

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The projected flows to the PGWWTP at buildout, including buildout of the 2005 SAB and the urban growth areas (which include the proposed project), is estimated to be 24.1 mgd ADWF. As discussed in the 1996 Wastewater Master Plan EIR, the potentially significant impacts to Pleasant Grove Creek associated with discharges of up to 29.5 mgd ADWF on water temperature, trace metals, organics, and dissolved oxygen were all reduced to less-than-significant levels⁵ with mitigation measures included in the 1996 Wastewater Master Plan, summarized in Final EIR Table 6.11-4. An increase in the permitted level of discharge could be required prior to buildout, which may result in the need to obtain additional permits from the RWQCB to increase the discharge amount. (FEIR, p. 2-28.)

The current permitted capacity of the PGWWTP is 12 mgd, which is available only to serve development within the 2005 SAB. Any request to expand the 2005 SAB would require appropriate CEQA review and any expansions of capacity beyond 12 mgd would require additional permits for discharge into Pleasant Grove Creek. The demand projected for buildout of the 1996 SAB in the 1996 Master Plan EIR was 20.7 mgd; the recent analysis prepared for the City of Roseville for demand in the UGAs found that demand in the 1996 service area boundaries would actually be 14.6 mgd due to revised flow estimates.⁶ As mentioned previously, treatment capacity expansion to meet the projected 24.1 mgd of all the UGAs analyzed by the City⁷ will be required. The extent to which the PGWWTP would need to expand to treat additional wastewater beyond the 24.1 mgd would depend on which projects would use the plant, subject to approval of the SPWA. Wastewater flows from outside the 2005 SAB would need to be analyzed, since that was the selected alternative in the Wastewater Master Plan EIR. Expansion of the plant to serve such unanticipated flows could result in impacts on the environment associated with construction to increase the capacity of the plant, loss of natural and other resources to expand the footprint of the facility, and degradation of water quality as a result of increased discharges to Pleasant Grove Creek. However, as noted above, prior to any expansion of the PGWWTP, the plant operator would be required to obtain and comply with a RWQCB permit. Compliance with the requirements in the permit would ensure that discharges from the PGWWTP would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. This would be a *less-than-significant impact*. (FEIR, pp. 2-29 .)

Mitigation Measure:

⁵ Merritt Smith Consulting, *Cumulative Analysis of UGA Impacts on Water Quality and Aquatic Resources in Pleasant Grove Creek, Roseville, California*, January 15, 2006.

⁶ RMC, *South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Report*, June 2007.

⁷ RMC, *South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Report*, June 2007.

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.11-4: **The proposed project, in combination with other development, could require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. This impact is *potentially significant*. (FEIR, p. 2-30.)**

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The 1996 Wastewater Master Plan EIR selected an alternative with future expansion of the PGWWTP to a capacity of 20.7 mgd to address buildout of anticipated future development within the approved service boundaries at the time the EIR analysis was prepared. In combination with other future development, the proposed project would contribute to an increased demand on the PGWWTP to serve future development outside the 1996 SAB and 2005 SAB. This would be a significant cumulative impact. Because the project has the potential to contribute to the need to expand the PGWWTP, the project's contribution would be considered cumulatively considerable, resulting in a *significant impact*. (FEIR, p. 2-30.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.11-4 *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.11-2(c).*

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Solid Waste

Standards of Significance:

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, Placer County has determined that a significant environmental impact could occur if the proposed Specific Plan would:

- Require or result in the construction of new or expansion of existing MRF or landfill facilities that would result in significant adverse environmental effects;
- Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs;
- Not comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; or
- Be inconsistent with the goals and policies in the *Placer County General Plan*.

(DEIR, p. 6.11-15.)

Impact 6.11-5: **The proposed project could require the construction of new or the expansion of an existing landfill, which could result in a significant adverse environmental effect. This impact is less than significant.** (DEIR, pp. 6.11-15 to 6.11-16.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project would result in the addition of residential, commercial, mixed-use, and university uses. As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.11-5, these uses would generate approximately 61,351 pounds (30.7 tons) of solid waste each day. The proposed project does not include any specific waste reduction measures; however, the plan states that the University would encourage recycling of all office paper/cardboard, glass, plastic, aluminum, and metal through an on-campus program. Auburn Placer Disposal Service provides curbside collection of green waste and will collect office paper/cardboard upon request. Because waste reduction rates are not available, it is assumed that all the waste generated would be delivered to the MRF and landfill. (DEIR, p. 6.11-15.)

The landfill currently receives an average of 694 tons/day, so, at buildout of the Specific Plan, the proposed project would increase daily deliveries to the landfill by 4.4 percent over current conditions. Annually, the proposed project would generate 11,196.6 tons of solid waste. During its first 20 years of operation, the proposed project would generate 223,931.2 tons of solid waste (based on the amount of solid waste generated between project buildout and landfill closure in 2036). Using a conversion factor of 500 lbs per cubic yard,²⁷ the proposed project would generate approximately 895,724 cubic yards of solid waste over 20 years. The landfill has a remaining capacity of approximately 28,569,000 cubic yards, and is expected to accept solid waste until 2036. The proposed

project would use approximately three percent of the remaining capacity at the landfill; the proposed project contributions to the landfill would be less with implementation of recycling programs. However, with no recycling programs in place, increased deliveries from the proposed project could shorten the life of the landfill by approximately one year (based on the amount of waste received daily at the landfill). Given the landfill is expected to continue operating for an additional 30 years and recycling programs would be required in the Plan Area, the reduction in lifespan of the landfill would be less than one year, which would not be considered substantial. (DEIR, p. 6.11-16.)

As discussed in the Environmental Setting section, the 465 acres west of the WRSL are available for a landfill expansion, although no expansion has been approved to date. The environmental impacts of the proposed expansion of the landfill on WPWMA property on the west side of Fiddymont Road were analyzed in the *Placer County Western Regional Landfill Expansion Draft Supplemental EIR* (SCH# 1985120208), and the WPWMA has obtained a conditional use permit authorizing the establishment of a landfill on this property. (DEIR, p. 6.11-16.)

Solid waste generated by the proposed project, which could shorten the lifespan of the landfill by up to one year, would not itself require expansion. However, compliance with regulations regarding the diversion of solid waste, would reduce the solid waste delivered from the Plan Area to the landfill to less than 3 percent of current deliveries. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental impacts associated with construction of new or the expansion of an existing landfill, and the impact would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.11-16.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.11-6: The proposed project could require the construction of new or expansion of the existing MRF, resulting in significant adverse environmental effects. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.11-16.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

A total of 30.7 tons per day would be hauled to the MRF for processing. This represents an increase of approximately 1.7% of the facility's current capacity. The landfill is currently estimated to remain open until 2036 with a remaining net capacity of approximately 28,569,000 cubic yards. The additional solid waste generated by the proposed project would have the potential to reduce the life of the landfill by up to one year, as discussed above under Impact 6.11-5. The WPWMA projects that by 2008 the MRF would receive a peak of 1,707 tons per day. The peak tonnage received at the MRF would continue to increase as growth occurs in the service area and would likely exceed 1,750 by 2009. If the 30.7 tons per day from the Plan Area is added to the projected 2008 peak tonnage at the MRF, the total of 1,736 tons per day would approach the existing permit, 1,750 tons per day, by 2008. However, the WPWMA is currently planning to expand the MRF to a final processing capacity of 2,200 tons per day. (DEIR, pp. 6.11-16 to 6.11-17.)

The County is required under AB 939 to prepare and adopt a *Source Reduction and Recycling Element* (SRRE), which includes the County's plan to divert solid waste from the landfill for all generated waste. To meet this requirement, the County actively pursues composting, business waste reduction, school recycling, curbside collection, public education and outreach programs to reduce the amount of solid waste generated. Community access to recycling facilities would increase the life of the landfill and reduce the amount of solid waste being separated at the MRF. However, the MRF is currently operating at approximately 55% of permitted capacity, but activity is expected to intensify as growth in the area continues. (DEIR, p. 6.11-17.)

Based on the standards of significance, at buildout of the proposed project, the direct contribution of solid waste generated in the Plan Area would not require the construction of new or expansion of the existing MRF; therefore this is considered a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, 6.11-17.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.11-7:

The proposed project, in combination with other development, could require the construction of new or expansion of the existing landfill and MRF, which could result in significant adverse environmental effects. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.11-17 to 6.11-18.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the construction of new or expansion of the existing landfill and MRF as a result of the proposed project, in combination with other development. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Development throughout unincorporated Placer County and the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, and Roseville would significantly increase the number of residents and businesses over the next 30 years. Waste generated by these new homes and commercial areas would need to be processed at the existing MRF and ultimately deposited at the landfill. WPWMA is currently planning to expand the MRF to accommodate future waste, and cumulative development would not require further expansion. The landfill is anticipated to be able to accept waste until year 2036 based on the current permitted configuration and assumed growth rates. However, the final closure date would be affected by several factors, including changes to the regional growth rates, economic conditions, and the efficiency of waste recovery.³⁰ Depending on these factors, waste from the Specific Plan area, in combination with other cumulative development, could shorten the lifespan of the landfill. Ultimately, the WRSL would be required to expand to accommodate waste from cumulative growth in the area. As previously mentioned, the 465-acre area west of the WRSL has been identified for expansion to extend the life of the WRSL. Environmental impacts of the proposed expansion of the landfill on the west side of Fiddymont Road were analyzed in the Placer County Western Regional Landfill Expansion Draft Supplemental EIR (SCH# 1985120208). (DEIR, pp. 6.11-17 to 6.11-18.)

In the event that the expansion of the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill is not approved, there are several other landfills in Northern California and Northwestern Nevada with adequate capacity that could serve the proposed project. They include:

- L and D Landfill, Sacramento County, 5,190,536 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Sacramento County (Keifer) Landfill, Sacramento County, 86,163,462 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Foothill Sanitary Landfill, San Joaquin County, 94,969,466 cubic yards remaining capacity

- Forward Landfill, San Joaquin County, 40,031,058 cubic yards remaining capacity
- North County Landfill, San Joaquin County, 13,239,032 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Hay Road Landfill, Solano County, 22,815,505 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Portero Hills Landfill, Solano County, 8,200,000 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Fink Road Landfill, Stanislaus County, 10,000,000 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Yolo County Central Landfill, Yolo County, 16,122,000 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Norcal Waste Systems Ostrom Road LF Inc., Yuba County, 11,252,490 cubic yards remaining capacity
- Lockwood Landfill, Sparks, Nevada, 37,500,000 cubic yards remaining capacity

(FEIR, pp. 2-31 to 2-32.)

Although the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill would be the closest landfill to the project site, there are several other options with substantial capacity remaining that could serve the proposed project. Some of the landfills listed above are planning expansions to further increase their ability to accept solid waste. If the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill cannot serve the proposed project, other landfills would be available to accept solid waste from the proposed project without substantially affecting capacity. (DEIR, p. 6.11-18.)

As stated under Impact Draft EIR 6.11-5, the proposed project would reduce the WRSL's lifespan by up to one year. This project, combined with existing uses and additional future development, would require expansion of the landfill. Although the project would not require expansion of either the landfill or the MRF in and of itself, it provides a considerable contribution of waste into the cumulative development scenario. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be considered *significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.11-18.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.11-7 a) *The project applicant shall require that all construction contracts include a provision requiring contractors to provide on-site separation of construction debris to assure a minimum 50% diversion of this material from the landfill.*

- b) *A source separated green waste program shall be implemented within the Plan Area, subject to review and approval by the Western Placer Waste management Authority and by Auburn Placer Disposal Service.*
- c) *The project applicant shall develop and ensure the continuous maintenance of recycling centers within the Plan Area. Recycling centers meeting the standards of the California Integrated Waste Management Board/LEA and County Facility Services Department, including provisions for staffing, continuous maintenance, and resident-friendly hours of operations, shall be a part of the permit conditions for new commercial development. Recycling centers shall accept all types of recyclable waste, shall be fenced and screened from view, and shall be located in commercial areas dispersed throughout the Plan Area. Implementation of all recycling programs shall be approved by the Western Placer Waste Management Authority*

(DEIR, p. 6.11-19; FEIR, p. 2-31.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Other Utilities

Standards of Significance:

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, Placer County has determined that a significant environmental impact could occur if the proposed Specific Plan would:

- Result in significant adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities, or create a need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives;
- Use scarce energy resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner; or
- Be inconsistent with the adopted *Placer County General Plan*.

(DEIR, pp. 6.11-23 to 6.11-24.)

Impact 6.11-8: The proposed project could require the construction of new

facilities to provide electrical and natural gas service, which could result in significant environmental effects. This impact is less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 6.11-24 to 6.11-26.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Electrical Service

Based on the generation rates listed in Table 6.11-6, the proposed project would demand 32.95 MW of electricity. As described in the Environmental Setting section, Roseville Electric or PG&E would supply electricity to the Plan Area. An electric substation is proposed on a 6-acre site (Parcel 29) on the north side of the Plan Area. This site would be co-located with planned water storage tanks and a potable water well adjacent to 8th Street. Underground electrical distribution would be extended from the substation to the Plan Area parcels in conjunction with roadway improvements. All electric facilities would be constructed to the standards of the service provider. A detailed review of all projects by service purveyors to assess the potential demands for utility services on a project-by-project basis would be conducted. Developers are required to obtain approval from PG&E for the construction of the needed infrastructure. Consistent with the RUSP and PG&E requirements, the County and the applicant would work with PG&E to locate transmission line corridors to distribute electricity to project uses from the distribution circuit. (DEIR, p. 6.11-24.)

There are many sources of electrical energy, and it is likely that various sources would be used in the Plan Area at buildout. According to PG&E's 2004 Generation Portfolio, the company obtains energy from hydroelectric, nuclear and fossil facilities. It is beyond the scope of this EIR to speculate regarding impacts of using any particular source of energy; however, for informational purposes common potential environmental impacts from various energy sources are listed below.

- Hydroelectric: Alteration of aquatic ecosystems and hydrologic processes, soil erosion, disruption of natural fish movement.
- Nuclear: Significant water use, discharge of warmed and polluted water into natural water bodies, generation of radioactive waste, soil contamination.
- Coal: Emission of nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, mercury and methane into the air; significant water use; discharge of warmed and polluted water into natural water bodies; generation of solid waste; soil contamination;

alteration of wildlife habitat during surface mining.

- Natural Gas: Emission of methane, nitrogen oxides, and carbon dioxide; alteration of habitat during extraction.

(DEIR, p. 6.11-25.)

PG&E

PG&E currently maintains the facilities described in the Environmental Setting section to serve the project region. The two nearest substations, Catlett Substation and Pleasant Grove Substation, have available capacity, as well as potential for expansion to carry additional load. All electric facilities would be constructed to the standards of the service provider. (DEIR, p. 6.11-25.)

Roseville Electric

If service is provided by Roseville Electric, Roseville Electric would construct a looped system, with one connection point at the substation at Fiddymont Road and Pleasant Grove Boulevard, then extending westerly along the existing Western and Sacramento Municipal Utilities District Power Corridor, and traveling north along the proposed Watt Avenue extension to the southeastern portion of the Plan Area. The other portion of the loop would extend from the northeastern portion of the Plan Area, north along the existing unimproved road to Phillips Avenue. The route would then continue east to the future power plant. (DEIR, p. 6.11-25.)

If Roseville Electric serves the project, an electric substation would be required. The substation could be accommodated within Parcel 29, as described above. (DEIR, p. 6.11-25.)

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations addresses required energy efficiency measures for construction. These construction practices can reduce costs to homeowners and businesses over the long-term. It is assumed that all new residential units would be built to Title 24 standards. (DEIR, p. 6.11-25.)

Natural Gas Service

Based on the generation rates listed in Draft EIR Table 6.11-6, the proposed project would demand 32,952,960 therms of natural gas per year. (DEIR, p. 6.11-25.)

The primary point of service for natural gas to the Plan Area would be a connection to the 6-inch gas line to be constructed in Pleasant Grove Boulevard as part of the West Roseville Specific Plan and an extension of that line to the eastern project boundary, which is sufficient to serve the Plan Area. (DEIR, p. 6.11-26.)

If Pleasant Grove Boulevard is not extended to the Plan Area in the early stages of project construction, and if Watt Avenue is constructed as the access road in the early stages of project construction, PG&E would tie into the existing 6-inch gas stub at Base Line and Fiddymont Roads. From that point of connection, gas service would be extended westerly in Base Line Road and north in the Watt Avenue extension to the Plan Area. (DEIR, p. 6.11-26.)

Within the Plan Area, 4-inch distribution mains would be stubbed off extensions of the 6-inch main located at Pleasant Grove Boulevard or Watt Avenue and looped through the internal circulation streets. (DEIR, p. 6.11-26.)

Gas regulation stations would be required along the backbone main in this scenario. These facilities would provide the necessary gas pressure reductions or increases to serve individual developments within the Plan Area and would be considered by PG&E as part of the standard development process. (DEIR, p. 6.11-26.)

Gas facility development and line extension within specific developments would proceed according to PG&E's typical subdivision line and facility extension policies. The feeder and service lines would be placed within a joint trench with other utilities to reduce the construction cost. (DEIR, p. 6.11-26.)

Conclusion

Roseville Electric and PG&E would have an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed electric and natural gas service plans. The ability of PG&E and Roseville Electric to provide their services concurrently with other development is evaluated during the development review process. The construction of the new facilities would occur on the project site, or within roadway extensions associated with implementation of the project. The physical impacts from the construction of these facilities are analyzed as part of the off-site infrastructure described in Chapter 2 of this EIR. The proposed project would not require the construction of new facilities to provide electrical and natural gas service that have not already been analyzed in this EIR; therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.11-26.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant.

Impact 6.11-9: **The proposed project could require the construction of new**

facilities to provide cable and communication service, which could result in significant environmental effects. This impact is less than significant. (DEIR, p. 6.11-26 to 6.11-27.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Buildout of the proposed project would result in an increased demand for telephone, cable, and other communication services. These services are not currently available in the project area. The site is within AT&T's Pleasant Grove Service Area. The Pleasant Grove Wire Center, located at Howsley and Pleasant Grove Road, would need to be upgraded due to the increase in demand as a result of the proposed project and the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. The existing distribution line from the wire center, along Brewer Road to Phillip Road would need to be upgraded to accommodate demand from the proposed project. An additional line would be installed in this trench (Brewer to Phillip Road) to accommodate telecommunication demand. Distribution lines to individual parcels would extend from the line in Brewer Road. (DEIR, pp. 6.11-26 to 6.11-27.)

One or more private cable companies would provide service to the proposed project. Cable and other communication services would be provided by private utility companies and would be funded through developer fees and future customer billing. In addition, the utility companies would be given the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed development requiring new service. All phone and cable lines would be installed in roadway rights-of-way, so there would not be any environmental impacts beyond the construction impacts identified in this EIR. Therefore, the demand for cable television and telephone services is considered a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.11-27.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.11-10: **The proposed project, combined with other development, could require the construction of new or expansion of existing facilities in order to provide electrical, natural gas, cable, or**

communication services. This impact is *less than significant*.
(DEIR, pp. 6.11-27 to 6.11-28.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Future development in the region would, increase residential and commercial needs for electricity, natural gas, cable, and other communication services. Existing facilities would not be adequate to meet this demand. Development in undeveloped areas would require the extension of existing lines, new transmission facilities, and substations. Natural gas regulators and transmission lines are required to serve residences and businesses. Expansions of these types of facilities would be required to serve the growing population of the region, and would be constructed by the service provider as demand from new development warrants. Therefore, the potential impacts of constructing any new facilities would be addressed concurrent with the proposed development. Infrastructure development will be governed by the Regional University Specific Plan Infrastructure Plan, described below. (See FEIR pp. 2-2—2-8.) The construction and operation of additional natural gas or electrical facilities in areas where such facilities currently do not exist could result in potentially significant environmental effects, in part, related to construction activities. However, it would be speculative to identify the level of significance of potential environmental impacts absent a plan that identifies a specific project and/or project location. Further, any infrastructure improvements would be subject to environmental review on a project-by-project basis as part of the proposed development or subsequently by the service provider. (DEIR, p. 6.11-27.)

The availability and provision of adequate natural gas and electricity would be required prior to project approval. The need for additional utility infrastructure, including electrical and natural gas facilities, cable TV, and phone service, increases as development occurs. PG&E and Roseville Electric build and/or contract for additional capacity on a continuing basis as development planning occurs in an area. Because service providers would construct facilities as demand occurs, and would be subject to environmental review as part of the proposed development project or analyzed independently by the service provider, this cumulative impact is considered *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.11-27 to 6.11-28.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

L. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Standards of Significance:

Roadway System

The roadway impact significance criteria outlined below were developed based on the applicable policies of the public agencies whose roadways are likely to be affected by development in the plan area.

Based on the LOS policy descriptions in the transportation setting, an impact to the roadway system is considered significant if implementation of the proposed project would meet the following criteria.

Placer County Roadways and Intersections

- Cause the existing or cumulative no project level of service for study locations not within one-half mile of a state highway to deteriorate from LOS C (or better) to LOS D (or worse) or for study locations within one-half mile of a state highway to deteriorate from LOS D (or better) to LOS E (or worse).
- Exacerbate the existing or cumulative no project LOS D (or worse) conditions for study locations not within one-half mile of a state highway or LOS E (or worse) conditions for study locations within one-half mile of a state highway.
- Generate vehicle travel demand that exceeds planned roadway network capacity.
- Cause LOS E or worse conditions on roadways or intersections within the plan area.

City of Roseville Roadways and Intersections

- Cause the existing or cumulative no project level of service for study locations to deteriorate from LOS C (or better) to LOS D (or worse).
- Exacerbate the existing or cumulative no project LOS D (or worse) conditions for study locations.
- Cause percentage of intersections operating at LOS C or better to fall below 70 percent.

Sacramento County Roadways and Intersections

- Cause the existing or cumulative no project level of service for study locations to deteriorate from LOS E (or better) to LOS F.
- Exacerbate the existing or cumulative no project LOS F conditions for study locations.

Sutter County Roadways and Intersections

- Cause the existing or cumulative no project level of service for study locations to deteriorate from LOS D (or better) to LOS E (or worse).
- Exacerbate the existing or cumulative no project LOS E (or worse) conditions for study locations.

Caltrans Facilities

- Cause the existing or cumulative no project level of service for study locations to deteriorate from LOS C (or better) to LOS D (or worse).
- Exacerbate the existing or cumulative no project LOS D (or worse) conditions for study locations by adding traffic to a freeway/highway segment, ramp terminal intersection, or ramp junction influence area.

Transit System

For the purposes of the EIR, an impact to the transit system is considered significant if implementation of the proposed project would:

- Create demand for public transit services or facilities above those that are provided, or planned to be provided.
- Disrupt existing or interfere with planned transit services or facilities.
- Create an inconsistency with the transit policies or standards of plans adopted by jurisdictions within the study area.

Bicycle and Pedestrian System

For the purposes of the EIR, an impact to the bicycle and pedestrian system is considered significant if implementation of the proposed project would:

- Disrupt existing or interfere with planned bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

- Create an inconsistency with the bikeway or pedestrian policies or standards of plans adopted by the jurisdictions within the study area.

(DEIR, pp. 6.12-26 to 6.12-28.)

Roadway System

Impact 6.12-1: **The proposed project could contribute to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the regional roadway network under existing plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.12-80, 6.12-95.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the project's contribution to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the regional roadway network under existing plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Development of the proposed project would generate approximately 33,000 daily vehicle trips at full build-out. The regional roadway network consisting of state highways (i.e., I-80, SR 65, and SR 70/99) and major arterials such as Base Line Road, Pleasant Grove Boulevard, and Watt Avenue does not have the capacity to accommodate the added project traffic under existing plus project conditions within the LOS thresholds established by local and state agencies. A disconnect exists between the current LOS thresholds and the level of investment dedicated to expanding the capacity of the regional roadway network. As a result, many regional roadways operate at or near LOS F under existing conditions, which will be exacerbated by the addition of project traffic. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-80, 6.12-95.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-1 *Developers of property within the plan area ("Specific Plan" or "the Project") shall be responsible for the project's fair share of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation-related impacts, as identified in this traffic analysis, consistent with the policies and exceptions set forth in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the 1994 Placer County General Plan as amended. The project's contribution toward such*

improvements, which the County recognizes will not be sufficient to mitigate all transportation-related impacts to less-than-significant levels, may take any or some combination of the following forms.

- 1. Construction of roads and related facilities within and adjacent to the boundaries of the Specific Plan area, which may be subject to fee credits and/or reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects with respect to roads or other facilities that would also serve fee-paying development projects other than RUSP.*
- 2. Construction of roads and/or road improvements or other transportation facilities outside the boundaries of the Specific Plan area but within unincorporated Placer County, subject in some instances to future reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects where the roads or improvements at issue would also serve fee-paying development projects other than RUSP.*
- 3. The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities to be built or improved within unincorporated Placer County, consistent with the County's Capital Improvement Program ("CIP").*
- 4. The payment of impact fees to the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority ("SPRTA") in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities funded through fees collected by the SPRTA for Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 projects.*
- 5. The payment of other adopted regional impact fees that would provide improvements to roadways, intersections and/or interchanges that are affected by multiple jurisdictions (e.g., Walerga/Fiddymont/Base Line).*
- 6. The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements within the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, and/or Sutter County needed in whole or in part because of the Project, to be made available to the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, and/or Sutter County, if and when those jurisdictions and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with Placer County General Plan policy 3.A.15(c). At the time of issuance of building permits for individual*

development projects within the Plan Area, the County shall collect fair share fee payments for improvements or facilities addressed by its CIP as it exists at that time.

7. *Developers of property within the plan area shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements on federal or state highways or freeways needed in part because of the Project, to be made available to the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") if and when Caltrans and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with state law and Placer County General Plan policy*
3.A.15(c).

8. *In pursuing a single agreement or multiple agreements with Roseville, Sacramento, Sutter, and Caltrans, Placer County shall negotiate in good faith with these other jurisdictions to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the RUSP, commitments for the provision of adequate "fair share" mitigation payments from the Project for its out-of-jurisdiction traffic impacts and its impacts on federal and state freeways and highways.*

9. *If transportation improvements required to be constructed as mitigation are constructed prior to RUSP implementation, the project will pay its fair share portion for those improvements.*

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-2: **The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is potentially significant. (DEIR, p. 6.12.-96.)**

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increase to daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions, that would occur as a result of the project. No further mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-10, implementation of the proposed project would cause the LOS for two City of Roseville roadway segments to deteriorate from acceptable (i.e., LOS C or better) to unacceptable (i.e., LOS D, E, or F). Trips from the proposed project would also exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions for two roadway segments. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-96.)

While implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.12-2A through 6.12-2C would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level (see Table 6.12-24 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. The City of Roseville can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the roadway segments would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-96.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.12-2 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*
- Segment A. *Widen Base Line Road from three to four lanes between Fiddymont Road and Foothills Boulevard.*
- Segment B. *Widen Pleasant Grove Boulevard from four to six lanes between Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard and Foothills Boulevard.*
- Segment C. *Widen Foothills Boulevard from four to six lanes between Base Line Road and Roseville Road.*

Segment D. *Widen Cirby Way from four to six lanes between Roseville Road and Riverside Avenue.*

The roadway projects recommended in Mitigation Measure 6.12-2A through 6.12-2C are already contained in the City of Roseville CIP because they are needed to accommodate previously approved development in the City and surrounding jurisdictions. The roadway project recommended in Mitigation Measure 6.12-2D has been removed from the City of Roseville CIP by recent City Council action and thus cannot be assumed. The need for these roadway projects could be accelerated with implementation of the RUSP.

(DEIR, p. 6.12-97.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-3: **The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-97.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increase to daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions, that would occur as a result of the project. No further mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-10, implementation of the proposed project would cause the LOS for one Sacramento County roadway segment to deteriorate from acceptable (i.e., LOS E or better) to unacceptable (i.e., LOS F). This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-97.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level (see Table 6.12-24 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Sacramento County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the roadway segments would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-97.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-3 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation project as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Segment A. *Widen Watt Avenue from four to six lanes between Elverta Road and Antelope Road.*

Significance After Mitigation

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-4: **The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments, exacerbating LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-98.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increase to daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions, that would occur as a result of the project. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-10 and summarized below, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS D and F) conditions for six Caltrans roadway segments. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-98.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-24 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the roadway segments would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-98.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-4 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Segment A-C. Widen SR 70/99 from four to six lanes between Sankey Road and Elkhorn Boulevard.

Segment D-E. Widen SR 65 from four to six lanes between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and I-80. The project's impact is limited to the SR 65 segment between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and I-80 under existing plus project conditions, but extends to all study segments of SR 65 (Sunset Boulevard to I-80) under cumulative plus project conditions.

Segment F. Construct HOV lanes (as currently planned by Caltrans) on I-80 from the Sacramento County line to just west of Rocklin Road. The project's impact is limited to the I-80 segment between SR 65 and Rocklin Road under existing plus project conditions, but extends to all study segments of I-80 under cumulative plus project conditions.

Payment of the applicable regional SPRTA impact fees satisfies the project's fair share responsibility for mitigating impacts to mainline SR 65 (segments D-E above).

(DEIR, p. 6.12-98.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-5: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Placer County intersections, resulting in unacceptable**

LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions: This impact is potentially significant. (DEIR, pp. 6.12-98 to 6.12-99.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-11, implementation of the proposed project would cause the LOS for two Placer County intersections to deteriorate from acceptable (i.e., LOS C or better) to unacceptable (i.e., LOS D, E, or F) during at least one peak hour. Trips from the proposed project would also exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions for four intersections during at least one peak hour. Note that the Fiddymont Road/Base Line Road intersection is identified as an impact under both Placer County and the City of Roseville since portions of the intersection are in both jurisdictions. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-99.)

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level (see Table 6.12-25 for LOS after mitigation). Because the RUSP will develop over time, implementation of the following mitigation projects will likely occur in phases and through various forms as outlined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Individual intersection widenings and traffic control modifications may be constructed as a result of other development that has been or may be approved within southern Placer County and/or the City of Roseville, depending upon when that development occurs, or may be constructed by the project applicant as provided by the terms of the development agreement. Major roadway and intersection widenings are expected to be constructed by the County using traffic impact fees paid by the project applicant and other developers in the same area, possibly in combination with state and federal funding. (DEIR, p. 6.12-99.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-5 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

- Intersection A. 1. Widen Base Line Road from two to four lanes between Watt Avenue and Pleasant Grove Road south (County line) and;*
- 2. Construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane and an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane.*

- Intersection B. 1. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5A.1 and;*
- 2. Widen Base Line Road from two to six lanes between Fiddymment Road and Watt Avenue and;*
 - 3. Modify the traffic signal and construct the following intersection lanes.*

Eastbound – an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane, three through lanes, and dual left-turn lanes

Westbound – a free right-turn lane, three through lanes that extend through the intersection and taper back to two lanes after a minimum of 1,000 feet, and dual left-turn lanes

Northbound – an exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane

Southbound – an exclusive right-turn lane, two through lanes, and dual left-turn lanes

- Intersection C. 1. Widen Watt Avenue from two to four lanes between Base Line Road and the current four-lane section just south of PFE Road and;*
- 2. Install a traffic signal and construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane and an exclusive northbound right-turn lane.*

- Intersection D. 1. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5B-2 and;*
- 2. Modify the traffic signal and widen the intersection to add the following intersection lanes.*

Eastbound – add a second left-turn lane

Northbound – add a second through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane

Southbound – add a second through lane and convert the right-turn lane to a free movement that becomes the third westbound through lane on Base Line Road as identified in Mitigation Measure 6.12-

5B.2. The second through lane should extend south of the intersection a minimum of 500 feet before transitioning back to one lane.

- Intersection E. 1. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5A.1 and;
2. Install a traffic signal and construct the following intersection lanes.

Eastbound – add a second through lane
Westbound – add a second through lane and an exclusive left-turn lane

Northbound – construct exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes

- Intersection F. 1. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5A.1 and;
2. Install a traffic signal and construct the following intersection lanes.

Northbound – construct an exclusive right-turn lane

(DEIR, p. 6.12-99 to 6.12-101.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.12-6: The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-101.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain

significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-11, implementation of the proposed project would cause the LOS for two City of Roseville intersections to deteriorate from acceptable (i.e., LOS C or better) to unacceptable (i.e., LOS D, E, or F) during both peak hours. Trips from the proposed project would also exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions for six intersections during at least one peak hour. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-101.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level (see Table 6.12-25 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. The City of Roseville can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to do so. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-101.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.12-6 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*
- Intersection A. Install a traffic signal.*
- Intersection B. Install a traffic signal and construct a second westbound left-turn lane.*
- Intersection C. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5D.*
- Intersection D. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-2A and modify the traffic signal.*
- Intersection E. Convert the third westbound through lane to a third left-turn lane.*
- Intersection F. Construct a second westbound left-turn lane*
- Intersection G. Construct a third northbound left-turn lane*
- Intersection H. Add a third northbound through lane, construct a second northbound left-turn lane, and convert the eastbound right-turn lane with overlap phasing.*

(DEIR, pp. 6.12-101 to 6.12-102.)

Some of these roadway projects are already contained in the City of Roseville CIP because they are needed to accommodate previously approved development in the City and surrounding jurisdictions. (DEIR, p. 6.12-102.)

However, the need for these roadway projects could be accelerated by implementation of the RUSP. (Note: Measures E through G have already been constructed.) (DEIR, p. 6.12-102.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-7: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-102.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Table 6.12-11 and summarized below, implementation of the proposed project would cause the LOS for two Sutter County intersections to deteriorate from acceptable (i.e., LOS C or better) to unacceptable (i.e., LOS D, E, or F) during both peak hours. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-102.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level (see Table 6.12-25 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at

an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-102.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-7 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A. 1. Install a traffic signal and construct exclusive left turn lanes for the eastbound and westbound approaches;

OR

2. *Widen Riego Road from two to four lanes between Pleasant Grove (south) and SR 70/99 and remove the stop signs on the eastbound and westbound approaches and construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane and an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane.*

Intersection B. 1. Install a traffic signal and construct exclusive left turn lanes for the eastbound and southbound approaches,

OR

2. *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-7A.2 and remove the stop signs on the eastbound and westbound approaches, and construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane.*

(DEIR, pp. 6.12-102 to 6.12-103.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-8: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-103.)

Finding:

conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is potentially significant. (DEIR, p. 6.12-103.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-11, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS D, E, or F) at two Caltrans intersections for at least one peak hour. This is a *significant impact*.

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-25 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-104.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-9 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4A.

Intersection B. Re-stripe the northbound approach ramp to include an exclusive left-turn lane, a shared left-turn/right-turn lane, and an exclusive right-turn lane.

(DEIR, p. 6.12-104.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-10: The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-104.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-13, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS D, E, or F) at four Caltrans intersections for at least one peak hour. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-104.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-26 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the ramp junctions would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-105.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-10 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Ramp A. 1. *Extend the acceleration lane 100 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 100 feet of acceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement to meet applicable design standards. Also, this improvement would occur on a bridge structure that may not be feasible to re-stripe or to expand,*

OR

2. *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4D-E.*

Ramp B. 1. *Extend the deceleration lane 50 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 50 feet of deceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement such as a two-lane off-ramp or a continuous auxiliary lane between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard to meet applicable design standards,*

OR

2. *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4D-E.*

Ramp C. 1. *Extend the acceleration lane 100 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 100 feet of acceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement such as a continuous auxiliary lane between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard to meet applicable design standards,*

OR

2. *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4D-E.*

Ramp D. 1. *Extend the deceleration lane 50 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. (Note: While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 50 feet of deceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement such as a two-lane off-ramp to meet applicable design standards).*

OR

2. *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4F. (Note: Constructing the HOV lanes currently planned by Caltrans through the I-80/SR 65 interchange area would reduce the mainline mixed-flow volume at the westbound I-80 off-ramp to northbound SR 65, resulting in improved ramp junction operations)*

(DEIR, pp. 6.12-105 to 6.12-106.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-11: The proposed project could generate substantial vehicle traffic flows before and after special events at the stadium that may exceed the typical weekday peak hour operational capacity of the local and regional roadways. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-106.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the generation of substantial vehicle traffic before and after special events at the stadium that may exceed the typical weekday peak hour operational capacity of local and regional roadways. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

The plan area roadway system and the surrounding roadway network are not planned to accommodate the vehicle trip generation for a sold-out special event. Further, the RUSP does not contain a traffic control plan showing what actions will be necessary to accommodate this substantial vehicle demand. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-106.)

If this mitigation is implemented, the impact would be reduced but not to a level of less than significant due to the uncertainty of specific event traffic and parking conditions and the effectiveness of the traffic control plans. Therefore, this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-106.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-11 *The college, university, or special event sponsor shall be required to prepare a traffic control plan for each "type" of special event (i.e., college football games). The traffic control plans shall be subject to County approval prior to any special events taking place. For regularly scheduled events, this mitigation only requires one traffic control plan that can be repeatedly used. Unique special events will require their own independent traffic control plans subject to County review and approval prior to the event.*

The traffic control plans shall contain the following elements.

- 1) *Identification of locations requiring traffic control officers and turn lane prohibitions.*
- 2) *Specifications for traffic control officer qualifications.*
- 3) *Identification of special traffic lane treatments including the use of traffic cones to delineate two lanes in each direction on University Boulevard between 8th Street and 16th Street. Special treatments may also be required on 16th Street.*
- 4) *Identification of specific bicycle and pedestrian routes to the stadium, especially pedestrian routes from designated parking areas.*
- 5) *Identification of advanced signing for circulation and parking.*

The college, university, or special event sponsor shall be responsible for implementing all elements of the traffic control plan required by Placer County unless the County decides otherwise.

In addition, the following items shall be provided for each event.

- 1) *Maps and information showing circulation and parking options shall be included with all ticket sales and available through a web site.*
- 2) *Shuttle or transit service to the event, which is coordinated with Placer County Transit and/or City of Roseville Transit.*

(DEIR, pp. 6.12-106 to 6.12-107.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-12: **The proposed project could generate vehicle parking demand that may exceed available supply during special events at the stadium. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-107.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the generation of vehicle parking demand that may exceed available supply during special events at the stadium. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Special events could generate parking demand for more than 6,000 spaces. These spaces are not currently delineated in the RUSP. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-107.)

If this mitigation is implemented, the impact would be reduced but not to a level of less-than-significant due to the uncertainty of specific event parking conditions and the effectiveness of the parking plan. Therefore, this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-107.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-12 *The project applicant or developer shall prepare, and submit to Placer County for approval, a University Master Plan that includes a detailed parking plan for special event conditions. The parking plan shall identify sufficient parking to accommodate projected demand for varying types of events and levels of attendance up to and including a sold-out event. The college, university, or special event sponsor shall be responsible for implementing all elements of the parking plan required by Placer County unless the County decides otherwise.*

(DEIR, p. 6.12-107.)

Significance After Mitigation

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-13: **The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-107.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-17, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS (i.e., D, E, or F) for eight City of Roseville roadway segments. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-107.)

While implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-27 for LOS after mitigation), some of the roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans, the City of Roseville, SPRTA, Sacramento County, and Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the roadway segments would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-108.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-13 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Segment A-H. Implement Mitigation Measures 6.12-3 and 6.12-4. In addition, construct Placer Parkway as a four-lane freeway between SR 65 and SR 70/99, connect Watt Avenue as four lanes to Blue Oaks Boulevard, and widen Watt Avenue from four to six lanes between Base Line Road and Elverta Road.

The recommended mitigation measure contains multiple roadway projects of a regional nature. This is necessary for two reasons. One, a future roadway network to support the cumulative no project scenario at the LOS thresholds established in local or State policies has not been developed. Two, traffic volume forecasts under cumulative conditions will change in response to changes in the roadway network. Therefore, the mitigation for the cumulative plus project scenario involved the testing of multiple roadway capacity expansion projects to determine the one set of projects that not only helped to accommodate cumulative no project traffic levels but also eliminated or minimized the project impacts. (DEIR, p. 6.12-108.)

Another important feature of the cumulative impact analysis is that the cumulative no project and cumulative plus project are two separate “snapshots” of the future. The project’s traffic is not added to a fixed amount of traffic under the no project scenario. Both scenarios are fully modeled, which more accurately allows for changes in the matching of trip origins and trip destinations as well as trip routing. Therefore, the project may contribute traffic to many roadways under the cumulative plus project scenario, but may not necessarily result in higher volumes on a roadway segment when compared to the cumulative no project scenario and not cause an impact. However, as noted in Draft EIR Mitigation Measure 6.12-1, the project will be required to pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the project’s fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities to be built or improved within unincorporated Placer County, consistent with the County’s CIP. This mitigation measure also extends responsibility for the project to mitigate roadway impacts in other jurisdictions if an enforceable agreement between Placer County and the other jurisdiction is established. (DEIR, p. 6.12-108.)

At this time, full funding has not yet been identified for Placer Parkway, the State highway capacity expansion projects, or the Watt Avenue widening, nor is any funding identified for the extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard. The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Draft EIR Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. (DEIR, p. 6.12-109.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-14: The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-109.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-17, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F conditions for two Sacramento County roadway segments. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-109.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-27 for LOS after mitigation), some of the roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans, the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, SPRTA, and Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the roadway segments would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-109.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-14 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Segment A-B. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.

(DEIR, p. 6.12-109.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-15: **The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-109.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-17, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate LOS F conditions for 10 Caltrans roadway segments. This is a *significant impact*.

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-27 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans, the City of Roseville, SPRTA, Sacramento County, and Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the roadway segments would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-110.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-15 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Segment A-J. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.

(DEIR, p. 6.12-110.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-16: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Placer County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-110.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased daily traffic volumes using Placer County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-18, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F conditions for three Placer County intersections. Note that the Fiddyment Road/Base Line Road intersection is identified as an impact under both Placer County and the City of Roseville since portions of the intersection are in both jurisdictions. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-110.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-28 for LOS after mitigation), some of these intersections are partially outside of Placer County and would require the cooperation and coordination of other jurisdictions to fully improve the intersections. Sutter County, Sacramento County, and the City of Roseville would need to implement comparable improvements, but may choose not to do so. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-110.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-16 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A-C. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.

Intersection D. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13 and add a second northbound left-turn lane.

(DEIR, p. 6.12-111.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-17: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p.6.12-111.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is

available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-18, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F conditions for eight City of Roseville intersections. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-111.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-28 for LOS after mitigation), these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans, SPRTA, Sacramento County, Sutter County, and the City of Roseville can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-111.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-17 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A-H. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.

Intersection C. Add a fourth through lane to the eastbound and westbound approaches.

Intersection H. Convert second eastbound through lane to a shared right-through lane.

(DEIR, pp. 6.12-111 to 6.12-112.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-18: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-112.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-18, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F conditions for one Sutter County intersection. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-112.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-28 for LOS after mitigation), some of these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans, the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, SPRTA, and Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-112.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-18 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A. Implement Mitigation Measures 6.12-13 and add a second southbound left-turn lane.

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-19: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-112.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-18, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F conditions for two Sacramento County intersections. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-112.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact (see Table 6.12-28 for LOS after mitigation), some of these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. If the mitigation measures were implemented, the impact to the Watt Avenue/Antelope Road intersection would be reduced to less than significant and the impact to the Watt Avenue/Elverta Road intersection would be lessened but not to a level of less than significant. Caltrans, the City of Roseville, SPRTA, Sacramento County, and Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-113.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-19 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13 and add a third through lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the intersection.

Intersection B. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-20: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-113.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into; the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-18 and summarized below, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions at two Caltrans intersections. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-113.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-28 for LOS after mitigation), some of these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans, the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, SPRTA, and Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.2-113.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-20 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A-B. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-21: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-114.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-19, implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS D, E, or F conditions for 16 Caltrans ramp junctions. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-114.)

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Table 6.12-29 for LOS after mitigation), some of these roadway projects are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Caltrans, the City of Roseville, SPRTA, Sacramento County, and Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified roadway projects are not made, the ramp junctions would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-115.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-21 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Ramp A-Q. Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.

Ramp J. Construct a continuous auxiliary lane from SR 65 eastbound on-ramp to the Rocklin Road eastbound off-ramp.

Ramp K. Construct a second off-ramp lane to SR 65 that will become the third northbound through lane on SR 65. This would include a 1,300 ft auxiliary lane on I-80 (see Figure 6.12-30A).

(DEIR, p. 6.12-115.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-22: **The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to the project site. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-115.)**

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue on the project site. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-22 and summarized below, implementation of the proposed project would cause unacceptable LOS D, E, or F conditions for two City of Roseville intersections under this scenario. This is a *significant impact*.

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level (see Appendix J for LOS after mitigation), some of these improvements are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. The City of Roseville can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified improvements are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-115.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-22 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A. Modify the traffic signal to split-phase and provide the following intersection turn lanes on Antelope Creek Drive.

Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane

Westbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, and one right-turn lane

Intersection B.

Modify the traffic signal and construct the following turn lanes at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection.

Northbound – two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane

Westbound – two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane

(DEIR, p. 6.12-116.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-23: The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-116.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.12-22 and summarized below, implementation of the proposed project would cause unacceptable LOS D, E, or F conditions for six City of Roseville intersections under this scenario. This is a *significant impact*.

While implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level for some intersections (see Appendix J for LOS after mitigation), physical improvements are not feasible for all locations. Further, where physical improvements are feasible, the improvements are outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. The City of Roseville can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measures but may choose not to. If the identified improvements are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-116.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.12-23 *The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.*

Intersection A. No physical mitigation available due to right-of-way constraints. This finding was confirmed with City of Roseville Public Works Department staff.

Intersection B. Modify the traffic signal to split-phase and construct the following turn lanes on Antelope Creek Drive.

Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane

Westbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, and one right-turn lane

Intersection C. No physical mitigation available due to right-of-way constraints. This finding was confirmed with City of Roseville Public Works Department staff.

Intersection D. Modify the traffic signal and construct the following turn lanes on Foothills Boulevard.

Northbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane

Southbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane

- Intersection E. Widen Blue Oaks Boulevard from six to eight lanes between Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard and SR 65.*
- Intersection F. Modify the traffic signal and construct the following turn lanes at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection.*
- Northbound – two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane*
- Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane*
- Westbound – two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane*

(DEIR, p. 6.12-117.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-24: **The proposed project could increase demand for public transit service beyond that currently planned and may result in unmet transit needs. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-117.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the increased demand for public transit service beyond that currently planned, which may result in unmet transit needs. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Placer County and the City of Roseville provide public transit service in the study area, but this service does not extend to the plan area. The plan area would contain land uses that generate new demand for public transit service such as residential housing and the university. While the RUSP identifies transit facilities within the plan area such as potential bus routes and transit stops, it does not provide for the extension of new public transit service to the plan area. This is a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-117.)

If this mitigation is implemented, Impact 6.12-24 would be reduced to less-than-significant. However, implementation is uncertain because the remaining share of mitigation funding has not been secured or identified. Therefore, no assurance exists that the recommended mitigation will be implemented, and this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-118.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.12-24 *The project applicant shall contribute its fair share of the cost to provide public transit service to the study area as determined by Placer County through participation in a benefit or assessment district or through a separate agreement between the applicant and Placer County consistent with Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. At a minimum, service is expected to include the following components:*
- *Fixed-route bus service connecting the plan area to the City of Roseville and Placer County Transit with a minimum of hourly headways and a maximum of 15-minute headways added in the peak periods.*
 - *Demand-responsive service meeting ADA paratransit requirements within the plan area.*
 - *Peak period (a.m. and p.m.) weekday commuter bus service to downtown Sacramento.*
 - *Costs shall include the capital costs of transit vehicles and facilities as well as the operating and maintenance costs of the service beyond what will be paid for through the transportation development act (TDA) funding.*

(DEIR, p. 6.12-118.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.12-25: **The proposed project could increase demand for non-motorized travel. This impact is *less than significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-118.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project includes facilities such as sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and multiple use trails to accommodate non-motorized travel demand. These facilities will adequately provide for non-motorized transportation within the project and are consistent with the various non-motorized policies of Placer County. Further, implementation of the project would not disrupt or interfere with existing or planned non-motorized facilities in the study area. This is a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.12-118.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.12-26: **Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect traffic in other jurisdictions. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.12-118.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with adverse traffic impacts in other jurisdictions as a result of mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

The roadway improvements identified in the mitigation measures throughout this section would improve traffic impacts by increasing roadway and intersection capacity in some locations. Such improvements would also redistribute traffic in the study area and throughout the region. For example, Placer Parkway, one of a number of possible improvements identified as mitigation, would provide additional east-west roadway capacity and thereby decrease volumes on numerous roadways in Roseville and Western Placer County but would increase traffic on portions of SR 70/99 in Sutter County. The widening of Watt Avenue in Placer County would increase traffic volumes on Watt Avenue in Sacramento County. (DEIR, pp. 6.12-118 to 6.12-119.)