the project foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing?
- Would the project encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively?

Current Physical Growth Constraints

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

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

Removal of Physical Growth Constraints

The proposed project includes extension of pipelines to provide potable water and recycled water service as well as wastewater collection to all portions of Fiddyment Ranch. Expansion of the wastewater treatment plant capacity is not included in the proposed project or required to provide service to the proposed project. The project would not extend any public infrastructure to property that is not within the WRSP boundaries.

Economic Effects

Under the proposed Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 project, the majority of the Fiddyment Ranch area would be developed with low density residential land uses, a total of 3,240 dwelling units. The Fiddyment Ranch area would also support 740 medium density residential units and up to 2,132 high density residential units. Of these residential units, the previously approved WRSP provides for development of 2,660 low density units, 131 medium density units, and 1,416 high density units, for a total of 4,207 units. The proposed project provides for development of an additional 1,905 units – 580 low density, 609 medium density, and 716 high density. The residential population of these areas of the project site would

generate general economic activity in the City of Roseville, including increased demand for services and shopping. Development of the high density residential areas would likely include rental communities that would create jobs associated with property management. Additionally, under the proposed project, the Fiddyment Ranch area would support a total of 46.24 acres of community commercial land uses. Of this amount, 38.97 acres are included in the previously approved WRSP and 7.27 acres are included in the proposed project. Development of the community commercial land uses would provide a total of approximately 1,439 jobs, assuming a Floor-Area-Ratio of 0.25 and that one job would be supported in every 350 square feet of building space. Of this total amount of employment, the proposed 7.27 additional acres of community commercial would support approximately 226 new jobs, representing a minor increase in the City's commercial activity.

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

As reported in the WRSP EIR, the indirect employment factor for commercial land uses is 0.07 and the induced employment factor for commercial land uses is 2.56. The induced employment factor is applied to the indirect employment total. Based on these factors and the job creation estimate for the project site of 226 direct employees, the proposed project could result in a total of 281 new jobs within the regional economy. While increased future employment generated by resident and employee spending ultimately results in physical development of space to accommodate those employees, given the high unemployment rate locally and statewide, the creation of 55 new jobs outside of the project boundaries is not expected to generate substantial amounts of growth in the region.

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

Impacts of Induced Growth

The proposed project would contribute to growth in the region, particularly in the City of Roseville. The growth induced directly and indirectly by the proposed project would contribute to a number of environmental impacts in the City, as well as the greater Sacramento/Placer County area. The impacts include: traffic congestion; air quality deterioration; contribution to global warming; loss of open space; loss of habitat and wildlife;

impacts on utilities and services, such as fire and police protection, water, recycled water, wastewater, solid waste, energy and natural gas; and increased demand for housing. New residential development in the region could lead to the need for construction of additional facilities for provision of public and governmental services.

As discussed in **CHAPTER 4 LAND USE**, the WRSP and the proposed Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 project is consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Preferred Blueprint Scenario, which identifies a regional land use plan to accommodate the amount of growth anticipated to occur in the region through 2050. The Preferred Blueprint Scenario promotes compact, mixed-use development, a greater range of housing products, reinvestment in already developed areas, and protection of natural-resource areas from urbanization. By intensifying land uses within an area already planned for urban development, the proposed project supports these Blueprint goals. In the absence of the proposed project, it could be assumed that at least some of the 1,905 additional residential units included in the proposed project would be developed in more remote locations and locations that are not already planned for development. This could increase regional environmental impacts such as traffic congestion, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and loss of agricultural, cultural and biological resources.

12.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

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

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

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

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

the impacts of the proposed project, *Table 12.5* summarizes the relative impacts of Alternative D1 compared with the impacts of the proposed project, and *Table 12.6* summarizes the relative impacts of Alternative D2 compared with the proposed project. In addition, the alternatives analysis is used to identify the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative Selection Process

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

Objectives of the Proposed Project

The project applicant has identified the following objectives for the proposed Fiddyment Ranch Specific Plan Amendment 3 project. These objectives have changed slightly since circulation of the Notice of Preparation of this EIR.

- Introduce a variety of housing types to Phases 2 and 3, similar to the diverse housing mix contained in Phase 1. This would be accomplished by adding pods of Medium Density and High Density Residential uses, as well as varying the density of the remaining Low Density Residential areas.
- Aid the City in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation obligations as identified in the current 2008 -2013 Housing Element of the General Plan by increasing the amount of High Density Residential dwelling units.
- Aid the City in meeting the SACOG Blueprint Preferred Growth scenario, the City's Blueprint Implementation Strategies, and the anticipated SACOG Sustainable Communities Strategy (required as part of meeting state-mandated regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets) by increasing the diversity of housing choices within the City, particularly by increasing residential density generally and providing more medium and high density residential units.
- Introduce a Community Commercial parcel in the northwest portion of Phase 3, providing for a centrally located small scale commercial use that would promote pedestrian and bicycle access.
- Given limited services on the western side of the city, change the designation of a two-acre parcel in the northeast portion of Phase 2, at the corner of Angus Road and Fiddyment Road from residential to Community Commercial in order to provide neighborhood services proximate to planned residential uses.
- Add further definition to the circulation system by establishing two east/west streets that will intersect both Hayden Parkway and Fiddyment Road. These two streets will provide multiple points of ingress and egress from the Phases 2 and 3 planning areas, improving local circulation opportunities and easing the traffic load on Hayden Parkway.

- Reconfigure and refine the paseo parcels to connect the open spaces, parks, schools, and residential neighborhoods within the northern portion of Fiddyment Ranch.
- Reconfigure the F-51 park site and F-71 school site to improve vehicular circulation and pedestrian safety to and from these sites and provide an attractive park frontage along Hayden Parkway for the added benefit of visual open space.
- Modify the street configuration and Class I bicycle system to provide access to the future planning area to the west of the Fiddyment Ranch development.

Impacts of the Proposed Project

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

Alternatives Selected for Analysis

Alternative A – No Project (No Development)

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

Alternative B – No Project (Buildout under WRSP)

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

Alternative C – Reduced Development

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

Table 12.1
Alternative C – Reduced Development

Land Use	Additional Development (compared to approved WRSP)	
	Proposed Additional Units	20 Percent Reduction Additional Units
LDR	580 units	464 units
MDR	609 units	487 units
HDR	716 units	573 units
Total Additional Units	***1,905***	***1,524***

Under this alternative, the Fiddyment Ranch site would support a total of 5,731 residential units. The Conceptual Land Use Plan would include the following land uses:

- 756.4 acres of LDR at a density of 4.1 units per acre (acreage does not include LDR pocket parks);
- 73.3 acres of MDR at a density of 8.4 units per acre;
- 86 acres of HDR at a density of 23.1 units per acre;
- 46.2 acres of community commercial;
- 19.1 acres of elementary school;
- 52.9 acres of high school;
- 4.5 acres of public/quasi-public;
- 216.5 acres of park (including LDR pocket parks);
- 6.7 acres of paseo;
- 340.2 acres of open space; and
- 75.8 acres of right of way

Alternative D1 – Relocated HDR Units

This alternative would reduce the proposed increase in onsite development by locating some of the proposed high density residential units offsite. Within the Fiddyment Ranch site, parcels 6B, 8A, 23, and 24 would remain as HDR, but would have a maximum density of 20 units per acre (as currently planned under the WRSP), compared to the proposed density of 25 units per acre. The result would be a transfer of 216 HDR units from the Fiddyment Ranch site. Other development within Fiddyment Ranch would remain as proposed. Specifically, parcels 21 and 22 would remain as HDR and would retain the proposed density of 25 units per acre.

Alternative D1 would provide for rezoning of the 10.75-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Douglas Boulevard and Harding Boulevard to Commercial Mixed Use. As shown in the aerial photograph of location in *Figure 12-1*, the site is currently developed with commercial land uses, including a gas station currently being reconstructed, a Brake Masters

north associates fork

N

0 125 250

1 inch = 250 feet

Harding Blvd. Site (±10.7 ac.)

Aerial Photo: 2008 (Placer County)

Figure 12-1

Harding Boulevard Site

Fiddyment Ranch

City of Roseville, Placer County, CA

repair shop, an Ace Hardware, a Dollar Tree, and Wells Fargo bank. Section 19.12.010 of the City of Roseville Municipal Code identifies the Commercial Mixed Use district as:

"intended to promote a variety of commercial uses types and the flexible citing of other uses that are typically considered to be compatible with commercial development. It is the intent of the CMU zoning district to establish a mix of uses, which will be accompanied by overlay zones, to ensure that different commercial uses will be successfully integrated into desirable, cohesive commercial districts. The CMU zoning district shall always be applied in conjunction with either the DS (development standards) or SA (special area) overlay zones."

The uses permitted in the Commercial Mixed Use zone district are established in Section 19.12.020 of the City of Roseville Municipal Code. These permitted uses include civic uses, a variety of residential uses, and a variety of commercial uses. Unless modified by specific development standards in accordance with the Development Standards or Special Area overlay zones, buildings within the Commercial Mixed Use zone district may reach a maximum height of 50 feet.

The Commercial Mixed Use designation would allow for redevelopment of the site with a mixture of commercial and high density residential land uses. The high density residential units lost from the proposed project could be developed at the Harding Boulevard site. No specific development plan is considered for the Harding Boulevard site; rather, the zoning would be in place to allow for future development at the site. The analysis of this offsite alternative is conducted at a programmatic level assuming development of the site at the maximum development densities allowed under the Commercial Mixed Use designation. The Commercial Mixed Use zoning of the site would allow for up to 269 HDR units and 21,500 square feet of commercial uses. The 269 HDR units would be a combination of 216 units transferred from the Fiddyment Ranch site and 53 additional HDR units allowed as a result of the rezone, resulting in a density of 25 dwelling units per acre. Any future development proposals for the site would be required to undergo subsequent project-level environmental review during the entitlement stage.

Alternative D1 is evaluated at a level of detail that would allow City approval of the contemplated rezoning with no additional environmental review.

Table 12.2 compares the amount of development in the four affected onsite parcels and at the Harding Boulevard site under the proposed project and Alternative D1.

Table 12.2
Alternative D1 – Relocated HDR Units

Parcel	Size (acres)	Number of HDR Units	
		Proposed Project	Alternative D
F-6B	7.80	195	156
F-8A	11.08	277	222
F-23	11.72	293	234
F-24	12.62	315	252

Harding Blvd	10.75	0	269
Total Units (on affected parcels)	--	1,080	1,133

Alternative D2 – Relocated HDR Units From Parcel F-8A

Similar to Alternative D1, Alternative D2 would reduce the proposed increase in onsite development by locating some of the proposed high density residential units offsite. Within the Fiddyment Ranch site, parcel 8A would be designated LDR, with a maximum density of 5 units per acre. Parcel 8A consists of 11.08 acres, thus it would be developed with 55 LDR units as opposed to the proposed 277 HDR units, resulting in a net reduction of 222 residential units within Fiddyment Ranch.

Other development within Fiddyment Ranch would remain as proposed. Specifically, parcels 6B, 21, 22, 23, and 24 would remain as HDR and would retain the proposed density of 25 units per acre.

As in Alternative D1, Alternative D2 would provide for rezoning of the 10.75-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Douglas Boulevard and Harding Boulevard to Commercial Mixed Use. The Commercial Mixed Use zoning of the site would allow for up to 269 HDR units (at a maximum density of 25 units per acre) and 21,500 square feet of commercial uses. The 269 HDR units would be a combination of 222 units transferred from the Fiddyment Ranch site and 47 additional HDR units allowed as a result of the rezone.

Table 12.3 compares the amount of development in the four existing HDR parcels within Fiddyment Ranch and at the Harding Boulevard site under the proposed project and Alternative D2.

Table 12.3
Alternative D2 – Relocated HDR Units From Parcel F-8A

Parcel	Size (acres)	Number of Units	
		Proposed Project	Alternative D2
F-6B	7.80	195 HDR	195 HDR
F-8A	11.08	277 HDR	55 LDR
F-23	11.72	293 HDR	293 HDR
F-24	12.62	315 HDR	315 HDR
Harding Blvd	10.75	0	269 HDR
Total Units (on affected parcels)	--	1,080	1,127

Summary of Impacts From the Proposed Project

Land Use: As evaluated in **CHAPTER 4 LAND USE**, the proposed project would have less than significant Land Use impacts. Mitigation measures identified throughout chapters 5 through 11 would be necessary to ensure that the proposed project would not

conflict with local and/or regional land use plans and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Transportation and Circulation: The proposed project would increase traffic and demand for transit services and bicycle facilities in the City of Roseville and would contribute to increased traffic volumes within the City of Roseville, City of Rocklin, Placer County, Sutter County, and on Sacramento County roadways. The project would also increase traffic volumes at State highway interchanges and on State highways. Increased traffic volumes associated with the proposed project would result in several Significant and Unavoidable transportation and circulation impacts both under the existing and cumulative conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

expanded wastewater treatment facilities to serve the project would be less than significant.

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

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

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

Alternatives Analysis

Alternative A – No Project (No Development)

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

Transportation and Circulation: The No Project (No Development) alternative would avoid all increases in traffic volumes and avoid all projected transportation and circulation impacts of the proposed project. Alternative A would result in reduced Transportation and Circulation impacts compared to the proposed project.

Noise: The No Project (No Development) alternative would not increase noise levels in the project area and would avoid constructing residential units in proximity to the Roseville Energy Park. Alternative A would result in reduced Noise impacts compared to the proposed project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alternative B – No Project (Buildout under WRSP)

Land Use: Under the No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative, the project site would be developed consistent with the adopted WRSP. Alternative B would result in no impacts related to inconsistencies with adopted land use or zoning designations.

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

Transportation and Circulation: The No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would construct 1,905 fewer residential units and 7.27 fewer acres of commercial land uses in the Fiddyment Ranch portion of the plan area, resulting in a substantial reduction in traffic volume and a slight decrease in trips generated from parks compared to the proposed project. Other changes proposed to the land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project area include minor adjustments in acreage for parks, open space, public/quasi-public, and roadway rights-of-way. These changes would not substantially alter trip generation from the project area. Alternative B would reduce daily trip ends by approximately 25 percent in comparison with the proposed project, reducing traffic volume generation under all scenarios. To provide a conservative analysis of specific impacts of this alternative, detailed Level of Service (LOS) comparisons were evaluated for Alternative B in the 2025 CIP conditions. Tables summarizing the LOS comparisons are provided in Appendix F1. These comparisons found that Alternative B would avoid each of the project's Significant and Unavoidable impacts in the 2025 CIP Plus Project scenario. Alternative B would result in reduced Cumulative – Transportation and Circulation impacts compared to the proposed project. While the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to transit and bicycle facilities, Alternative B would introduce fewer residents and workers into the project area, thereby reducing demand for and impact to transit services and bicycle facilities. Alternative B would decrease the severity of Transportation and Circulation impacts than the proposed project under existing plus project conditions; however, it is likely that some Transportation and Circulation impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Noise: Under the No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative, land use intensity and residential and commercial development density would be lower than under the proposed project, which would result in reduced traffic volumes. This would reduce traffic-generated noise levels in the area. Noise impacts under Alternative B would be the same as were evaluated in the WRSP EIR, which found that mitigation would be required to reduce onsite traffic noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative B would not be expected to change noise levels associated with the Roseville Energy Park or aviation-related activities. Alternative B would result in no change in Noise impacts compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality: The No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would generate emissions that have already been incorporated into the regional Air Quality Attainment Plan and the SIP, and would result in no impacts related to inconsistencies with these adopted plans. Alternative B would generate lower emissions associated with residential development, but would still result in Significant and Unavoidable impacts related

to generation of emissions exceeding Placer County APCD thresholds of significance, as identified in the WRSP EIR. Alternative B would decrease the severity of Air Quality impacts compared to the proposed project; however, these impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Climate Change: The No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would construct fewer homes and would reduce traffic volumes compared to the proposed project, and would therefore generate a lower total volume of GHG emissions than the proposed project. The per capita rate of emissions would likely be higher because there would be a higher proportion of LDR to HDR and because LDR has a higher trip generation rate. Mitigation similar to that required for the proposed project would be necessary to reduce emission to a less than significant level. Mitigation required for the proposed project includes substantial design and construction measures to increase the energy-efficiency and water-efficiency of individual residential units. These measures are not included in the WRSP and would not be required under Alternative B. Thus it is likely that the per capita emission rate of buildout of the WRSP would exceed the emission rate threshold established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (which is applied to the proposed project as discussed in **CHAPTER 8 CLIMATE CHANGE**), resulting in a Significant and Unavoidable impact. Alternative B would result in increased climate change impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply: Based on the City's water demand land use factors, the No Project (Buildout under WRSP) alternative would require 137 acre-feet per year (AFY) less water than the proposed project, as shown in Table 9A-3. While the total water demand would be slightly less under Alternative B compared to the proposed project, both the proposed project and Alternative B would result in less than significant impacts related to potable water supply. Therefore, Alternative B would result in no change in Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: While Alternative B would generate less demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment it would also require upgrades or expansion of existing conveyance and treatment facilities, requiring implementation of mitigation to ensure impacts associated with construction remain less than significant. Alternative B would result in no change in Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment impacts compared to the proposed project.

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

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

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

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

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

Alternative C – Reduced Development

Land Use: The Reduced Development alternative would develop the project site with a total of 5,731 residential units. This is 381 units fewer than the proposed project. Alternative C would not change the location of land uses shown on the proposed project's Conceptual Land Use plan, but would reduce density within each residential area. Alternative C would require the same General Plan, Specific Plan, and Zoning designation amendments as the proposed project. With approval of those amendments, the Reduced Development alternative would have no impact related to consistency with those designations. Land use impacts under both the proposed project and the Reduced Development alternative would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Alternative C would result in no change in Land Use impacts compared to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation: The Reduced Development alternative would construct 381 fewer residential units than the proposed project, resulting in a slight reduction in traffic volume. Alternative C would generate 2,829 fewer daily trip ends than the proposed project, providing a slight reduction in traffic volumes and traffic congestion under all scenarios. Detailed LOS comparisons between the proposed project and Alternative C were completed for the 2025 CIP Plus Project

scenario. Tables summarizing the LOS comparisons are provided in Appendix F1. These comparisons found that Alternative C would avoid each of the project's Significant and Unavoidable impacts in the 2025 CIP Plus Project scenario. Alternative C would result in reduced Cumulative – Transportation and Circulation impacts compared to the proposed project.

While the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to transit and bicycle facilities, Alternative C would introduce fewer residents and workers into the project area, thereby reducing demand for and impact to transit services and bicycle facilities. Alternative C would decrease the severity of some Transportation and Circulation impacts compared to the proposed project under existing plus project conditions however it is likely that some Transportation and Circulation impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

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

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

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

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

Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: Alternative C would result in slightly lower demands for wastewater conveyance and treatment than the proposed project, but would increase total Citywide wastewater generation in the existing plus project and City-buildout plus project conditions. Under both the proposed project and the Reduced Development alternative impacts related to wastewater conveyance and treatment would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. Alternative C would result in no change in Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment impacts compared to the proposed project.

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

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

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

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

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

Alternative D1 – Relocated HDR Units

As discussed above, the following analysis of Alternative D1 provides a level of detail that provides a full environmental analysis of the contemplated rezoning of the 10.75-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Douglas Boulevard and Harding Boulevard and reduction in the number of high density units at the Fiddyment Ranch site. Under this alternative, the Harding Boulevard site would be rezoned and could accommodate a maximum of 269 HDR units and 21,500 square feet of commercial land uses. The detailed analysis below allows for approval of Alternative D1 with no additional environmental review although additional environmental review would be needed for any future development proposal at the Harding Boulevard site.

Alternative D1 Impacts Compared to Impacts of the Proposed Project Evaluated in the Subsequent Draft EIR

Land Use: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in land uses. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Land Use impacts.

Alternative D1 would introduce residential land uses to an area that currently supports only commercial uses. This could lead to some land use conflicts as residents are exposed to potential noise, air pollution, and hazardous materials. These potential impacts are evaluated in this Alternative D1 analysis, and found to be less than significant. Therefore it is expected that future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site as anticipated under Alternative D1 would result in less than significant land use impacts.

Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site would not change the overall distribution of land uses and would not affect issues related to land use compatibility. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Land Use impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in trip generation rates, traffic patterns, or traffic congestion. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Transportation and Circulation impacts.

If the Harding Boulevard site is developed at the maximum density allowed under the proposed zoning, the site would support 21,500 square feet of commercial land uses and 269 high density residential units. A trip generation comparison memorandum was prepared by City Department of Public Works staff, provided in Appendix F2, which found that trip generation associated with future development at the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would be much less than under existing conditions. In addition, Alternative D1 would reduce the number of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site, which would reduce trip generation from the Fiddyment Ranch site. Future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site combined with the reduced high density residential development at the Fiddyment Ranch site would reduce overall trip generation in the City compared to the proposed project. Alternative D1 would decrease the

severity of Transportation and Circulation impacts than the proposed project however it is likely that some Transportation and Circulation impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Noise: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in noise levels associated with land uses and traffic patterns. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Noise impacts.

An environmental noise assessment was conducted for the Harding Boulevard site. This assessment, which is provided in Appendix F4, found that the site is exposed to substantial noise levels from Interstate 80 (I-80), Harding Boulevard, and Douglas Boulevard. The assessment identified the following three potential impacts and found that mitigation measures are available to ensure that each impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact Noise 1: construction activities could potentially expose sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the applicable noise standards and/or result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels.

- ***Mitigation Noise 1A:*** Construction activities shall comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance.

- ***Mitigation Noise 1B:*** Locate fixed construction equipment such as compressors and generators as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Shroud or shield all impact tools, and muffle or shield all intake and exhaust ports on power construction equipment.

- ***Mitigation Noise 1C:*** Designate a disturbance coordinator and conspicuously post this person's number around the project site and in adjacent public spaces. The disturbance coordinator will receive all public complaints about construction noise disturbances and will be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint and implementing any feasible measures to be taken to alleviate the problem.

Impact Noise 2: Proposed residential land uses located adjacent to any of the major project-area arterial roadways may be exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 60 dB Ldn and interior noise levels exceeding 45 dB Ldn.

- ***Mitigation Noise 2A:*** Locate outdoor activity areas for residential uses outside of the 60 dB Ldn noise level contours. As an alternative, locate primary outdoor activity areas on portions of the project site which are shielded from traffic noise levels.

- ***Mitigation Noise 2B:*** An analysis of traffic noise levels and specific mitigation measures on future High Density Residential uses shall be submitted with applications for tentative map approval or other development entitlements. The analysis shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant and shall specify the measures required to achieve

compliance with the City of Roseville 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard at the outdoor activity areas. In addition, an interior noise level analysis shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant and shall specify the measures required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard.

Impact Noise 3: Based upon background noise measurements conducted onsite, it is likely that onsite noise sources will exceed the City of Roseville stationary noise source criteria contained in Table IX-3 of the General Plan Noise Element.

- ***Mitigation Noise 3A:*** Where commercial uses abut residential property lines or loading docks/truck circulation routes face residential areas, the following features shall be included in the project design:
  - Loading docks and truck delivery areas shall maintain a minimum distance of 30 feet from residential property lines;
  - Property line barriers shall be 6 to 8 feet in height. Circulation routes for trucks shall be located a minimum of 30-feet from residential property lines;
  - All heating, cooling and ventilation equipment shall be located within mechanical rooms where possible;
  - All heating, cooling and ventilation equipment shall be shielded from view with solid barriers or building parapets;
  - Emergency generators shall comply with the City of Roseville Municipal Code Noise Ordinance at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers.
  - Delivery/loading activities shall comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Municipal Code Noise Ordinance.

Under Alternative D1, fewer residential units would be developed at the Fiddyment Ranch site. This would reduce traffic-generated noise levels in the Fiddyment Ranch area. However, the noise levels along major roadways would likely continue to exceed the City's standards and the mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would still be required to ensure impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Noise impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality: The Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with approximately 100,000 square feet of commercial and retail uses. Rezoning the site to Commercial Mixed Use would allow for development of up to 21,500 square feet of commercial uses and up to 269 dwelling units on the site but would result in no immediate change in the land uses supported at this Harding Boulevard site. There would be no construction air pollutant emissions and no change in operational air pollutant emissions as a direct result of approval of Alternative D1.

If the Harding Boulevard site is developed at the maximum residential density under the proposed zoning, this alternative would result in a total of 53 more high density residential units than the proposed project but would reduce the total amount of commercial land uses at the site and in the City overall. A trip generation comparison memorandum was prepared by City Department of Public Works staff, provided in Appendix F2, which found that trip generation at the Harding Boulevard site developed with 21,500 square feet of commercial land uses and 269 high density residential units would be much less than under existing conditions. This would reduce operational air pollutant emissions from the Harding Boulevard site. Future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site as allowed under Alternative D1 would be expected to result in less than significant air quality impacts.

Under Alternative D1, fewer residential units would be developed at the Fiddyment Ranch site. This would reduce operational air pollutant emissions from vehicular and area sources generated at the project site. However, the operational air pollutant emissions would likely continue to exceed the APCD thresholds. Alternative D1 would reduce the severity of Air Quality impacts, but would continue to result in a Significant and Unavoidable impact.

Climate Change: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in GHG emissions associated with land uses. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Climate Change impacts.

As discussed above, future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site and development of fewer high density residential units at the Fiddyment Ranch site would reduce trip generation in the City overall. It is assumed that the energy-efficiency and water-efficiency standards required as mitigation for the proposed project would also be required development under Alternative D1. With the efficiency standards implemented and the net reduction in traffic trips in the City, it is expected that Alternative D1 would result in approximately the same per capita GHG emissions for residents and employees of the Fiddyment Ranch and Harding Boulevard sites. Both the proposed project and Alternative D1 would result in less than significant contributions to climate change impacts. Alternative D1 would result in no change in Climate Change impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no direct change in the demand for water supply. Future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would increase demand for water supply by 53.3 AFY. However, the reduction in high density residential units at the Fiddyment Ranch site would offset this increase by 43.7 AFY resulting in a net increase for water supply of 9.6 AFY. The City's water supply contracts are sufficient to meet the water supply needs of this alternative in all year types. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply impacts.

City staff conducted an analysis to determine if existing treatment facilities and local water infrastructure within the vicinity of the Harding Boulevard site can support the additional water demand while maintaining existing service levels at buildout.

The results of the analysis indicate the City's existing infrastructure is sufficient to support this rezone. Approval of Alternative D1 and future development at the rezoned site would result in no direct Public Utilities – Potable Water Infrastructure impacts.

Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no direct changes in the demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment. Wastewater flows associated with future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would be conveyed to the City's Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment (DCWWTP) plant as compared to the Fiddyment Ranch site which conveys wastewater to the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP). Future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would increase average dry weather flows (ADWF) to the DCWWTP by 0.04 million gallons per day (mgd). The DCWWTP currently treats 10 mgd ADWF and has an existing permitted wastewater capacity of 18 mgd ADWF. The increase in ADWF from the Harding Boulevard site are small compared to overall wastewater flows and are therefore not expected result in an impacts at the DCWWTP. City staff also reviewed the impact to local sewer collection facilities to determine if existing sewer infrastructure can support the increase flows from the Harding site. The results of the analysis indicate the City's existing infrastructure is sufficient to support this rezone.

The reduction in high density residential units at the Fiddyment Ranch site would result in reduced wastewater flows to the PGWWTP as compared to the proposed project. Therefore approval of Alternative D1 and future development at the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would result in no direct Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment impacts.

Public Utilities – Recycled Water: The proposed project would implement a water conservation plan, which would decrease the project's demands for recycled water. It is assumed that Alternative D1 would implement the same water conservation plan. Although fewer high density residential units would develop, the area where recycled water would be used would remain unchanged, thus the demand for recycled water would not change.

The Harding Boulevard site is not located within an area of the City that utilizes recycled water for irrigation supply; therefore, rezoning this site and future development of the rezoned site would not impact citywide demand for recycled water. Recycled water demands under Alternative D1 are expected to remain the same as compared to recycled water demands for the proposed project. Under both the proposed project and Alternative D1 the City's recycled water supply and conveyance infrastructure would be sufficient to serve the Fiddyment Ranch project site and impacts would remain less than significant. Alternative D1 would result in no change in Public Utilities – Recycled Water impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Services: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate land use changes, and thus no immediate changes in demand for public services. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Public Services impacts.

If the Harding Boulevard site is developed at the maximum residential density under the proposed zoning, this alternative would result in a total of 53 more high density residential units than the proposed project. Based on the City's average population of 2.54 people per residential unit, Alternative D1 would increase the City's population by 135 people compared with the proposed project. This would slightly increase demands for public services Citywide. However, the small increase in population is not expected to result in any significant impacts to public services.

The fire station nearest to the Harding Boulevard site is Station No. 1 at 401 Oak Street, approximately one mile to the west. Provision of fire protection services to the Harding Boulevard site would not change as a result of future development of the rezoned site.

Development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site under Alternative D1 would result in a slight increase in the population of the City of Roseville compared with the proposed project. Based on the City's desired ratio of 1.2 officers per 1,000 people, this increase would not require any additional police officers or administrative staff. The additional population supported under Alternative D1 would also not generate demand for a new branch library.

Future development of 269 HDR units at the Harding Boulevard site would be expected to generate 37 elementary school students, 11 middle school students, and 15 high school students. The nearest elementary schools to the site are Cirby Elementary and Sierra Gardens. As shown in Table 10.3 in Chapter 10 Public Services, both of these schools are currently operating below capacity. The nearest middle school to the site is Eich Intermediate School, which is also operating below capacity. The nearest high school to the site is Oakmont High School, which is operating slightly above capacity. The additional 15 high school students could be accommodated with the use of portable classrooms. Any developer of residential units at the Harding Boulevard site would be required to pay school impact fees in accordance with SB 50. This would ensure that impacts to schools would remain less than significant.

Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site would slightly reduce demands for public services at Fiddyment Ranch. Public service impacts would be less than significant under both the proposed project and Alternative D1. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Public Services impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate land use changes, and thus no immediate changes in traffic congestion, noise, and air pollutant emissions. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Cumulative impacts.

Future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would result in an overall decrease in trip generation in the City, which would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts in transportation and circulation, noise, and air

quality. Alternative D1 would decrease Cumulative impacts compared to the proposed project.

Alternative D1 Impacts Compared to Impacts of the Proposed Project Evaluated in the Initial Study

Aesthetics: The Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with commercial uses including by an auto repair shop, a gas station, retail stores and a bank. Rezoning the site would result in no immediate change in the site's appearance. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Aesthetic impacts.

Approval of Alternative D1 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site. Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's Zoning Ordinance, Construction Standards, Improvement Standards and Community Design Guidelines. Development consistent with these adopted City policies and regulations would ensure that aesthetic impacts of future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant. Additionally, future development at the site would be required to undergo project level environmental review prior to approval. If any component of the proposed development would be inconsistent with the adopted City policies and regulations or would create a special circumstance that could result in a significant aesthetic impact, this would be evaluated in the environmental review process.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to the significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts identified in the WRSP EIR. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of this impact, but the impact would remain Significant and Unavoidable. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Aesthetic impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources: The Harding Boulevard site contains no designated Farmland, is not currently zoned for agricultural or forestry uses, and supports no agricultural or forestry uses. Rezone and future development of the site would result in no impacts related to conversion of, or conflict with, agricultural or forestry uses. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Agricultural and Forestry Resources impacts. Future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would result in no direct Agricultural and Forestry Resources impacts. Alternative D1 would not alter the development footprint within the Fiddyment Ranch site, and impacts to agricultural and forestry resources at that site would be the same as evaluated in the Initial Study for the proposed project. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Agricultural and Forestry Resources at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources: The majority of the Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with commercial and retail uses. Rezoning the site would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site, but would

not result in immediate development of the site. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct impacts to biological resources.

Approximately 1.47 acres of the Harding Boulevard site is unpaved and vegetated. A field study of this vacant portion of the site was conducted to identify any significant biological resources that could be affected future development of the rezoned site. The Biological and Wetlands Evaluation of the Harding Boulevard site is provided in Appendix F3. This report found that the vacant portion of the site "appears to have been in its current state for many years, but has clearly been substantially altered in the past. The fallow area has rolling topography and is entirely covered with weedy herbaceous vegetation. A sporadic line of trees and shrubs occurs along the eastern fenceline (bordering the freeway off-ramp)." The site supports three interior live oaks and one valley oak. Each of the trees are healthy and has good to fair structure. The report concludes that the Harding Boulevard site "has virtually no potential to support special status plant or animal species" and that the "site does not contain any areas that would qualify as wetlands or other waters." Based on the conclusions of this report, the only biological resources that could be affected by future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site are the four oak trees. Impacts to oak trees on commercial property in the City of Roseville require a tree permit,. Mitigation for tree impacts could occur through the City's In-Lieu Mitigation fee for tree replacement. With mitigation of impacts to oak trees, future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources.

Alternative D1 would not change the development footprint within the Fiddyment Ranch site. Alternative D1 would result in no change to Biological Resource impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources: The majority of the Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with commercial and retail uses. As noted in the biological resource assessment of the site, the small vacant area of the site has clearly been substantially altered in the past. Based on the existing developed condition and prior disturbance, it is very unlikely that there are any cultural resources at the ground surface of the Harding Boulevard site. However, as with any land in the City of Roseville, there is a potential that cultural resources could be discovered during ground disturbing activities associated with construction. Rezone of the Harding Boulevard site under Alternative D1 would result in no ground disturbance on the site therefore there would be no potential for direct impacts to previously unknown cultural resources.

Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's requirement that Improvement Plan and construction contracts include notes stipulating that if cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all site-preparation and construction activities in the area of the find must be halted, the City must be notified, and a qualified archeologist must be retained to investigate the find and provide recommendations for further analysis and treatment. Compliance with these requirements and any recommendations for further analysis

and treatment would ensure that impacts to cultural resources from future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site remain less than significant.

Alternative D1 would not change the development footprint within the Fiddyment Ranch site. Impacts to known cultural resources and any unknown cultural resources that may be discovered during ground disturbance activities at the Fiddyment Ranch site were mitigated under the WRSP EIR. Alternative D1 would result in no change to Cultural Resource impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate ground disturbing activities. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Geology and Soils impacts.

Approval of Alternative D1 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the Harding Boulevard site. Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's Zoning Ordinance, Grading Ordinance, Construction Standards, and Improvement Standards. Construction consistent with these adopted City policies and regulations would ensure that geology and soils impacts of future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant. Additionally, future development at the site would be required to undergo environmental review prior to approval. If any component of the proposed development would be inconsistent with the adopted City policies and regulations or would create a special circumstance that could result in a significant geology and soils impact, this would be evaluated in the environmental review process.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to impacts related to soil erosion, loss of topsoil, development on expansive soils, and slope instability identified in the WRSP EIR. The WRSP EIR identified mitigation measures sufficient to reduce all geology and soils impacts to less-than-significant levels. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of these impacts, but implementation of mitigation measures would continue to be required. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Geology and Soils impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The rezone of the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate ground disturbing activities and no new use, transport, or storage of hazardous materials. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts.

A modified Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed for the Harding Boulevard site to determine if the site contains any known or likely hazardous conditions that could affect future development of the site. The modified Phase I ESA is provided in Appendix F4. This report found the southern portion of the site (the location of the gas station currently being reconstructed) has been affected by previous releases of hazardous materials from the onsite gas station, and

that the site was used for agricultural production for a short time in the 1950s. The site could be contaminated with agricultural chemicals associated with this prior use. Additionally, due to the age of the existing structures onsite, some lead-based paint and termiticide residues could be present in site soils in concentrations that would pose a health risk. There has been a history of illegal dumping on the vacant parcel within the Harding Boulevard site. The vacant parcel provided no obvious evidence of hazardous material discharge to this parcel, however it is possible that hazardous materials may have been discharged to this parcel in the past. The report concludes that additional investigation, and potentially cleanup and monitoring activities will be necessary to ensure that site conditions do not pose a health hazard to future redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site. Future development at the site would be required to undergo environmental review prior to approval. At that the time, the necessary investigation, cleanup and monitoring activities would be required to be completed prior to construction of new commercial and residential land uses at the site. Compliance with applicable federal, state, and city policies and regulations regarding acceptable exposures to hazardous materials would ensure that impacts from redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to impacts related to accident release or spill of hazardous materials, increased demand for hazardous materials incident emergency response; risk of exposure to accidental releases of hazardous materials from the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant; increased risk of soil or water contamination from improper disposal of household hazardous waste; soil or groundwater contamination related to past uses; use of recycled water for landscape irrigation in areas accessible to the public; potential effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs) from high-voltage transmission lines; temporary truck route for transportation of hazardous materials through the WRSP area; and siting of a school within one-fourth mile of the handling or transportation of hazardous materials. The WRSP EIR identified mitigation measures sufficient to reduce all hazards and hazardous materials impacts to less-than-significant levels. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of these impacts, but implementation of mitigation measures would continue to be required. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes to the amount of impervious surfaces at the site, the amount of stormwater runoff from the site, and the potential for land uses at the site to introduce contaminants into stormwater runoff. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Hydrology and Water Quality impacts.

Approval of Alternative D1 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site. Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's Zoning Ordinance, Flood Damage Prevention

Ordinance, Construction Standards, and Improvement Standards. Development consistent with these adopted City policies and regulations would ensure that hydrology and water quality impacts of future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant. Additionally, future development at the site would be required to undergo project level environmental review prior to approval. If any component of the proposed development would be inconsistent with the adopted City policies and regulations or would create a special circumstance that could result in a significant hydrology or water quality impact, this would be evaluated in the environmental review process.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to the following impacts identified in the WRSP EIR: Changes in the Rate or Stormwater Runoff (Peak Flows) Through the Development of New Impervious Surfaces; Increase in the Amount of Surface Runoff, Which Would Exceed the Capacity of Existing Storm Drainage Systems and Increase the Potential for Downstream Flooding; Placement of Fill or Structures in 100-Year Floodplain Could Affect Water Surface Elevations, Which Could Increase the Risk of Flooding; Erosion and Runoff from Construction Sites Containing Soil or Other Materials Could Degrade Water Quality if Discharged to Local Streams; Changes in Surface Water or Groundwater Quality Resulting from Urban Stormwater Runoff; Groundwater Use During Dry Years; Changes in Groundwater Recharge Potential Through the Development of Impervious Surfaces. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of these impacts, but implementation of mitigation measures would continue to be required. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Hydrology and Water Quality impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Mineral Resources: The Harding Boulevard site is currently developed and does not provide access to any mineral resources. There are no mineral resources known to occur within the Fiddyment Ranch project area. Neither the proposed project nor Alternative D1 would result in any impacts to Mineral Resources.

Population and Housing: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes to the land uses supported at the site, the number of jobs available in Roseville, or the residential population of the City. Approval of Alternative D1 would result in no direct Population and Housing impacts.

Approval of Alternative D1 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site. This would likely reduce the number of jobs supported onsite and increase the residential population of the site. With an average of one job for every 350 square feet of commercial space, the Harding Boulevard site is expected to support approximately 286 jobs currently. If the site is redeveloped with a total of 21,500 square feet of commercial space, it would support 61 jobs. Assuming a ratio of 1.26 employees per household in the City, as used in the WRSP EIR based on 2000 U.S. Census data, Alternative D1 could support 339 employees. These employees would be located in the central portion of

the City, which is approximately 8.3 miles wide. The City has established a goal for a jobs/housing balance that provides for 80 percent of City workers to live within eight miles of their place of employment and 60 percent of workers to live within six miles of their place of employment. By placing new residents in the central portion of the City, Alternative D1 would contribute to attainment of this goal.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to the following impacts identified in the WRSP EIR: Changes in Jobs/Housing Balance; Provision of Affordable Housing; Displacement of Existing Housing; and Inducement of Substantial Population Growth. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of the impacts related to the jobs/housing balance and inducement of substantial population growth. The impact related to displacement of existing housing would not be affected by the high density residential component of the proposed project, thus reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses would also have no effect on this impact. The proposed project's increase in the amount of high density residential land uses may improve provision of affordable housing within the City. Alternative D1 would reduce the amount of high density residential land uses in the Fiddyment Ranch site but would increase the amount of high density residential land uses in the City overall. This would result in provision of more affordable housing in the City overall. The rezone of both the Fiddyment Ranch and Harding Boulevard site would trigger the City's 10% Affordable Housing Goal (AHG), as identified in the Housing Element of the General Plan. The 269 HDR units at the Harding Boulevard site would require 27 units to be affordable, per the City's AHG. Alternative D1 would result in no changes to Population and Housing impacts compared to the proposed project.

Alternative D2 – Relocated HDR Units From Parcel F-8A

As discussed above, the following analysis of Alternative D2 provides a level of detail that provides a full environmental analysis of the contemplated rezoning of the 10.75-acre site at the northeast corner of the intersection of Douglas Boulevard and Harding Boulevard and reduction in the number of high density units at the Fiddyment Ranch site. As in Alternative D1, future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site could accommodate a maximum of 269 HDR units and 21,500 square feet of commercial land uses. The detailed analysis below allows for approval of Alternative D2 with no additional environmental review although additional environmental review would be needed for any future development proposal at the Harding Boulevard site.

Alternative D2 Impacts Compared to Impacts of the Proposed Project Evaluated in the Subsequent Draft EIR

Land Use: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in land uses. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Land Use impacts.

Alternative D2 would introduce residential land uses to an area that currently supports only commercial uses. This could lead to some land use conflicts as residents are exposed to potential noise, air pollution, and hazardous materials.

These potential impacts are evaluated in this Alternative D2 analysis, and found to be less than significant. Therefore it is expected that future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site as anticipated under Alternative D2 would result in less than significant land use impacts.

Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site would not change the overall distribution of land uses and would not affect issues related to land use compatibility. Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Land Use impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in trip generation rates, traffic patterns, or traffic congestion. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Transportation and Circulation impacts.

If the Harding Boulevard site is developed at the maximum density allowed under the proposed zoning, the site would support 21,500 square feet of commercial land uses and 269 high density residential units. A trip generation comparison memorandum was prepared by City Department of Public Works staff, provided in Appendix F2, which found that trip generation at the rezoned Harding Boulevard site would be much less than under existing conditions. In addition, Alternative D2 would reduce the number of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site, which would reduce trip generation from the Fiddyment Ranch site. Future development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site combined with the reduced high density residential development at the Fiddyment Ranch site would reduce overall trip generation in the City compared to the proposed project. Alternative D2 would decrease the severity of Transportation and Circulation impacts than the proposed project however it is likely that some Transportation and Circulation impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

Noise: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in noise levels associated with land uses and traffic patterns. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Noise impacts.

An environmental noise assessment was conducted for the Harding Boulevard site. This assessment, which is provided in Appendix F4, found that the site is exposed to substantial noise levels from Interstate 80 (I-80), Harding Boulevard, and Douglas Boulevard. The assessment identified three potential impacts and found that mitigation measures are available to ensure that each impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact Noise 1: construction activities could potentially expose sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the applicable noise standards and/or result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels.

- ***Mitigation Noise 1A:*** Construction activities shall comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance.

- ***Mitigation Noise 1B:*** Locate fixed construction equipment such as compressors and generators as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Shroud or shield all impact tools, and muffle or shield all intake and exhaust ports on power construction equipment.

- ***Mitigation Noise 1C:*** Designate a disturbance coordinator and conspicuously post this person's number around the project site and in adjacent public spaces. The disturbance coordinator will receive all public complaints about construction noise disturbances and will be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint, and implement any feasible measures to be taken to alleviate the problem.

Impact Noise 2: Proposed residential land uses located adjacent to any of the major project-area arterial roadways may be impacted by exterior noise levels exceeding 60 dB Ldn and interior noise levels exceeding 45 dB Ldn.

- ***Mitigation Noise 2A:*** Locate outdoor activity areas for residential uses outside of the 60 dB Ldn noise level contours. As an alternative, locate primary outdoor activity areas on portions of the project site which are shielded from traffic noise levels.

- ***Mitigation Noise 2B:*** An analysis of traffic noise levels and specific mitigation measures on future High Density Residential uses should be required once tentative maps for this site are available. The analysis shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant and should specify the measures required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard at the outdoor activity areas. In addition, an interior noise level analysis should be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant and should specify the measures required to achieve compliance with the City of Roseville 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard.

Impact Noise 3: Based upon background noise measurements conducted on the site, it is likely that on-site noise sources will exceed the City of Roseville stationary noise source criteria contained in Table IX-3 of the General Plan Noise Element (Table 6 of this report).

- ***Mitigation Noise 3A:*** Where commercial uses abut residential property lines or loading docks/truck circulation routes face residential areas, the following mitigation measures should be included in the project design:

  - Loading docks and truck delivery areas should maintain a minimum distance of 30 feet from residential property lines;
  - Property line barriers should be 6 to 8 feet in height. Circulation routes for trucks should be located a minimum of 30-feet from residential property lines;

- All heating, cooling and ventilation equipment should be located within mechanical rooms where possible;
- All heating, cooling and ventilation equipment shall be shielded from view with solid barriers or building parapets;
- Emergency generators shall comply with the City of Roseville Municipal Code Noise Ordinance at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers.
- Delivery/loading activities shall comply with the requirements of the City of Roseville Municipal Code Noise Ordinance.

Under Alternative D2, fewer residential units would be developed at the Fiddyment Ranch site. This would reduce traffic-generated noise levels in the Fiddyment Ranch area. However, the noise levels along major roadways would likely continue to exceed the City's standards and the mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would still be required to ensure impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Noise impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality: The Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with approximately 100,000 square feet of commercial and retail uses. Rezoning the site to Commercial Mixed Use would allow for development of up to 21,500 square feet of mixed commercial and residential uses to be developed on the site but would result in no immediate change in the land uses supported at this Harding Boulevard site. There would be no construction air pollutant emissions and no change in operational air pollutant emissions as a result of approval of Alternative D2.

If the Harding Boulevard site is developed at the maximum residential density under the proposed zoning, this alternative would result in a total of 47 more high density residential units than the proposed project but would reduce the total amount of commercial land uses at the site and in the City overall. A trip generation comparison memorandum was prepared by City Department of Public Works staff, provided in Appendix F2, which found that trip generation at the Harding Boulevard site developed with 21,500 square feet of commercial land uses and 269 high density residential units would be much less than under existing conditions. This would reduce operational air pollutant emissions from the Harding Boulevard site. Future redevelopment of this site as allowed under Alternative D2 would be expected to result in less than significant air quality impacts.

Under Alternative D2, fewer residential units would be developed at the Fiddyment Ranch site. This would reduce operational air pollutant emissions from vehicular and area sources generated at the project site. However, the operational air pollutant emissions would likely continue to exceed the APCD thresholds. Alternative D2 would reduce the severity of Air Quality impacts, but would continue to result in a Significant and Unavoidable impact.

Climate Change: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes in GHG emissions associated with land uses. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Climate Change impacts.

As discussed above, redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site and development of fewer high density residential units at the Fiddyment Ranch site would reduce trip generation in the City overall. It is assumed that the energy-efficiency and water-efficiency standards incorporated into the proposed project would also be incorporated into development under Alternative D2. With the efficiency standards implemented and the net reduction in traffic trips in the City, it is expected that Alternative D2 would result in slightly lower per capita GHG emissions for residents and employees of the Fiddyment Ranch and Harding Boulevard sites. Both the proposed project and Alternative D2 would result in less than significant contributions to climate change impacts. Alternative D2 would result in no change in Climate Change impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would increase demand for water supply on the Harding Boulevard site by 53.3 AFY. However, the reducing in high density residential units at the Fiddyment Ranch site would offset this increase by 43.7 AFY resulting in a net increase for water supply of 9.6 AFY. This City's water supply contracts are sufficient to meet the water supply needs of this alternative in all year types. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply impacts.

City staff conducted an analysis to determine if existing treatment facilities and local water infrastructure within the vicinity of the Harding Boulevard site can support the additional water demand while maintaining existing service levels at buildout. The results of the analysis indicate the City's existing infrastructure is sufficient to support this rezone. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Public Utilities – Potable Water Infrastructure impacts.

Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment: Wastewater flows from the Harding Boulevard site would be conveyed to the City's Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment (DCWWTP) plant as compared to the Fiddyment Ranch site which conveys wastewater to the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP). Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site increase average dry weather flows (ADWF) to the DCWWTP by 0.04 million gallons per day (mgd). The DCWWTP currently treats 10 mgd ADWF and has an existing permitted wastewater capacity of 18 mgd ADWF. The increase in ADWF from the Harding Boulevard site are small compared to overall wastewater flows and are therefore not expected result in an impacts at the DCWWTP. City staff also reviewed the impact to local sewer collection facilities to determine if existing sewer infrastructure can support the increase flows from the Harding site. The results of the analysis indicate the City's existing infrastructure is sufficient to support this rezone.

The reduction in high density residential units at the Fiddyment Ranch site would result in reduced wastewater flows to the PGWWTP as compared to the proposed

project. Therefore approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment impacts.

Public Utilities – Recycled Water: The proposed project would implement a water conservation plan, which would decrease the project's demands for recycled water. It is assumed that Alternative D2 would implement the same water conservation plan. Although fewer high density residential units would develop, the area where recycled water would be used would remain unchanged.

The Harding Boulevard site is not located within an area of the City that utilizes recycled water for irrigation supply; therefore, rezoning of this site also would not impact citywide demand for recycled water. Recycled water demands under Alternative D2 are expected to remain the same as compared to recycled water demands for the proposed project. Under both the proposed project and Alternative D2 the City's recycled water supply and conveyance infrastructure would be sufficient to serve the Fiddyment Ranch project site and impacts would remain less than significant. Alternative D2 would result in no change in Public Utilities – Recycled Water impacts compared to the proposed project.

Public Services: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate land use changes, and thus no immediate changes in demand for public services. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Public Services impacts.

If the Harding Boulevard site is developed at the maximum residential density under the proposed zoning, this alternative would result in a total of 47 more high density residential units than the proposed project. Based on the City's average population of 2.54 people per residential unit, Alternative D1 would increase the City's population by 119 people compared with the proposed project. This would slightly increase demands for public services Citywide. However, the small increase in population is not expected to result in any significant impacts to public services.

The fire station nearest to the Harding Boulevard site is Station No. 1 at 401 Oak Street, approximately one mile to the west. Provision of fire protection services to the Harding Boulevard site would not change as a result of future development of the rezoned site.

Development of the rezoned Harding Boulevard site under Alternative D1 would result in a slight increase in the population of the City of Roseville compared with the proposed project. Based on the City's desired ratio of 1.2 officers per 1,000 people, this increase would not require any additional police officers or administrative staff. The additional population supported under Alternative D1 would also not generate demand for a new branch library.

Future development of 269 HDR units at the Harding Boulevard site would be expected to generate 37 elementary school students, 11 middle school students, and 15 high school students. The nearest elementary schools to the site are Cirby Elementary and Sierra Gardens. As shown in Table 10.3 in Chapter 10 Public Services, both of these schools are currently operating below capacity. The nearest

middle school to the site is Eich Intermediate School, which is also operating below capacity. The nearest high school to the site is Oakmont High School, which is operating slightly above capacity. The additional 15 high school students could be accommodated with the use of portable classrooms. Any developer of residential units at the Harding Boulevard site would be required to pay school impact fees in accordance with SB 50. This would ensure that impacts to schools would remain less than significant.

Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site would slightly reduce demands for public services at Fiddyment Ranch. Public service impacts would be less than significant under both the proposed project and Alternative D2. Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Public Services impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate land use changes, and thus no immediate changes in traffic congestion, noise, and air pollutant emissions. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Cumulative impacts.

Redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site would result in an overall decrease in trip generation in the City, which would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts in transportation and circulation, noise, and air quality. Alternative D2 would decrease Cumulative impacts compared to the proposed project.

Alternative D2 Impacts Compared to Impacts of the Proposed Project Evaluated in the Initial Study

Aesthetics: The Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with commercial uses including by an auto repair shop, a gas station, retail stores and a bank. The rezone of the site would result in no immediate change in the site's appearance. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Aesthetic impacts.

Approval of Alternative D2 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site. Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's Zoning Ordinance, Construction Standards, Improvement Standards and Community Design Guidelines. Development consistent with these adopted City policies and regulations would ensure that aesthetic impacts of future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant. Additionally, future development at the site would be required to undergo project level environmental review prior to approval. If any component of the proposed development would be inconsistent with the adopted City policies and regulations or would create a special circumstance that could result in a significant aesthetic impact, this would be evaluated in the environmental review process.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to the significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts identified in the WRSP EIR. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of this impact, but the impact would remain Significant and Unavoidable. Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Aesthetic impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources: The Harding Boulevard site contains no designated Farmland, is not currently zoned for agricultural or forestry uses, and supports no agricultural or forestry uses. Rezone and future development of the site would result in no impacts related to conversion of, or conflict with, agricultural or forestry uses. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Agricultural and Forestry Resources impacts. Future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would result in no direct Agricultural and Forestry Resources impacts. Alternative D2 would not alter the development footprint within the Fiddyment Ranch site, and impacts to agricultural and forestry resources at that site would be the same as evaluated in the Initial Study for the proposed project. Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Agricultural and Forestry Resources at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources: The majority of the Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with commercial and retail uses. Rezoning the site would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site, but would not result in immediate development of the site. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct impacts to biological resources.

Approximately 1.47 acres of the Harding Boulevard site is unpaved and vegetated. A field study of this vacant portion of the site was conducted to identify any significant biological resources that could be affected by redevelopment of the site. The Biological and Wetlands Evaluation of the Harding Boulevard site is provided in Appendix F3. This report found that the vacant portion of the site "appears to have been in its current state for many years, but has clearly been substantially altered in the past. The fallow area has rolling topography and is entirely covered with weedy herbaceous vegetation. A sporadic line of trees and shrubs occurs along the eastern fenceline (bordering the freeway off-ramp)." The site supports three interior live oaks and one valley oak. All of the trees are healthy and have good to fair structure. The report concludes that the Harding Boulevard site "has virtually no potential to support special status plant or animal species" and that the "site does not contain any areas that would qualify as wetlands or other waters." Based on the conclusions of this report, the only biological resources that could be affected by redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site are the four oak trees. Impacts to oak trees on commercial property in the City of Roseville require a tree permit. Mitigation for tree impacts could occur through the City's In-Lieu Mitigation fee for tree replacement. With mitigation of impacts to oak trees, redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources.

Alternative D2 would not change the development footprint within the Fiddyment Ranch site. Alternative D2 would result in no change to Biological Resource impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources: The majority of the Harding Boulevard site is presently developed with commercial and retail uses. As noted in the biological resource assessment of the site, the small vacant area of the site has clearly been substantially altered in the past. Based on the existing developed condition and prior disturbance, it is very unlikely that there are any cultural resources at the ground surface of the Harding Boulevard site. However, as with any land in the City of Roseville, there is a potential that cultural resources could be discovered during ground disturbing activities associated with construction. Rezone of the Harding Boulevard site under Alternative D2 would result in no ground disturbance on the site therefore there would be no potential for direct impacts to previously unknown cultural resources.

Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's requirement that Improvement Plan and construction contracts include notes stipulating that if cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all site-preparation and construction activities in the area of the find must be halted, the City must be notified, and a qualified archeologist must be retained to investigate the find and provide recommendations for further analysis and treatment. Compliance with these requirements and any recommendations for further analysis and treatment would ensure that impacts to cultural resources from redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site remain less than significant.

Alternative D2 would not change the development footprint within the Fiddyment Ranch site. Impacts to known cultural resources and any unknown cultural resources that may be discovered during ground disturbance activities at the Fiddyment Ranch site were mitigated under the WRSP EIR. Alternative D2 would result in no change to Cultural Resource impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate ground disturbing activities. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Geology and Soils impacts.

Approval of Alternative D2 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the Harding Boulevard site. Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's Zoning Ordinance, Grading Ordinance, Construction Standards, and Improvement Standards. Construction consistent with these adopted City policies and regulations would ensure that geology and soils impacts of future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant. Additionally, future development at the site would be required to undergo environmental review prior to approval. If any component of the proposed development would be inconsistent with the adopted City policies and regulations or would create a special circumstance that could result in a significant geology and soils impact, this would be evaluated in the environmental review process.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to impacts related to soil erosion, loss of topsoil, development on expansive soils, and slope instability identified in the WRSP EIR. The WRSP EIR identified mitigation measures sufficient to reduce all geology and soils impacts to less-than-significant levels. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of these impacts, but implementation of mitigation measures would continue to be required. Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Geology and Soils impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The rezone of the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate ground disturbing activities and no new use, transport, or storage of hazardous materials. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts.

A modified Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed for the Harding Boulevard site to determine if the site contains any known or likely hazardous conditions that could affect future development of the site. The modified Phase I ESA is provided in Appendix F4. This report found the southern portion of the site (the location of the gas station currently being reconstructed) has been affected by previous releases of hazardous materials from the onsite gas station, and that the site was used for agricultural production for a short time in the 1950s. The site could be contaminated with agricultural chemicals associated with this prior use. Additionally, due to the age of the existing structures onsite, some lead-based paint and termiticide residues could be present in site soils in concentrations that would pose a health risk. There has been a history of illegal dumping on the vacant parcel within the Harding Boulevard site. The vacant parcel provided no obvious evidence of hazardous material discharge to this parcel, however it is possible that hazardous materials may have been discharged to this parcel in the past. The report concludes that additional investigation, and potentially cleanup and monitoring activities will be necessary to ensure that site conditions do not pose a health hazard to future redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site. Future development at the site would be required to undergo environmental review prior to approval. At that the time, the necessary investigation, cleanup and monitoring activities would be required to be completed prior to construction of new commercial and residential land uses at the site. Compliance with applicable federal, state, and city policies and regulations regarding acceptable exposures to hazardous materials would ensure that impacts from redevelopment of the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to impacts related to accident release or spill of hazardous materials, increased demand for hazardous materials incident emergency response; risk of exposure to accidental releases of hazardous materials from the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant; increased risk of soil or water contamination from improper disposal of household hazardous waste; soil or groundwater contamination related to past uses; use of recycled water for landscape

irrigation in areas accessible to the public; potential effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs) from high-voltage transmission lines; temporary truck route for transportation of hazardous materials through the WRSP area; and siting of a school within one-fourth mile of the handling or transportation of hazardous materials. The WRSP EIR identified mitigation measures sufficient to reduce all hazards and hazardous materials impacts to less-than-significant levels. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of these impacts, but implementation of mitigation measures would continue to be required. Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes to the amount of impervious surfaces at the site, the amount of stormwater runoff from the site, and the potential for land uses at the site to introduce contaminants into stormwater runoff. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Hydrology and Water Quality impacts.

Approval of Alternative D2 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site. Any future proposed project would be subject to the City's Zoning Ordinance, Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Construction Standards, and Improvement Standards. Development consistent with these adopted City policies and regulations would ensure that hydrology and water quality impacts of future construction at the Harding Boulevard site would remain less than significant. Additionally, future development at the site would be required to undergo project level environmental review prior to approval. If any component of the proposed development would be inconsistent with the adopted City policies and regulations or would create a special circumstance that could result in a significant hydrology or water quality impact, this would be evaluated in the environmental review process.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to the following impacts identified in the WRSP EIR: Changes in the Rate or Stormwater Runoff (Peak Flows) Through the Development of New Impervious Surfaces; Increase in the Amount of Surface Runoff, Which Would Exceed the Capacity of Existing Storm Drainage Systems and Increase the Potential for Downstream Flooding; Placement of Fill or Structures in 100-Year Floodplain Could Affect Water Surface Elevations, Which Could Increase the Risk of Flooding; Erosion and Runoff from Construction Sites Containing Soil or Other Materials Could Degrade Water Quality if Discharged to Local Streams; Changes in Surface Water or Groundwater Quality Resulting from Urban Stormwater Runoff; Groundwater Use During Dry Years; Changes in Groundwater Recharge Potential Through the Development of Impervious Surfaces. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of these impacts, but implementation of mitigation measures would continue to be required. Alternative D2 would result in

no changes to Hydrology and Water Quality impacts at the Fiddyment Ranch site compared to the proposed project.

Mineral Resources: The Harding Boulevard site is currently developed and does not provide access to any mineral resources. There are no mineral resources known to occur within the Fiddyment Ranch project area. Neither the proposed project nor Alternative D2 would result in any impacts to Mineral Resources.

Population and Housing: Rezoning the Harding Boulevard site would result in no immediate changes to the land uses supported at the site, the number of jobs available in the Roseville, or the residential population of the City. Approval of Alternative D2 would result in no direct Population and Housing impacts.

Approval of Alternative D2 would allow for future development consistent with the mixed use zoning that would be applied to the site. This would likely reduce the number of jobs supported onsite and increase the residential population of the site. With an average of one job for every 350 square feet of commercial space, the Harding Boulevard site is expected to support approximately 286 jobs currently. If the site is redeveloped with a total of 21,500 square feet of commercial space, it would support 61 jobs. Assuming a ratio of 1.26 employees per household in the City, as used in the WRSP EIR based on 2000 U.S. Census data, Alternative D2 could support 339 employees. These employees would be located in the central portion of the City, which is approximately 8.3 miles wide. The City has established a goal for a jobs/housing balance that provides for 80 percent of City workers to live within eight miles of their place of employment and 60 percent of workers to live within six miles of their place of employment. By placing new residents in the central portion of the City, Alternative D2 would contribute to attainment of this goal.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project, development under the proposed project would contribute to the following impacts identified in the WRSP EIR: Changes in Jobs/Housing Balance; Provision of Affordable Housing; Displacement of Existing Housing; and Inducement of Substantial Population Growth. Reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses within the Fiddyment Ranch project site could slightly reduce the severity of the impacts related to the jobs/housing balance and inducement of substantial population growth. The impact related to displacement of existing housing would not be affected by the high density residential component of the proposed project, thus reducing the intensity of high density residential land uses would also have no effect on this impact. The proposed project's increase in the amount of high density residential land uses may improve provision of affordable housing within the City. Alternative D2 would reduce the amount of high density residential land uses in the Fiddyment Ranch site but would increase the amount of high density residential land uses in the City overall. This would result in provision of more affordable housing in the City overall. The rezone of both the Fiddyment Ranch and Harding Boulevard site would trigger the City's 10% Affordable Housing Goal (AHG), as identified in the Housing Element of the General Plan. The 269 HDR units at the Harding Boulevard site would require 27 units to be affordable, per the City's AHG.

Alternative D2 would result in no changes to Population and Housing impacts compared to the proposed project.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

According to CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(b), an EIR must identify the Environmentally Superior alternative other than the No-Project Alternative and explain why alternatives other than the proposed project were rejected. Based on the analysis presented above, the proposed project is the Environmentally Superior alternative.

Alternative A – Alternative A, the No Project (No Development) Alternative is rejected because although it would reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project and avoid the project's Significant and Unavoidable impacts, it would increase impacts in two resource areas – Land Use and Public Services, and it would not attain any of the basic project objectives. By precluding development of portions of the WRSP as approved, Alternative A would violate the City's General Plan and would result in severe land use impacts in the West Roseville area.

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

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

Alternative D1 – Alternative D1, the Relocated HDR Units Alternative is rejected because it would not result in a substantial improvement in environmental impacts compared to the proposed project. It would reduce impacts in some areas but would not avoid any of the Significant and Unavoidable impacts of the proposed project.

Alternative D2 – Alternative D2, the Relocated HDR Units From Parcel F-8A Alternative is rejected because it would not result in a substantial improvement in environmental impacts compared to the proposed project. It would reduce impacts in some areas but would not avoid any of the Significant and Unavoidable impacts of the proposed project.

Table 12.4

Analysis Summary for Alternatives A, B, and C

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

Table 12.5
Analysis Summary for Alternative D1

Resource Area	Proposed Project	Alternative D1		
		Direct Impacts from Rezone	Impacts at Harding Boulevard Site	Impacts at Fiddyment Ranch Relative to Proposed Project
Impacts Evaluated in the EIR				
Land Use	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Transportation and Circulation	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Noise	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Slightly Reduced, Less than Significant with Mitigation
Air Quality	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Potentially Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Climate Change	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Public Utilities – Recycled Water	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Public Services	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Cumulative Impacts – Traffic	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts – Noise	Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts – Air Quality	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable

Resource Area	Proposed Project	Alternative D1		
		Direct Impacts from Rezone	Impacts at Harding Boulevard Site	Impacts at Fiddyment Ranch Relative to Proposed Project
Impacts Evaluated in the Initial Study				
Aesthetics	Degradation of scenic vistas, impacts to scenic resources, and visual incompatibility between land uses would be Less than Significant. Create sources of light and glare would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. Change in visual character of the site would be Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Agriculture and Forestry	No impact to Forestry. Less than Significant with Mitigation impact related to conversion of agricultural land to developed uses	None	No Impact	No Change
Biological Resources	Impacts would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. In the short-term, loss of oak trees would be a Significant and Unavoidable impact; in the long-term this impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.	None	Less than Significant with mitigation	No Change
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation impact related to affecting unknown subsurface resources	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with additional field study and compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change

Resource Area	Proposed Project	Alternative D1		
		Direct Impacts from Rezone	Impacts at Harding Boulevard Site	Impacts at Fiddyment Ranch Relative to Proposed Project
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Mineral Resources	No Impact	None	No Impact	No Change
Population and Housing	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant/Beneficial Impact	No Change

Table 12.6
Analysis Summary for Alternative D2

Resource Area	Proposed Project	Alternative D2		
		Direct Impacts from Rezone	Impacts at Harding Boulevard Site	Impacts at Fiddyment Ranch Relative to Proposed Project
Impacts Evaluated in the EIR				
Land Use	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Transportation and Circulation	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Noise	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Slightly Reduced, Less than Significant with Mitigation
Air Quality	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Potentially Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Climate Change	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Public Utilities – Potable Water Supply	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Public Utilities – Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Public Utilities –	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant	No Change

Resource Area	Proposed Project	Alternative D2		
		Direct Impacts from Rezone	Impacts at Harding Boulevard Site	Impacts at Fiddyment Ranch Relative to Proposed Project
Recycled Water				
Public Services	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant	No Change
Cumulative Impacts – Traffic	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts – Noise	Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts – Air Quality	Mitigation required, some impacts remain Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant	Reduced but still Significant and Unavoidable
Impacts Evaluated in the Initial Study				
Aesthetics	Degradation of scenic vistas, impacts to scenic resources, and visual incompatibility between land uses would be Less than Significant. Create sources of light and glare would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. Change in visual character of the site would be Significant and Unavoidable	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Agriculture and Forestry	No impact to Forestry. Less than Significant with Mitigation impact related to conversion of agricultural land to developed uses	None	No Impact	No Change
Biological Resources	Impacts would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. In the short-term, loss of oak trees would be a Significant and Unavoidable impact; in the long-term this impact	None	Less than Significant with mitigation	No Change

Resource Area	Proposed Project	Alternative D2		
		Direct Impacts from Rezone	Impacts at Harding Boulevard Site	Impacts at Fiddyment Ranch Relative to Proposed Project
	would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.			
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation impact related to affecting unknown subsurface resources	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with additional field study and compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than Significant with Mitigation	None	Less than Significant with compliance with City policies and regulations	No Change
Mineral Resources	No Impact	None	No Impact	No Change
Population and Housing	Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant/Beneficial Impact	No Change