

20.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describe and comparatively evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, or location of the project, that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant effects. The range of alternatives evaluated in the following analysis is dictated by the range of project significant impacts identified in this Draft PEIR, and evaluated alternatives are limited to those that would avoid or significantly lessen identified environmental impacts.

This Draft PEIR found that many significant impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measures outlined within this document. Exceptions include impacts in the environmental topics of visual resources, agricultural resources, air resources, biological resources, cultural resources, mineral resources, global climate change, noise, traffic, and tribal cultural resources. Significant cumulative impacts to which implementation of the 2035 General Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution include visual resources, agricultural resources, air resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, global climate change, noise, traffic, and tribal cultural resources. Two alternatives, in addition to the required No Project alternative, were formulated to illustrate the range of project alternatives that could be implemented as alternatives to the proposed Folsom 2035 General Plan (2035 General Plan) project. A detailed description of the proposed project is provided in Chapter 3, *Project Description*. CEQA does not require the environmental review of alternatives to be at the same level of detail as that for the proposed project [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d)]. The review must be at a sufficient level, however, to allow for a meaningful comparison of the environmental merits of each.

This meaningful comparison of the identified alternatives is summarized in Table 20-5, shown at the end of this chapter. The alternatives, as well as their comparative merits, are described below.

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

An EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed, identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination [State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)]. This section describes the process used to select the alternatives. The alternatives addressed in this Draft PEIR were selected in consideration of one or more of the following factors as set forth in Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines:

- The extent to which the alternative would accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed project [*Section 15126.6(a)*];
- The extent to which the alternative would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the project [*Section 15126.6(b)*];
- The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account location, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, and consistency with various applicable plans and regulatory limitations [*Section 15126.6(f)(1)*]

- The appropriateness of the alternative in contributing to a “reasonable range” of alternatives [Section 15126.6(c)]; and,
- The requirement of the CEQA Guidelines to consider a “no project” alternative and, where the “no project” alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, to identify an “environmentally superior” alternative in addition to the no-project alternative [Section 15126.6(e)].

The significant environmental impacts that the City, in identifying alternatives, seeks to eliminate or reduce are:

- Adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the scenic character
- Damage to scenic resources within a scenic corridor
- Create new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views
- Potential conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts adjacent to the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area
- Increase in operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors associated with 2035 General Plan buildout that could contribute to a violation of air quality standards
- Increase in health risks associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of toxic air contaminants
- Increase in exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of odors
- Have a substantial adverse effect on special-status species
- Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource
- Damage or destruction of previously unknown unique paleontological resources during construction-related activities
- Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site
- Potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for reducing GHG emissions
- Potential to conflict with long-term statewide GHG emissions reduction goals for 2050
- Exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires
- Alter the course of stream/river increasing runoff resulting in flooding
- Contribute runoff that exceeds stormwater drainage capacity or contributes additional polluted runoff
- Place housing or other structures within 100-year flood hazard area
- Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure of people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels resulting from the proposed project

- Require construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment – state and regional facilities
- Traffic level of service on local intersections
- Traffic level of service on U.S. 50 freeway
- Interference with, or a substantial change in the significance of, tribal cultural resources
- Cumulative Visual Resource impacts
- Cumulative Agricultural Resources impacts
- Cumulative Air Quality impacts
- Cumulative Biological Resources impacts
- Cumulative Cultural Resources impacts
- Cumulative Geological Resource impacts
- Cumulative Global Climate Change impacts
- Cumulative Noise impacts
- Cumulative Transportation impacts
- Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources impacts
- Inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy
- Irreversible Environmental Changes

The alternative selection process was completed in consideration of the project objectives. The Draft PEIR alternatives are developed to address scenarios that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects associated with implementation of the proposed 2035 General Plan.

Complicating the selection of alternatives are two characteristics of the 2035 General Plan: 1. The 2035 General Plan identifies an area designated for urban development that is only slightly greater than the area designated for urbanization in the 1988 General Plan; and 2. Within the area identified for urban development (termed the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area in this Draft PEIR), the primary land uses designated by the adopted 1988 General Plan as amended and the 2035 General Plan are relatively consistent with one another. As set forth in Table 3-4, *Acreage by Land Use Type*, in Chapter 3 of this Draft PEIR, the 2035 General Plan does not meaningfully expand the developed area of the City of Folsom beyond that already planned in the City’s adopted 1988 General Plan. While the relative area allocated to different types of land uses changes between the 1988¹ and the 2035 General Plans, the overall area of the city would expand by only five acres². Within the area to be developed, the largest area of change would be a significant decrease in the amount of land allocated to commercial uses, and concurrent increases in the land designated for mixed uses and industrial/office uses³.

Within the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area, the majority of vacant parcels have been issued various types of land use permits (e.g., Specific Plan approval, subdivision maps, use permits, design review permits). Thus, even if the 2035 General Plan were not approved, most of the urban development identified in the 2035 General Plan would still occur consistent with the adopted 1988 General Plan.

¹ The 1988 General Plan as amended through September 2017, including the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan area.

² The additional 5 acres consists of land dedicated to new freeway interchanges.

³ See Table 3-4 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this Draft PEIR.

New land uses introduced by the 2035 General Plan are several overlay land use designations to encourage the development of projects that combine employment and residences on a single parcel, or projects that would be of greater intensity than would be allowed by the underlying land use designation. These overlay land use designations are proposed by the City in furtherance of the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).

Because the area allocated to urban uses by the two General Plans is so similar, as is the range of land uses, identified alternatives are limited to those required by law (No Project alternative), those that seek to avoid or substantially lessen the significance or intensity of identified impacts, or those that reduce or avoid incompatibilities between the 2035 General Plan and the policies of surrounding land management agencies.

Consistent with CEQA Requirements (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)), during the Draft PEIR preparation process, alternatives were reviewed to develop a range of alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the project objectives, but also avoid or lessen several significant effects associated with the proposed project.

The objectives of the 2035 General Plan, based upon regulatory requirements, the City's vision, and the City's guiding principles as set forth in the 2035 General Plan, are as follows:

1. **Maintain a close-knit, neighborly, family-friendly city with a small town feel**
Preserve and enhance Folsom's small town charm by ensuring Folsom remains a safe, attractive, family-friendly community with social gathering places where neighbors can meet and interact. Inherent to that small-town feel is the Historic District, a complete small town preserved within the larger city.
2. **Focus on Historic Folsom's Commercial District as a center of shopping, dining, entertainment, and cultural attractions**
Focus on maintaining Historic Folsom's Commercial District as a vibrant mixed-use entertainment district that offers high-quality housing, a dynamic nightlife, and rich cultural experiences for residents, families, and visitors. Preserve and enhance the historic area's pedestrian orientation, architectural integrity, and collection of unique, locally-owned businesses. Embrace the city's rich historical Gold Rush heritage and connections to the historic railroad by conserving and enhancing historical and cultural amenities and attracting visitors through cultural events and programs.
3. **Promote town centers as social gathering places**
Promote mixed-use, walkable districts that serve as social gathering places for the community. Ensure that all residents have convenient access to town centers by establishing several throughout Folsom.
4. **Promote the revitalization of aging commercial corridors**
Encourage pedestrian-oriented infill and redevelopment of Folsom's aging commercial corridors. Create mixed-use developments that take advantage of alternative transportation modes, where people can live, work, and shop.
5. **Support the regional retail base**
Expand Folsom's role as a regional retail center that provides a broad range of goods to area residents, ensures financial security for the city, and supports the high level of community services that Folsom residents enjoy.

6. **Enhance gateways into Folsom**
Signify arrival into Folsom by enhancing the major entryways into the community with context-appropriate solutions including landscaping, public art, and design that strengthen Folsom’s unique identity.
7. **Continue to be a premier recreation destination in Northern California**
Enhance and expand Folsom’s role as a premier outdoor recreation destination in Northern California by continually improving cultural resource activities and programs, recreation opportunities and quality including new bicycle trails, parks and open space, and sports facilities.
8. **Brand Folsom as the “Gateway to the Foothill Wine Region”**
Capitalize on Folsom’s location near the wine country by expanding lodging and dining opportunities, and marketing Folsom as the “Gateway to the Foothill Wine Region.”
9. **Provide all residents with opportunities to live an active, healthy, and green lifestyle**
Promote healthy lifestyles by enhancing opportunities for physical activity, healthy eating, and sustainable living.
10. **Provide for a range of attractive and viable transportation options, such as bicycling, walking, rail, and transit**
Support higher-density, mixed use, transit-oriented development near light rail stations and in core areas where alternative transportation modes are planned. Support transportation improvements that allow and encourage more residents, workers, and visitors to walk, bike, or use transit.
11. **Provide a range of housing choices for all generations**
Provide for a range of housing choices to ensure Folsom is a community for all generations, where children can grow, raise families, and age in place.
12. **Preserve the High Quality of Folsom’s Neighborhoods**
Preserve the high quality of Folsom’s neighborhoods by maintaining quality housing stock, walkability, convenient access to parks and trails, attractive landscaping, and functional and efficient infrastructure.
13. **Foster economic growth and diversity to become recognized as one of the smartest cities in the region**
Build a thriving innovation-based economy that creates new jobs and welcomes businesses and entrepreneurship. Support the incubation of new startups as well as the efforts of Folsom Cordova Unified School District and Folsom Lake College to provide quality education to the community and beyond. Foster partnerships between educational institutions and local employers to grow a highly-educated local workforce.
14. **Commit to high-quality design**
Promote development that strengthens the physical form of the city, enhances livability, incorporates sustainable design practices, and fosters a unique sense of place through context-sensitive design and commitment to high-quality execution.

15. Foster a sustainable community for the next generation's benefit

Balance resource conservation with economic growth to ensure that meeting today's needs does not compromise the ability of the community to meet future needs. Lead by example in municipal projects and daily operations through City commitments and policies to advancing best practices in sustainability. Conserve resources and reduce operational costs without sacrificing quality of life.

16. Integrate the "old" and the "new" areas of the city

Promote an integrated, cohesive city by connecting new development areas with the existing city fabric through pedestrian, bicycle, and transit linkages; harmonious design; and shared gathering places.

17. Embrace Folsom's Heritage

Embrace the city's rich historic and prehistoric heritage, preserving, restoring, maintaining, and enhancing heritage sites throughout the city.

18. Celebrate Folsom's Cultural Diversity

Recognize and celebrate the cultural diversity of Folsom residents.

19. Encourage citizen participation and good leadership

Facilitate active and meaningful community participation by maintaining a transparent and open government and actively seeking citizen input in the decision-making process. City government shall be guided by the public interest and be an active leader in maintaining and improving quality of life in Folsom.

ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

The following alternatives were identified during preparation of this Draft PEIR, but were determined to not be feasible for continued evaluation because the alternatives would not avoid or lessen significant environmental effects, or were otherwise infeasible. As a result, the following alternatives were eliminated from further consideration.

- **No Mixed Use or East Bidwell/Transit Oriented Development Overlay Districts Alternative.** This alternative would delete the overlay General Plan land use designations that would permit mixed use development within the East Bidwell Corridor and in the vicinity of light rail stations in the city. This alternative was not chosen for further review because it would be inconsistent with the adopted RTP/SCS, and would not fully implement City Planning Principles 4, 10, 11, and 15 as set forth above.
- **Alternative Project Location.** The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(f)(2)) recommend considering an alternative project location to reduce potential project impacts. However, the goals and policies of the proposed 2035 General Plan are specific to the jurisdictional boundaries and future 2035 General Plan Planning Area. Buildout of the proposed General Plan consistent with its goals and policies at another location does not make sense for a General Plan that applies to all parcels within the City's jurisdiction and within its 2035 General Plan Planning Area. Therefore, the Draft PEIR does not evaluate an alternative project location.

20.2 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Two action alternatives, in addition to the required No Project alternative, were formulated to illustrate the range of project alternatives that could be implemented as alternatives to the proposed 2035 General Plan project. These additional alternatives include: Alternative 2, Deletion of Planning Area 2; and Alternative 3, Amend the River District and Planning Area 1. The characteristics of each of the three alternatives are set forth below, together with an evaluation of their potential environmental effects relative to those impacts identified for the 2035 General Plan.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines require discussion of the “No Project” alternative to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the project [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)]. When the project is a revision or update of an existing land use plan or regulatory policy, the No Project Alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan or policy. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing Folsom General Plan (1988 Plan) adopted in 1988 and amended through 2017 would remain the long-range planning policy document for the City. Therefore, the effects of continued implementation of the existing 1988 Plan are evaluated. Consequently, current development patterns would continue to occur in accordance with the existing 1988 Plan and the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

Without approval of the proposed 2035 General Plan, the existing 1988 Plan would continue to rely upon policies adopted in 1988 and would not reflect current state law and recent legislation. (See Table 20-1 for a list of eliminated 2035 General Plan policies that would act to reduce or avoid environmental effects.) Because the proposed 2035 General Plan contains new and updated goals and policies to better direct urban development to accommodate population growth and protect natural resources, the No Project Alternative would not include any of the new policies and implementation programs designed to address the environmental impacts of future city development. Additionally, implementation of the No Project alternative would not include implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this Draft PEIR.

As noted above, the 2035 General Plan does not meaningfully expand the developed area of the City of Folsom beyond that already planned in the City’s adopted 1988 General Plan. While the relative area allocated to different types of land uses changes between the 1988 and the 2035 General Plans, the overall area of the city would expand by only five acres. Within the area to be developed, the largest area of change would be a significant decrease in the amount of land allocated to commercial uses, and concurrent increases in the land designated for mixed uses and industrial/office uses.

Within the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area, the majority of vacant parcels have been issued various types of land use permits (e.g., Specific Plan approval, subdivision maps, use permits, design review permits). Thus, even if the 2035 General Plan were not approved, most of the urban development identified in the 2035 General Plan would still occur consistent with the adopted 1988 General Plan.

The No Project Alternative would increase the magnitude of most anticipated environmental impacts associated with the proposed project because the new and updated goals and policies included as part of the proposed 2035 General Plan would not be implemented. Compared to the proposed 2035 General Plan, the existing 1988 General Plan lacks detailed goals and policies to: 1. Guide urban development to meet contemporary needs and demands; 2. Respond to new and evolving state policies with respect to global climate changes, water supply and management, and

protection from environmental hazards; and, 3. Protect environmental resources within the city. The lack of new and updated policies could potentially result in greater impacts to many environmental resources as shown in Table 20-2. Compared to the proposed 2035 General Plan, the existing 1988 General Plan lacks extensive goals and policies requiring the efficient and timely provision of public services, recreation facilities, and utility infrastructure. Further, the 1988 General Plan does not have updated wildland fire requirements for new development, or new standards for development within the 100-year and 200-year floodplains. It does not include updated land use and transportation policies to ensure consistency with state and regional growth, and climate change policies.

Table 20-1 2035 General Plan Policies Not Implemented under the No Project Alternative

Chapter Number and Name	New Goal or Policy
6 Aesthetics and Visual Resources	
	Policy NCR 1.1.7 Fugitive Light
	Policy NCR 2.1.2: Complementary Development
	Policy NCR 2.1.3: Light Pollution Reduction
	Implementation Program NCR-6: Lighting Design Standards
7 Agricultural and Forestry Resources	
	None
8 Air Resources	
	Policy LU 1.1.6: Compact Development Patterns
	Policy LU 1.1.12 Infill Development
	Policy LU 1.1.13 Sustainable Building Practices
	Policy LU 1.1.14 Promote Resiliency
	Policy LU 1.1.15: SACOG Blueprint Principles
	Goal LU 3.1
	Policy LU 3.1.1 Mixed-Use Nodes
	Goal LU 4.1
	Policy LU 4.1.2: Mix of Uses Near Station
	Policy LU 4.1.3: Maximize TOD-Related CEQA Streamlining Benefits
	Policy LU 4.1.4: Restrict Auto-Oriented Uses Around Transit Stations
	Policy LU 4.1.5: Connections Between Modes
	Goal LU 6.1
	Policy LU 6.1.1 Complete Neighborhoods
	Policy LU 6.1.3 Efficiency Through Density
	Policy LU 6.1.10: Enhanced Walking and Biking
	Policy LU 9.1.5 Pedestrian-Friendly Entrances
	Policy LU 9.1.9: Passive Solar Access
	Goal M 1.1
	Policy M 1.1.6: Intermodal Connections
	Policy M 1.1.8: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Master Plan
	Policy M 1.1.9: Transportation Demand Management
	Policy M 1.1.10: Facilities for Emerging Technologies
	Goal M 2.1
	Policy M 2.1.3: Pedestrian and Bicycle Linkages in New Development
	Policy M 3.1.3: Regional Transit Connectivity
	Policy M 6.1.3: Support Zero- and Low-Emission Vehicle Adoption
	Policy NCR 3.1.3: Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled
	Policy NCR 3.1.4: Maintain Ambient Air Quality Standards
	Policy NCR 3.1.5: Emission Reduction Threshold for New Development
	Policy NCR 3.1.6: Sensitive Uses
	Policy NCR 3.2.6: Coordination with SMAQMD
	Policy NCR 3.2.7: Preference for Reduced-Emission Equipment
	Policy PFS 8.1.8: City Fleet Fuel Efficiency

Table 20-1 2035 General Plan Policies Not Implemented under the No Project Alternative

Chapter Number and Name	New Goal or Policy
9 Biological Resources	
	NCR 1.1.1: Habitat Preservation
	NCR 1.1.3 Wetland Preservation
	NCR 1.1.4 Native and Drought Tolerant Vegetation
	NCR 1.1.5 New Open Space
	NCR 1.1.8 Planting in New Development
	NCR 1.1.9 Public Awareness
	NCR 4.1.2: Community Education
	NCR 4.1.3: Protection
	NCR 4.1.4: Creek Clean-Up
	NCR 4.1.5: New Development
	NCR 4.1.6: Low-Impact Development
	PR 4.1.5: Waterway Recreation and Access
10 Cultural Resources	
	Policy NCR 5.1.3: Nominate Additional Cultural Resources
	Policy NCR 5.1.4: Applicable Laws and Regulations
	Implementation Program NCR-7: Management of Inadvertently Discovered Cultural Resources
	Implementation Program NCR-8: Management of Paleontological Resources
11 Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources	
	Policy NCR 4.1.5: New Development
	Policy NCR 4.1.6: Low-Impact Development
	Goal SN 1.1
	Policy SN 1.1.2: Community Emergency Response Team
	Policy SN 1.1.3: Cooperation
	Policy SN 1.1.4: Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan
	Goal SN 2.1
	Policy SN 2.1.1: Requirements
	Policy SN 2.1.2: Roads, Bridges, and Utility Lines
12 Global Climate Change	
	Policy LU 1.1.6: Compact Development Patterns
	Policy LU 1.1.12 Infill Development
	Policy LU 1.1.13 Sustainable Building Practices
	Policy LU 1.1.14 Promote Resiliency
	Goal LU 3.1
	Policy LU 3.1.1 Mixed-Use Nodes
	Policy LU 3.1.1 Mixed-Use Nodes
	Policy LU 3.1.6 Central Commercial District
	Goal LU 4.1
	Policy LU 4.1.2: Mix of Uses Near Station
	Policy LU 4.1.3: Maximize TOD-Related CEQA Streamlining Benefits
	Policy LU 4.1.4: Restrict Auto-Oriented Uses Around Transit Stations
	Policy LU 4.1.5: Connections Between Modes
	Goal LU 6.1
	Policy LU 6.1.1 Complete Neighborhoods
	Policy LU 6.1.3 Efficiency Through Density
	Policy LU 6.1.10: Enhanced Walking and Biking
	Policy LU 8.1.5 Transit
	Policy LU 9.1.3 Eliminate Large Blocks
	Policy LU 9.1.5 Pedestrian-Friendly Entrances
	Policy LU 9.1.8 Cool Paving

Table 20-1 2035 General Plan Policies Not Implemented under the No Project Alternative

Chapter Number and Name	New Goal or Policy
Global Climate Change, cont.	Policy LU 9.1.9 Passive Solar Access
	Policy LU 9.1.10 Renewable and Alternative Energy Generation Systems
	Goal M 1.1
	Policy M 1.1.1 Complete Streets
	Policy M 1.1.2 Adequate Rights-of-Way
	Policy M 1.1.4 Existing Streets Retrofits
	Policy M 1.1.5 Connected Neighborhoods
	Policy M 1.1.6 Intermodal Connections
	Policy M 1.1.8 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Master Plan
	Policy M 1.1.9 Transportation Demand Management
	Policy M 1.1.10 Facilities for Emerging Technologies
	Policy M 1.1.11 Historic Southern Pacific Rail Right-of-way
	Goal M 2.1
	Policy M 2.1.2 New Sidewalks
	Policy M 2.1.3 Pedestrian and Bicycle Linkages in New Development
	Policy M 2.1.4 Sidewalk Network
	Policy M 2.1.10 Bicycle Parking
	Policy M 2.1.11 Bicycle Parking at City Facilities
	Policy M 2.1.12 Trail Network
	Policy M 2.1.14 Intersections
	Policy M 2.1.17 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpasses
	Goal M 3.1
	Policy M 3.1.1 Access to Public Transit
	Policy M 3.1.3 Regional Transit Connectivity
	Policy M 3.1.4 Light Rail Double-Tracking
	Policy M 3.1.5 Extended Light Rail Service
	Policy M 3.1.6 “Hi-Bus” Transit Corridors
	Policy M 3.1.7 Transit to Key Locations
	Goal M 4.1
	Policy M 4.1.8 Energy Efficiency
	Policy M 4.1.10 Traffic Calming
	Goal M 4.2
	Policy M 4.2.1 Parking
	Policy M 4.2.2 Reduce Minimum Parking Standards
	Policy M 4.2.3 Shared Parking
	Policy M 4.2.4 Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
	Policy M 6.1.3 Support Zero- and Low-Emission Vehicle Adoption
	Policy EP 3.2.2 Infill Sites
	Goal NCR 1.1
	Policy NCR 1.1.8 Planting in New Development
	Policy NCR 3.1.3 Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled
	Goal NCR 3.2
	Policy NCR 3.2.1 Community Greenhouse Gas Reductions
	Policy NCR 3.2.2 Municipal Greenhouse Gas Reductions
	Policy NCR 3.2.3 Greenhouse Gas Reduction in New Development
	Policy NCR 3.2.4 Additional GHG Emissions Programs
	Policy NCR 3.2.5 Climate Change Assessment and Monitoring:
	Policy NCR 3.2.6 Coordination with SMAQMD
	Policy NCR 3.2.7 Preference for Reduced-Emission Equipment
	Goal PFS 3.1
	Policy PFS 3.1.1 Water Master Plan

Table 20-1 2035 General Plan Policies Not Implemented under the No Project Alternative

Chapter Number and Name	New Goal or Policy
Global Climate Change, cont.	Policy PFS 3.1.2 Urban Water Management Plan
	Policy PFS 3.1.3: Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance
	Policy PFS 3.1.7 Water Supply
	Policy PFS 3.1.9 Water Conservation Programs
	Policy PFS 3.1.10 Water Conservation Standards
	Policy PFS 3.1.12 Non-Potable Water
	Goal PFS 7.1
	Policy PFS 7.1.1 Adequate Facilities and Services
	Goal PFS 8.1
	Policy PFS 8.1.3 Renewable Energy
	Policy PFS 8.1.4 Regional Energy Conservation
	Policy PFS 8.1.5 PACE Program
	Policy PFS 8.1.6 Energy-Efficient Lighting
	Policy PFS 8.1.7 Energy Conservation in City Operations
	Policy PFS 8.1.8 City Fleet Fuel Efficiency
	Goal PFS 9.1
	Policy PFS 9.1.2 Waste Reduction
	Policy PFS 9.1.3 Recycling Target
	Policy PFS 9.1.4 Composting
	Policy PR 1.1.9 Water-Wise Landscaping
Policy PR 4.1.4 Connections	
13 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	
	Policy PFS 7.1.1: Adequate Facilities and Services
	Policy PFS 7.1.2: Fire Response Standards
	Policy PFS 7.1.3: Mutual Aid Agreements
	Policy PFS 7.1.4: Optimal Siting
	Policy PFS 7.1.5: Fire Flow Requirements
	Policy PFS 7.1.6: Inspections
	Policy PFS 7.1.7: Built-In Fire Suppression
	Policy PFS 7.1.8: New Development
	Policy PFS 7.1.9: Fire Access Design and Building Materials
	Policy PFS 7.1.10: Removal of Fire Hazards
	Policy PFS 7.1.11: Community Education
	Policy SN 1.1.2: Community Emergency Response Team.
	Policy SN 1.1.3: Cooperation
	Policy SN 1.1.4: Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan
	Policy SN 2.1.1: Asbestos
	Policy SN 4.1.1: Defensible Space
	Policy SN 4.1.2: Coordination
	Policy SN 4.1.3: Community Wildfire Preparedness Plan
	Policy SN 4.1.4: Wildland Fire Risk Reduction
14 Hydrology and Water Quality	
	Policy SN 1.1.2: Community Emergency Response Team.
	Policy SN 1.1.3: Cooperation
	Policy SN 1.1.4: Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan
	Policy SN 3.1.3: Public Facilities
	Policy SN 3.1.4: Flood Control Costs
	Policy SN 3.1.5: Agency Coordination
	Policy PR 4.1.5: Waterway Recreation and Access
	Policy NCR 1.1.1: Habitat Preservation
	Policy NCR 1.1.3 Wetland Preservation

Table 20-1 2035 General Plan Policies Not Implemented under the No Project Alternative

Chapter Number and Name	New Goal or Policy
Hydrology/Water Quality, cont.	Policy NCR 4.1.2: Community Education
	Policy NCR 4.1.3: Protection
	Policy NCR 4.1.4: Creek Clean-Up
	Policy NCR 4.1.5: New Development
	Policy NCR 4.1.6: Low-Impact Development
15 Noise	
	Policy SN 6.1.6: Aircraft Noise
	Policy SN 6.1.8: Vibration Standards
	Implementation Program SN-1: Adopt a Noise Reduction Program
16 Public Services and Recreation	
	Policy LU 1.1.10: Network of Open Space
	Goal LU 5.1
	Policy LU 5.1.1: River District Overlay
	Policy LU 5.1.2: Vision for the River District
	Policy LU 5.1.3: River District Master Plan
	Policy LU 5.1.4: Enhance Lake Natoma with Compatible Recreation Uses
	Goal NCR 1.1
	Policy NCR 1.1.5: New Open Space
	Policy PFS 1.1.1: City Facilities
	Policy PFS 1.1.2: Arts and Culture Master Plan
	Policy PFS 1.1.3: Public Art
	Policy PFS 1.1.4: Harris Center for the Arts
	Policy PFS 1.1.5: Relocate Corporation Yard
	Policy PFS 1.1.6: Partnerships with the Private Sector
	Goal PFS 2.1
	Policy PFS 2.1.3: Adequate Financing
	Policy PFS 2.1.4: Higher Education
	Policy PFS 2.1.5: Library
	Goal PFS 6.1
	Policy PFS 6.1.1: Adequate Facilities
	Policy PFS 6.1.2: Police Response Standards
	Policy PFS 6.1.3: Police Communication
	Policy PFS 6.1.4: Neighborhood Watch
	Policy PFS 6.1.5: Citizen Alert System
	Policy PFS 6.1.6: Youth Programs
	Policy PFS 6.1.7: Development Review
	Goal PFS 7.1
	Policy PFS 7.1.1: Adequate Facilities and Services
	Policy PFS 7.1.2: Fire Response Standards
	Policy PFS 7.1.3: Mutual Aid Agreements
	Policy PFS 7.1.4: Optimal Siting
	Policy PFS 7.1.5: Fire Flow Requirements
	Policy PFS 7.1.6: Inspections
	Policy PFS 7.1.7: Built-In Fire Suppression
	Policy PFS 7.1.8: New Development
	Policy PFS 7.1.9: Fire Access Design and Building Materials
	Policy PFS 7.1.10: Removal of Fire Hazards
	Policy PR 1.1.1: Parks and Recreation Master Plan
	Policy PR 1.1.2: Complete System
	Policy PR 1.1.4: Park Acreage Service Level Goal
	Policy PR 1.1.9: Water-Wise Landscaping

Table 20-1 2035 General Plan Policies Not Implemented under the No Project Alternative

Chapter Number and Name	New Goal or Policy
Public Services/Recreation, cont.	Policy PR 1.1.13: Community Gardens
	Policy PR 2.1.1: Diversity of Users
	Policy PR 4.1.1: Coordination with State and County Parks
	Policy PR 4.1.3: County, State, and Federal Cooperation
	Policy PR 4.1.4: Connections
	Policy PR 4.1.5: Waterway Recreation and Access
17 Transportation and Circulation	
	Policy M 1.1.1: Complete Streets
	Policy M 1.1.2: Adequate Rights-of-way
	Policy M 1.1.3: Accessibility
	Policy M 1.1.4: Existing Streets Retrofits
	Policy M 1.1.5: Connected Neighborhoods
	Policy M 1.1.6: Intermodal Connections
	Policy M 1.1.8: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Master Plan
	Policy M 1.1.9: Transportation Demand Management
	Policy M 1.1.10: Facilities for Emerging Technologies
	Policy M 2.1.2: New Sidewalks
	Policy M 2.1.3: Pedestrian and Bicycle Linkages in New Development
	Policy M 2.1.4: Sidewalk Network
	Policy M 2.1.7: Design Guidelines
	Policy M 2.1.10: Bicycle Parking
	Policy M 2.1.11: Bicycle Parking at City Facilities
	Policy M 2.1.12: Trail Network
	Policy M 2.1.14: Intersections
	Policy M 2.1.15: Funding
	Policy M 2.1.16: Safe Routes to School
	Policy M 2.1.17: Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpasses
	Policy M 2.1.18: Public Involvement
	Policy M 3.1.1: Access to Public Transit
	Policy M 3.1.2: Transit for Elderly and Persons with Disabilities
	Policy M 3.1.3: Regional Transit Connectivity
	Policy M 3.1.4: Light Rail Double-Tracking
	Policy M 3.1.5: Extended Light Rail Service
	Policy M 3.1.6: "Hi-Bus" Transit Corridors
	Policy M 3.1.7: Transit to Key Locations
	Policy M 4.1.1: Road Network Hierarchy
	Policy M 4.1.2: Roadway Maintenance
	Policy M 4.1.3: Level of Service
	Policy M 4.1.4: Capital Southeast Connector
	Policy M 4.1.8: Energy Efficiency
	Policy M 4.2.1: Parking
	Policy M 4.2.2: Reduce Minimum Parking Standards
	Policy M 4.2.3: Shared Parking
	Policy M 4.2.4: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
	Policy M 5.1.1: Efficient Goods Movement
	Policy M 5.1.2: Off-Peak Deliveries
	Policy M 5.1.3: Truck Routes
	Policy M 5.1.4: STAA Truck Routes
	Policy M 5.1.5: Quarry Trucks
	Policy M 6.1.1: State and Regional Communication
	Policy M 6.1.1: Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Consistency

Table 20-1 2035 General Plan Policies Not Implemented under the No Project Alternative

Chapter Number and Name	New Goal or Policy
Transportation/Circulation, cont.	Policy M 6.1.3: Support Zero- and Low-Emission Vehicle Adoption
	Policy M 7.1.1: New Development
	Policy M 7.1.2: Fair Share for Transportation Infrastructure Improvements
	Policy M 7.1.3: Funding Sources
18 Tribal Cultural Resources	
	Policy NCR 1.1.4: Native and Drought Tolerant Vegetation
	Policy NCR 5.1.2: Cultural Resources Inventory
	Policy NCR 5.1.3: Nominate Additional Cultural Resources
	Policy NCR 5.1.4: Applicable Laws and Regulations
19 Utilities and Service Systems	
	Goal PFS 3.1
	Policy PFS 3.1.1: Water Master Plan
	Policy PFS 3.1.2: Urban Water Management Plan
	Policy PFS 3.1.3: Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance
	Policy PFS 3.1.4: New Technologies
	Policy PFS 3.1.5: Agency Coordination
	Policy PFS 3.1.6: Water Quality
	Policy PFS 3.1.7: Water Supply
	Policy PFS 3.1.9: Water Conservation Programs
	Policy PFS 3.1.10: Water Conservation Standards
	Policy PFS 3.1.11: Resilient System
	Policy PFS 3.1.12: Non-Potable Water
	Goal PFS 4.1
	Policy PFS 4.1.1: Wastewater System
	Policy PFS 4.1.2: Regional Cooperation
	Goal PFS 5.1
	Policy PFS 5.1.1: Maintain Adequate Storm Drainage
	Policy PFS 5.1.2: FEMA Flood Maps
	Policy PFS 5.1.3: Urban Runoff
	Policy PFS 5.1.4: Green Stormwater Infrastructure
	Goal PFS 8.1
	Policy PFS 8.1.1: Provision of Utilities
	Policy PFS 8.1.2: Telecommunications Technologies
	Policy PFS 8.1.3 Renewable Energy
	Policy PFS 8.1.4 Regional Energy Conservation
	Policy PFS 8.1.5 PACE Program
	Policy PFS 8.1.6 Energy-Efficient Lighting
	Policy PFS 8.1.7 Energy Conservation in City Operations
	Policy PFS 8.1.8 City Fleet Fuel Efficiency
	Goal PFS 9.1
	Policy PFS 9.1.1: Collection
	Policy PFS 9.1.2: Waste Reduction
	Policy PFS 9.1.3: Recycling Target
	Policy PFS 9.1.4: Composting

Source: Planning Partners 2018.

While the No Project Alternative would result in some similar environmental impacts to the proposed 2035 General Plan, most environmental impacts would be greater because the protective policies contained within the 2035 General Plan or identified as mitigation in this Draft PEIR would

not be implemented. Based on the foregoing, the No Project Alternative would result in more environmental effects than the proposed 2035 General Plan project.

Table 20-2 includes an evaluation of the relative impacts of implementing Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative.

Table 20-2 Evaluation of Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative		
Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency for Project	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Land Use, Population and Housing		
Plan and Policy Consistency MTP/SCS	Consistent	Inconsistent with the MTP/SCS since new goals and policies would not be implemented
Plan and Policy Consistency PC SVRA GP	Consistent with mitigation	Same as project
Physical Division of an Established Community	No adverse effect	Increased potential since new goals and policies would not be implemented
Conflict with HCP/NCCP	No adverse effect	Same as project
Growth Inducement	No adverse effect	Same as project
Displacement of Housing or Persons	No adverse effect	Same as project
Aesthetics and Visual Resources		
Adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the scenic character	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since new goals and policies would not be implemented
Damage to scenic resources within a scenic corridor	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since new goals and policies would not be implemented
Create new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Agriculture and Forestry Resources		
Convert important farmlands to urban uses	LS	Same as project
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts within the 2035 Planning Area	LS	Same as project
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts adjacent to the 2035 Planning Area	SU	Same as project
Conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland	LS	Same as project
Result in the loss of forestland or timberland	LS	Same as project
Air Resources		
Increase in construction-related emissions	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented

Table 20-2 Evaluation of Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency for Project	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Increase in operational emissions	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Consistency with air quality planning efforts	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Increase in local mobile-source emissions of CO	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Increase in health risks associated with exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Increase in exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of odors	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Biological Resources		
Substantial adverse effect on special-status species	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources	LS	Same as project
Conflict with a HCP or NCCP	LS	Same as project
Cultural Resources		
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since some new goals and policies would not be implemented
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since some new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Damage or destruction of previously unknown unique paleontological resources during construction	S/LS	Increased magnitude but not significance since some new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Disturb interred human remains during construction	LS	Same as project
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources		
Expose people or structures to risk from seismic hazards	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented

Table 20-2 Evaluation of Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency for Project	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Soil erosion from heightened exposure to wind or water erosion	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Geologic hazards related to unstable soils	LS	Same as project
Loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site	SU	Same as project
Have soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks where sewers are not available	LS	Same as project
Global Climate Change		
Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for reducing GHG emissions	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Conflict with long-term statewide GHG emissions reduction goals for 2050	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and EIR mitigation would not be implemented
Climate change adaptation	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or accidental release of hazardous materials	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Hazards to the public or environment from development at a known hazardous materials site	LS	Same as project
Hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	LS	Same as project
Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Result in a safety hazard from a public airport	LS	Same as project
Result in a safety hazard from a private airport	LS	Same as project
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Substantially alter drainage patterns leading to erosion or siltation	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented

Table 20-2 Evaluation of Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency for Project	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Alter the course of stream/river increasing runoff resulting in flooding	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Contribute runoff that exceeds stormwater drainage capacity or contributes additional polluted runoff	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Place housing or other structures within 100-year flood hazard area	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Expose persons or structures to a significant risk of flooding	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since new goals and policies would not be implemented
Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge	LS	Same as project
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	LS	Same as project
Noise and Vibration		
Noise levels in excess of standards; or a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
A substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since new goals and policies would not be implemented
For a project located within an airport land use plan, exposure of people to excessive noise levels	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies related to noise and vibration	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration	LS	Same as project
Exposure to aircraft noise from a private airport	LS	Same as project
Public Services and Recreation		
Physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered governmental facilities	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Deterioration of City of Folsom parks and recreational facilities	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of City of Folsom recreational facilities	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of state and regional recreational facilities	S/LS	Decreased magnitude and significance since the proposed River District is absent from the 1988 General Plan

Table 20-2 Evaluation of Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency for Project	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Transportation and Circulation		
Traffic level of service on local intersections	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Traffic level of service on US 50 freeway	S/SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Change in air traffic patterns that results in a safety risk	LS	Same as project
Increase in safety hazards due to design features or incompatible uses	LS	Same as project
Result in inadequate emergency access	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Eliminate or adversely affect existing facilities for alternative transportation modes	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Interfere with the implementation of a planned bikeway, pedestrian facility, or transit facility	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Result in demands greater than available capacity for transit facilities	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance since goals and policies that encourage transit use would not be implemented
Tribal Cultural Resources		
Interference with, or a substantial change in the significance of, tribal cultural resources	SU	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Utilities and Service Systems		
Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the CVRWQCB	LS	Same as project
Require the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Require new or expanded wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities	LS	Same as project
Have sufficient water supplies available to serve development identified by the 2035 General Plan	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Increase the generation of solid waste, resulting in a demand for additional landfill capacity	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Increased demand for private utility services	LS	Same as project

Table 20-2 Evaluation of Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency for Project	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Cumulative Impacts		
Aesthetics	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Agricultural Resources	SU	Same as project
Air Quality	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Biological Resources	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Cultural Resources	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources	SU	Same as project
Global Climate Change	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Hydrology and Water Quality	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation measures would not be implemented
Noise and Vibration	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Public Services and Recreation	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Transportation and Circulation	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Tribal Cultural Resources	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Utilities and Service Systems	LS	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented
Growth Inducement & Secondary Effects	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance since Planning Areas 1 and 2 would not be identified in the General Plan
Energy Use	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented

Table 20-2 Evaluation of Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency for Project	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Irreversible Commitment of Resources	S/LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Irreversible Environmental Changes	SU	Increased magnitude but not significance since the new goals and policies, and PEIR mitigation would not be implemented
Potential Environmental Damage from Accidents	LS	Increased magnitude and significance since the new goals and policies would not be implemented

Notes:

LS = Less than significant impact, S = Significant impact, SU = Significant and unavoidable impact, S/LS – Less than significant impact after mitigation, S/SU – Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation

Source: *Planning Partners, 2018.*

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not fully meet the following objectives of the proposed 2035 General Plan project as set forth in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft PEIR.

- Focus on Historic Folsom’s Commercial District as a center of shopping, dining, entertainment, and cultural attractions
- Promote town centers as social gathering places
- Promote the revitalization of aging commercial corridors
- Provide all residents with opportunities to live an active, healthy, and green lifestyle
- Provide for a range of attractive and viable transportation options, such as bicycling, walking, rail, and transit
- Provide a range of housing choices for all generations
- Preserve the High Quality of Folsom’s Neighborhoods
- Foster a sustainable community for the next generation’s benefit
- Integrate the “old” and the “new” areas of the city
- Embrace Folsom’s Heritage

ALTERNATIVE 2 – DELETION OF PLANNING AREA 2

Under the Deletion of Planning Area 2 Alternative, Planning Area 2 would be deleted from the 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram (reproduced in Figure 3-2 of this Draft PEIR). As set forth in the Land Use Diagram, Planning Area 2 includes a portion of the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area. Although no developed land uses are proposed by the 2035 General Plan for Planning Area 2, encroachment into the PC SVRA could conflict with ongoing and proposed uses at this State-owned and managed facility. Additionally, incorporating a portion of the SVRA into the City would be inconsistent with the following goals and policies of the PC SVRA General Plan:

- **OM Guideline 2.5:** Acquire neighboring lands from willing sellers to expand OHV recreational opportunities consistent with the General Plan.

- **OM Goal 5:** Develop and maintain SVRA facilities and monitor OHV activities to ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses.
- **OM Guideline 5.2:** Require that noise levels not exceed relevant jurisdiction (county) noise standards for hourly exposure at or beyond the boundary line of the SVRA. In the SVRA, similar limits shall be strived for in areas of permanent human habitation (e.g., State Parks caretaker housing units).

Although adoption of the 2035 General Plan has been determined by this Draft PEIR to have a less-than-significant impact on growth inducement, deletion of Planning Area 2 from the 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram could reduce the potential that urban development could occur in Planning Area 2 prior to the year 2050 as established by the Blueprint Preferred Scenario adopted by SACOG. For additional information regarding the Blueprint and SACOG, please refer to Chapter 3 of this Draft PEIR.

Table 20-3 includes an evaluation of the relative impacts of implementing Alternative 2 – Delete Planning Area 2 Alternative.

Table 20-3 Evaluation of Alternative 2 – Deletion of Planning Area 2		
Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Land Use, Population and Housing		
Plan and Policy Consistency MTP/SCS	Consistent	Same as project
Plan and Policy Consistency PC SVRA GP	Consistent with mitigation	Decreased potential for conflict since PC SVRA would not be included within the 2035 General Plan’s Planning Area
Physical Division of an Established Community	No adverse effect	Same as project
Conflict with HCP/NCCP	No adverse effect	Same as project
Growth Inducement	No adverse effect	Same as project
Displacement of Housing or Persons	No adverse effect	Same as project
Aesthetics and Visual Resources		
Adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the scenic character	SU	Same as project
Damage to scenic resources within a scenic corridor	SU	Same as project
Create new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views	S/SU	Same as project
Agriculture and Forestry Resources		
Convert important farmlands to urban uses	LS	Same as project

Table 20-3 Evaluation of Alternative 2 – Deletion of Planning Area 2

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts within the 2035 Planning Area	LS	Same as project
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts adjacent to the 2035 Planning Area	SU	Same as project
Conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland	LS	Same as project
Result in the loss of forestland or timberland	LS	Same as project
Air Resources		
Increase in construction-related emissions	LS	Same as project
Increase in operational emissions	S/SU	Same as project
Consistency with air quality planning efforts	LS	Same as project
Increase in local mobile-source emissions of CO	LS	Same as project
Increase in health risks associated with exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants	SU	Same as project
Increase in exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of odors	S/SU	Same as project
Biological Resources		
Substantial adverse effect on special-status species	S/SU	Same as project
Substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities	LS	Same as project
Substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands	S/SU	Same as project
Interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species	LS	Same as project
Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources	LS	Same as project
Conflict with a HCP or NCCP	LS	Same as project
Cultural Resources		
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource	SU	Same as project
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource	S/SU	Same as project
Damage or destruction of previously unknown unique paleontological resources during construction	S/LS	Same as project

Table 20-3 Evaluation of Alternative 2 – Deletion of Planning Area 2

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Disturb interred human remains during construction	LS	Same as project
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources		
Expose people or structures to risk from seismic hazards	LS	Same as project
Soil erosion from heightened exposure to wind or water erosion	LS	Same as project
Geologic hazards related to unstable soils	LS	Same as project
Loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site	SU	Same as project
Have soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks where sewers are not available	LS	Same as project
Global Climate Change		
Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for reducing GHG emissions	S/LS	Same as project
Conflict with long-term statewide GHG emissions reduction goals for 2050	S/SU	Same as project
Climate change adaptation	LS	Same as project
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction	LS	Same as project
Routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or accidental release of hazardous materials	LS	Same as project
Hazards to the public or environment from development at a known hazardous materials site	LS	Same as project
Hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	LS	Same as project
Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires	S/LS	Same as project
Result in a safety hazard from a public airport	LS	Same as project
Result in a safety hazard from a private airport	LS	Same as project
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality	LS	Same as project
Substantially alter drainage patterns leading to erosion or siltation	LS	Same as project

Table 20-3 Evaluation of Alternative 2 – Deletion of Planning Area 2

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Alter the course of stream/river increasing runoff resulting in flooding	S/LS	Same as project
Contribute runoff that exceeds stormwater drainage capacity or contributes additional polluted runoff	S/LS	Same as project
Place housing or other structures within 100-year flood hazard area	S/LS	Same as project
Expose persons or structures to a significant risk of flooding	LS	Same as project
Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge	LS	Same as project
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	LS	Same as project
Noise and Vibration		
Noise levels in excess of standards; or a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	S/SU	Same as project
A substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project	LS	Same as project
For a project located within an airport land use plan, exposure of people to excessive noise levels	S/LS	Same as project
Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies related to noise and vibration	LS	Same as project
Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration	LS	Same as project
Exposure to aircraft noise from a private airport	LS	Same as project
Public Services and Recreation		
Physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered governmental facilities	LS	Same as project
Deterioration of City of Folsom parks and recreational facilities	LS	Same as project
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of City of Folsom recreational facilities	LS	Same as project
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of state and regional recreational facilities	S/LS	Same as project

Table 20-3 Evaluation of Alternative 2 – Deletion of Planning Area 2

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Transportation and Circulation		
Traffic level of service on local intersections	S/SU	Same as project
Traffic level of service on US 50 freeway	S/SU	Same as project
Change in air traffic patterns that results in a safety risk	LS	Same as project
Increase in safety hazards due to design features or incompatible uses	LS	Same as project
Result in inadequate emergency access	LS	Same as project
Eliminate or adversely affect existing facilities for alternative transportation modes	LS	Same as project
Interfere with the implementation of a planned bikeway, pedestrian facility, or transit facility	LS	Same as project
Result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians	LS	Same as project
Result in demands greater than available capacity for transit facilities	LS	Same as project
Tribal Cultural Resources		
Interference with, or a substantial change in the significance of, tribal cultural resources	SU	Same as project
Utilities and Service Systems		
Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the CVRWQCB	LS	Same as project
Require the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities	LS	Same as project
Require new or expanded wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities	LS	Same as project
Have sufficient water supplies available to serve development identified by the 2035 General Plan	LS	Same as project
Increase the generation of solid waste, resulting in a demand for additional landfill capacity	LS	Same as project
Increased demand for private utility services	LS	Same as project
Cumulative Impacts		
Aesthetics	SU	Same as project
Agricultural Resources	SU	Same as project
Air Quality	SU	Same as project

Table 20-3 Evaluation of Alternative 2 – Deletion of Planning Area 2

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Biological Resources	SU	Same as project
Cultural Resources	SU	Same as project
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources	SU	Same as project
Global Climate Change	SU	Same as project
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LS	Same as project
Hydrology and Water Quality	LS	Same as project
Noise	SU	Same as project
Public Services and Recreation	LS	Same as project
Transportation	SU	Same as project
Tribal Cultural Resources	SU	Same as project
Utilities and Service Systems	LS	Same as project
Growth Inducement & Secondary Effects	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance since Planning Area 2 would not be identified in the General Plan
Energy Use	S/LS	Same as project
Irreversible Commitment of Resources	S/LS	Same as project
Irreversible Environmental Changes	SU	Same as project
Potential Environmental Damage from Accidents	LS	Same as project

Notes:

LS = Less than significant impact, S = Significant impact, SU = Significant and unavoidable impact, S/LS – Less than significant impact after mitigation, S/SU – Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation

Source: *Planning Partners, 2018.*

Implementation of the Deletion of Planning Area 2 Alternative would not fully meet the following objective of the proposed 2035 General Plan project.

- Foster a sustainable community for the next generation’s benefit

ALTERNATIVE 3 – AMEND THE RIVER DISTRICT AND PLANNING AREA 1

Under the Amend the River District and Planning Area 1 Alternative, the following modifications to the Land Use Diagram, and goals and policies would be implemented:

Modify the 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram – River District

Modify the 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram to delete any indication that the proposed River District would include public lands within the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and American River Parkway. This is not intended to preclude the addition of such lands to the River District upon completion of the River District Master Plan prepared in compliance with Policy LU 5.1.3.

Modify the **2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram – Transit Priority Areas**

Modify the 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram to delete any indication that proposed Transit Priority Areas would include public lands within the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and American River Parkway.

Modify the **2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram – Planning Area 1.**

Modify the 2035 General Plan Land Use Diagram to amend the boundary of Planning Area 1 to exclude the Alder Creek/Pond area within the FLSRA.

Modify **Goal LU 5.1.**

Support the appropriate enhancement of Folsom’s riverfront areas for current and future residents in order to increase public access, recreational opportunities, and economic development in consultation with federal, State, and regional public lands management agencies.

Modify **Policy LU 5.1.1: River District Overlay.**

Policy LU 5.1.1: River District Overlay: Apply a River District Overlay designation to the riverfront areas of Folsom outside of the boundaries of the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park, and American River Parkway to elevate the importance of the river.

Modify **Policy LU 5.1.2: Vision for the River District.**

Policy: LU 5.1.2: Vision for the River District: Engage the community, ~~and~~ stakeholders, and federal, State, and regional land management agencies in establishing a vision for Folsom’s River District.

Modify **Policy LU 5.1.3: River District Master Plan.**

Policy LU 5.1.3: River District Master Plan. Prepare a River District Master Plan for Folsom’s riverfront area, that is based on widespread community engagement as well as coordination with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and Sacramento County Regional Parks Department.

Modify **Policy LU 5.1.4: Enhance Lake Natoma with Compatible Recreation Uses.**

Enhance the role of Lake Natoma as a place to recreate and an amenity for Folsom residents, and elevate Lake Natoma’s role in supporting local and regional business and commerce, including tourism, recreation and leisure, while maintaining compatibility with the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area General Plan. Invest in strategically-located sites along the length of Lake Natoma for a diverse mix of passive and active recreation and tourism activities that are compatible with nearby land uses, historically and culturally important sites, significant habitat areas, restoration sites, and native fish and wildlife usage.

Modify **Policy PR 4.1.3: County and State Cooperation.**

Policy PR 4.1.3: County and State Cooperation. Cooperate with the County Department of Regional Parks, State Department of Parks and Recreation, State Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on facility development and program offerings as appropriate.

Modify Policy PR 4.1.5: Waterway Recreation and Access.

Policy PR 4.1.5: Waterway Recreation and Access. Coordinate with federal agencies, state agencies, Sacramento County Regional Parks, private landowners, and developers to manage, preserve, and enhance the American River Parkway, urban waterways, and riparian corridors, including to increase public access for active and passive recreation.

Although no developed land uses currently are proposed by the 2035 General Plan for the River District, the goal and policy for this area set forth in the 2035 General Plan land use element prescribe the development of a land use plan that could increase development adjacent to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (FLSRA), Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park (FPSHP), and American River Parkway (ARP). Potential land uses and activities could include portions of the FLSRA, FPSHP, and ARP. Potential encroachment or changes in use patterns could conflict with ongoing and proposed uses and management activities at these publicly-owned and managed facilities. Potential changes to access and uses within the FSLRA/ FHSHP, and American River Parkway could be inconsistent with the adopted management and planning documents of these facilities, and could conflict with resource management activities in the FLSRA and American River Parkway. For additional information regarding federal, state, and regional plans and policies related to these areas, see Chapter 16, Public Services and Recreation of this Draft PEIR.

Table 20-4 includes an evaluation of the relative impacts of implementing Alternative 3 – Amend the River District and Planning Area 1 Alternative.

Table 20-4 Evaluation of Alternative 3 – Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1		
Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Land Use, Population and Housing		
Plan and Policy Consistency MTP/SCS	Consistent	Same as project
Plan and Policy Consistency PC SVRA GP	Consistent with mitigation	Same as project
Physical Division of an Established Community	No adverse effect	Same as project
Conflict with HCP/NCCP	No adverse effect	Same as project
Growth Inducement	No adverse effect	Same as project
Displacement of Housing or Persons	No adverse effect	Same as project
Aesthetics and Visual Resources		
Adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the scenic character	SU	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for modifying the visual quality of the FLSRA and ARP would be reduced
Damage to scenic resources within a scenic corridor	SU	Same as project

Table 20-4 Evaluation of Alternative 3 – Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Create new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views	S/SU	Same as project
Agriculture and Forestry Resources		
Convert important farmlands to urban uses	LS	Same as project
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts within the 2035 Planning Area	LS	Same as project
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts adjacent to the 2035 Planning Area	SU	Same as project
Conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland	LS	Same as project
Result in the loss of forestland or timberland	LS	Same as project
Air Resources		
Increase in construction-related emissions	LS	Same as project
Increase in operational emissions	S/SU	Same as project
Consistency with air quality planning efforts	LS	Same as project
Increase in local mobile-source emissions of CO	LS	Same as project
Increase in health risks associated with exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants	SU	Same as project
Increase in exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of odors	S/SU	Same as project
Biological Resources		
Substantial adverse effect on special-status species	S/SU	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the biological resources of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the biological resources of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands	S/SU	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the biological resources of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the biological resources of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced

Table 20-4 Evaluation of Alternative 3 – Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources	LS	Same as project
Conflict with a HCP or NCCP	LS	Same as project
Cultural Resources		
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource	SU	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the historic resources of the FPSHP is reduced
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource	S/SU	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the cultural resources of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Damage or destruction of previously unknown unique paleontological resources during construction	S/LS	Same as project
Disturb interred human remains during construction	LS	Same as project
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources		
Expose people or structures to risk from seismic hazards	LS	Same as project
Soil erosion from heightened exposure to wind or water erosion	LS	Same as project
Geologic hazards related to unstable soils	LS	Same as project
Loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site	SU	Same as project
Have soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks where sewers are not available	LS	Same as project
Global Climate Change		
Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for reducing GHG emissions	S/LS	Same as project
Conflict with long-term statewide GHG emissions reduction goals for 2050	S/SU	Same as project
Climate change adaptation	LS	Same as project
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction	LS	Same as project
Routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or accidental release of hazardous materials	LS	Same as project
Hazards to the public or environment from development at a known hazardous materials site	LS	Same as project

Table 20-4 Evaluation of Alternative 3 – Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	LS	Same as project
Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires	S/LS	Same as project
Result in a safety hazard from a public airport	LS	Same as project
Result in a safety hazard from a private airport	LS	Same as project
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the hydrologic features of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Substantially alter drainage patterns leading to erosion or siltation	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the hydrologic features of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Alter the course of stream/river increasing runoff resulting in flooding	S/LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the hydrologic features of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Contribute runoff that exceeds stormwater drainage capacity or contributes additional polluted runoff	S/LS	Same as project
Place housing or other structures within 100-year flood hazard area	S/LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with the hydrologic features of the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Expose persons or structures to a significant risk of flooding	LS	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential population exposed to flood risks is reduced
Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge	LS	Same as project
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	LS	Same as project
Noise and Vibration		
Noise levels in excess of standards; or a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	S/SU	Same as project
A substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project	LS	Same as project
For a project located within an airport land use plan, exposure of people to excessive noise levels	S/LS	Same as project
Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies related to noise and vibration	LS	Same as project

Table 20-4 Evaluation of Alternative 3 – Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration	LS	Same as project
Exposure to aircraft noise from a private airport	LS	Same as project
Public Services and Recreation		
Physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered governmental facilities	LS	Same as project
Deterioration of City of Folsom parks and recreational facilities	LS	Same as project
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of City of Folsom recreational facilities	LS	Same as project
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of state and regional recreational facilities	S/LS	Decreased magnitude and significance from project as the potential for interfering with the recreation resources the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Transportation and Circulation		
Traffic level of service on local intersections	S/SU	Same as project
Traffic level of service on US 50 freeway	S/SU	Same as project
Change in air traffic patterns that results in a safety risk	LS	Same as project
Increase in safety hazards due to design features or incompatible uses	LS	Same as project
Result in inadequate emergency access	LS	Same as project
Eliminate or adversely affect existing facilities for alternative transportation modes	LS	Same as project
Interfere with the implementation of a planned bikeway, pedestrian facility, or transit facility	LS	Same as project
Result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians	LS	Same as project
Result in demands greater than available capacity for transit facilities	LS	Same as project
Tribal Cultural Resources		
Interference with, or a substantial change in the significance of, tribal cultural resources	SU	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with any tribal cultural resources within the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Utilities and Service Systems		
Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the CVRWQCB	LS	Same as project

Table 20-4 Evaluation of Alternative 3 – Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1

Impact	Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Level of Impact of Alternative 1
Require the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities	LS	Same as project
Require new or expanded wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities	LS	Same as project
Have sufficient water supplies available to serve development identified by the 2035 General Plan	LS	Same as project
Increase the generation of solid waste, resulting in a demand for additional landfill capacity	LS	Same as project
Increased demand for private utility services	LS	Same as project
Cumulative Impacts		
Aesthetics	SU	Same as project
Agricultural Resources	SU	Same as project
Air Quality	SU	Same as project
Biological Resources	SU	Same as project
Cultural Resources	SU	Same as project
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources	SU	Same as project
Global Climate Change	SU	Same as project
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LS	Same as project
Hydrology and Water Quality	LS	Same as project
Noise	SU	Same as project
Public Services and Recreation	LS	Same as project
Transportation	SU	Same as project
Tribal Cultural Resources	SU	Decreased magnitude but not significance from project as the potential for interfering with any tribal cultural resources within the FLSRA and ARP is reduced
Utilities and Service Systems	LS	Same as project
Growth Inducement & Secondary Effects	LS	Same as project
Energy Use	S/LS	Same as project
Irreversible Commitment of Resources	S/LS	Same as project
Irreversible Environmental Changes	SU	Same as project
Potential Environmental Damage from Accidents	LS	Same as project

Notes:

LS = Less than significant impact, S = Significant impact, SU = Significant and unavoidable impact, S/LS – Less than significant impact after mitigation, S/SU – Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation

Source: *Planning Partners, 2018.*

Implementation of the Amendment of the River District Alternative would not fully meet the following objective of the proposed 2035 General Plan project.

- Focus on Historic Folsom’s Commercial District as a center of shopping, dining, entertainment, and cultural attractions.
- Continue to be a premier recreation destination in Northern California
- Provide all residents with opportunities to live an active, healthy, and green lifestyle
- Provide for a range of attractive and viable transportation options, such as bicycling, walking, rail, and transit.

20.3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MERITS OF EACH ALTERNATIVE

In Table 20-5, the symbol “-5” means that an alternative has a lower magnitude of impact and level of significance than that for the project (e.g., the adverse environmental condition is less than for the project, so that the impact is less than significant rather than significant). The symbol “-1” means that an alternative has a lower magnitude of impact than that for the project (e.g., the adverse environmental condition is somewhat less than for the project, but the significance of the impact is unchanged). The symbol “0” means that the alternative has an environmental effect that is equal in significance and magnitude to the proposed project. The symbol “+1” means that an alternative has a higher magnitude of impact than that for the project (e.g., adverse environmental condition is more than for the project, but the significance of the impact is unchanged). Finally, the symbol “+5” means that an alternative has a more significant impact than the proposed project (i.e., a significant impact rather than less than significant). These numerical values have been assigned to these categories in order to assess each alternative across a large number of impact areas.

Definition	Numerical Value (as shown in Table 20-5)
Decreased magnitude and significance of impact compared to proposed project	-5
Decreased magnitude of impact, but no change in level of significance	-1
Same magnitude and significance of impact as proposed project	0
Increased magnitude of impact, but no change in level of significance	1
Increased magnitude and significance of impact compared to proposed project	5

Because the emphasis of the alternatives analysis is on minimizing or avoiding impacts, those categories associated with avoiding or causing impacts not attributable to the project are assigned a value of -5 or 5 respectively. If an alternative lessens or increases the magnitude of an impact without changing its significance, the category is assigned a value of -1 or 1. The number at the bottom of Table 20-5 indicates, for each alternative, the net number of identified impacts of the project that were avoided or reduced by the alternative.

CEQA requires the selection of an environmentally superior alternative; however, if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). In the case of this Draft PEIR, the No Project Alternative is the least effective of the evaluated alternatives in reducing or avoiding the environmental effects of the 2035 General Plan. Rather, the No Project Alternative would result in substantially greater numbers of adverse effects and an increase in the severity of impacts compared to the proposed 2035 General Plan. Based on a comparative evaluation of all the alternatives, Alternative 3 (Amend the River District and Planning

Area 1) would reduce the magnitude of the most impacts as an action alternative. Alternative 3 would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Table 20-5 Relative Comparison of Alternatives

Impact	Project Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Deletion of Planning Area 2	Alternative 3 Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1
Land Use, Population and Housing				
Plan and Policy Consistency MTP/SCS	Consistent	5	0	0
Plan and Policy Consistency PC SVRA GP	Consistent with mitigation	0	-5	0
Physical Division of an Established Community	No adverse effect	1	0	0
Conflict with HCP/NCCP	No adverse effect	0	0	0
Growth Inducement	No adverse effect	0	0	0
Displacement of Housing or Persons	No adverse effect	0	0	0
Aesthetics and Visual Resources				
Adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the scenic character	SU	1	0	-1
Damage to scenic resources within a scenic corridor	SU	1	0	0
Create new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views	S/SU	1	0	0
Agriculture and Forestry Resources				
Convert important farmlands to urban uses	LS	0	0	0
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts within the 2035 Planning Area	LS	0	0	0
Conflicts with existing agricultural operations and Williamson Act Contracts adjacent to the 2035 Planning Area	SU	0	0	0
Conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland	LS	0	0	0
Result in the loss of forestland or timberland	LS	0	0	0
Air Resources				
Increase in construction-related emissions	LS	5	0	0
Increase in operational emissions	S/SU	1	0	0
Consistency with air quality planning efforts	LS	5	0	0
Increase in local mobile-source emissions of CO	LS	5	0	0
Increase in health risks associated with exposure to emissions of toxic air contaminants	SU	1	0	0

Table 20-5 Relative Comparison of Alternatives

Impact	Project Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Deletion of Planning Area 2	Alternative 3 Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1
Increase in exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of odors	S/SU	1	0	0
Biological Resources				
Substantial adverse effect on special-status species	S/SU	1	0	-1
Substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities	LS	5	0	-1
Substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands	S/SU	1	0	-1
Interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species	LS	5	0	-1
Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources	LS	0	0	0
Conflict with a HCP or NCCP	LS	0	0	0
Cultural Resources				
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource	SU	1	0	-1
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource	S/SU	1	0	-1
Damage or destruction of previously unknown unique paleontological resources during construction	S/LS	1	0	0
Disturb interred human remains during construction	LS	0	0	0
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources				
Expose people or structures to risk from seismic hazards	LS	5	0	0
Soil erosion from heightened exposure to wind or water erosion	LS	5	0	0
Geologic hazards related to unstable soils	LS	0	0	0
Loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site	SU	0	0	0
Have soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks where sewers are not available	LS	0	0	0
Global Climate Change				
Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for reducing GHG emissions	S/LS	5	0	0
Conflict with long-term statewide GHG emissions reduction goals for 2050	S/SU	1	0	0

Table 20-5 Relative Comparison of Alternatives

Impact	Project Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Deletion of Planning Area 2	Alternative 3 Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1
Climate change adaptation	LS	5	0	0
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials during construction	LS	5	0	0
Routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or accidental release of hazardous materials	LS	5	0	0
Hazards to the public or environment from development at a known hazardous materials site	LS	0	0	0
Hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	LS	0	0	0
Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires	S/LS	5	0	0
Result in a safety hazard from a public airport	LS	0	0	0
Result in a safety hazard from a private airport	LS	0	0	0
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality	LS	5	0	-1
Substantially alter drainage patterns leading to erosion or siltation	LS	5	0	-1
Alter the course of stream/river increasing runoff resulting in flooding	S/LS	5	0	-1
Contribute runoff that exceeds stormwater drainage capacity or contributes additional polluted runoff	S/LS	5	0	0
Place housing or other structures within 100-year flood hazard area	S/LS	5	0	-1
Expose persons or structures to a significant risk of flooding	LS	5	0	-1
Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge	LS	0	0	0
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	LS	0	0	0
Noise and Vibration				
Noise levels in excess of standards; or a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	S/SU	1	0	0
A substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project	LS	5	0	0

Table 20-5 Relative Comparison of Alternatives

Impact	Project Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Deletion of Planning Area 2	Alternative 3 Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1
For a project located within an airport land use plan, exposure of people to excessive noise levels	S/LS	5	0	0
Implementation of 2035 General Plan policies related to noise and vibration	LS	5	0	0
Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration	LS	0	0	0
Exposure to aircraft noise from a private airport	LS	0	0	0
Public Services and Recreation				
Physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered governmental facilities	LS	5	0	0
Deterioration of City of Folsom parks and recreational facilities	LS	5	0	0
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of City of Folsom recreational facilities	LS	5	0	0
Physical impacts associated with construction or expansion of state and regional recreational facilities	S/LS	-5	0	-5
Transportation and Circulation				
Traffic level of service on local intersections	S/SU	1	0	0
Traffic level of service on US 50 freeway	S/SU	1	0	0
Change in air traffic patterns that results in a safety risk	LS	0	0	0
Increase in safety hazards due to design features or incompatible uses	LS	0	0	0
Result in inadequate emergency access	LS	5	0	0
Eliminate or adversely affect existing facilities for alternative transportation modes	LS	5	0	0
Interfere with the implementation of a planned bikeway, pedestrian facility, or transit facility	LS	5	0	0
Result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians	LS	5	0	0
Result in demands greater than available capacity for transit facilities	LS	-1	0	0

Table 20-5 Relative Comparison of Alternatives

Impact	Project Level of Impact or Plan Consistency	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Deletion of Planning Area 2	Alternative 3 Amendment of the River District and Planning Area 1
Tribal Cultural Resources				
Interference with, or a substantial change in the significance of, tribal cultural resources	SU	5	0	-1
Utilities and Service Systems				
Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the CVRWQCB	LS	0	0	0
Require the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities	LS	5	0	0
Require new or expanded wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities	LS	0	0	0
Have sufficient water supplies available to serve development identified by the 2035 General Plan	LS	5	0	0
Increase the generation of solid waste, resulting in a demand for additional landfill capacity	LS	5	0	0
Increased demand for private utility services	LS	0	0	0
Cumulative Impacts				
Aesthetics	SU	1	0	0
Agricultural Resources	SU	0	0	0
Air Quality	SU	1	0	0
Biological Resources	SU	1	0	0
Cultural Resources	SU	1	0	0
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources	SU	0	0	0
Global Climate Change	SU	1	0	0
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LS	5	0	0
Hydrology and Water Quality	LS	5	0	0
Noise	SU	1	0	0
Public Services and Recreation	LS	5	0	0
Transportation	SU	1	0	0
Tribal Cultural Resources	SU	1	0	-1
Utilities and Service Systems	LS	1	0	0
Growth Inducement & Secondary Effects	LS	-1	-1	0
Energy Use	S/LS	5	0	0
Irreversible Commitment of Resources	S/LS	5	0	0
Irreversible Environmental Changes	SU	1	0	0
Potential Environmental Damage from Accidents	LS	5	0	0
Impacts Relative to Project		213	-6	-14

The City of Folsom will consider the selection of a preferred project upon review of this Draft PEIR and other information in the public record. Identification of an environmentally superior alternative does not require that the City choose that alternative. In choosing a preferred project, the City is required to make written findings regarding its choice of a project to implement, including the reasons why it chose not to implement an environmentally superior alternative or alternatives, if the selected project is not the environmentally superior alternative. In the findings, the City must set forth its reasoning for proceeding with the 2035 General Plan project. Such reasoning could include the social, economic, or other benefits provided by the 2035 General Plan project. This process allows a lead agency to balance any environmental harm with other factors appropriate in judging the merits of a project.

This page intentionally
left blank.