Ability to Meet the Project Objectives:

Regional Plans

The Draft General Plan was developed in consideration of the general principles, land use concepts and "smart growth" principles of the SACOG Blueprint Project. SACOG's "Draft Preferred Blueprint Scenario" provides an estimate of Lincoln's existing housing stock and outlines projections for new housing growth (48,900 dwelling units) through 2050 by residential land use type (see **Table 10-25**).

TABLE 10-25
SACOG DRAFT PREFERRED BLUEPRINT SCENARIO FOR LINCOLN

Residential Land Use Type	Existing	New Housing Growth through 2050
Rural Residential	6%	0%
Large Lot Single Family	80%	40%
Small Lot Single Family	0%	29%
Attached Products	14%	31%

In order to achieve the population of 130,000 persons for Alternative 6, the following residential land uses projections were made that resulted in approximately 58 percent Medium Density Residential and 31 percent High Density Residential (see Table 10-26). The remaining 11 percent residential land uses are Rural Residential, Country Estates and Low Density Residential (see Table 10-26).

Specifically, the approximate number of residential units projected to achieve a 130,000 population for Alternative 6 by residential density category are: 720 Rural Residential dwelling units at 0.5 dus/ac, 1,188 Country Estates dwelling units at 2 dus/ac, 1,543 Low Density dwelling units at 4.5 dus/ac, 20,376 Medium Density dwelling units at 8 dus/ac, 10,960 High Density dwelling units at 16 dus/ac for a total of approximately 34,800 dwelling units. The residential densities for this alternative are the same as those included under the Proposed Project.

Using the City's Draft General Plan's residential densities, a comparison of proposed or projected residential type or density by percentages from SACOG Draft Preferred Blueprint Scenario for Lincoln to Lincoln's Draft General Plan as well as the Alternative 6 is presented in **Table 10-26**.

TABLE 10-26
COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL GOALS USING LINCOLN'S DENSITIES

Residential Land Use	SACOG Goals	Lincoln Goals	DFG Projections
Rural Residential (RR at 0.5 dus/ac)	0%	8% (a)	11%
Low Density Residential (LDR at 4.5 dus/ac)	40%	40%	Combined with RR
Medium Density Residential (MDR at 8 dus/ac)	29%	28%	58%
High Density Residential (HDR at 16 dus/ac)	31%	24%	31%

Note:
a. Rural Residential is the only permitted land use in Lincoln Regional Airport overflight zone.

Source: City of Lincoln, 2006

SACOG's Blueprint projections for a variety of residential land uses types are recommended goals similar to those contained within the City's Draft General Plan. However, Alternative 6 provides a substantial amount of Medium Density Residential land uses at 58 percent in contrast to SACOG's projection of 29 percent or the Proposed Project's amount of 28 percent.

Alternative 6 provides 29 percent more Medium Density Residential land uses than recommended by SACOG's Blueprint Project and is therefore not considered consistent with the Proposed Project's following objective to:

- Develop a general plan that provides for the orderly development of the City with a 2050 planning horizon and projected growth that is both economic sustainable (120,000 to 130,000) and corresponds to the SACOG Blueprint Transportation and Land Use study.

Village Concept

The Draft General Plan was prepared at the direction of the General Plan Steering Committee (GPSC) as appointed by the Lincoln City Council. The GPSC conducted 13 public workshops from February 2002 to August 2005. The GPSC specifically stated that new residential areas should be design following land use principals of the Village concept. The Village concept is more fully described in the Draft General Plan on page 4-7 under "Village," page 4-24 under "Villages - Overview", page 4-25 under "Guiding Principals/Description of Villages", and page 4-33 under "Villages Goals and Policies."

Under this Village concept, the Proposed Project's new residential areas are planned for seven "Villages" with each new residential village reflecting a land use formula that generally represents approximately 70 percent single family, 20 percent medium family and 10 percent high density in acres which is considered marketable in today's economic conditions. Definition of residential categories and densities are presented in Table 10-26. Each village land use formula is presented in Chapter 4, Land Use, beginning on page 4-4.

Development proposed under Alternative 6 would not be organized under a Village concept because achieving a 130,000 population under a more compressed area would require using 58 percent Medium Density Residential land use under a more traditional and efficient design of grid streets and urban blocks. Alternative 6 would appear (visually) more towards an urban city which would have a dramatically different flavor of residential villages as those promoted under the Draft General Plan Steering Committee. Alternative 6 with its' high percentage of 58 percent Medium Density Residential is not conducive to the development of a Village concept.

Therefore Alternative 6 is not considered consistent with the Proposed Project's following objective to:

- Maintain a cohesive City development pattern that focuses new urban development in a Village pattern, while encouraging existing neighborhood revitalization.

Open Space

As previously described, the Draft General Plan was prepared at the direction of the GPSC as appointed by the Lincoln City Council. The GPSC conducted 13 public workshops from February 2002 to August 2005. The GPSC specifically stated that new residential areas should look similar to Del Webb's Lincoln Hills project and contain 40 percent open space. When this project was approved by the Lincoln City Council in December 1997, the project consisted of the land use assumptions identified below in **Table 10-27**

TABLE 10-27
LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE LINCOLN HILLS PROJECT

Land Use	Number of Acres	Dwelling Units	Density
Residential – Low Density	1,003	4,175	4.2 dus/ac
Residential – Medium Density	147	900	6.1 dus/ac
Residential – High Density	15	225	15 dus/ac
Village Commercial	4		
Community Commercial	24		
Parks	69		
Open Space	594		
Golf Courses	405		
Public	15		
Streets	84		
Total	2,360	5,300	

Source: Draft Subsequent EIR for Revised Twelve Bridges Specific Plan, August 1997, Table 2-2.

As shown in Table 10-27, the Lincoln Hills project provides 1,068 acres of open space, which, when combined, the acreage for parks, open space and golf courses would result in 45 percent open space lands.

The Draft General Plan has a goal of 40 percent Open Space within the new Village areas which are intended to provide an amenity to City residents and an opportunity to meet mitigation requirements for the loss of habitat associated with new development (draft Open Space and Conservation Implementation Measure 3.0). The Draft General Plan promotes the goal of having the proposed open space areas be internal to the new residential areas and should be planned as an integral part of the communities' fabric and blend with the various land uses and to ensure public accessibility to all appropriate areas.

Under Alternative 6 the only open space proposed within the new residential areas would be floodplains at approximately 1,250 acres and approximately 723 acres of active park land resulting in 8 percent Open Space as compared to the Proposed Project's goal of 40 percent open space, or approximately 5,200 acres.

Alternative 6 would locate the required 40 percent open space external to the compressed developable portion of this alternative and would preserve the future City's periphery in existing agricultural uses. Specifically, Alternative 6 would leave the area between the compressed developable portion of this alternative and the boundary of the Proposed Project (including the expanded Sphere of Influence area) of approximately 11,500 acres as existing agricultural uses.

The area between the compressed developable footprint and the Proposed Project could be designated as Lincoln's Urban Reserve.

Alternative 6 would plan for 89 percent in Medium and High Density Residential land uses. These higher densities may require more planned park and open space. Alternative 6 locates the open space areas outside or surrounding the city thereby isolating future open space areas from proposed community areas. The Proposed Project integrates the 40 percent open space areas into new residential areas while Alternative 6 displaces or removes these areas under the reduced boundary. Consequently, there would be an additional need for more useable open space under this alternative.

The GPSC stated that new residential areas under the Draft General Plan should be designed as seven stand alone Villages that have open space areas integrated throughout the Village areas with pedestrian/bicycle pathways and trails that are connected to the Village Neighborhood Commercial center, parks and school areas resulting in reduced use of motorized vehicles and decreased air emissions. The 40 percent open space areas could be used for a variety of uses including the preservation of vernal pools grasslands, wetlands, riparian areas, floodplains, tree clusters and cultural resources.

Alternative 6 would not affect all the open space areas surrounding the perimeter of the new residential area. This would not allow for interconnecting land uses with pathways and trails and probably result in the increased use of motorized vehicles and increased air emissions. Therefore, Alternative 6 does not meet the following integrated open space objective of the Proposed Project:

- Encourage the preservation and maintenance of open space areas (40 percent or greater) within developing Village areas.

Density

The GPSC also recommended a higher residential density and Village design in order to implement the smart growth principles of the SACOG Blueprint Project. A comparison of the amount of residential land uses included under the Proposed Project and the SACOG Blueprint Project is presented in Table 10-25. The Draft General Plan provides for 40 percent Low Density Residential, 28 percent Medium Density Residential and 24 percent High Density Residential while Alternative 6 would include 11 percent Low Density Residential, 58 percent Medium Density Residential and 31 percent High Density Residential. The Draft General Plan has a reasonable range of housing types while Alternative 6 tends to have a high percentage of Medium Density Residential.

The Proposed Project assume 15 percent for major infrastructure (streets, retention basins, etc) while Alternative 6 assumes 20 percent of major infrastructure because more people will be compacted into a smaller area resulting in the need to add more parks and schools to provide services to new residential areas.

Lincoln currently has a suburban design with mostly single family detached housing on 7,000 to 8,000 square foot lots (4 dus/ac). The Draft General Plan recommends that Low Density Residential provide a density of 4.5 dus/ac which results in approximately 7,000 square foot lots which would encompass approximately 40 percent of the proposed new residential areas. Alternative 6 provides for a more compact area with 58 percent as Medium Density Residential land uses at 8 dus/ac or approximately 3,500 square foot lots.

In order to achieve a similar population (130,000) to that identified for the Proposed Project, most of the Low Density Residential (single family detached housing at 4.5 dus/ac) located on either side of SR 193 east of Lone Tree Lane, south of Wise Road and the northeast quadrant at Moore/Dowd Roads was changed to Medium Density Residential (8 dus/ac). Generally, these areas are flat with minor development constraints. One exception includes the area south of SR 193, along the eastern boundary, which has a large cluster of trees and some topography constraints.

The Draft General Plan promotes the Village concept with integrated open space that has pathways and a trail system connecting mixed residential land uses as well as parks and schools. The Proposed Project also follows the smart growth principals as promoted by SACOG and New Urbanism planning principals and concepts.

Alternative 6 provides one primary residential land use of 58 percent Medium Density Residential which is not consistent with smart growth principals and therefore does not meet the mixed density objectives of the Proposed Project.

Design

Currently Lincoln's residential areas have homes that are set back from the street by approximately 20 feet reflecting a suburban community. The Draft General Plan proposes that new residential areas be designed with seven stand alone Villages with 40 percent integrated open space and pedestrian/bicycle pathways/trail system that connects with the Neighborhood Commercial center, parks and schools. The design concept for the Village is to have mixed residential land uses with a centralized Neighborhood Commercial center that is all connected by pedestrian/bicycle pathways and trails that promote the use of non-motorized vehicles in order to reduce traffic and air emissions.

Alternative 6 with 58 percent of Medium Density Residential and 31 percent High Density Residential land uses in a compressed area and at almost double the density could result in an urban residential design of repetitive urban residential blocks with small residential lots and units. This limited use of density ranges would likely result in a structure that will not meet the level of quality design sought by the Proposed Project and set forth in the General Plan Land Use policies.

Alternative 6 would result in an urban residential City development form characterized by a tight grid of streets within residential blocks of increased residential densities with small residential lots and an increased number of attached units. This development pattern would also result in an overall greater percent of building coverage without the Village concept and would not meet the 40 percent integrated open space objectives of the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 6 does not meet the design objectives of the Proposed Project.

Traffic

The amount of traffic generated is directly related to the specific types of land uses proposed under a particular project. Generally a single family home generates approximately 10 trips per day while a medium density residential project will generate approximately 8 trips per day and a high density residential project will generate 6 trips per day. While the actual number of trips per day are reduced by increasing the density, the total number of trips generated by acre increases. A comparison of residential densities by trips is presented below in **Table 10-28**.

TABLE 10-28
COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES AND VEHICLE TRIPS

Residential Type	Density	Trips/day	Total
Low Density	4.5 dus/ac	10	45
Medium Density	8 dus/ac	8	64
High Density	16 dus/ac	6	96

The Draft General Plan has two important traffic policies regarding Level of Service for streets and highways in Lincoln. These policies are presented below.

Policy T-2.3 Level of Service for Local Streets and Intersections
Strive to maintain a LOS C at all signalized intersections I the City during the p.m. peak hours. Exceptions to this standard may be considered for intersections where the city determines that the required road improvements are not acceptable (i.e., due to factors such as the cost of improvements exceeding benefits achieved, results are contrary to achieving a pedestrian design, or other factors) or that based upon overriding considerations regarding project benefits, an alternative LOS may be accepted. For purposes of this policy, City intersections along McBean Park Drive between East Avenue and G Street, and G Street between First Street and Seventh Street, are excluded from the LOS C standard, and will operate at a lower LOS.

Policy T-2.4 Level of Service for State Highways
The City shall coordinate with Caltrans in order to strive to maintain a minimum LOS D for SR 65 and SR 193.

A comparison of the population to the potential vehicle trips generated can be considered by comparing Alternative 4 – Highway 65 Bypass (with 106,000 persons at buildout) to Alternative 5 – Increased Density (with 120,000 persons at buildout). Both alternatives include similar boundaries. The total trips generated by Alternative 4 are projected at 529,000 trips while the total trips generated by Alternative 5 are projected at 695,000 trips.

The primary difference between Alternative 4 and Alterative 5 is that Alternative 5 provides for a 13 percent increase in population but a 31 percent increase in vehicle trips. This increased number of trips may require wider streets however existing streets may not have sufficient rights-of-way to be widened within established areas of the City.

Alternative 6 would generate slightly more traffic than Alternative 5 because this alternative has slightly more Medium Density and High Density Residential land uses which generate increased traffic (64 trips per acre for MDR and 96 trips per acre for HRD) resulting in increased congestion and increased air emissions. Therefore, Alternative 6 does not meet the traffic Level of Service policies and objectives of the Proposed Project.

Housing Absorption

The Draft General Plan proposes a wide range of housing types compared to Alternative 6, of which 58 percent of the total units are Medium Density Residential (MDR), with an average density of 8 dwelling units per acre, or approximately 3,500 square feet per lot (see the section addressing "Density" issues provided above). At this density, these houses are generally built as attached units instead of the preferred detached housing.

The quantity of MDR units proposed under Alternative 6 provide little market diversification. Presently, Lincoln is an untested market for a large percentage of medium density housing as suggested under Alternative 6. Most master planned communities, which the City is defining in its Proposed Plan through its series of villages, provide a more balanced mix of single family detached and single family attached products of varying densities. Alternative 6 does not provide the same diversity of housing.

Higher density residential development (MDR and HDR) would likely be less attractive to master developers than typical detached Single Family Residential (SFR) units. Lower density SFR homes are more likely to be absorbed at a faster rate than higher density attached units. Reducing the number of SFR units from 48 percent to 11 percent of the total units could severely limit the City's ability to attract major developers to build out the proposed village areas.

In a traditional master planned community, the ratio of low to medium and high density residential is closer to 60 to 70 percent low density to 30 to 40 percent medium or higher density. Under Alternative 6, over 90 percent of the residential units would be medium and high density. There are few developers who are building this volume of medium and high density housing. Consequently, many developers are hesitant to invest their resources in an untested product of this scale.

The MDR units under Alternative 6 would have to be competitive with high density developments proposed in more urban areas, such as Sacramento. The location of these higher density units in Lincoln is not likely to be competitive with other higher density projects in the region.

The demand for commercial uses would also be affected. Alternative 6, which places most of the MDR to the east of Highway 65, weakens the concentration of residences around the proposed retail center, and limits the potential success of retail uses located on the Highway 65 Bypass corridor. Future residents living in the more affordable MDR and HDR units are more likely to have lower incomes and will have less spending power, reducing the amount of supportable commercial space. In addition, these future residents, who under Alternative 6 are located primarily in the east side of the City, would be attracted more to existing retail options offered in Roseville or Rocklin due to their closer distance.

The lack of diversity of housing types under Alternative 6 will result in slower housing absorption. Absorption of MDR units will be much slower due to the smaller market potential for this product type, as noted above. Based on this slower absorption, it would be difficult for the City to become economically sustainable within the Proposed Project's time frame.

Infrastructure Financing

The Draft General Plan includes the establishment of multiple villages in which the backbone infrastructure likely would be financed by a master developer. Developers of detached Low Density Single Family Residential (SFR) housing initially pays for the infrastructure of Medium and High Density Residential units, because the greatest housing demand is for this type of product. Usually the SFR is built before the MDR and HDR products and the typical SFR developer covers the cost of backbone infrastructure for MDR and HDR land uses. The SFR developer then is reimbursed upon construction of the Medium and High Density units. Should the MDR product absorb at a slower pace under Alternative 6, as noted in the previous section, the cost borne by the SFR developers would be too high to oversize the financing of infrastructure for the entire project. Developers are not likely to place this great of a burden (public or private) on their land in order to oversize infrastructure for MDR and HDR land uses.

Alternative 6 has 58 percent MDR and 31 percent HDR which would result in large infrastructure improvement costs being born principally by MDR and HDR projects which are traditionally smaller, more affordable, and less able to accept high debt burden. In growing areas like Lincoln, MDR and HDR designated parcels are among the last parcels to develop further reducing the ability to feasibly cover the cost of infrastructure needed to serve the community.

The infrastructure burden of Alternative 6 would limit the ability of a master developer to construct any of the proposed villages and would discourage this scale of development from occurring in Lincoln. Due to economies of scale, infrastructure construction would likely be piecemeal and more costly compared to that of a master developer building out a major area. The City may be forced to either advance funding for the infrastructure in order for the higher density residential projects to be completed or to relax the timing of major infrastructure or public facilities.

In addition, any potential cost savings from compact development could be offset by the proposed street loading system. Alternative 6 has a considerable amount of single loaded streets (development on one side) which are more expensive to construct because the developed side has to pay for the full roadway instead of each side paying their respective share. Examples of Alternative 6 having single loaded streets are Wise Road (3 miles), Dowd Road (5 miles), and Moore Road (1.5 miles). If bridges are required then the cost to the developed side will also increase.

Alternative 6 would result in delayed completion of backbone infrastructure because of the slower absorption rate of the Medium Density Residential land uses and the inability of developers to bear the costs of infrastructure over and above their fair share. Infrastructure would have to be funded incrementally on a project-by-project basis and the City might have to advance funds for infrastructure in order for development to occur.

There may also be increased infrastructure costs borne by developers for the construction of single loaded streets as compared to the Proposed Project.

City's Economic Sustainability

The Draft General Plan designates approximately 1,450 acres of new community and regional commercial land uses on the south and west sides of the Lincoln Regional Airport along the future Highway 65 Bypass. Depending on the type of commercial uses located in this designated area, the trade service area can range from one to five miles. Therefore to make this designated commercial area feasible, the Draft General Plan designated residential land uses two miles to the west which is the only location for this density of housing. The area south of the airport is restricted to Rural Estates (0.5 du/ac) because the area is within the airport overflight zone.

To achieve the 130,000 population of the Proposed Project, the majority of the Medium Density Residential housing under Alternative 6 could only be located east of existing SR 65 and south of Wise Road with a small amount on the eastside of Dowd Road between Nicolaus and Moore Roads. Alternative 6 would require persons to travel from the east side of Lincoln on Wise and Nicolaus Roads to the west side to the designated commercial sites which would result in increased traffic congestion and increase air emissions.

The Proposed Project designated community and regional commercial land uses on the south and west side of the Lincoln Regional Airport and along the proposed Highway 65 Bypass in order for these commercial land uses to be vehicle accessible and to have sufficient residential development in the trade service area. The 1,450 acre of commercial land uses would provide retail uses resulting in an increased sales and property taxes to Lincoln as well as the recapture of currently lost sales taxes to other jurisdictions. The provision of a large viable retail area is needed to assist Lincoln in achieving its fiscal objectives of an economically sustainable community.

Alternative 6 would retain the 1,450 acres of commercial land uses but would eliminate approximately 2,500 acres of residential land uses within a two mile radius of this commercial site that are needed to support the commercial designated land uses. Therefore, Alternative 6 would not meet the Draft General Plan's goal of achieving an economically sustainable city.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternative

The environmental impacts of Alternative 6 are summarized in Table 10-3. Because Alternative 6 has the same boundaries as Alternative 5 (the Increased Density Alternative) and similar population of 130,000 persons then the potential impacts on biological resources, wildlife, plants, traffic, air quality and noise would be similar to those previously identified for Alternative 5.

10.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

As previously described, Table 10-3 provides a summary of the anticipated impacts resulting from implementation of the alternatives compared to those identified for the Proposed Project. As shown in the table, Alternative 1 (No-Project/Buildout of Existing City Limits) is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it reduces the severity of most environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Among the "action" alternatives, the environmentally superior alternative for this project would be Alternative 4 (Highway 65 Bypass Corridor). Other than the No Project Alternative, this is the only alternative that would reduce the severity of most environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project. As described above, buildout of the Highway 65 Bypass Corridor Alternative would convert less open space and agricultural areas than the Proposed Project. Additionally, because Alternative 4 would result in fewer vehicle trips generated, air quality impacts would also be reduced under this alternative. However, as shown in Table 10-3, implementation of Alternative 4 would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts to biological, agricultural, air quality, and traffic resources.