

8 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The guiding principles for the analysis of alternatives presented in this Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) are provided by California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines) Section 15126.6, which specifies that the alternatives analysis shall:

- ▶ describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project;
- ▶ consider alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental impacts of the proposed project; and
- ▶ evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.

The focus and definition of the alternatives evaluated in this EIR are governed by the “rule of reason” in accordance with Section 15126.6(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines. That is, the range of alternatives presented in this EIR must permit a reasoned choice by the City of Roseville’s (City’s) decision makers. The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6) require that an EIR evaluate a “No-Project Alternative,” evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, identify alternatives that were initially considered but then rejected from further evaluation, and identify the “environmentally superior alternative.”

While the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[d]) require an evaluation of alternatives, they permit the evaluation to be conducted in less detail than is done for the proposed project. Consistent with Section 15126.6(d), sufficient information is provided about each alternative to allow for a meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison of the alternatives with the proposed project.

The following discussion is intended to inform the public and decision makers of potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed project that could be implemented to attain the basic project objectives while substantially reducing the significant effects of the project, as well as the effects of the No-Project Alternative.

8.1.1 BASIC PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

As described above, one of the key factors in considering alternatives is whether they can feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project. Section 3, “Description of the Proposed Project,” of this DEIR describes the basic project goals and objectives. The following list identifies the overall goals and selected specific objectives of the proposed Downtown Roseville Specific Plan (Plan):

- ▶ Improve connectivity within Downtown as well as between Downtown and its surroundings;
- ▶ Respect and honor the history and influence of the railroad;
- ▶ Identify land uses and development standards that are responsive to market opportunities and that facilitate quality architecture and urban design;
- ▶ Reinforce identity through the establishment of character districts and gateway elements;
- ▶ Create and enhance public places that support community activity, spirit, and involvement; and
- ▶ Promote arts, culture, heritage, education, and entertainment.

8.1.2 SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Impacts associated with the proposed project are evaluated in Section 4 of this DEIR and are summarized in Section 2. Cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project are presented in Section 5. Listed below in Table 8-1 are the 12 environmental issue areas evaluated in this DEIR. For each issue area, the table indicates whether the project would result in a less-than-significant impact or significant impact before mitigation and whether the impact can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level using feasible measures or if it would remain significant (and unavoidable). Because more than one impact statement is provided within the resource areas addressed in this DEIR, the impacts presented in the table below represent the “most significant” impact identified for that resource area. For example, Table 2-1 presents three impact statements related to Land Use and Planning, two of which are “No Impact” and one of which is “Less-than-significant”. Therefore, “Less-than-significant” is the impact before mitigation that is provided below.

Environmental Topic	Before Mitigation	After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning	Less-than-significant	Less-than-significant
Public Utilities	Less-than-significant	Less-than-significant
Public Services	Less-than-significant	Less-than-significant
Geology and Soils	Potentially Significant	Less-than-significant
Aesthetics	Less-than-significant	Less-than-significant
Transportation and Circulation	Significant	Significant (Unavoidable)
Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant	Less-than-significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Potentially Significant	Less-than-significant
Biological Resources	Potentially Significant	Less-than-significant
Air Quality	Potentially Significant	Significant (Unavoidable)
Noise	Potentially Significant	Significant (Unavoidable)
Hydrology and Water Quality	Potentially Significant	Less-than-significant

As shown in Table 8-1, the project would result in potentially significant impacts (before mitigation) related to hazards and hazardous materials, cultural resources, transportation and circulation, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, geology and soils, air quality, and noise. After mitigation, significant impacts would still remain for transportation and circulation, air quality, and noise (i.e., significant and unavoidable impacts).

8.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REMOVED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Several alternatives were considered for their potential to reduce the environmental impacts of the proposed project. They were rejected from further consideration because they were infeasible, would not attain even the most basic of project objectives, or were unable to reduce any of the significant impacts of the project. These rejected alternatives are described below.

Because the Plan is site-specific, and has been developed through an iterative, collaborative planning process in the Downtown Roseville community and with City staff, its goals and objectives are specific to the Plan area described in Section 3 of this DEIR and are intended to revitalize the Plan area. It is intended to benefit those in the community, while avoiding or minimizing direct environmental impacts.

8.2.1 OFF-SITE ALTERNATIVES

Off-site alternatives are generally considered in EIRs when one of the means to avoid or eliminate the significant impacts of a proposed project is to develop it in a different available location. Under case law, such alternatives are appropriate where a proposed project would put a site to uses different than those contemplated in the governing general plan, which presumably reflects land use policies reached after much deliberation. The *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* identifies the Plan area as being located in an infill area encompassing the oldest portions of the City, including Central Roseville (i.e., Oldtown/Downtown, Riverside business districts). The *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* envisions this area as the focus of redevelopment and revitalization planning efforts.

To attain the basic objectives of the Specific Plan, the proposed project would have to be located in the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan area because the main objective of the project is to redevelop this area. Goals and objectives of the proposed project would not be applicable to any other sites in Roseville. Given this consideration, there are no alternative sites that can feasibly meet the project objectives. For this reason, an off-site alternative is not evaluated further in this EIR.

8.3 DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives are evaluated in this section:

- ▶ No-Project Alternative, and
- ▶ Low-Density Alternative.

Each alternative is described, and an analysis is provided of the alternative for each environmental issue area evaluated in this EIR. The analysis is comparative, identifying whether the alternative would result in impacts that are “greater,” “less,” or “similar” in comparison to those of the proposed project. This determination is made in brackets at the end of the discussion for each environmental issue analyzed.

8.3.1 NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No-Project Alternative, the Plan area would be developed in accordance with the existing *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* land use map, which is the City’s approved land use plan applicable to the area. The *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* defines the Downtown Roseville area for redevelopment and revitalization. However, the General Plan does not specify a change in land uses to accomplish redevelopment or revitalization. The Downtown Roseville Specific Plan would achieve this goal by defining the land uses envisioned for the Downtown Roseville area and by implementing specific actions at several catalyst sites. As a result, the No-Project Alternative development scenario would result in similar urban uses currently developed in the Plan area. This alternative would not change the existing land uses allowed or envisioned in the Plan area. A summary comparison between development under the proposed project and under the No-Project Alternative in each of the 11 districts addressed in the Plan is provided in Table 8-2.

As shown in Table 8-2, the development potential of the *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* is slightly different from land uses proposed in the Plan. At build-out, the proposed Specific Plan envisions higher density residential than the *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* (see Douglas Corridor, Creek View Residential, Washington Corridor) and envisions residential uses in areas identified in the *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* solely for commercial- and retail-related uses (see Dry Creek Mixed-Use, Vernon Street, Old Town Commercial). Areas identified for commercial-, retail-, and office-related uses in the *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* continue to be identified for similar uses under the proposed Specific Plan.

**Table 8-2
Summary Comparison of Development Under the Proposed Project
and the No-Project Alternative**

District	Specific Plan (Proposed Project) Land Uses	General Plan (No Project) Land Uses
Washington Corridor	mixed use, retail, restaurants, services, offices, and multi-family residential	Retail stores and businesses selling a full range of goods and services (CC), Attached and detached single family residences (LDR)
Washington Corridor Intensification District	mixed commercial and residential uses	Retail stores and businesses selling a full range of goods and services (CC), Attached and detached single family residences (LDR)
Old Town Bungalow	single-family residential and cottage office	Attached and detached single family residences (LDR)
Old Town Commercial	mixed use, retail, restaurants, entertainment, nightclubs/bars, grocery store/pharmacy, offices, multi-family residential, and live/work space	Mix of retail and office uses including municipal offices, public assembly, theaters, and restaurants (CBD)
Old Town Commercial Extension District	public surface parking	Vacant Union Pacific Railroad land
Vernon Street	mixed use, retail restaurants, entertainment, nightclubs, offices, public/quasi-public, and multi-family residential	Municipal, governmental, or public facilities (P/QP), Mix of retail and office uses including municipal offices, public assembly, theaters, and restaurants (CBD)
Dry Creek Mixed-Use	mixed use, retail, restaurants, public/quasi-public, offices, multi-family residential, live/work space, public market, and vendor/kiosk	Retail stores and businesses selling a full range of goods and services (CC), Municipal, governmental, or public facilities (P/QP), Mix of retail and office uses including municipal offices, public assembly, theaters, and restaurants (CBD), Limits uses to those that minimize impacts on upstream and downstream areas (FP)
Royer Park	improvements to existing recreational opportunities at Royer/Saugstad Parks	Public park and recreation facilities and private recreation (PR), Passive recreation and minor recreation facilities, walking and bike trails, and resource interpretive facilities (OS), Limits uses to those that minimize impacts on upstream and downstream areas (FP)
Creek View Residential	multi-family residential and neighborhood grocery store	Passive recreation and minor recreation facilities, walking and bike trails, and resource interpretive facilities (OS), Limits uses to those that minimize impacts on upstream and downstream areas (FP), Attached and detached single family residences (LDR-4)
Vernon Bungalow	single-family residential and cottage office	Attached and detached single family residences (LDR), Limited range of goods and services intended for the convenience of the immediate neighborhood and compatible with adjacent land uses (NC)
Douglas Corridor	mixed use, retail, restaurants, service, offices, and multi-family residential	Attached and detached single family residences (LDR), Limited range of goods and services intended for the convenience of the immediate neighborhood and compatible with adjacent land uses (NC), Retail stores and businesses selling a full range of goods and services (CC), Limits uses to those that minimize impacts on upstream and downstream areas (FP)

Although disparities in the density and type of development exist between the proposed project and the No-Project Alternative, the impacts of development consistent with the General Plan build-out are expected to be similar to impacts associated with the proposed Plan. Impacts associated with aesthetics and hydrology and water quality would be nearly identical. However, implementation of this alternative would not include improvements in Dry Creek to improve aquatic and riparian habitats. The Plan area is currently developed with urban uses as defined by the City of Roseville General Plan; therefore, the No-Project Alternative essentially defines the existing conditions in the Plan area.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Land Use and Planning

The proposed project includes amendments to the *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* and zoning code to change General Plan land use designations and zoning designations for parcels in Downtown Roseville. These amendments would not be required under the No-Project Alternative. Because the land uses in the Plan area would remain unchanged under the No-Project Alternative, there would be no impact related to land uses. Similarly, no significant land use impacts were identified for the proposed project. However, impacts for this alternative would be less than the project with respect to land use, as no change in land use would occur under the No-Project Alternative. *[Less]*

Public Utilities

Under the No-Project Alternative, no new development, or very limited amounts, would be constructed or operated in the Plan area. Therefore, there would be no increased demand for water, wastewater treatment, storm water conveyance, electricity, or natural gas beyond existing conditions; and no need for new facilities and infrastructure to support additional demand would exist. By comparison, the proposed project would create an increased demand for water, sewer, storm drain, and dry utilities. Utility upgrades to existing facilities have been identified for the remainder of the Plan area based upon various studies prepared by the City. Construction of utility improvements and upgrades in the Historic Old Town began in Fall of 2006. Further utility improvements already identified by the City include water, wastewater, and storm water conveyance improvements that would bring undersized and otherwise inadequate conveyance systems up to City standards. Increased demand for electricity and natural gas would also be less-than-significant. Because the proposed project would not result in direct significant utilities impacts, the No-Project Alternative would not avoid any such impacts. However, the No-Project Alternative would avoid increased demand for water supplies and sewer services; therefore, overall utilities impacts associated with the No-Project Alternative are considered less than what would occur under the proposed project. *[Less]*

Public Services

The No-Project Alternative would not include any new development or very limited amounts of development. Therefore, this alternative would not generate a noticeable increase in demand for public services. By contrast, the proposed project would develop approximately 122 residential units on catalyst sites and allow for the development of additional or higher intensity of dwelling units in residential and mixed-use districts. The increased number of dwelling units in Downtown Roseville would create additional demands for public services. The high schools nearest the Plan area are already operating at capacity or exceeding capacity; therefore, the proposed project would contribute to the need for new high school facilities to serve new development in the Plan area. To ensure adequate funding for these new school facilities, landowners and developers would pay the state-mandated mitigation fees before building permits are issued for construction in the Plan area. In addition, the proposed project would increase demand for fire protection, law enforcement, and library services. However, these public services are adequately provided in the Plan area and these services would continue to adequately serve Downtown Roseville with implementation of the Plan. The proposed project would create an incremental increase in demand for public services, particularly school services, which would not occur under the No-Project

Alternative. The No-Project Alternative would result in a less degree of significant impacts related to school services as compared to the proposed project. *[Less]*

Geology and Soils

The No-Project Alternative would not include any new development or very limited amounts of development. Therefore, residential units would not expose persons to potentially significant geologic and soil hazards (e.g., ground shaking, liquefaction) similar in nature to the proposed project. By comparison, the proposed project would result in development of approximately 1,275 housing units which would place a greater number of residents at risk to geologic and soil hazards in the Plan area. Although geologic and soil hazards would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation under the proposed project, this alternative would significantly reduce the numbers of people exposed to potential hazards in the Plan area. Therefore, this alternative would place fewer persons at risk to geologic and soil hazards as related to the proposed project. *[Less]*

Aesthetics

Under the No-Project Alternative, no new development, or very limited amounts, would be constructed or operated in the Plan area. Therefore, there would be no alteration of the existing visual character of Downtown Roseville and views of Dry Creek would remain largely unchanged. By comparison, under the proposed project, views of the Plan area would be slightly altered by increased intensity of urban development (i.e., mixed use). Although opinions may differ on whether a higher density urban setting would enhance or degrade the existing visual character of Downtown Roseville, the impact is considered less than significant under the proposed project because of the existing urban character in the Plan area. With this alternative, this minimal impact would not occur because views would not change from existing conditions. However, implementation of the proposed project would revitalize stagnant portions of Downtown Roseville and include design guidelines intended to maintain or enhance the visual character of this portion of the City. Overall, aesthetic resource impacts would be perceived as similar to the proposed project because while the intensity of urban development in the Plan area would not increase, revitalization would also be less likely to occur. *[Similar]*

Transportation and Traffic

The No-Project Alternative would not include any new development, or very limited amounts, and thus would not generate new traffic-related impacts. By comparison, with introduction of traffic generated as a result of the proposed project, peak hour traffic volumes would increase at signalized and unsignalized intersections in the project study area. This anticipated increase in traffic would significantly affect the local roadway system, and after mitigation, some intersections would still fail to operate at an acceptable level of service, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts related to traffic and circulation. Implementation of the No-Project Alternative would avoid the project's contribution to these impacts. However, due to cumulative development in the Plan area and surrounding region, many of these impacts would still occur. *[Less]*

Cultural Resources

The No-Project Alternative would not implement any specific construction activities, thereby avoiding impacts related to the disturbance, destruction, and physical or visual alteration of known or undiscovered/unrecorded cultural resource sites. Under the proposed project, ground disturbance and development of new structures is expected to occur (i.e., catalyst sites), resulting in greater potential for the disturbance of undiscovered/unrecorded subsurface archaeological sites and human remains. These impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after mitigation. However, the proposed project could result in the loss of a historical resource. Because the No-Project Alternative does not include any new development, or very limited amounts, or ground disturbance, it has less potential to result in the disturbance of as yet undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources and/or human remains and would most likely not result in the loss of a historical resource. Therefore, cultural resources impacts would be less under this alternative. *[Less]*

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the No-Project Alternative no new development, or limited development, would occur; therefore, new facilities that use hazardous materials (e.g., dry cleaners, gas stations) are less likely to be located in the Plan area and fewer residents, workers, or visitors would be potentially exposed to existing or new sources of hazardous materials in the Plan area.

By comparison, the proposed project would result in increased storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials during construction and operation from increased land use densities. There would be increased potential for construction workers, residents, and visitors to be exposed to hazardous materials at existing and newly identified contaminated areas in the Plan area. Because no significant impacts related to hazardous materials and public health were identified for the proposed project, the No-Project Alternative would not reduce or avoid any significant impacts related to this issue area. However, impacts are considered slightly less than those associated with the proposed project because there would be fewer overall opportunities for workers and residents to be exposed to hazardous materials under the No-Project Alternative (e.g., less site disturbances). *[Less]*

Biological Resources

Under the No-Project Alternative no new development, or very limited development, would occur. As a result, existing biological conditions in the Plan area would remain unchanged and impacts to existing biological resources would not occur. However, the existing conditions in the Plan area are urban in nature and the No-Project Alternative would not change these conditions. The proposed project would include improvements in Dry Creek to improve aquatic and riparian habitats. Because the No-Project Alternative would not involve implementing improvements to the aquatic and riparian habitats in Dry Creek, these beneficial impacts would not occur. Therefore, the No-Project Alternative is considered to result in more impacts related to biological resources. *[More]*

Air Quality

The No-Project Alternative would not include any new development, or very limited amounts, and would not generate significant amounts of new construction or operations-related air emissions. The proposed project would include new construction and operational activities resulting in significant short-term impacts related to construction emissions and the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air emissions. After mitigation, residual significant air quality impacts would remain. Implementation of the No-Project Alternative would not result in increasing these significant unavoidable air quality impacts above existing conditions, and would avoid exposing additional sensitive receptors (i.e., residential uses) to toxic air emissions. Therefore, this alternative would result in less air quality impacts than the proposed project. *[Less]*

Noise

Under the No-Project Alternative, no new construction activities, or only limited construction, would occur. Few new noise-generating land uses or sensitive noise receptors would be developed, and limited amounts of additional traffic would be generated. Therefore, there would be no increase in potential noise conflicts under this alternative. By comparison, the proposed project would include temporary noise generated by construction activities, development of various noise-generating land uses, increases in traffic noise, and development of sensitive receptors (i.e., residential uses) that would be exposed to existing or project-generated noise levels exceeding City standards. Several of these actions would result in significant noise impacts before mitigation. After mitigation, residual significant noise impacts would remain related to increased traffic noise at existing noise-sensitive areas. Implementation of the No-Project Alternative would not result in new significant noise impacts related to sensitive receptors; therefore, this alternative would result in less noise impacts than the proposed project. *[Less]*

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No-Project Alternative new development would not occur in the Plan area but similar amounts of storm water runoff and discharges (including water quality) would continue to occur from existing urban conditions. Different from the proposed project, the No-Project Alternative would not involve improvements in the Dry Creek floodplain to improve flood conveyance and aquatic and riparian habitats. Therefore, potential hydraulic impacts would not occur under this alternative. The proposed project would not increase the overall amount storm water runoff and discharges and all hydrology and water quality impacts for the proposed project including impacts related to construction, are considered less-than-significant with mitigation. The No-Project Alternative would not implement improvements to Dry Creek (i.e., hydraulic, habitat). Therefore, this alternative would result in similar hydrology and water quality impacts relative to the proposed project. *[Similar]*

8.3.2 LOW-DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

Under the Low-Density Alternative, the Plan area would be developed at a reduced intensity level of land uses. This alternative would develop the same mix of land uses and improvements as the proposed Specific Plan but would reduce the density of residential uses developed in the Downtown Roseville area. The proposed Specific Plan envisions an increased amount of residential land uses in Downtown Roseville as part of mixed-use development. For comparison, the proposed Specific Plan would develop approximately 1,275 new dwelling units in the Plan area and the Low-Density Alternative would develop approximately 850 (one-third reduction) new dwelling units in the same areas.

Given the similarities in the type of development between the Low-Density Alternative and the proposed project, impacts of development would be anticipated to be similar. Impacts associated with traffic, air quality, and noise would be nearly identical. All other impacts would also be similar given the similarities in the level of development. This alternative would not reduce or avoid any of the significant impacts of the project. Because of this, it would not achieve the basic purpose of an alternatives evaluation under CEQA, which is to describe alternatives that would "... avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the project..." (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15126.6[a]).

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Land Use and Planning

The proposed project includes amendments to the *City of Roseville General Plan 2020*. These amendments would continue be required under the Low-Density Project Alternative. Because the land uses in the Plan area under the Low-Density Alternative would remain similar to those under the proposed project and would potentially also require a rezone action and General Plan amendment, the land use impacts would also remain similar. However, no significant land-use impacts were identified for the proposed project in this DEIR. Thus, impacts for this alternative would be similar to the project with respect to land use. *[Similar]*

Public Utilities

Under the Low-Density Alternative, new development would be constructed or operated in the Plan area similar to proposed project. An increased demand for water, sewer, storm drainage, electricity, or natural gas would occur and the need for new facilities and infrastructure to support additional demand would continue to be required. By comparison, the proposed project would also create an increased demand for the same utilities. This alternative would also construct water, sewer, and storm drainage improvements to bring undersized and otherwise inadequate conveyance systems up to City standards. Increased demand for electricity and natural gas would also be similar to the proposed project and considered a less-than-significant impact.

Because the proposed project would not result in direct significant utilities impacts after mitigation, the Low-Density Alternative would not avoid any such impacts. However, the Low-Density Alternative would reduce the demand for water and sewer services; therefore, overall utilities impacts associated with the Low-Density Alternative are considered less than what would occur under the proposed project. *[Less]*

Public Services

The Low-Density Alternative would include new development similar in nature to the proposed project. Similarly, this alternative would generate an increased demand for public services. For comparison, the proposed project would develop approximately 1,275 new dwelling units in the Plan area and the Low-Density Alternative would develop approximately 850 (one-third reduction) new dwelling units in the same areas. Under the Low-Density Alternative, space previously to be developed as dwelling units would be developed as office and retail uses. Both the proposed project and the Low-Density Alternative would create additional demands for public services. The high schools nearest the Plan area are already operating at capacity or exceeding capacity; therefore, new high school facilities would be needed to accommodate the new development. To ensure adequate funding for these new school facilities, landowners and developers would pay the state-mandated mitigation fees before building permits are issued for construction in the Plan area. In addition, the proposed project would increase demand for fire protection, law enforcement, and library services. However, these public services are adequately provided in the Plan area and these services would continue to adequately serve Downtown Roseville with implementation of the Plan. The proposed project would create an incremental increase in demand for public services, particularly school services, which would continue to occur under the Low-Density Alternative. The proposed project would create an incremental increase in demand for public services that would also occur under the Low-Density Alternative. *[Similar]*

Geology and Soils

The Low-Density Alternative would include new development similar in nature to the proposed project. Therefore, approximately 850 new residential units constructed in the Plan area could expose persons to potentially significant geologic and soil hazards (e.g., ground shaking, liquefaction) similar in nature to the proposed project. By comparison, the proposed project would result in development of approximately 1,275 housing units which would place a greater number of residents at risk to geologic and soil hazards in the Plan area. Although geologic and soil hazards would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation under the proposed project, this alternative would reduce the numbers of people exposed to potential hazards in the Plan area. Therefore, this alternative would place fewer persons at risk to geologic and soil hazards as related to the proposed project. *[Similar]*

Aesthetics

The Low-Density Alternative would include new development similar in nature to the proposed project including the development of new residential units and commercial land uses. Therefore, the Low-Density Alternative would slightly alter the existing urban visual character of Downtown Roseville and change views of Dry Creek. By comparison, under the proposed project, views of the Plan area would be slightly altered by increased intensity of urban development (i.e., mixed use). Although opinions may differ on whether a higher density urban setting would enhance or degrade the existing visual character of Downtown Roseville, the impact is considered less than significant under the proposed project because of the existing urban character in the Plan area. With this alternative, similar impacts would also occur because the type of urban development would be similar in nature to the proposed project. Overall, aesthetic resource impacts would be perceived the same as the proposed project because an increased intensity of urban development would occur in the Plan area. *[Similar]*

Transportation and Traffic

The Low-Density Alternative would include new development similar in nature to the proposed project including the development of new residential units and commercial land uses. By comparison, with introduction of traffic

generated as a result of the proposed project, peak hour traffic volumes would increase at signalized and unsignalized intersections in the project study area. This anticipated increase in traffic would significantly affect the local roadway system, and after mitigation, some intersections would still fail to operate at an acceptable level of service, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts related to traffic and circulation. Implementation of the Low-Density Alternative would reduce the project's contribution to these impacts, but may not eliminate significant impacts. In addition, due to cumulative development in the Plan area, significant impacts to traffic and circulation in the project study area would still occur. *[Similar]*

Cultural Resources

The Low-Density Alternative would include new development similar in nature to the proposed project, thereby resulting in similar impacts related to the disturbance, destruction, and physical or visual alteration of any known or undiscovered/unrecorded cultural resource sites. Under the proposed project, ground disturbance and development of new structures would occur, resulting in potential disturbance of undiscovered/unrecorded subsurface archaeological sites and human remains. These impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels after mitigation. However, the proposed project could result in the loss of a historical resource. Because the Low-Density Alternative includes new development and ground disturbance activities, it has similar potential to result in the disturbance of as yet undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources and/or human remains and could similarly result in the loss of a historical resource. Therefore, cultural resources impacts would be similar under this alternative. *[Similar]*

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Low-Density Alternative development of the Plan area would continue to occur; therefore, new facilities that use hazardous materials (e.g., dry cleaners, gas stations) could be located in the Plan area, and new residents, workers, or visitors would have the potential to be exposed to existing or new sources of hazardous materials in the Plan area.

Similarly, the proposed project would result in increased storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials during construction and operation of project facilities. There would be increased potential for construction workers, residents, and visitors to be exposed to hazardous materials at existing and newly identified contaminated areas in the Plan area. Because no significant impacts related to hazardous materials and public health were identified in the Plan area following implementation of required mitigation measures, the Low-Density Alternative would not reduce or avoid any significant impacts related to this issue area. There would be similar opportunities for workers and residents to be exposed to hazardous materials under the Low-Density Alternative and, therefore, impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project. *[Similar]*

Biological Resources

The Low-Density Alternative would include new development similar in nature to the proposed project. As a result, existing biological conditions in the Plan area would potentially change and impacts to existing biological resources in the Plan area would occur. However, the existing conditions in the Plan area are urban in nature and the Low-Density Alternative would not change these conditions. In addition, the proposed project would include improvements in Dry Creek to improve aquatic and riparian habitats. Because the Low-Density Alternative would also involve implementing improvements to the aquatic and riparian habitats in Dry Creek, this alternative is considered to result in similar impacts related to biological resources. *[Similar]*

Air Quality

The Low-Density Alternative would involve new development that would generate new construction and operations-related air emissions. The proposed project would include new construction and operational activities resulting in significant short-term impacts related to construction emissions and exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air emissions. After mitigation, residual significant air quality impacts would remain. Implementation of the

Low-Density Alternative would result in similar increases in these significant unavoidable air quality impacts above existing conditions, and would not avoid exposing additional sensitive receptors (i.e., residential land uses) to toxic air emissions. Development activities would occur on all properties through implementation of the Low-Density Alternative. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar air quality impacts as compared to the proposed project. *[Similar]*

Noise

Under the Low-Density Alternative, construction activities would occur similar to the proposed project, new noise generating land uses or sensitive noise receptors would be developed, and additional traffic would be generated. Therefore, there would be an increase in potential noise conflicts under this alternative. For comparison, the proposed project would generate temporary noise from construction activities, development of various noise-generating land uses, increases in traffic noise, and development of sensitive receptors (i.e., residential uses) that would be exposed to existing or project-generated noise levels exceeding City standards. Several of these actions would result in significant noise impacts before mitigation. After mitigation, residual significant noise impacts would remain related to increased traffic noise at existing noise-sensitive areas. Implementation of the Low-Density Alternative would not avoid or reduce these significant noise impacts related to sensitive receptors; therefore, this alternative would result in similar noise impacts as compared to the proposed project. *[Similar]*

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Low-Density Alternative, new development would occur in a similar manner as the proposed project and similar amounts of storm water runoff and discharges (including water quality) would continue to occur from existing urban conditions. Similar to the proposed project, the Low-Density Alternative would also involve improvements in the Dry Creek floodplain to improve flood conveyance and aquatic and riparian habitats. However, construction of a golf course and improvements to aquatic and riparian habitats in the Dry Creek floodplain has not been analyzed to determine the potential hydraulic impacts that may occur. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall amount storm water runoff and discharges and all hydrology and water quality impacts for the proposed project are considered less-than-significant with mitigation, this alternative would result in the same hydrology and water quality impacts as the proposed project related to improvements that would occur in Dry Creek. *[Similar]*

