

## 2.2 Growth

### 2.2.1 Regulatory Setting

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, which established the steps necessary to comply with NEPA, requires evaluation of the potential environmental effects of all proposed federal activities and programs. This includes a requirement to examine indirect effects, which may occur in areas beyond the immediate influence of a proposed action and at some time in the future. The CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1508.8) refer to these consequences as “indirect impacts.” Indirect impacts may include changes in land use, economic vitality, and population density, which are all elements of growth.

CEQA also requires analysis of a project’s potential to induce growth. The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.2[d]) require that environmental documents “...discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment....”

### 2.2.2 Affected Environment

This section is a summary of the analysis documented in the CIA prepared for the project (ICF International 2014). The report is available on the project website at <http://8065interchange.org/>.

The project is located in Placer County, in the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, at the I-80/SR 65 interchange (Figure 1-1). The project boundaries consist of I-80 from the Douglas Boulevard interchange to the Rocklin Road interchange and SR 65 from the I-80 separation to the Pleasant Grove Boulevard interchange. The total length of the project is 2.5 miles along SR 65 and 4.2 miles along I-80.

As shown in Table 2.2-1, rapid population growth occurred in Placer County, the City of Roseville, and the City of Rocklin between 2000 and 2010. The City of Rocklin grew from a population of 36,330 in 2000 to 56,974 in 2010, which was the highest 10-year growth rate, at 56.8 percent (4.6 percent average annual growth rate [AAGR]). Placer County grew from a population of 248,399 in 2000 to 348,432 in 2010, representing a 40.3 percent growth rate (3.4 percent AAGR). The City of Roseville also had significant growth, from a population of 79,921 in 2000 to 118,788 in 2010, a 48.6 percent growth rate (4.0 percent AAGR). Unincorporated Placer County also experienced some growth, from 100,701 in 2000 to 108,128 in 2010, approximately a 7.4 percent growth rate (0.7 percent AAGR). Please refer to Section 2.3 for a more detailed population analysis.

**Table 2.2-1. Existing Regional and Local Population Change**

Area	2000	2010	Percent Change (%)	AAGR (%)
Unincorporated Placer County	100,701	108,128	7.38	0.7
Placer County total	248,399	348,432	40.27	3.4
Roseville	79,921	118,788	48.63	4.0
Rocklin	36,330	56,974	56.82	4.6

Source: Placer County 2013.

Employment forecasts project rapid growth in Placer County, with a total employment projection of 32.4 percent growth by 2022. Business activities directly adjacent to the project area are associated with a variety of auto repair shops and self-storage business along Taylor Road and the large-scale retail businesses along SR 65, both associated with the Roseville Galleria mall and operated independently of the mall. There are also some restaurants and smaller businesses, including a law office, gyms, and a hardware store. In addition, a few hotels, Roseville Golf and Sunsplash, and various medical services providers are in the project vicinity.

## 2.2.3 Environmental Consequences

### 2.2.3.1 Build Alternatives

Caltrans provides guidelines for determining whether a project will cause growth-related impacts on the surrounding community. The Caltrans *Guideline for Preparers of Growth-Related, Indirect Impact Analysis* (California Department of Transportation 2006) (referred to in the remainder of this section as *the Guidance document*) is the document used to determine whether the I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project would cause growth-related impacts on Placer County and the Cities of Roseville and Rocklin. A two-phase approach was used to determine whether the project is anticipated to cause growth-related impacts. The first phase was a first-cut screening, based on factors that include how the project potentially changes accessibility, how the project type and location may influence growth, whether project-related growth is “reasonably foreseeable,” and whether any project-related growth would affect resources of concern. If the project is determined to have significant impacts under first-cut screening criteria, a second screening analysis is needed.

The first-cut screening considers the following factors.

- How, if at all, does the project potentially change accessibility?
- How, if at all, do the project type, project location, and growth-pressure potentially influence growth?
- Determine whether project-related growth is “reasonably foreseeable.”
- If there is project-related growth, how, if at all, will that impact resources of concern?

To determine the potential for growth-related impacts associated with the three build alternatives, a first-cut screening was performed in accordance with the Guidance document. The interrelated screening factors (accessibility, growth pressure, project type, and project location) discussed in Chapter 5 and summarized in Figure 5-2 of the Guidance document were considered. The results of this analysis are detailed below.

In terms of accessibility, the project's build alternatives would improve the I-80/SR 65 interchange and adjacent intersections to reduce future traffic congestion. All of the highways and local roadways to be improved are already in existence, and no new roads would be constructed. The land surrounding the project is made up of commercial, residential, and open space. Improving the I-80/SR 65 interchange and adjacent intersections would improve access throughout the project area, which would benefit the surrounding residents of Rocklin and Roseville.

In terms of growth pressure, the extent to which the project's build alternatives would induce growth in the project area depends largely on the strength of local planning and growth management mechanisms, including adhering to adopted growth boundaries, maintaining existing zoning restrictions and land use designations, and implementing farmland and floodplain protection policies. In this case, there appears to be a strong, integrated structure that discourages premature and unplanned growth in the project area. The Cities of Roseville and Rocklin have provided land use designations to guide future growth in the region; and new development must adhere to these land use designations, per the rules and regulations of the relevant cities. Adherence to these restrictions reduces pressure for unplanned development by making adequate quantities of land available for development in locations that best serve the policy goals of the relevant cities. Given the coordinated growth control mechanisms in place, the project is unlikely to substantially encourage unplanned development in the project area, or to shift or hasten planned growth along the SR 65 and I-80 corridors. Therefore, the proposed project would cause no, or only minimal, growth-related impacts.

In terms of project type, the project's build alternatives include improving the I-80/SR 65 interchange and adding HOV lanes. This type of project on an existing facility is described specifically in the Guidance document as a project that could cause growth-related impacts because it adds capacity to existing freeways.

In terms of location, the project is located in a suburban area. As detailed in the Guidance document, transportation projects in suburban areas could cause growth-related impacts because of a greater presence of open space/vacant land. Presently, the land in the project area consists largely of residential uses, in addition to commercial and open space. The project area has very little undeveloped land. As stated in Section 2.1, "Land Use," growth is expected in the surrounding region, outside of the project limits. However, some new growth could occur inside the project limits through development of vacant and underutilized lots. The population of Placer County is growing and is expected to grow rapidly in the Cities of Rocklin and Roseville. This growth would not be attributable to, or otherwise influenced by, the project.

The results of the first-cut screening analysis indicate that, because of the developed nature of the project area, the existing land use designations and the planning and growth mechanisms enforced by local agencies, the project is not expected to encourage unplanned development, or

increase growth along the SR 65 and I-80 corridors. The project type, interchange improvements with addition of travel lanes, would help ease current and forecasted congestion at the interchange but would not cause extensive development beyond what is already planned for in the General Plans of the local jurisdictions.

Based on the first-cut screening analysis detailed above, the project's build alternatives would not be growth-inducing, and further analysis of the potential for growth inducement is not necessary.

### **2.2.3.2 No Build Alternative**

The No Build Alternative would not lead to any growth-inducing improvements in the project area or in the surrounding community. The existing roadways and interstate systems would operate at current levels of service and efficiency, and existing congested conditions would stay the same and likely worsen over time.

### **2.2.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**

No measures are necessary.

### **2.2.5 References Cited**

California Department of Transportation. 2006. *Guidance for Preparers of Growth-Related Indirect Impact Analysis*. May. Sacramento, CA. Available: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/Growth-related\\_IndirectImpactAnalysis/gri\\_guidance.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/Growth-related_IndirectImpactAnalysis/gri_guidance.htm). Accessed: August 15, 2014.

ICF International. 2014. *Community Impact Assessment – I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project, Placer County, Interstate 80 and State Route 65*. Sacramento, CA. November.

Placer County. 2013. *Placer County Housing Element, Part II Background Report*. Public Hearing Draft. August 1. Available: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/~media/cdr/Planning/HousingElement/TrackChange%20Background%20Report.pdf>.