

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

3.0.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an analysis of each resource topic that was identified through preliminary environmental analysis and the public scoping process as likely to be affected by the Proposed Action. Each section describes the environmental setting as it relates to that specific resource topic; the direct and indirect effects that could result from implementation of the Proposed Action or an alternative; and mitigation measures that would avoid, reduce, or compensate for substantial adverse effects of the Proposed Action or an alternative (cumulative effects are addressed in **Chapter 4.0, Cumulative Impacts**). The sections below summarize the approach to the impact analysis, including key assumptions and data used in the analysis, to assist the reader in better understanding the analyses contained in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS).

3.0.2 SCOPE OF THE EIS

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), this Draft EIS provides an evaluation of potential effects on the human environment, which includes an analysis of the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment (40 CFR 1508.14). Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1508.27) provide guidance as to the requirement to evaluate impacts in an EIS and identify the need to evaluate a Proposed Action's effects on the following: public health and safety; historical and cultural resources; parklands; prime farmlands; wetlands; wild and scenic rivers; ecologically critical areas; and endangered or threatened species or their habitat.

Based on the input received during the EIS scoping process, as described in **Chapter 1.0, Introduction**, this EIS addresses the following resource topics or categories of effects in detail:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Climate Change
- Cultural Resources
- Environmental Justice
- Geology, Soils, and Minerals
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Traffic and Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems

3.0.3 SECTION CONTENTS AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

Each resource topic considered in this chapter of the EIS is addressed under six primary subsections: **Introduction; Affected Environment; Regulatory Framework/Applicable Laws, Regulations, Plans and**

Policies; Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology; Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures; and Residual Significant Impacts. An overview of the information included in these subsections is provided below.

3.0.3.1 Introduction

The introduction subsection describes the analyzed topic and the contents of the analysis. It also provides the sources used to characterize the affected environment and evaluate the potential effects of the project.

3.0.3.2 Affected Environment

This subsection describes the existing conditions in the area of the Proposed Action and the alternatives for each resource topic. The subsection provides a description of the applicable physical setting of the project site and its surroundings (e.g., existing land uses, existing soil conditions, existing traffic conditions). The proposed Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) is expected to be built out over a period of 15 to 30 years depending on market conditions, with full project buildout in 2025 (or later). As such, the EIS presents future 2025 No SVSP conditions for certain resource topics such as traffic, to evaluate accurately the effects of the Proposed Action and its alternatives.

3.0.3.3 Regulatory Framework/Applicable Laws, Regulations, Plans, and Policies

This subsection presents relevant federal, state, and local laws, regulations, plans, and policies. Only those laws, regulations, and policies that are pertinent to the impact analysis are included.

3.0.3.4 Significance Thresholds and Analysis Methodology

Significance Thresholds

For each resource topic included in this subsection, the Draft EIS identifies significance criteria used by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to evaluate the significance of the effects. Although Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1508.27) provide guidance as to the requirement to evaluate impacts in an EIS, CEQ guidance generally does not specify the significance criteria to be used to evaluate the significance of the specific effects of the proposed action.

In evaluating the significance of a project's effects, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires a consideration of both context and intensity (40 CFR 1508.27). "Context" means that the significance must be analyzed in several contexts, such as the human environment, affected region, affected interests, and the local setting. "Intensity" refers to the severity of the impact. Impacts must be evaluated that may be both beneficial and adverse.

Analysis Methodology

This subsection summarizes the methodology used to evaluate direct and indirect effects. Impacts are evaluated quantitatively where possible and qualitatively where quantification is not feasible. Depending on the resource topic, some impacts are evaluated relative to No SVSP conditions that would exist if the permits were denied by the USACE, whereas others are evaluated relative to existing conditions.

3.0.3.5 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures

This subsection presents the environmental effects from the construction and operation of the Proposed Action or its alternatives. All impacts are numbered (for instance, Impact AES-1 refers to the first impact under **Aesthetics**) and shown in bold type. Mitigation measures are numbered to correspond to the impact. Impacts and mitigation measures are numbered consecutively within each topic.

The following terms, as defined below, are used in this Draft EIS to describe the types of effects that could result from the implementation of the Proposed Action or its alternatives.

- **Direct Effect.** An effect that is caused by the action and occurs at the same time and place.
- **Indirect Effect.** An effect that is caused by the action and occurs later in time or in a different location than the action, but is still reasonably foreseeable.
- **No Effect.** There would be no effect from implementation of the action.
- **Adverse Effect.** An effect that would negatively affect the environmental resource value or quality as it exists prior to the project. These effects are qualified as significant or less than significant impacts.
- **Residual Effect.** The remaining effect after feasible mitigation measures have been implemented to reduce a significant effect.
- **Cumulative Effect.** An effect resulting from the incremental impact of the action when added to the effects from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.
- **Beneficial Effect** – An effect resulting from the action that would result in improvement of the environmental resource value or quality as it exists prior to the project.

3.0.3.6 Residual Significant Impacts

This subsection discusses any potentially significant impacts that cannot be fully mitigated and would remain significant even after mitigation.

3.0.4 TOPICS WITH LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT OR NO IMPACTS FROM THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

Implementation of the Proposed Action or its alternatives would not result in any significant impacts to the following resources:

3.0.4.1 Parks and Recreation

Proposed Action Buildout of the Proposed Action would result in a population increase of approximately 16,891 residents based on an average household size of 2.54 persons in the City of Roseville. Based on this estimated population and the City's requirement for the provision of 9 acres (3.6 hectares) of parks per 1,000 residents, the Proposed Action would be required to provide a total of 152.1 acres (61.6 hectares) of parkland. Furthermore, the park acreage is required to be dedicated as at least 50.7 acres (20.5 hectares) each of Community/Citywide, Neighborhood/Neighborhood School, and Open Space parkland. The SVSP proposes approximately 332.6 acres (134.6 hectares) of

park uses, split into about 39.9 acres (16.1 hectares) for the Signature City-wide park, 50.0 acres (20.2 hectares) of Neighborhood parks, and approximately 242 acres (97.9 hectares) of open space, including paseos. This allocation results in a shortfall of approximately 10 acres (4 hectares) of City-wide parkland and 0.7 acre (0.3 hectares) for Neighborhood parks under the proposed plan. Pursuant to General Plan policy, the parkland dedication shortfall would be made up via payment of the City's park in-lieu fee. Because adequate parkland would be provided, there would be no effect related to parks and recreation.

No Action, Alts. 1, 2, 3 All of the on-site alternatives (No Action, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3) would have effects on parks and recreation that are very similar to those described above for the Proposed Action. Because adequate parkland would be provided, there would be no effect related to parks and recreation.

Alt. 4 This alternative would be located in unincorporated Placer County and would increase population in the County by approximately 17,024 persons assuming an average household size of 2.56 persons in unincorporated Placer County. The County parkland dedication requirements call for 5 acres of improved park per 1,000 persons and 5 acres (2 hectares) of passive parks per 1,000 persons. Based on a population of 17,024 persons, the County would need approximately 85.1 acres (34.4 hectares) each of improved park and passive parkland to accommodate the increased population under this alternative. The applicant would dedicate approximately 90.0 acres (36.4 hectares) of improved parkland and 89.4 acres (36.2 hectares) of open space and paseos under this alternative, which would exceed the dedication requirements. Therefore, there would be no effect related to parks and recreation under this alternative.

3.0.4.2 Population and Housing

Proposed Action There are four large-lot, single-family residences located on the project site. These four residences would be removed to accommodate development outlined in the SVSP. Assuming a household size of 2.54 persons per household, the Proposed Action would displace about 10 persons, which is not considered a significant number of people. The Proposed Action will have a less than significant effect on displacement of dwelling units and persons.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in the construction of 6,650 homes in the SVSP area, which could accommodate approximately 16,891 additional persons, assuming an average household size of 2.54 persons (which is the average household size for the City of Roseville). The increase in housing and population associated with the SVSP was included in the City of Roseville's housing and population projections for the area as well as in the projections produced by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). Based on projections listed in the City's General Plan, the City expects to add approximately 14,400 housing units and a population of about

50,600 residents between 2010 and 2025. The increase in housing associated with the Proposed Action represents approximately 46 percent of the City General Plan's 2025 housing projection and the increase in population associated with the SVSP represents approximately 33 percent of the General Plan's 2025 population projection.

Based on projections provided by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), the City is projected to add approximately 25,600 housing units and a population of about 56,700 residents between 2010 and 2035. The Proposed Action accounts for about 26 percent of SACOG's 2035 housing projection and about 30 percent of SACOG's 2035 population projection.

As the SVSP housing and population increases were included in future housing and population forecasts for the City and the region, the Proposed Action would not directly induce substantial population growth in Placer County or the City of Roseville that was not anticipated. Therefore, this effect would be less than significant.

**No Action,
Alts. 1, 2, 3** All of the on-site alternatives would have effects on population and housing that would be very similar to those described above for the Proposed Action, although the population and housing increases under the alternatives would be less than that under the Proposed Action.

Alt. 4 Similar to the Proposed Action, Alternative 4 would have a minimal effect on population and housing in the region. This alternative would displace up to 15 dwelling units and therefore displace up to 38 persons, which is a small number of people. This impact related to displacement of dwelling units and persons is therefore a less than significant effect.

Similar to the Proposed Action, this alternative would also develop 6,650 dwelling units, which would result in a population increase of approximately 17,024 persons in Placer County (based on an average household size of 2.56 persons for unincorporated Placer County). The Placer County General Plan does not anticipate the development of the Alternative 4 site with urban uses. Therefore, this alternative would increase the population in unincorporated Placer County in excess of what is planned in the County. At the same time, the alternative would reduce the growth projected for Roseville. The net effect on the region would be the same as that of the Proposed Action, which would be less than significant.