

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

4.11.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes public services provided in the City of Roseville (City), including law enforcement, fire protection, schools, libraries, and parks and recreation. This section also identifies the anticipated demand for these services resulting from the proposed Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP or Proposed Project), and describes the potential adverse impacts of the Proposed Project on fire services, schools, libraries, and parks and recreation. It should be noted that impacts on these public services due to the Proposed Project would not be considered significant environmental effects unless the Proposed Project involves construction of new facilities or otherwise results in the need to construct new facilities, the construction of which would have a physical impact on the environment, or causes a substantial physical deterioration of a park or recreational facility.

Primary sources reviewed during preparation of this section include:

- *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*, as amended June 2015 (City of Roseville, 2015a)
- *Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan*, February 2016 (City of Roseville, 2016); Included as **Appendix A**.
- *Creekview Specific Plan Final EIR*, April 2011 (City of Roseville, 2011a)

These sources and other documents listed as references throughout this section are available for review during normal business hours at:

City of Roseville Permit Center
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

4.11.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Public services are currently provided to the project site by Placer County (County), special districts, other providers, and state agencies, as noted in **Table 4.11-1**.

TABLE 4.11-1
EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICE PROVIDERS

Service	Provider
Fire Protection	Placer County Fire under contract with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)
Law Enforcement	Placer County Sheriff and California Highway Patrol
Schools	Roseville City School District and Roseville Joint Union High School District
Library	Auburn Placer County Library District

As explained below, following annexation to the City of Roseville (City), all of the services listed in **Table 4.11-1** would be provided by the City, with the exception of schools. The County provides other public services that would continue to be provided such as social health services and the courts.

4.11.2.1 Placer County Mosquito Control District

The Placer County Mosquito Control District was established in 1996, and in spring 2000, Measure M was passed to provide funding for implementation of mosquito control in western Placer County. Currently, the City provides mosquito abatement services to residents. The Placer County Animal Control responds to complaints associated with other wildlife creating a nuisance or presenting a danger within the County.

4.11.3 LAW ENFORCEMENT

No comments were received from the public in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) regarding law enforcement. The NOP and NOP comments can be found in **Appendix C**.

4.11.3.1 Law Enforcement Environmental Setting

The Placer County Sheriff's Department (Sheriff's Department) is responsible for providing law enforcement services to the unincorporated areas immediately adjacent to the City, including the ARSP and Urban Reserve Area. The project site is served by the South Placer Sheriff's substation. The Sheriff's Department also acts as the County coroner and serves legal papers in all areas of the County. An inter-agency coordination program between the Roseville Police Department (RPD) and the Sheriff's Department exists. In addition, the RPD has inter-agency agreements with the Cities of Rocklin and Lincoln to provide 911 and dispatching services in the event of an evacuation or system failure.

The RPD is authorized to have a force of 127 sworn officers and 67.5 non-sworn employees headquartered at 1051 Junction Boulevard, approximately seven miles from the southern boundary of the project site (Smithson, 2015). Sworn officers are responsible for emergency and law enforcement related activities. Non-sworn employees are responsible for other duties including: animal control, dispatch, record maintenance, jail management, and administrative tasks. Funding for law enforcement services comes from the City's General Fund.

The RPD has divided the City into four major patrol beats, east and west of I-80, that are further divided into reporting districts or neighborhood areas. In addition to routine patrol, traffic enforcement, and responding to calls for service, the RPD assigns a beat officer to neighborhood areas on a long-term basis. Each beat officer monitors his or her assigned area for recurring crime, helps organize neighborhood groups, attends community meetings, and works with residents and businesses to solve problems.

The RPD's Community Services Unit is responsible for community-based crime prevention and public education. The Unit administers Neighborhood Watch programs and community relations events. It acts as a liaison between the RPD and the Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (RCONA). Each homeowners' association under RCONA is assigned at least one beat officer. The Youth Services Division assigns police officers to every public elementary, intermediate, and high school in the City.

The City has not adopted a police-to-population ratio, but strives to keep a ratio above 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents. With 127 sworn officers, the RPD is currently consistent with its desired police-to-

population ratio. The RPD also has not adopted a formal response time standard, but the current response time is approximately three to five minutes or less for an emergency call.

4.11.3.2 Law Enforcement Regulatory Setting

Federal and State

There are no specific federal or State regulations pertaining to law enforcement applicable to the ARSP.

Local

City of Roseville

The City of Roseville General Plan, safety element includes goals and policies for police services.

Safety Element – Police Services Goals

Goal Maintain a professional law enforcement agency that proactively prevents crime; controls crime that the community cannot prevent; and reduces fear and enhances the security of the community.

Safety Element – Police Services Policies

Policy 1 Provide a high level of visible patrol services within the City.

Policy 2 Respond to both emergency and routine calls for service in a timely manner consistent with department.

Policy 8 Work with other city departments to review public and private development plans, ensuring that crime prevention is addressed.

The ARSP will be required to comply with RPD recommendations regarding safety and security, including design features for well-lit visible paseos and emergency access.

4.11.3.3 Law Enforcement Impacts

Method of Analysis

Although there is not a City adopted police-to-population ratio, for purposes of this analysis, a ratio of 1.2 officers is used as a threshold to determine adequate service based on department policy. In addition, this analysis assumes maintenance of the current response time, of approximately three to five minutes or less for an emergency call.

Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a significant impact would occur if development proposed in the ARSP would:

- Create an increased demand for police protection services that would require the construction of new facilities, or the physical alteration of existing facilities, that could result in a substantial adverse physical impact on the environment.

Impacts

IMPACT 4.11-1	INCREASE DEMAND FOR POLICE PROTECTION SERVICES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Safety Element (Police Services)
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

Roseville Police Department

The increased residential population resulting from the proposed ARSP would create additional demand for police services. The ARSP would create additional residential areas within the City's western patrol beat. The ARSP would contribute a total of 7,379 new residents to the area. Based on a desired ratio of 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents, approximately 9 new officers would be required. More administrative staff would be needed to support the additional police force. Expansion of the Police Headquarters would likely not be needed for the additional police staff and is not proposed as part of the ARSP. Police provide service to geographic areas of the City, based on beat areas.

A satellite facility would not be warranted by the proposed ARSP. Revenues generated by sales tax and property taxes associated with development of the ARSP would increase the City's General Fund, a portion of which could pay for the additional law enforcement personnel needed to serve the Proposed Project. Because no expansion of the Police Headquarters or other physical impacts of the Proposed Project would result due to increased police services, this is considered a **less-than-significant** impact.

California Highway Patrol (CHP)

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) based out of the Auburn area handles enforcement of traffic investigations, traffic control, and other related traffic incidents within Placer County. Once annexed to the City, the project site would be located entirely within the City. The City would provide adequate police services to patrol the project site, including traffic investigations and traffic control. State services are funded in part by property taxes. Development of the ARSP would increase property taxes paid to the State of California that could go toward CHP staffing levels.

For all of these reasons, and because the Proposed Project would not require the construction or expansion of any CHP facilities that may have a significant effect on the environment, the impact on the CHP is considered **less than significant** for the ARSP.

Cumulative impacts associated with the ARSP on state highway systems are addressed in **Section 4.3, Transportation and Circulation**, of this EIR.

IMPACT 4.11-2	CUMULATIVE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR POLICE PROTECTION SERVICES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Safety Element (Police Services)
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

Buildout of the City in combination with other development in south Placer County would increase the demand for police protection services in the vicinity. However, this is considered a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact. Development would be consistent with the City's level of service policies and with inter-agency agreements with neighboring jurisdictions. ARSP's contribution to cumulative impacts would be **less than significant**.

4.11.4 FIRE PROTECTION

No comments were received from the public in response to the NOP regarding fire protection. The NOP and NOP comments can be found in **Appendix C**.

4.11.4.1 Fire Protection Environmental Setting

The Roseville Fire Department (RFD) provides fire protection, fire suppression, emergency medical services, and hazardous materials management within the City. The RFD operates eight fire stations within the City, with an additional station proposed within the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area. The RFD employs approximately 100 staff members for fire operations, 7 fire and life safety personnel, 1 fire training professional, and 7 administrative support personnel (RFD, 2015).

The existing and planned fire stations and facilities are listed below (RFD, 2015); the closest existing fire station is Station No. 9 in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area.

- Station No. 1 at 401 Oak Street
- Station No. 2 at 1398 Junction Boulevard
- Station No. 3 at 1300 Cirby Way
- Station No. 4 at 1900 Eureka Road
- Station No. 5 at 1565 Pleasant Grove Boulevard
- Station No. 6 1430 E. Roseville Parkway
- Station No. 7 911 Highland Pointe Drive
- Station No. 9 2451 Hayden Parkway
- Fire Training Center 2030 Hilltop Circle

For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the ARSP fire station would be constructed to serve the Proposed Project, and would provide first response within the project site. Interim and secondary response would be provided by Station No. 9 in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area.

The RFD has a mutual aid agreement with Placer County/California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) and the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District. The RFD also has an automatic aid agreement with the South Placer Fire District, the Rocklin Fire Department, and the Sacramento Fire Metropolitan Fire District.

In order to assess demand for fire service, the RFD uses a risk assessment model that uses existing fire stations and the number of engine/truck companies as the primary criteria in determining the need for a new fire station or additional staff. Large infill development can, for example, be adequately served by an existing proximate station, while a remote smaller development could require a new facility. To maintain adequate fire protection, the RFD uses three different service standards documented in the City's General Plan: 1) respond to all emergencies within four minutes, 80 percent of the time; 2) maintain an International Organization for Standardization Insurance Service Office (ISO) rating of 3; and 3) deliver 500 gallons per minute (gpm) of water to a fire scene within 10 minutes. The emergencies are not broken down by type, such as fire response, basic life support or advanced life support. The RFD strives to respond within four minutes in all cases. In addition, the RFD provides self-audits of services and programs to reaffirm station locations, equipment, and staffing placement.

4.11.4.2 Fire Protection Regulatory Setting

Federal and State

There are no specific federal or state regulations pertaining to fire protection associated with the ARSP.

Local

City of Roseville

The City of Roseville General Plan, Safety Element includes goals and polices for fire protection services.

Safety Element – Fire Protection Goals

- Goal 1** Protect against the loss of life, property, and the environment by appropriate prevention, education, and suppression measures.
- Goal 2** Provide emergency services in a well-planned, cost-effective, and professional manner through the best utilization of equipment, facilities, and training available.

Safety Element – Fire Protection Policies

- Policy 2** Strive to achieve the following services levels in urban areas:
- Four minute response time for all emergency calls
 - ISO rating of 3 or better
 - 500 gallons of water per minute within 10 minutes of alarm

- Policy 3** Monitor Fire Department service levels annually, concurrent with the City budget process and via quarterly reports.
- Policy 6** Phase the timing of the construction of fire stations to be available to serve the surrounding service area.
- Policy 8** Provide a comprehensive emergency medical services program to provide Advance Life Support services and ensure reliable ambulance transport services to aid citizens in need of rescue or medical assistance.

Through December 31, 2009, the RFD had received a portion of its budget from the City's General Fund. In 1984, to compensate for City growth, the Fire Facilities Tax was approved. The tax expired in December 2009. In fiscal year 2008-2009, for example, the RFD received approximately \$450,000 from the Fire Facilities Tax for capital improvements, such as fire stations and fire equipment. None of these funds were allocated for operating expenses, such as salaries or training. Without the Fire Facilities Tax, additional funding from development fees or user fees will be needed to be secured to fund capital improvements and the construction of new stations. As described in **Section 2.7.9**, an approximately three-acre fire station site is proposed in the southeast portion of the project site and the project proposes to pay a fire construction equivalent fee (also known as Fire Service Construction Tax) to fund capital improvements.

4.11.4.3 Fire Protection Impacts

Method of Analysis

The RFD does not have an adopted ratio of fire protection personnel to resident population. Instead, the impact analysis is based on the ability of the RFD to respond to all emergencies within four minutes, 80 percent of the time; maintain an ISO rating of 3; and deliver 500 gallons of water per minute to a fire scene within 10-minutes.

Thresholds of Significance

For purposes of this EIR, a significant impact would occur if development proposed in the ARSP could:

- Create an increased demand for fire protection that would substantially interfere with the ability of the fire department to provide adequate response time to the project site or require the construction of new facilities, or the physical alteration of existing facilities, which could result in substantial adverse environmental impacts.
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

Impacts

IMPACT 4.11-3	INCREASED DEMAND FOR FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES, AND EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES TO A SIGNIFICANT RISK OF LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING WILDLAND FIRES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Safety Element Fire Service goals and policies
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

As part of the Proposed Project, annexation of the project site to the City will result in a shift of service boundaries for fire protection from the County/CAL FIRE to the RFD. The CAL FIRE Protection District would no longer be responsible for service. At buildout, 2,827 residential units would be built in the project site (not including commercial developments). These residences, as well as commercial and public uses, would require fire protection services. The Amoruso Ranch Development Agreements will require the project applicant to fund additional fire protection resources to serve the Proposed Project. Staff funding could come from developer fees, other user fees, the General Fund, or from an agreement between the City and the ARSP applicant whereby a percentage of the funds necessary to increase staff to serve the ARSP would come from the Proposed Project.

The open space preserve areas would include large open grassland areas that could be subject to wildland fires. The open space transition area between the open space preserve and proposed development would include fire breaks between the open space and residential communities. The RFD would maintain a fire management plan that includes maintenance of firebreaks and periodic fuel reduction (mowing, grazing, and other measures), subject to the management standards included in the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 permit.

The maintenance measures would ensure that impacts associated with wildland fires would be minimal. Firebreaks are intended to minimize the spread of fires. The lack of combustible fence materials would also minimize the risk of fire by reducing the amount of potential fire fuel. The RFD's fire management plan would ensure that there is adequate access to the site, and that there is adequate fire staff to serve the project site in the event of a wildland fire.

Fire Station No.9 on Hayden Parkway would provide emergency response until the construction of the proposed fire station on the designated three-acre site in the southeast portion of the project site. Once constructed, the proposed station will provide first response within the project site and stations located outside the project site will provide secondary response. Timing of construction and staffing of the station will be consistent with the RFD's Standards of Response Coverage Study. Potential environmental effects that could occur as result of construction and operation of the on-site fire station are addressed in

this EIR, including **Section 4.4, Air Quality; Section 4.8, Vegetation and Wildlife; Section 4.9, Cultural and Paleontological Resources;** and **Section 5.0, CEQA Considerations.**

It is expected that phasing would ensure that the Proposed Project will not create traffic congestion during construction or operation that would substantially impede response times on City streets. For all of these reasons, the impact on fire protection services from the ARSP would be considered **less than significant**.

IMPACT 4.11-4	CUMULATIVE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES AND EMERGENCY ACCESS
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Safety Element Fire Service goals and policies
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

Buildout of the City in combination with other development in south Placer County would increase the demand for fire services in the vicinity. However, this is considered a **less-than-significant** cumulative impact. Development would be consistent with the City's level of service policies and with mutual aid agreements with neighboring jurisdictions. ARSP's contribution to cumulative impacts would be **less than significant**.

4.11.5 SCHOOLS

No comments were received from the public in response to the NOP regarding schools. The NOP and NOP comments can be found in **Appendix C**.

4.11.5.1 Schools Environmental Setting

Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD)

The Roseville Joint Union High School District (RJUHSD) serves 9th through 12th grades and receives students from three main elementary school districts: Roseville City School District (RCSD), the Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District (DCJESD), and the Eureka School District (ESD). The RJUHSD boundaries overlap numerous jurisdictions, including the City, the County, and Sacramento County. The RJUHSD currently operates a total of eight schools: Adelante High School, Antelope High School, Granite Bay High School, Independence High School, Oakmont High School, Roseville High School, and Woodcreek High School in addition to the Roseville Adult School. The enrollment in the RJUHSD for the

2013-2014 school year was 10,273¹, excluding the Roseville Adult School as outlined in the **Table 4.11-2** below.

TABLE 4.11-2
ROSEVILLE JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL
CAPACITIES AND ENROLLMENT – 2013 - 2014

School	Maximum Capacity	2013 – 2014 Enrollment ¹	Percent of Capacity
Adelante	N/A	136	N/A
Antelope	2,300	1830	79
Granite Bay	2,300	2108	91
Independence	N/A	176	N/A
Oakmont	2,300	1799	78
Roseville	2,300	1955	85
Woodcreek	2,300	2225	96

Notes: N/A = Not Available or Applicable
Source: 1 - Roseville Joint Union High School District, 2014 Adopted Budget 2014-2015

The RJUHSD Board of Trustees adopted the District Facilities Master Plan in 2004. Over a ten-year period, the plan calls for the construction of two comprehensive high schools to be added into the RJUHSD. Since adoption of the plan, Antelope High School has been completed. A 53-acre site is available in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area for an additional 2,300-student high school when funding becomes available.

Roseville City School District

The RCSD provides both elementary and intermediate school facilities for portions of the City. The enrollment and existing capacity of each school is shown in **Table 4.11-3**. In general, as shown in **Table 4.11-3** below, most of the schools in the City have enough capacity to accommodate additional students.

4.11.5.2 Schools Regulatory Setting

State

Proposition 1A/Senate Bill (SB) 50

Prop 1A/Senate Bill (SB) 50 has resulted in State preemption of school mitigation. Satisfaction of the statutory requirements by a developer is deemed to be “full and complete mitigation.” According to Government Code section 65996, except for development fees authorized by Education Code section 17620 or pursuant to provisions for interim facilities appearing at Government Code section 65970 through 65981, no “fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement” shall be “levied or imposed in connection with, or made a condition of, a legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property or a change in governmental organization or reorganization” (Gov. Code, § 65995, subd. [a]). These development fees authorized by SB 50 are “deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation” (Gov. Code, § 65996, subd. [b]). The

¹ Includes special programs not included in **Table 4.11-2**. See Page 17, Roseville Joint Union High School District, 2014 - Adopted Budget 2014-2015

law does identify, however, certain circumstances under which the statutory fee can be exceeded. As described below, these increases require preparation and adoption of a “needs analysis,” eligibility for state funding, and other provisions.

TABLE 4.11-3
ROSEVILLE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL CAPACITY 2014-2015

School	Maximum Capacity	Enrollment ¹	Approximate Percent of Capacity
Blue Oaks Elementary	575	639	111
Brown Elementary	600	468	78
Cirby Elementary	800	398	50
Crestmont Elementary	575	435	76
Diamond Creek Elementary	600	659	110
Jefferson Elementary	N/A	597	N/A
Junction Elementary	N/A	735	N/A
Kaseberg Elementary	675	441	65
Sargeant Elementary	600	489	82
Sierra Gardens Elementary	625	321	51
Spanger Elementary	625	456	73
Gates Elementary	600	551	92
Woodbridge Elementary	625	250	40
Stoneridge Elementary	400	473	118
Cooley Middle School	999	962	96
Buljan Middle School	891	1135	127
Barbara Chilton Middle	N/A	338	N/A
Eich Intermediate School	810	728	90
N/A = Not Available Source: 1 - Roseville City School District, 2015a, Dynamic 2014-15 Reports as of February 20, 2015			

SB 50 establishes three levels of development fees that may be levied upon new construction. Level 1 fees are the maximum amount of fees that can be imposed on new development as set by the State Allocation Board. A school district imposing the development impact fees must show “that a valid method was used for arriving at the fee in question, ‘one which established a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden imposed by the development’” (*Shapell Industries, Inc. v. Governing Bd.* [1991] 1 Cal.App.4th 218, 235). Level 1 fees are intended to be increased every two years at the January meeting of the State Allocation Board, at which time the increase will become effective (Gov. Code, § 65995, subd. [b](3)). The State Allocation Board last increased development fees on January 22, 2014 to \$3.36 per square foot for residential development and \$0.54 per square foot for commercial and industrial development (SAB, 2014).

In general, Level 2 and Level 3 fees apply to new residential construction only. Level 2 fees allow the school district levying the fees to increase development fees beyond the statutory levels to no more than 50 percent of construction costs, under certain circumstances stated in Government Code Section 65995.5 (b)(3). This assumes that State funds will cover the remaining 50 percent. Level 3 fees allow

the school district to impose 100 percent of the cost of the school facility or mitigation when State funds for new school facility construction have been exhausted after 2006 (Gov. Code, § 65995.7.). Both Level 2 and Level 3 funds only may be levied if the school districts have conducted and adopted a school facility needs analysis.

All fees are levied at the time the building permit is issued. District certification of payment of the applicable fee is required before the City or County can issue a building permit.

Class Size Reduction Program

The Class Size Reduction program, which was established by the state in 1996, is intended to improve education, especially in reading and mathematics, of children in kindergarten through third grade. There are financial penalties for schools that exceed classroom sizes greater than 20. It should be noted that it is within the school district's discretion whether it will opt into the program and receive the associated funding, and thus the program is not a requirement.

Department of Education Standards

The California Department of Education has published the Guide to School Site Analysis and Development in order to establish a valid technique for determining acreage for new school development. Rather than assigning a strict student/acreage ratio, this guide provides flexible formulas that permit each district to tailor its answers as necessary to accommodate its individual conditions. The Department of Education then recommends that a site utilization study be prepared for the site, based on these formulas.

Safe Routes to Schools

Safe Routes to School is an international movement that has taken hold in communities throughout the United States. The concept is to increase the number of children who walk or bicycle to school by funding projects that remove the barriers that currently prevent students from doing so. Barriers include lack of infrastructure, unsafe infrastructure, lack of programs that promote walking and bicycling.

Education/encouragement programs are aimed at children, parents, and the community. The State adopted a funding program through Streets and Highways Code Sections 2330-2334 to implement a competitive "Safe Routes to School" grant program, administered by Caltrans and the CHP, which allows local governments to compete for funding for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety projects that will allow more children to walk or bike to school safely (Streets and Highways Code Section 2333.5). Assembly Bill (AB) 57 extended the program indefinitely.

Local

City of Roseville

The City of Roseville General Plan, Public Facilities Element includes goals and policies for schools.

Public Facilities Element – Schools Goals

- Goal 1** The provision of adequate school facilities is a community priority. The school districts and the City will work closely together to obtain adequate funding for new school facilities. If necessary, and where legally feasible, new development may be required to contribute, on the basis of need generated, 100 percent of the cost for new facilities.
- Goal 2** The City and the school districts enjoy a mutually beneficial arrangement in the joint-use of school and public facilities. Joint-use facilities shall be encouraged in all cases unless there are overriding circumstances that make it impossible or detrimental to either the school district or the City's park and recreation facilities/programs.
- Goal 3** School facilities shall be available for use in a timely manner.
- Goal 4** The City will work with all school districts within the region to provide educational opportunities for all students.

Public Facilities Element – Schools Policies

- Policy 2** Adequate facilities must be shown to be available in a timely manner before approval will be granted to new residential development.
- Policy 3** Financing for new school facilities will be identified and secured before new development is approved.
- Policy 5** The City and school districts will work together to develop criteria for the designation of school sites and consider the opportunities for reducing the cost of land for school facilities. The City shall encourage the school districts to comply with City standards in the design and landscaping of school facilities.
- Policy 6** The City and school districts will prepare a joint-use study for each school facility to determine the feasibility of joint-use facilities. If determined to be feasible, a joint-use agreement will be pursued to maximize public use of facilities, minimize duplication of services provided, and facilitate shared financial and operational responsibilities.
- Policy 7** Designate public/quasi-public land uses in clusters so that the use of schools, parks, open space, libraries, child care, and community activity and service centers create a community or activity focus.
- Policy 8** Schools, where feasible, shall be located away from hazards or sensitive resource conservation areas, except where the proximity of resources may be of educational value and the protection of the resource reasonably assured.

School Facilities Funding and Fees

To ensure adequate funding for new school facilities the City Council adopted Ordinance 2434 (School Facilities Mitigation Plan) in February 1991. This ordinance encourages the payment of fees,

participation in a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD), and school facility mitigation plans for new development proposed within over-crowded districts. With the enactment of SB 50, Ordinance 2434 cannot be made mandatory, but can be negotiated as part of the development agreement process. With voluntary participation by the applicants, however, the funding sources encouraged by Ordinance 2434 may be greater than the state-mandated fees. These mitigation fees vary depending upon the school district. If the applicant chooses to submit a mitigation plan, the plan must explain how the project developer would participate in financing additional interim and permanent school facilities needed to serve the applicant's residential development project. The mitigation plan would be reviewed by the school district(s) in which the Proposed Project is situated. The district(s) may approve, disapprove, or modify the mitigation plan based upon the funding and facilities needs identified in the construction schedule or plan by each district.

4.11.5.3 School Impacts

Method of Analysis

The estimated demand for school services due to the Proposed Project is based on the additional number of students generated by development of residential uses in the project site. The student generation rates for RJUHSD and the RCSD are provided in **Table 4.11-4**. To quantify the total number of students, the residential development identified in the ARSP was multiplied by the applicable student generation rates.

TABLE 4.11-4
STUDENT GENERATION

Roseville City School District						
Grades	Single Family	Multi-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Students Generated ¹	School Capacity	Schools Required
Grades K-5	0.3329	0.22	0.1118	676	600	1.13
Grades 6-8	0.1164	0.0776	0.0352	233	1000	0.23
Roseville Joint Union High School District						
Grades	LDR/MDR	HDR	Students Generated ²	School Capacity	Schools Required	
Grades 9-12	0.161	0.036	280	1800	0.16	
1 - Assumes 1,423 Single Family units (< 8 dwelling units/acre), 422 Multi-Family Detached units (> 8 dwelling units/acre), and 982 Multi-Family Attached units (> 8 dwelling units/acre) 2 - Assumes 1,845 LDR/MDR units and 982 HDR units. Source: Roseville City School District, 2015b; Roseville Joint Union High School District, 2004.						

Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, a significant impact would occur if development proposed in the project would:

- Create an increased demand for schools that would exceed existing school capacity or require the construction of new facilities or the physical alteration of existing facilities, which could result in substantial adverse environmental impacts.

Impacts

IMPACT 4.11-5	INCREASED DEMAND FOR SCHOOL SERVICES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Public Facilities Element, Roseville Ordinance 2434
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

At buildout, the ARSP would generate an estimated 233 middle school (6-8) students in the RCSD and 280 high school students in the RJUSD. The Proposed Project would also generate approximately 676 elementary school children; and as a result, would require construction of one elementary school. As described in **Section 2.7.10**, the proposed ARSP includes one 9.62-acre school site (AR-50) to accommodate the future demand for new elementary school that would be generated by residential development in this area. The location of the Elementary School site can be seen on **Figure 2-5**. It is anticipated the school will be an 800-student two-story urban school that supports the community character of an urban village. Facility planning and the sequencing of development of the school would be determined by the RCSD. Potential environmental effects that could occur as result of construction and operation of the on-site elementary school are addressed in this EIR, including **Section 4.4, Air Quality; Section 4.8, Vegetation and Wildlife; Section 4.9, Cultural and Paleontological Resources; and Section 5.0, CEQA Considerations**.

Middle school capacity is available at schools outside of the ARSP, such as Cooley Middle School or Chilton Middle school. Middle School students (grades 6-8) would attend school in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area. All high school students would attend high school outside the project site. High school students would attend either Oakmont or Roseville High Schools, or a future high school located to the south in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area. The high school district has adequate capacity to serve the high school student population.

Consistent with City policy, the project applicant has agreed to voluntarily enter into mutual benefit impact fee agreements with the school districts to fully mitigate school impacts in accordance with the ARSP Development Agreements and the funding agreements with the respective school districts. This is considered a **less-than-significant** impact.

IMPACT 4.11-6	CUMULATIVE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR SCHOOL SERVICES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Public Facilities Element, Roseville Ordinance 2434
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

Buildout of the City in combination with other development in south Placer County would increase the demand on the school districts serving the project site (RJUHSD and the RCSD). Existing and planned schools may not have capacity to serve all future development without the need for additional schools sites. This is a significant cumulative impact. School fees would be collected to fund construction of new schools, as required and allowed by State law. While a school site is dedicated in the ARSP that could serve some of the students generated by future development, it is likely that additional school capacity would be needed to serve elementary, middle, and high school students. ARSP's contribution to school impacts would be less than significant, for elementary school students generated by the Proposed Project, because the Proposed Project includes providing a site for an elementary school to serve the additional demand generated by the ARSP, as described above in Impact 4.11-5. ARSP's contribution would be considered potentially significant for middle and high school students.

New residential development would be required to pay school impact fees to the school districts to offset the capital costs of constructing new schools, which would ensure that the cumulative impacts are less than significant. The identification of school sites and the payment of applicable fees, consistent with State law and City and County policies would ensure that the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be reduced. This would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

4.11.6 LIBRARIES

No comments were received from the public in response to the NOP regarding law enforcement. The NOP and NOP comments can be found in **Appendix C**.

4.11.6.1 Libraries Environmental Setting

The City operates its own library system. According to the General Plan, the City views libraries as an essential public service and contributing factor to the community's quality of life.

The Downtown Roseville Library is located at 225 Taylor Street, approximately seven miles from the project site. The Downtown Library is approximately 30,000 square feet. The Maidu Library is located approximately eight miles away from the project site at Maidu Regional Park, located in southeast Roseville. The Martha Riley Community Library is located approximately four miles from the project site at 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard and is the closest library to the project site. The Riley Library is

approximately 14,000 square feet in size. It is located in Mahany Park at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard. It is housed in the same 32,500 square foot building as the Utility Exploration Center, which provides education supporting sustainability, and the Roseville Community Television Studio.

The City libraries serve populations from the City as well as the surrounding counties of Placer, Sacramento, and Sutter.

4.11.6.2 Libraries Regulatory Setting

Federal and State

There are no specific federal or state regulations pertaining to the provision of libraries.

Local

City of Roseville

The City of Roseville General Plan, Public Facilities Element includes goals and policies for libraries.

Public Facilities Element – Public Library System Goals

Goal 1 Recognize library services as a vital public service that contributes to the community's quality of life.

Goal 2 Provide services and locate library facilities to adequately serve all City residents.

Public Facilities Element – Public Library System Policies

Policy 4 Provide branch libraries to service population increments of + 40,000.

Placer County

The County currently collects a public facilities fee which helps to fund library facilities. This fee is not collected in the City.

4.11.6.3 Libraries Impacts

Method of Analysis

The demand for library services needed to serve the increased City resident population resulting from development of the project site is estimated based on the General Plan guidelines for libraries. This impact analysis includes the calculation of additional library building area to serve the anticipated demand. As stated above, the General Plan policy calls for one branch library for every 40,000 residents. The size of library branches is typically approximately 10,300 square feet per building.

Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, a significant impact would occur if development proposed in the project would:

- Create an increased demand for library services that would exceed the current or planned level of library services so that new or expanded facilities would be required which could result in substantial adverse environmental impacts.

Impacts

IMPACT 4.11-7	INCREASED DEMAND ON LIBRARY SERVICES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Public Facilities Element
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measure	None Required
Significance After Mitigation	Less than Significant

Development within the project site would add approximately 7,379 residents to the City, which is fewer residents than is warranted for a new branch library (more than 40,000). Development of the ARSP would contribute to the General Fund that finances libraries, such as the Riley Library at Mahany Park, which is approximately four miles to the project site. Adequate capacity is available at this library to serve the entire new population in the project site. The project site would be adequately served by existing libraries. Therefore, there would be no physical impact on the environment as a result of the ARSP due to the need for new or expanded library facilities, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

IMPACT 4.11-8	CUMULATIVE INCREASE IN DEMAND ON LIBRARY SERVICES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Public Facilities Element
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measure	None Required
Significance After Mitigation	Less than Significant

Development within the City and the region would result in growth that would place additional demand on existing library facilities. This could result in a potentially significant impact in other areas of the City and region by potentially requiring the construction of additional branch libraries or expansion of existing library facilities. However, with the payment of fees and the implementation of the General Plan policies, the ARSP contribution to cumulative demand for library facilities would not be cumulatively considerable and would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

4.11.7 PARKS AND RECREATION

No comments were received from the public in response to the NOP regarding parks and recreation. The NOP and NOP comments can be found in **Appendix C**.

4.11.7.1 Parks and Recreation Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project has relatively easy access to the Sierra Nevada mountain range, the Central Valley, and the Pacific Coast. Locally, recreational opportunities are commonly associated with lakes and community programs and facilities. The following discussion focuses on the existing parks and recreational facilities provided by the City of Roseville.

Park Types

The City has defined parklands to include developed parks, recreational open space, and joint-use park-school facilities, as shown in **Table 4.11-5** below. Parklands are further divided to distinguish between active and passive (open space) parks.

TABLE 4.11-5
2012 PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Use	Acres
Developed Parks	1,042.38
Golf Courses	678
Open Space/Park Preserves	4,429.8
Undeveloped Park	473.61
Roadway Landscape Areas ¹	263
Greenway/Paseos ²	59.67

1 - Roadway landscape areas consist of landscape corridors and medians only. This figure is comprised of existing Landscape and Lighting District maintained areas plus an estimate for the WRSP, SVSP/Westbrook and Creekview based on similar population from other plan areas.
 2 - Greenways/Paseos consist of paseos in the WRSP, SVSP/Westbrook and Creekview areas as well as the one existing greenway along the Sunrise Corridor.
 Source: City of Roseville, 2015a.

Traditional Parks

Traditional parklands typically provide a variety of active facilities, such as ball fields, multi-use turf areas, hard court areas and picnic areas. These types of parks can be classified into Neighborhood, Neighborhood/School; and Community/Citywide (regional).

Non-Traditional Parks and Other Recreation Facilities

In addition to traditional parks, the City also provides non-traditional, park/open space areas such as vernal pool preserves, oak woodlands, watershed/riparian areas, and greenbelts. These areas are often used for passive recreation and visual and aesthetic enjoyment. Open space areas also commonly include pathways for walking, jogging, or bike riding.

There are several golf courses within the City. The City operates Diamond Oaks Golf Course, in the north central portion of the City and Woodcreek Oaks Golf Club in the Northwest Roseville Specific Plan Area. Other private courses in the vicinity of the project site are Sierra Pines, Timber Creek, Sun City, and the Sierra View Country Club.

The City operates three swimming pools: Johnson Pool, the Roseville Aquatics Complex, and the Mike Shellito Indoor Pool at 10210 Fairway Drive, in Central Park. The Mike Shellito Indoor Pool provides opportunity for year-round swimming.

The Parks and Recreation and Alternative Transportation Departments together manage the pedestrian and bicycle pathways throughout the City (e.g., Miners Ravine, Dry Creek, and Linda Creek).

4.11.7.2 Parks and Recreation Regulatory Setting

Federal

There are no specific federal regulations pertaining to the provision of local parks and recreation facilities.

State

The Quimby Act (Act; California Government Code Section 66477) permits local jurisdictions to require the dedication of land or the payment of fees in-lieu of land for parks and recreational purposes as a condition for approval of a new development's tentative or parcel map. The Act sets the requirement at three to five-acres per 1,000 residents, based on the existing park-to-population ratio of the surrounding community.

Local

City of Roseville

The City of Roseville Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Master Plan includes baseline data, policies, and recommendations for the day-to-day tasks of the Department, as well as standards for planning future park and recreation facilities.

The City of Roseville General Plan, Parks and Recreation Element contains policies and goals related to the provision of parks.

Parks and Recreation Element – Parks and Recreation Goals

- Goal 1** Provide adequate park land, recreational facilities and programs within the City of Roseville through public and private resources.
- Goal 2** Provide residents with both active and passive recreation opportunities by maximizing the use of dedicated park lands and open space areas.

Parks and Recreation Element – Parks and Recreation Policies

- Policy 1** The City shall ensure the provision of nine acres of park land per 1,000 residents, except in certain instances in the Riverside and Downtown Specific Plan Areas.

- Policy 2** Retain flexibility in applying parks standards, in terms of size, facilities, and service areas so that existing and future needs can be met.
- Policy 3** Consider allocating park credits for lands that provide active and passive recreational value.
- Policy 5** Cooperate with other jurisdictions to provide regional recreation facilities where appropriate.
- Policy 6** Take into consideration energy efficiency and water conservation, including the use of treated wastewater in park development and design.
- Policy 12** Ensure that new public parks and recreation facilities, open space, paseos, landscape areas and greenways provide adequate funding for initial development, as well as ongoing maintenance and operation.

As noted above, the City General Plan establishes a park acreage standard of nine acres per 1,000 residents; which exceeds the state standards. The requirement is broken down into three acres of neighborhood park land, three acres of citywide park land, and three acres of open space per 1,000 residents. The City currently has approximately 12 acres of parks per 1,000 residents, which exceeds the City's standards (City of Roseville, 2015a).

Park acreage credit can typically be obtained for property with a public recreational value; however, properties with less active recreational value typically receive less credit. A traditional "active" park is normally granted a 1:1 park acreage credit, while non-traditional "passive" parks are granted partial park acreage credits ranging from 5:1 and 10:1 (open space acreage such as wetlands, greenbelts, and woodlands fall into this category) towards the provision of park land.

Park Facility Funding

Parks and recreation facilities are funded through a variety of mechanisms which vary depending on the location of the facility. The Neighborhood Park Fee is required by Roseville Municipal Code, Chapter 4.37, and varies in amount depending on the neighborhood (and corresponding population) in which the park is located. This fee increases annually (each July 1st) based on the inflation rate for construction costs from the previous year. It is collected from all new residential units, although park fee credits may apply. Based on neighborhoods, this fee is intended to provide sufficient funds to develop neighborhood parks within a specific plan area.

The Citywide Park Fee was established in 1989 by the Roseville Municipal Code, Chapter 4.38. This fee is collected from all new residential dwelling units within the City limits and is adjusted each July 1st based on the inflation rate for construction costs from the previous year. The Citywide Park Fee is allocated for large-scale active recreation facilities intended to serve the entire City, typically located within identified citywide parks.

Park Fee Credits have been allowed in the past for example when neighborhood parks improvements have been completed by developers on behalf of the City in advance of normal park development. The

park fee credits vary by specific plan. However, park fee credits are not automatic, and the ARSP fees will be based on the plan's park program and credits may or may not apply.

4.11.7.3 Parks and Recreation Impacts

Method of Analysis

The amount and type of park acreage included in the Proposed Project was compared to the standards established in the Parks Visions 2010 Master Plan. The following factors have been applied to determine the park acreage required by the Proposed Project:

- Three acres of Neighborhood/Neighborhood School Park land per 1,000 residents
- Three acres of Community/Citywide Park land per 1,000 residents
- Three acres Open Space/Passive land per 1,000 residents

Thresholds of Significance

For purposes of this EIR, a significant impact would occur if development proposed in the project would:

- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreation facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- Include recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities the construction or expansion of which would have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Impacts

IMPACT 4.11-9	INCREASED DEMAND FOR PARK OR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Parks and Recreation Element, Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.36, 4.37, and 4.38.
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

The ARSP would result in a population increase of approximately 7,379 residents based on an average household size of 2.61. With this estimated population increase, the City's General Plan standard of nine acres of parkland per 1,000 residents requires a total of 66.41 credited acres of parkland in the project site. This standard would result in a dedication requirement of 22.14 acres each of Community/Citywide, Neighborhood/Neighborhood School, and Open Space parkland. The proposed ARSP includes approximately 22.14 acres of neighborhood park uses and approximately 137.57 acres of total open space (general and preserve). This results in a short-fall of approximately 22.14 acres of citywide parkland.

The parkland dedication shortfall is proposed to be made up by the City’s two park in-lieu fees pursuant to General Plan policy. The actual in-lieu shortfall fee (land and development) will be determined based on actual land cost estimates. These in-lieu fees will be used to construct the proposed city-wide parks. Parks and recreation facilities in the City are funded through a variety of mechanisms.

The Neighborhood and City Wide Park Fees would be collected from all residential units. The Proposed Project developers would be required to dedicate the required parkland, to pay park development fees, and to pay any identified in-lieu fees. As outlined in the ARSP Development Agreements, CFDs for service will pay for ongoing maintenance of the ARSP parks. Further, existing park acreage per 1,000 residents exceeds the City’s General Plan standards. For these reasons, adequate park facilities would be provided, avoiding any adverse effects on existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreation facilities, and this impact is considered to be **less than significant**.

IMPACT 4.11-10	CUMULATIVE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR PARK FACILITIES
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan Parks and Recreation Element, Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.36, 4.37, and 4.38.
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures	None Required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than Significant

As Roseville and the surrounding communities continue to grow, there will continue to be a need to create parklands and open space. Development in the County would also create a demand for parks. Payment of the Neighborhood and Community Park Fee and the Citywide Park Fee would be collected from all residential units developed in the City. The ARSP would be required to dedicate land and to pay park development fees. With the payment of fees and the implementation of the General Plan policies, the ARSP contribution to cumulative demand for parks and recreation facilities would not be cumulatively considerable and would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

4.11.8 PUBLIC SERVICES MITIGATION MEASURES

4.11.8.1 Law Enforcement

No mitigation is required.

4.11.8.2 Fire Protection

No mitigation is required.

4.11.8.3 Schools

No mitigation is required.

4.11.8.4 Libraries

No mitigation is required.

4.11.8.5 Parks and Recreation

No mitigation is required.