

# **SECTION 5.0**

---

---

## **CEQA CONSIDERATIONS**

## 5.0 CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126 of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires that all aspects of a project must be considered when evaluating its impact on the environment, including planning, acquisition, development, and operation. As part of this analysis, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) identifies:

- Significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project (**Section 5.2**);
- Significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project is implemented (**Section 5.3**);
- Significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the Proposed Project (**Section 5.4**);
- Growth-inducing impacts of the Proposed Project (**Section 5.5**);
- Mitigation Measures proposed to Minimize Significant Effects (**Section 5.2**); and
- Alternatives to the Proposed Project (**Section 6.0, Alternatives**).

Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable (**Section 5.6**).

### 5.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Section 3.0, Executive Summary**, and **Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis**, of this EIR provide a comprehensive identification of the Proposed Project's significant environmental effects and feasible mitigation measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts. These sections identify the level of significance of each environmental impact both before and after mitigation.

### 5.3 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. The following is a summary of significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to the Proposed Project as described in each issue area contained in **Section 4.0**.

#### Land Use and Agriculture

Impact 4.1-3 Potential Incompatibility with Existing Agricultural and Other Land Uses in Placer County and the City of Roseville

Impact 4.1-8 Cumulative Impacts from Agricultural Resources Conversion

## Population and Housing

Impact 4.2-4 Inducement of Substantial Population Growth

## Transportation and Circulation

Impact 4.3-5 Increased Traffic Volumes at Intersections within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln under Existing Conditions

Impact 4.3-6 Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Rocklin under Existing Conditions

Impact 4.3-8 Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways under Existing Conditions

Impact 4.3-9 Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections under 2035 CIP Conditions

Impact 4.3-11 Increased Traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Intersections under 2035 CIP Conditions

Impact 4.3-12 Increased Traffic Volumes on Roadways within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Rocklin under 2035 CIP Conditions

Impact 4.3-15 Increased Traffic on City of Roseville Intersections under 2035 Cumulative Conditions

Impact 4.3-17 Increased Traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Intersections under 2035 Cumulative Conditions

Impact 4.3-20 Increased Traffic Volumes on State Highways under 2035 Cumulative Conditions

## Air Quality

Impact 4.4-1 Generate Short-Term Construction Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants

Impact 4.4-2 Generate Long-Term Operational Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants

Impact 4.4-5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odors

Impact 4.4-6 Consistency with Plans and Policies

Impact 4.4-7 Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants

## Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 4.5-1 Generate a Substantial Contribution to GHG Emissions that Conflicts with an Applicable Plan or Policy

## Noise

- Impact 4.6-1 Short-Term Noise Generated by Construction Activity
- Impact 4.6-5 Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the Existing Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise
- Impact 4.6-7 Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 CIP Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site
- Impact 4.6-9 Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site

## Vegetation and Wildlife

- Impact 4.8-18 Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources

## Public Utilities

- Impact 4.12.1-4 Capacity of Water Treatment System to Meet Potable Water Demand (Long Term)
- Impact 4.12.1-8 Cumulative Water Supply and Water Treatment Impacts
- Impact 4.12.3-3 Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Treatment Facilities
- Impact 4.12.3-5 Cumulative Wastewater Impacts
- Impact 4.12.4-5 Cumulative Solid Waste Impacts

## Hydrology and Water Quality

- Impact 4.13-6 Construction of Off-Site Stormwater Retention Facilities

## Aesthetics

- Impact 4.14-1 Alteration of the Visual Character of the Site and Vicinity
- Impact 4.14-2 New Sources of Light and Glare
- Impact 4.14-3 Degradation of Scenic Resources and Scenic Vistas
- Impact 4.14-4 Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts

## 5.4 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Section 15126.2 (c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental change that would be caused by the Proposed Project. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible changes if:

- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area);
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the long-term commitment of project site resources to urban land use. The Proposed Project would result in or contribute to the following irreversible environmental changes:

- Conversion of undeveloped land. Approximately 481.5 acres of undeveloped land would be converted to urban uses, thus precluding other alternate land uses in the future.
- Irreversible consumption of energy and natural resources associated with the future use of the site.

Development of the Proposed Project would result in the commitment of the majority of the project site to eventual urban development, thereby precluding other uses for the lifespan of the Proposed Project. Restoration of the site to pre-developed conditions would not be feasible given the degree of disturbance, the urbanization of the area, and the level of capital investment.

Resources that will be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include: water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels. Wood products, asphalt, and concrete would be used in construction. With respect to operational activities, compliance with all applicable building codes, as well as mitigation measures, planning policies, and standard conservation features, would ensure that resources are conserved to the maximum extent possible. The Proposed Project would incorporate a number of sustainable practices that reduce the consumption of energy. Nonetheless, construction activities related to the Proposed Project would result in irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, natural gas, and gasoline for automobiles and construction equipment.

The CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by environmental accidents associated with the Proposed Project. While the Proposed Project would result in the use, transport, storage, and disposal of minor amounts of hazardous materials during construction and operation of the Proposed Project, as described in **Section 4.10, Hazardous Materials and Public Safety**, all such activities would comply with applicable state and federal laws related to hazardous materials, which significantly reduces the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible environmental damage. The Proposed Project does not include any uniquely hazardous

uses that would require any special handling or storage. Further, no industrial uses that would use or store acutely hazardous materials are proposed in the project site.

As described above, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the long-term commitment of resources to urban development. The most notable significant irreversible impacts of conversion of the site to urban uses are a reduction in natural vegetation and wildlife communities, alteration of the visual character of the site, increased generation of pollutants, the use of non-renewable and/or slowly renewable natural and energy resources, such as lumber and other forest products and water resources during construction activities. Operations associated with future uses would also consume natural gas and electrical energy. These irreversible impacts, which are unavoidable consequences of urban growth, are described in detail in the appropriate sections of this EIR (see **Section 4.0**).

## 5.5 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2 (d) CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR discuss ways in which a Proposed Project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Also, the EIR must discuss the characteristics of the Proposed Project that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Growth can be induced in a number of ways, such as through the elimination of obstacles to growth, through the stimulation of economic activity within the region, or through the establishment of policies or precedents that directly or indirectly encourage additional growth. Under CEQA, growth is not to be considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or of significant consequence. Induced growth would be considered a significant impact if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth, directly or indirectly, significantly affects the environment

### 5.5.1 GROWTH INDUCEMENT POTENTIAL OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In general, a project may foster growth in a geographic area if the project removes an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, the provision of new access to an area, a change in zoning or general plan approval); or economic expansion in response to the project (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion). These circumstances are further described below:

- **Elimination of Obstacles to Growth:** This refers to the extent to which a Proposed Project removes infrastructure limitations or provides infrastructure capacity, or removes regulatory constraints that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval.
- **Economic Effects:** This refers to the extent to which a Proposed Project could cause increased activity in the local or regional economy. Economic effects can include such effects as the Multiplier Effect. A “Multiplier” is an economic term used to describe inter-relationships among various sectors of the economy. The multiplier effect provides a quantitative description of the direct employment effect of a project, as well as indirect and induced employment growth. The multiplier effect acknowledges that the onsite employment and population growth of each project is not the complete picture of growth caused by the project.

## Elimination of Obstacles to Growth

### *Removal of Infrastructure Limitations or Provision of Capacity*

The elimination of physical obstacles to growth is considered a growth-inducing effect. A number of physical constraints to growth currently exist in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. In summary, the primary growth obstacles in the area today include:

- Limited capacity of the roadway system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville;
- Limited capacity of the potable water system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville;
- Limited capacity of the recycled water system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville;
- Limited capacity of the wastewater system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville;
- and
- Limited capacity of the electric distribution system serving the western portion of the City of Roseville.

The project site and surrounding areas to the north, northwest, and east, are within the jurisdiction of the County, and are not fully served by adequate urban infrastructure. The fact that the project site is unincorporated is itself an impediment to growth which would be removed through completion of annexation proceedings. Development of the Proposed Project would extend public services to the project site including water, recycled water, sewer, electric, natural gas and telecommunication lines (see **Section 2.0, Project Description**, and **Section 4.12, Public Utilities**). Proposed infrastructure would be proportionate to the level of service necessary to accommodate the Proposed Project and would originate from the extension of City services to be provided to the approved Creekview Specific Plan (CSP) south of the project site. Some of this infrastructure would be sized to also serve nearby existing land uses in the County. Specifically, sewer lines would be sized to serve existing residential homes in the Toad Hill Ranches. Because these homes are existing, this is not considered to “foster growth.” Additionally, roadways, powerlines, and sewer lines may be designed and sized to accommodate anticipated future demands in the adjacent Placer Ranch area, removing an obstacle to growth in this area.

The construction of infrastructure improvements would facilitate the expansion of urban development into the project site. This would also eliminate some of the infrastructure constraints that currently are obstacles to growth in areas north of the existing City boundary, including the Placer Ranch area located to the east. Other areas to the northwest and north of the project site are located in the County, and are subject to County General Plan and zoning requirements that would limit urban levels of growth; thus it is not anticipated that the Proposed Project would induce growth in these areas.

### ***Cumulative Removal of Infrastructure Limitations***

In combination with past and possible future actions, approval of the Proposed Project would further facilitate development in southwestern Placer County, and could stimulate future growth in the region through the cumulative extension of infrastructure and services to this area.

The proposed Placer Parkway would bring a major new transportation corridor into the area, and would connect the area to the regional road system to the west, including State Routes (SR) 99/70 and the Sacramento International Airport (SMF).

A western pattern of growth in the region has been further reinforced by other jurisdictions. North and south of Baseline Road, Placer County has approved substantial new development including: Riolo Vineyards, Regional University, and Placer Vineyards. Placer Vineyards would extend development to an area just east of the Sutter County line. Sutter County also has approved the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan (SPSP), which could eventually become a new city. Immediately to the south of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP) lies the 501-acre CSP, which has recently been annexed into the City of Roseville and approved for development. Southwest of the project site, Placer County has identified the 5,200-acre Curry Creek Community Plan (CCCP) Area as a future study area. The Board of Supervisors identified the Curry Creek area as a future community plan area given the location of adjacent development. Although no plan has been prepared for this area, if it is built out consistent with densities of adjacent projects, it could accommodate approximately 15,000 units.

### **Economic Effects**

In addition to the employment anticipated to be generated by the proposed land uses, additional local employment can be generated through what is commonly referred to as the “multiplier effect.” The multiplier effect tends to be greater in regions with larger diverse economies due to a decrease in the requirement to import goods and services from outside the region.

Two different types of additional employment are tracked through the multiplier effect. *Indirect* employment includes those additional jobs that are generated through the expenditure patterns of direct employment associated with the Proposed Project. For example, workers in offices in the commercial area of the ARSP would spend money in the local economy. The expenditure of the money from employees would result in additional jobs. Indirect jobs tend to be in relative proximity to the places of employment and residences.

In addition to direct and indirect employment, the multiplier effect also takes into effect *induced* employment. Induced employment follows the economic effect of employment beyond the expenditures of the employees within the project site to include jobs created by the stream of goods and services necessary to support businesses within the Proposed Project. For example, when a manufacturer buys products or sells products, the employment associated with those transactions is considered induced employment.

The multiplier effect also considers the secondary effect of employee expenditures. Thus it includes the economic effect of the dollars spent by the employees of the Proposed Project.

Increased future employment generated by resident and employee spending ultimately results in physical development of space to accommodate those employees. It is the characteristics of this physical space and its specific location that will determine the type and magnitude of environmental impacts of the additional economic activity. Although the economic effect can be predicted, the actual environmental implications of this type of economic growth are too speculative to predict or evaluate, because they can be spread throughout the City, Placer County, and beyond.

## 5.5.2 IMPACTS OF INDUCED GROWTH

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, but are not limited to: increased traffic congestion, air quality deterioration, contribution to climate change, loss of open space, loss of habitat and wildlife, changes to visual character, impacts to water resources, increased consumption of energy resources, and impacts on utilities and services; such as fire and police protection, water supply, recycled water, wastewater, solid waste, energy and natural gas. The environmental impacts of induced growth are described in more detail in the cumulative impacts discussion of this EIR (refer to **Section 5.6**) and are considered **significant and unavoidable**.

## 5.6 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

### 5.6.1 INTRODUCTION

This EIR analyzes overall cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project taken together with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects producing related impacts, as required by §15130 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The goal of this analysis is twofold: first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such projects would be cumulatively significant; and second, to determine whether the Proposed Project itself would cause a “cumulatively considerable” (and thus significant) incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts<sup>1</sup>.

In other words, the required analysis first creates a broad context in which to assess the project’s incremental contribution to anticipated cumulative impacts, viewed on a geographic scale well beyond the project site itself, and then determines whether the Proposed Project’s incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts from all projects is itself significant (i.e., “cumulatively considerable”).

“Cumulative impacts” refers to two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355). The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or many separate projects. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the Proposed Project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant impacts taking place over time.

Consistent with state CEQA Guidelines §15130(a), the discussion of cumulative impacts in this EIR focuses on significant and potentially significant cumulative impacts. According to §15130(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, in part, “The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the Proposed Project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards

---

<sup>1</sup> See CEQA Guidelines §15130 [a]- [b], §153355 [b] (See state CEQA Guidelines §§15130[a]-[b], §15355[b], §15064[h], §15065[c]; *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* [2002] 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 120.)

of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.”

To be adequate, a discussion of the cumulative effects should include:

- A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.
- Define the geographic scope of the area affected by the cumulative effect and provide a reasonable explanation for the geographic limitation used.
- A summary of expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information.
- A reasonable analysis of the impacts of the relevant project, and feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project’s contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

## 5.6.2 CUMULATIVE CONTEXT

### Development Considered in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis

This cumulative impacts analysis considers the environmental effects of growth in the region, as represented by adopted planning documents and proposals currently under consideration, as well as build-out of the ARSP and Urban Reserve. Development considered in this cumulative analysis includes:

- Build-out of City of Roseville (existing City including approved specific plans);
- Build-out of the Regional University Specific Plan (RUSP);
- Build-out of Phase 1 of Placer Vineyards;
- 2035 levels of residential market absorption in City of Lincoln;
- Build-out of residential and 2035 market absorption levels of non-residential in City of Rocklin;
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2035 market absorption for specific projects outside of South Placer County including the Elverta Specific Plan (ESP; Sacramento County), Johnson Ranchos (City of Wheatland), and Sutter Pointe (Sutter County);
- Partial build-out of the Placer Ranch area (50 percent residential, 25 percent non-residential, and 25,000-student University);
- Campus Oaks (Hewlett Packard [HP] Campus Rezone) project including the extension of HP Way from Foothills Boulevard through the HP Campus northwesterly to Blue Oaks Boulevard; and
- Extension of Placer Parkway westerly as a four-lane roadway from Foothills Boulevard to Santucci Boulevard.

## ***Proposed and Anticipated Development***

### ***Creekview Specific Plan***

The CSP was approved on September 19, 2012 for the 501-acre area located immediately south of the project site. The land was annexed into the City on April 18, 2013. A total of 2,011 dwelling units would be distributed as follows: 826 low-density single family units; 665 medium-density units; and 520 high-density multi-family units. Approved land uses include a total of 136 acres that would set aside as permanent open space, 15.7 acres for neighborhood parks, a 7-acre elementary school site, 2.6 acres of utilities sites, and 19.3 acres for commercial development.

### ***Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP)***

The Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) includes 2,064 acres west of Fiddymont Road, north of Baseline Road. The SVSP Area was annexed into the City of Roseville from unincorporated Placer County. The SVSP as amended in 2012 includes 8,679 single and multi-family units, including approximately 259 acres of commercial, 106 acres of park, 304 acres of open space, and 56 acres for schools. Additionally, the SVSP included a large Urban Reserve area that did not participate in the specific plan process. At build-out, the SVSP Area is expected to accommodate approximately 20,045 residents and provide 9,000 jobs. The SVSP was adopted in May 2010 and annexed into the City in January 2012.

The SVSP was amended in June 2012 to entitle land uses on 397 acres of the SVSP Area including: 141 acres (705 units) of low density residential (LDR), 79 acres (635 units) of medium density residential (MDR), and 28 acres (689 units) of high density residential (HDR). In addition, 6 acres of commercial mixed use, 37 acres of general commercial uses, 11 acres of public/quasi-public uses including an elementary school, 16 acres of parks, and 36 acres of open space are proposed.

### ***West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP)***

The West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) includes 3,162 acres west of Fiddymont Road, generally north of Pleasant Grove Boulevard. The WRSP is a mixed-use development that includes single and multi-family units, age-restricted units, commercial, industrial, parks, open space, and schools. The WRSP was originally adopted in February 2004. The proposed project is 60 percent built out.

### ***Placer Ranch Specific Plan (PRSP)***

The Placer Ranch area, formerly the site of the proposed Placer Ranch Specific Plan (PRSP), is located immediately north of the City of Roseville, south of the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL), and north of the WRSP, North Roseville Specific Plan, and the North Industrial Planning Area. The Placer Ranch area is currently located outside the City's sphere of influence area, in unincorporated Placer County within the portion of the County's Sunset Industrial Area (SIA) designated as "Agriculture / Fairgrounds Relocation Area". The Placer Ranch area is 2,213 acres. No project is pending at this time, but as part of the SIA update, the County could re-designate the site to allow uses consistent with the former PRSP land use plan, which would include 5,376 dwelling units; a 300-acre site for a satellite campus of California State University Sacramento which, at build-out, could accommodate up to three million square feet of academic and administrative space and 30,000 students; and nine million square feet of commercial, light industrial and employment uses. Other land uses could include permanent open space, parks, and public/quasi-public uses (i.e. elementary school, middle school, fire station,

substations, well sites, lift stations, etc.). A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an EIR was issued by the City on December 19, 2014<sup>2</sup>. However, the development application for the PRSP was withdrawn on September 23, 2015. Placer County is currently considering the land use plan as part of its update to the SIA.

***Hewlett Packard Campus Oaks Project***

In August 2015, the City received approved an application from BBC Roseville for a Rezone, General Plan Amendment, Master Plan Amendment and Development Agreement for a 189-acre portion of the HP property located approximately three miles southeast of ARSP. At this time, BBC Roseville proposes developing the site as a mixed use project referred to as “Campus Oaks” that would include residential uses of varying densities, commercial and office/tech uses, parks, and a fire station.

***Pleasant Grove North Retention Basin***

The Pleasant Grove Retention Basin Facility (formerly Reason Farms) at the Al Johnson Wildlife Area, is located southwest of the ARSP. The EIR for the Pleasant Grove Retention Basin Facility was certified in 2003, and evaluated full build-out of the regional retention basin to 2,350 acre-feet (AF) capacity. At build-out the Retention Basin Project will provide retention storage in two basins, a south basin with 1,850 AF of storage and a north basin with 680 AF of storage. The south basin has been constructed and it is anticipated that the north basin will be constructed in the future to accommodate cumulative development in the City. The City is currently collecting drainage impact fees from new development projects to fund construction of this project, which will be constructed as funds are made available.

***Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP)***

The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP) Area is located south of the SVSP, (south of Baseline Road), and was originally approved by Placer County in July 2007 and includes development on 5,230 acres. At build-out, Placer Vineyards would include 14,132 dwelling units, 274 acres of commercial development, 919 acres of park and open space land and 851 acres of quasi-public uses, and roadways. To date, development of PVSP has not yet commenced.

***Regional University Specific Plan***

The RUSP is 1,157 acres located immediately west of the WRSP Area. Access to the site would be through an extension of Watt Avenue. It will include a 600-acre private university campus on the western portion of the plan area, and a 557.5 urban community on the eastern portion of the site. Approximately 3,232 residential units and a private high school for 1,200 students would be included in the development. The RUSP was approved by Placer County in December 2008. To date, development of RUSP has not yet commenced.

***Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan (RVSP)***

Originally approved on May 12, 2009, the Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan (RVSP) is proposed as a residential community with open-space, recreational, and commercial components and encompasses

---

<sup>2</sup> The traffic analysis used draft land use assumptions for the PRSP provided by the applicant in April 2015 rather than the description provided in the December 19, 2014 NOP.

approximately 525 acres. The development would include a total of 933 residential units consisting of low-, medium- and high- density as well as rural and agricultural residences. An amendment to the RVSP was approved on March 24, 2015. To date, development of RVSP has not yet commenced.

### ***Curry Creek Community Plan***

The CCCP Area is located west of the SVSP and WRSP. Although the RUSP, described above, lies within the CCCP Area, it is independent of the CCCP. While the Board of Supervisors gave direction to County Staff to proceed with studying the area for future development in 2003, no formal community plan is pending at this time.

### ***Sunset Industrial Area Plan Update***

Placer County is coordinating with area stakeholders to update the 1997 SIA Plan. The SIA is an 8,900-acre area in unincorporated western Placer County, located west of the Highway 65 corridor and situated between the cities of Lincoln to the north, Rocklin to the east, and Roseville to the south. The overall objective of the SIA Plan update is to re-envision and re-brand the SIA to fully implement the County's long-term vision for the SIA. The County intends to attract large mixed-use developments, commercial uses, universities, industrial manufacturing, corporate campuses, institutions, and entertainment venues that encourage businesses with primary wage jobs to locate in the SIA. The Placer Ranch area is included within the SIA. The Plan update will examine market conditions; assess existing business retention and expansion; generate an overall economic analysis; identify infrastructure needs and infrastructure finance alternatives; develop a new land use diagram, and produce a constraints and opportunities analysis. A public workshop to kick-off the effort was held on Tuesday, August 26, 2014. A second public workshop unveiling the Economic Market Analysis and Existing Conditions Report was held on November 19, 2015.

### ***Placer Parkway***

The Placer Parkway is to be an approximate 15-mile long, high-speed transportation facility, which will connect SR 65 in western Placer County to SR 70/99 in south Sutter County. It will link existing and planned development near some of the region's fastest growing communities while improving access to the I-5 corridor, downtown Sacramento, and SMF. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) completed a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/EIR which analyzed the five corridor alignment alternatives identified by SPRTA. The Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR, released in November 2009, identified Alternative 5 as the Preferred Alternative and the Environmentally Superior Alternative subject to approvals by FHWA and SPRTA. As discussed throughout this EIR and shown on **Figure 2-1**, the Placer Parkway alignment extends through the northern portion of the ARSP boundaries. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Phase I of Placer Parkway, which extends from Highway 65 to Foothills Boulevard North was published in May 2015.

### ***Sutter Pointe Specific Plan***

The SPSP encompasses approximately 7,528 acres of land in south Sutter County, adjacent to the Placer County line. It includes approximately 3,600 acres of commercial and industrial uses, 2,900 acres for residential uses, and 1,000 acres of parks, recreation, and open space. The SPSP was originally

approved by Sutter County in June 2009. On October 28, 2014, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the SPSP affecting the eastern plan area located south of Sankey Road, North of Riego Road and east of Pacific Avenue.

***Elverta Specific Plan***

The ESP includes 1,744 acres in the north-central portion of Sacramento County, immediately south of PVSP. Approximately 881 acres would accommodate 4,950 residential units, and 552 acres would include agricultural/rural land use. It also would include 19 acres of commercial and office professional units. The ESP was approved by Sacramento County in August 2008.

***Johnson Rancho Project***

The Johnson Rancho Project consists of 3,357 acres and was annexed, along with the Hop Farm Property, into the City of Wheatland in 2012. Development includes a mix of low, medium, and high residential, commercial, employment/office, parks, open space, and schools.

***Village 7 Specific Plan***

The Village 7 Specific Plan includes 703 acres in south Placer County, within the southwest portion of the City of Lincoln. The 703-acre Village 7 Specific Plan includes four planning areas for future development. Development includes a mix of low, medium, and HDR, a school, a community park, a fire station, a recreation center, neighborhood-serving retail uses, and park and open space amenities. The Village 7 Specific Plan was adopted by the City of Lincoln on September 10, 2013.

**Geographic Scope**

The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis varies depending upon the specific environmental issue area being analyzed. For example, the scope of the cumulative impact analysis for aesthetics include the area that comprises the view shed of and from the project site, whereas the scope of the cumulative impact analysis for air quality would analyze impacts in the air basin, which is a much larger area. **Table 5-1** summarizes the geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis for each issue area.

The cumulative analysis assumes build out of the Proposed Project and Urban Reserve area.

**TABLE 5-1**  
GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>Geographic Area</b>
Land Use and Agriculture	Regional development identified in Placer, Sutter, and Sacramento Counties. Compatibility limited to project site and immediate vicinity
Population, Housing, and Employment	City of Roseville
Transportation and Circulation	State, regional, and local facilities in Placer, Sutter and Sacramento Counties
Air Quality	Placer County and Sacramento Valley Air Basins
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Global, regional, and local (Placer County and Sacramento Valley Air Basins)
Noise	Project site and immediate vicinity
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Regional development in the City of Roseville and western Placer County
Vegetation and Wildlife	Regional development in western Placer County
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Regional development in the City of Roseville and western Placer County
Hazardous Materials and Public Safety	Project site and immediate vicinity
Public Services	City of Roseville, and local service providers including the school districts
Water Supply	Regional development in the City of Roseville (i.e. buildout of general plan including approved specific plans, ARSP, and Placer Ranch area) as well as the regional water demands generated in Sacramento County, South Placer County, and Western El Dorado County under the provisions of the Water Forum Agreement (WFA)
Wastewater and Recycled Water	Regional development in the City of Roseville and Placer County
Solid Waste	Service area of the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill
Hydrology, Water Quality and Groundwater	Regional development in the City of Roseville including Pleasant Grove Creek Watershed
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Project site and immediate vicinity

### 5.6.3 CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE IMPACTS

CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15130(a) provides the following direction with respect to the cumulative impact analysis and the determination of significant effects:

1. A cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.
2. When the combined cumulative impact associated with the project's incremental effect is not significant, the EIR shall briefly indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed further.
3. An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative effect will be rendered less than cumulative considerable and thus is not significant. A project's contribution is

less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.

The following is a list of cumulative impacts related to the Proposed Project by environmental topic as described in **Section 4.0**. Refer to **Section 4.0** for a detailed discussion of the nature and scope of cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

### **Land Use and Agriculture**

Impact 4.1-7 Cumulative Land Use Compatibility Impacts. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.1-8 Cumulative Impacts from Agricultural Resources Conversion. Significant and Unavoidable.

### **Population and Housing**

Impact 4.2-5 Cumulative Impacts Regarding Population and Housing. Less than Significant.

### **Transportation and Circulation**

Impact 4.3-9 Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections under 2035 CIP Conditions. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-10 Consistency of project with City's policy of 70 percent of intersections operating at LOS C or better under 2035 CIP Conditions. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.3-11 Increased traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Intersections under 2035 CIP conditions. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-12 Increased Traffic volumes on roadways within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Rocklin under 2035 CIP Conditions. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-13 Increased Traffic volumes on existing State interchanges under 2035 CIP conditions. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.3-14 Increased Traffic volumes on State Highways under 2035 CIP conditions. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.3-15 Increased Traffic on City of Roseville Intersections under 2035 Cumulative Conditions. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.3-16 Consistency of project with City's policy of 70 percent of intersections operating at LOS C or better under 2035 Cumulative conditions. Less than Significant.

- Impact 4.3-17 Increased traffic on Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Lincoln Intersections under 2035 cumulative conditions. Significant and Unavoidable.
- Impact 4.3-18 Increased Traffic volumes on roadways within Placer County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, or City of Rocklin under 2035 Cumulative Conditions. Less than Significant.
- Impact 4.3-19 Increased Traffic volumes on State Interchanges under 2035 Cumulative Conditions. Less than Significant.
- Impact 4.3-20 Increased Traffic volumes on State Highways under 2035 Cumulative conditions. Significant and Unavoidable.

### **Air Quality**

- Impact 4.4-7 Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net increase in Criteria Pollutants. Significant and Unavoidable.

### **Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

- Impact 4.5-1 Generate a substantial contribution to GHG emissions that conflicts with an applicable plan or policy. Significant and Unavoidable.

### **Noise**

- Impact 4.6-7 Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 CIP Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site. Significant and Unavoidable.
- Impact 4.6-9 Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels as a Result of the 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Increase in Traffic Noise Outside the Project Site. Significant and Unavoidable.

### **Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

- Impact 4.7-5 Cumulative Geology and Soils Impacts. Less than Significant.

### **Vegetation and Wildlife**

- Impact 4.8-18 Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources. Significant and Unavoidable.

### **Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

- Impact 4.9-5 Cumulative Impacts to Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Less than Significant.

## **Hazardous Materials and Public Safety**

Impact 4.10-7 Potential for Cumulative Effects Associated with Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Less than Significant.

## **Public Services**

Impact 4.11-2 Cumulative Increase In demand for police protection services. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.11-4 Cumulative Increase in Demand for Fire Protection Services and Emergency Access. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.11-6 Cumulative Increase In Demand for School Services. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.11-8 Cumulative Increase In Demand on Library Services. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.11-10 Cumulative Increase in Demand for Park Facilities. Less than Significant.

## **Public Utilities**

Impact 4.12.1-8 Cumulative Water Supply and Water Treatment Impacts. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.12.2-2 Cumulative Recycled Water Impacts. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.12.3-3 Construction or Expansion of Wastewater Treatment Facilities. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.12.3-5 Cumulative Wastewater Impacts. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.12.4-5 Cumulative Solid Waste Impacts. Significant and Unavoidable.

Impact 4.12.5-4 Cumulative Impacts Regarding Electricity Service. Less than Significant.

Impact 4.12.5-5 Cumulative Impacts Regarding Natural Gas and Telecommunication Services. Less than Significant.

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Impact 4.13-8 Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts. Less than Significant.

## **Aesthetics**

Impact 4.14-4 Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts. Significant and Unavoidable.