

FPA Electronic Readerboard Project

Initial Study/Addendum
to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR

Prepared by:

City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

With technical support from:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
1180 Iron Point Road, Suite 130
Folsom, CA 95630

October 2023

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
INITIAL STUDY INFORMATION SHEET	v
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND	2
3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	3
3.1 PROJECT LOCATION	3
3.2 PROJECT SETTING.....	3
3.3 PROPOSED PROJECT.....	3
4.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS	4
5.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.....	5
Incorporation of the Previous Relevant Environmental Analysis	5
Evaluation of the FPA Electronic Readerboard Project	5
6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	6
7.0 DETERMINATION	7
8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST.....	8
I. AESTHETICS	9
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES	11
III. AIR QUALITY	13
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	21
V. CLIMATE CHANGE	29
VI. CULTURAL RESOURCES	34
VII. GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERALS.....	44
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	48
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	51
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	54
XI. NOISE	56
XII. PARKS AND RECREATION	60
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING	61
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	63
XV. TRANSPORTATION	66
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	69
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	71
9.0 REFERENCES	73
10.0 PREPARERS.....	75

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF TABLES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
	Table 1. Sacramento Valley Air Basin Attainment Status	15
	Table 2. SMAQMD Significance Thresholds	16
	Table 3. Global Warming Potentials and Atmospheric Lifetimes	30

LIST OF APPENDICES

A	Figures
B	Proposed Project Design Details
C	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

ACRONYMS

AB	Assembly Bill
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
amsl	above mean sea level
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
City	City of Folsom
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CRPR	California Rare Plant Ranks
CVRWQCB	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DPM	Diesel Particulate Matter
EDHFD	El Dorado Hills Fire Department
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FPA	Folsom Plan Area
FPASP	Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan; Folsom South of US Highway 50 Specific Plan
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
kV	kilovolt
LOS	Level of Service
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MM	Mitigation Measure

ACRONYMS (Cont.)

MMRP	Mitigation Management Reporting Program
mph	miles per hour
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PM	Particulate Matter
RC	Regional Commercial
RCC	Regional Commercial Center
ROG	Reactive Organic Gas
SB	Senate Bill
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SPA	Specific Plan Area
Specific Plan	Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminant
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

INITIAL STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

1. Project title: FPA Electronic Readerboard Project
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
3. Contact person and phone number: Steve Banks, Principal Planner
(916) 461-6207
4. Project location: South of US Highway 50 near the East Bidwell
Street freeway exit, Folsom, CA 94560
5. Project sponsor's name and address: TK Consulting, Inc.
Attn: Tim Kihm
2082 Michelson Drive, 4th Floor
Irvine, CA 92612
6. Current General Plan designation: Regional Commercial (RC)
7. Current Zoning: Specific Plan – Regional Commercial – Planned
Development District (SP-RC-PD)
8. Current FPA Specific Plan land use
designation: Specific Plan – Regional Commercial (SP-RC)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Folsom (City) certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Folsom Plan Area (FPA) Specific Plan (Specific Plan), in May 2011 (State Clearinghouse No. 2008092051). This Initial Study addresses a project proposed by the City of Folsom for property within the FPA Specific Plan area, and whether it may cause significant effects on the environment. The potential environmental effects of the FPA electronic readerboard project are further evaluated to determine whether they were examined in the Specific Plan EIR. Consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162 and 15168(c)(2), this Initial Study focuses on any effects on the environment that are specific to the proposed FPA electronic readerboard project, or to the parcels on which the project would be located, which were not analyzed as potentially significant effects in the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan, or for which substantial new information shows that identified effects would be more significant than described in the EIR.

This Initial Study relies on CEQA Guidelines environmental review procedures that allow for the updating and use of a previously certified EIR for projects that are different from the previous project or the conditions under which the project was analyzed. The following subsections of Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines state the following with respect to an addendum to a certified EIR:

- a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.
- c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.
- d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.
- e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in the addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, this Initial Study has been prepared to document that the proposed project modifications do not require preparation of a subsequent EIR under Section 15162.

The environmental impacts of the proposed project are substantially similar to the project evaluated in the certified EIR. As supported in the analysis contained in this Initial Study, there are no substantial changes proposed to the project which would result in any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. There is no new information of substantial importance which was not known for the certified EIR, and no new mitigation measures are necessitated by new significant impacts.

None of the circumstances listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR are present, and only minor technical changes or additions are necessary to update the previously certified EIR; therefore, an addendum may be prepared.

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The approximately 36-acre FPA electronic readerboard project site lies within the FPA Specific Plan area which encompasses approximately 3,509.8 acres in the southern portion of the City of Folsom. The Specific Plan area is generally bounded on the north by US Highway 50, White Rock Road to the south, Prairie City Road to the west, and the Sacramento/El Dorado County line to the east. A Final EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2008092051) was prepared and certified, and the Specific Plan was adopted by the city in 2011.

A Specific Plan amendment is required for any proposed change to the Specific Plan that will increase environmental impacts or other major changes that meet one of more of the following criteria:

- Significant changes to the distribution of land uses beyond those allowed by the Specific Plan
- New land use categories not specifically described in the FPASP, such as electronic readerboards
- Significant changes to the circulation pattern that may alter the backbone infrastructure network or capacity (roadways or utilities)
- Changes that exceed the analysis limitation of the EIR
- Changes to the Development Standards that would significantly alter the quality or character of the Plan Area

A Specific Plan amendment requires approval of the City of Folsom Planning Commission and the City Council. The Specific Plan may be amended as often as deemed necessary by the City of Folsom Planning Commission and the City Council. A Specific Plan amendment shall be approved in the same manner the FPA Specific Plan was approved pursuant to California Code Section 65453.

Electronic readerboard signage would be a new land use category not specifically described in the Specific Plan. Therefore, the proposed FPA electronic readerboard project would require an amendment to the Specific Plan to modify Table A.7 "Transportation, Communication & Infrastructure" allowed uses to allow one electronic readerboard sign to be permitted specifically on Parcel 61 within the Regional Commercial Zoning District (SP-RCC-PD) along US Highway 50 with approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the Planning Commission. No other changes to the Specific Plan are proposed.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

3.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project site is located within the City of Folsom in northeastern Sacramento County, along US Highway 50 near the East Bidwell Street exit. The proposed FPA electronic readerboard project would be located on the following Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 072-3190-052. The majority of the proposed project site is located in Sections 8 and 17 of Township 9 North and Range 8 East of the US Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute "Clarksville" quadrangle map (quad). The western portion of the site is unsectioned (unsurveyed). Refer to Figure 1 for the project's regional location and Figure 2 for the proposed potential readerboard locations (all figures are included as Appendix A).

3.2 PROJECT SETTING

The project site is historically undeveloped open space. The surrounding land uses are characterized by open space, commercial, and residential and mixed-use development. Terrain in the potential project sites is relatively flat while the surrounding areas appear to be hilly and undeveloped, with elevations ranging between approximately 372 feet above mean sea level (amsl) at the westernmost potential project site, 384 feet amsl at the central potential project site, and 451 feet amsl at the easternmost potential site location. The readerboard would be located immediately off of the south side of US Highway 50 slightly west of East Bidwell Street. Two electronic readerboards are already existing in the City of Folsom along US Highway 50 to the east of the potential project site, and have heights of 75 and 65 feet. The project site contains no natural biological communities as they have all been previously rough graded and cleared.

3.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would develop an electronic readerboard on a site located along US Highway 50 in APN 072-3190-052. The approximately 36-acre project parcel is currently zoned Regional Commercial/Planned Development/ Specific Plan – Folsom Plan Area (SP-RC-PD [SP 11-1]), and has a General Plan designation of Regional Commercial Center (RCC). The readerboard would be 65 feet in height with a base of approximately 180 square feet. The readerboard would feature landscaping that includes ornamental shrubs and groundcover at the base of the electronic readerboard sign, which would be constructed of architectural stone with cap. The readerboard would feature individual LED illuminated letters and an LED illuminated logo so that the readerboard is visible from US Highway 50. The proposed project would not exceed the illuminated square footage and height of the existing electronic readerboard signage in the City of Folsom, such as the 75-foot-tall Broadstone pylon sign and the 65-foot-tall Folsom Pointe pylon sign. The proposed project would not require access to a gas or water source; however, it would require a connection to existing electric facilities during construction and operation. Maintenance access during construction and operation of the proposed project would be provided by an access road, and construction would consist of fine grading, construction of a 65-foot tall electronic readerboard, and undergrounding of electric utilities. Some landscaping is proposed to be located immediately next to the foundations of the readerboard. Refer to Appendix B for the site design elements.

The proposed project would require a Specific Plan Amendment to the FPA Specific Plan to modify FPASP Table A.7 "Transportation, Communication & Infrastructure" allowed uses (City of Folsom 2010;

Page A-11) to allow one electronic readerboard sign to be permitted within Parcel 61 of the Specific Plan Area along US Highway 50 upon approval of a Conditional Use Permit. No other changes to the Specific Plan are anticipated to be required with this Amendment. A Conditional Use Permit will be required at the time of application for approval of the electronic readerboard sign.

4.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS

A listing and brief description of the regulatory permits and/or approvals required to implement the FPA electronic readerboard Project are provided below. This environmental document is intended to address the environmental impacts associated with the following discretionary actions and approvals:

City of Folsom

- **Specific Plan Amendment** to modify FPA Specific Plan Table A.7 “Transportation, Communication & Infrastructure” allowed uses to allow one electronic readerboard sign to be permitted within Parcel 61 along US Highway 50 with approval of a Conditional Use Permit.
- **Conditional Use Permit**
- **Consideration of the Environmental Document:** The City of Folsom will act as the lead agency as defined by CEQA and will have authority to determine if the environmental document is adequate under CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.
- **Project Approval:** The City of Folsom will consider approval of the project and the entitlements described above.

5.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

An EIR was prepared for the FPA Specific Plan, pursuant to the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan. The Specific Plan required that the General Plan be amended to incorporate the proposed Specific Plan and its allowable land uses, development regulations, design guidelines, and infrastructure improvements. The City adopted the updated General Plan in August 2018 and the Final EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2017082054) addressing the General Plan was published in May 2018. These documents have incorporated the Specific Plan, of which the FPA electronic readerboard project is included. The Specific Plan EIR evaluated the potential impacts of the implementation of the entire Specific Plan, including the development of the FPA electronic readerboard project site.

Incorporation of the Previous Relevant Environmental Analysis

The EIRs for the City of Folsom 2034 Updated General Plan and the FPA Specific Plan are comprehensive documents. These documents provide important context to understanding the environmental analyses that have occurred to date with respect to development in the City of Folsom and FPA Specific Plan, therefore, both documents are hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.

Evaluation of the FPA Electronic Readerboard Project

This Initial Study evaluates whether the environmental effects of the currently proposed FPA electronic readerboard project were adequately addressed in the FPA Specific Plan EIR. For impacts that were adequately addressed, this Initial Study provides a cross-reference to the relevant discussion in the EIR. Impacts specific to the FPA electronic readerboard project that were not fully addressed in the FPA Specific Plan EIR are evaluated in detail in this document. This Initial Study also identifies whether changes have occurred to the project or circumstances since the EIR was certified that require additional analysis in this document.

Mitigation measures contained in the FPA Specific Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) relevant to the proposed project have been identified and summarized in this Initial Study and are included in Appendix C.

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that may require mitigation to reduce the impact from “New Significant Impact” to “Less than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

An Initial Study is conducted by a Lead Agency to determine if a project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063). An EIR must be prepared if an Initial Study indicates that further analysis is needed to determine whether a significant impact will occur or if there is substantial evidence in the record that a project may have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(f)).

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forestry Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology, Soils, and Minerals	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

7.0 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and an ADDENDUM will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an environmental impact report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potential impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Steven Banks
Printed Name:

October 26, 2023

Date

City of Folsom (Principal Planner
For:

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, responses to the following questions and related discussion indicate if the proposed project will have or will potentially have a significant adverse impact on the environment, either individually or cumulatively with other projects. All phases of project planning, implementation, and operation are considered. Mandatory Findings of Significance are discussed in Section 8.XVIII below.

- A. “New Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant that was not previously identified as a significant impact in the Specific Plan EIR. If there are one or more “New Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- B. “Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of project-level mitigation measures (not including mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan EIR) are required to reduce an effect from “New Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- C. “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts.
- D. “No New Impact” applies where a project does not create a new significant impact or result in a substantial increase in the severity of the impact identified in the Specific Plan EIR for that category. Applicable mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR will be cross-referenced and applied as appropriate.

I. AESTHETICS

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The project site is vacant following rough grading and clearing as part of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. Terrain on the project site and surrounding area has been altered and will be developed as part of the Folsom Plan Area. Elevation on the project site is approximately 384 feet amsl. Terrain in the area surrounding the potential project sites is primarily flat and cleared. There are three existing electronic readerboard signage along US Highway 50 in the City of Folsom: the 80-foot-tall Palladio at Broadstone electronic readerboard, the 75-foot-tall Broadstone pylon sign, and the 65-foot-tall Folsom Pointe pylon sign all located north and northeast of the potential project location.

The project site is bordered by US Highway 50 to the north and cleared, rough graded open space to the south, west, and east. Due to the relatively flat terrain and few trees near any site, the site is within the viewshed of motorists on US Highway 50.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

Visual resources (i.e., aesthetics) are discussed in Chapter 3A.1 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The EIR concluded that implementation and construction of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan would substantially degrade the scenic vista and existing view and introduce a substantial quantity of light into a rural landscape, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 3A.1-1, 3A.1-4, and 3A.1-5, but the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Evaluation of Aesthetics

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No New Impact. Neither the project site, nor views to or from the project site, have been designated as an important scenic vista by the City of Folsom or any other public agency. Therefore, construction of

the proposed development would not interfere with or degrade a scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant, and no new impact would occur.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No New Impact. There are no State or locally designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the proposed project site (Caltrans 2023). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not adversely affect scenic resources within a designated scenic highway, and impacts would be less than significant. No new impact would occur.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?

No New Impact. The FPA Specific Plan EIR concluded that construction activities would temporarily degrade the existing visual character of the SPA in the vicinity of developed areas, resulting in a direct and significant impact. The existing visual character of the area surrounding the project site is defined by cleared and rough graded open space as well as ongoing construction and development, and the project site is vacant and largely barren. Implementation of the project would result in the construction of a 65-foot-tall electronic readerboard along US Highway 50, located outside of the 50-foot landscaped corridor along US Highway 50. While the proposed project would result in a change in visual character on-site, the proposed project is expected to integrate with the planned and existing Specific Plan area and surrounding land uses. Further, there are three currently existing readerboards north and northeast of the proposed project site: the 80-foot-tall Palladio at Broadstone electronic readerboard, the 75-foot-tall Broadstone pylon sign, and the 65-foot-tall Folsom Pointe pylon sign. The FPA Specific Plan EIR stated impacts to the visual character of the area would be significant and unavoidable; this impact was previously realized with construction of the aforementioned electronic readerboards and construction/operation of the proposed electronic readerboard would not exacerbate this condition as it is roughly the same height, footprint, and illumination as the other readerboards. Thus no new impact would occur and no mitigation measures would apply.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No New Impact. The FPA Specific Plan EIR concluded that because the scale of proposed developed and because project implementation would introduce a substantial quantity of light into a rural landscape, overall light and glare effects are considered significant and unavoidable. As seen in the design plans included as Appendix B, the readerboard would have the lettering and logo illuminated with one potential design including a screen for displaying images. Because the proposed project includes the installation of a 65-foot-tall electronic readerboard that would be operational 24 hours a day/7 days a week, the proposed project would result in the introduction of a new source of substantial light that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. However, as noted above, the FPA Specific Plan area concluded that implementation of the FPA Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from new sources of light and glare. Therefore, no new impact would occur.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

No agricultural activities or timber management occur on or near the project site, and the project site is not designated for those land uses. The California Important Farmland Finder Interactive Map prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation (CDC) classifies the project site as urban and built-up land, and immediately adjacent areas are also urban and built-up land and other land (CDC 2022). Urban and built-up land is defined by the California Department of Conservation as land occupied by structures or infrastructure with a building density of at least one unit to one and one-half acres, or approximately six structures to a 10-acre parcel. Other land is defined by land that is not included in any other category, which includes areas not suitable for agricultural uses (CDC 2022).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Certified EIR

As discussed in Chapter 3A - 10 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan, the Sacramento County Important Farmland map designates the Specific Plan Area (SPA) and off-site US Highway 50 interchange improvements, the sewer force main, and the detention basin as Grazing Land and Urban and Built-Up Land. The two roadway extensions from the Folsom Heights property into El Dorado Hills are designated by the El Dorado County Important Farmland Map as Grazing Land and Urban and Built-Up Land. These farmland designations are not considered Important Farmland under CEQA (California Public Resources Code Sections 21060.1 and 21095 and CEQA Guidelines Appendix G). Thus, there would be no impact related to the conversion of Important Farmland or changes which result in the conversion of Important Farmland and no mitigation measures were required.

Evaluation of Agriculture and Forestry Services

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No New Impact. Because no agricultural resources or activities exist on the project site, no new impact would occur for questions a) and b).

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

No New Impact. Because the project site is not zoned nor used for agriculture, no new impact would occur for question c).

III. AIR QUALITY

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The potential air quality impacts associated with implementation of the Specific Plan were evaluated in Chapter 3A.2 of the EIR. The project site is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) in the northeastern portion of Sacramento County. The SVAB comprises all of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Placer, Sacramento, Shasta, Solano, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo, and Yuba counties.

Air Quality Regulatory Framework

The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) have established ambient air quality standards for common pollutants. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws in the SVAB. As required by the California Clean Air Act, SMAQMD has published Clean Air Plans and adopted rules and regulations to limit the emissions that can be generated by various uses and/or activities to bring the SVAB into compliance with the federal and state ambient air quality standards.

Criteria Air Pollutants

Criteria pollutants, defined by state and federal law as a risk to the health and welfare of the general public, include the following compounds:

- Ozone (O₃)
- Carbon monoxide (CO)

- Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)
- Particulate matter (PM), which is further subdivided:
 - Coarse PM, 10 micrometers or less in diameter (PM₁₀)
 - Fine PM, 2.5 micrometers or less in diameter (PM_{2.5})
- Sulfur dioxide (SO₂)
- Lead (Pb)

Criteria pollutants can be emitted directly from sources (primary pollutants; e.g., CO, SO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and lead), or they may be formed through chemical and photochemical reactions of precursor pollutants in the atmosphere (secondary pollutants; e.g., ozone, NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}). Note that PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} can be both primary and secondary pollutants. The principal precursor pollutants of concern are reactive organic gases ([ROGs] also known as volatile organic compounds [VOCs])¹ and nitrogen oxides (NO_x).

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TAC) are a diverse group of air pollutants that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness, or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. TACs can cause long-term health effects such as cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, asthma, bronchitis, or genetic damage, or short-term acute effects such as eye watering, respiratory irritation (a cough), runny nose, throat pain, and headaches. TACs are considered either carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic based on the nature of the health effects associated with exposure to the pollutant. For carcinogenic TACs, there is no level of exposure that is considered safe, and impacts are evaluated in terms of overall relative risk expressed as excess cancer cases per one million exposed individuals. Noncarcinogenic TACs differ in that there is generally assumed to be a safe level of exposure below which no negative health impact is believed to occur. These levels are determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

Diesel engines emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, including both gaseous and solid material. The solid material in diesel exhaust is known as diesel particulate matter (DPM). Almost all DPM is 10 microns or less in diameter, and 90 percent of DPM is less than 2.5 microns in diameter (CARB 2018a). Because of their extremely small size, these particles can be inhaled and eventually trapped in the bronchial and alveolar regions of the lung. In 1998, CARB identified DPM as a TAC based on published evidence of a relationship between diesel exhaust exposure and lung cancer and other adverse health effects. DPM has a significant impact on California's population—it is estimated that about 70 percent of total known cancer risk related to air toxics in California is attributable to DPM (CARB 2018a).

Ambient Air Quality Standards

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The EPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS)

¹ CARB defines and uses the term ROGs while the USEPA defines and uses the term VOCs. The compounds included in the lists of ROGs and VOCs and the methods of calculation are slightly different. However, for the purposes of estimating criteria pollutant precursor emissions, the two terms are often used interchangeably.

for several air pollution constituents. As permitted by the Clean Air Act, California has adopted more stringent air emissions standards (CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air constituents.

The CARB is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for any state standard. An “attainment” designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A “nonattainment” designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once.

TABLE 1.
SACRAMENTO VALLEY AIR BASIN ATTAINMENT STATUS

Pollutant	State of California Attainment Status	Federal Attainment Status
Ozone (1-hour)	Nonattainment	No Federal Standard
Ozone (8-hour)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Suspended Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	Nonattainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Carbon Monoxide	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Lead	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified/Attainment	No Federal Standard

Sources: CARB 2018b.

Construction activities would include fine grading and installation of underground utilities, paving, construction of structures, and architectural coating (e.g., painting). Grading includes fine grading for installation of the foundation of the readerboard. Because grading would be limited to fine grading, no import or export of soil is anticipated. Construction would require heavy equipment during grading, underground utilities, paving and building construction.

The only operations present on the site would be on-site energy use to power the electronic readerboard and trips generated by the occasional passenger vehicle for maintenance purposes.

Levels of Significance

The SMAQMD has adopted thresholds which lead agencies can use to determine the significance of a development project’s short-term construction and long-term operational pollutant emissions. The SMAQMD’s 2020 thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant and precursors are shown in Table 2, *SMAQMD Significance Thresholds* (SMAQMD 2020).

TABLE 2.
SMAQMD SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)
Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG)	NONE	65
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	85	65
Particulate Matter Exhaust (PM ₁₀)	80	80
Fine Particulate Matter Exhaust (PM _{2.5})	82	82
Local Carbon Monoxide (CO)	9.0 ppm (8-hour average), 20.0 ppm (1-hour average)	

For construction fugitive dust, rather than a numeric threshold, SMAQMD recommends that lead agencies consider projects which implement Best Management Practices (BMP) to have a less than significant impact related to fugitive dust (SMAQMD 2020). The FPA Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a requires implementation of the BMP.

For cancer risks to sensitive receptors as a result of TAC emissions, the SMAQMD has adopted a threshold: any project that has the potential to directly impact a sensitive receptor and results in an increased risk from cancer greater than 10 in 1 million would have a potentially significant impact (SMAQMD 2020).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

Air Quality is discussed in Chapter 3A.2 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan. The EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan could have potentially significant adverse air quality impacts and includes measures to reduce impacts to less than significant.

The EIR concluded that, due to the extent of the development allowed under the Specific Plan and because grading activities are anticipated to be extensive, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Implementation of the FPA Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a would require implementation of the SMAQMD's list of Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices, and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices. In addition to SMAQMD-recommended measures, construction operations shall comply with all applicable SMAQMD rules and regulations. Implementation of FPA Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a would reduce short-term construction emissions of criteria pollutants to a less than significant level.

The EIR concluded that based on modeling conducted as part of the EIR, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a net increase in unmitigated long-term regional emissions. According to traffic data used to prepare the EIR, full build-out of the Specific Plan Area would result in approximately 247,0000 additional vehicle trips per day. FPA Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a requires project applicants for all project phases to implement SMAQMD's list of Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices, and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices.

Evaluation of Air Quality

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No New Impact. Consistency with the air quality plan is determined by whether the project would hinder implementation of control measures identified in the air quality plan or would result in growth of population or employment that is not accounted for in local and regional planning. The proposed project would construct a 65-foot-tall electronic readerboard at a location off of US Highway 50, and would not result in the growth of population or employment that is not accounted for in the FPA Specific Plan. While electronic readerboards are not currently an allowed use, approval of this amendment to allow one electronic readerboard sign to be conditionally permitted within Parcel 61 along US Highway 50 would not have any new impact on the applicable air quality plan by SMAQMD. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the plan, and the impact would be less than significant and would not exceed the significance of the impact in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No New Impact.

Construction Emissions. With implementation of the FPA Specific Plan Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a, the project's construction period emissions of criteria pollutant and precursors would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds. Construction would include fine grading, placement of foundations and construction of the electronic readerboard. The impact related to emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors during project construction activities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and would not exceed the significance determination in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

Operation Emissions. Operations at the project site would consist of occasional maintenance and would not generate emissions, criteria pollutants, or precursors at a level above the significance determination in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

FPA Specific Plan Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a: Implement Measures to Control Air Pollutant Emissions Generated by Construction of On-Site Elements.

To reduce short-term construction emissions, the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall require their contractors to implement SMAQMD's list of Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices, and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices (list below) in effect at the time individual portions of the site undergo construction. In addition to SMAQMD-recommended measures, construction operations shall comply with all applicable SMAQMD rules and regulations.

Basic Construction Emission Control Practices

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.

- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes (as required by the state airborne toxics control measure [Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations]). Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be in proper running condition before it's operated.

Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices – Soil Disturbance Areas

- Water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil. However, do not overwater to the extent that sediment flows off the site.
- Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- Plant vegetative ground cover (fast-germinating native grass seed) in disturbed areas as soon as possible. Water appropriately until vegetation is established.

Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices – Unpaved Roads

- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Treat site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6 to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel to reduce generation of road dust and road dust carryout onto public roads.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the construction site regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of SMAQMD and the City contact person shall also be posted to ensure compliance.

Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices

- The project shall provide a plan, for approval by the City of Folsom Community Development Department and SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower [hp] or more) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20% NOx reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most current California Air Resources Board fleet average that exists at the time of construction. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. The project applicant(s) of each project phase or its representative shall submit to the City of Folsom Community Development Department and SMAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 hp, that would be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. SMAQMD's Construction Mitigation Calculator can be used to identify an equipment fleet that achieves this reduction (SMAQMD 2021). The project shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the SPA do not exceed 40% opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and the City and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of noncompliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration for the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. SMAQMD staff and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this mitigation measure shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.
 - If at the time of construction, SMAQMD has adopted a regulation or new guidance applicable to construction emissions, compliance with the regulation or new guidance may completely or partially replace this mitigation if it is equal to or more effective than the mitigation contained herein, and if SMAQMD so permits.
- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

No New Impact. In developing project-level thresholds of significance for air pollutants, SMAQMD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. If a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air

quality conditions. The proposed project would not exceed the identified significance thresholds as it is an electronic readerboard with minimal emissions. Therefore, additional analysis to assess cumulative impacts is unnecessary. As discussed in question b), above, the project's short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions would not exceed the SMAQMD threshold with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, the project's emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors would be less than cumulatively considerable. The impact would be less than significant and would not exceed the significance of the impact in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No New Impact.

Construction Emissions. Construction of the proposed project would result in temporary short-term emissions of diesel exhaust from on-site heavy-duty equipment. Diesel particulate matter from construction activities would not expose any sensitive receptors to TAC emissions, as there are no sensitive receptors within 300 feet of the proposed project site. Furthermore, the use of mobilized equipment would be temporary. Considering this information and the highly dispersive nature of DPM, it is not anticipated that construction of the project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations. The impact would be less than significant and would not exceed the significance determination in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

Localized Carbon Monoxide

Vehicle exhaust is the primary source of CO, and in an urban setting, the highest CO concentrations are generally found in close proximity to congested intersections. Under typical meteorological conditions, CO concentrations tend to decrease as distance from the emissions source (i.e., congested intersection) increase. The proposed project would be located near US Highway 50, and would not contribute significantly to localized "hot spots" of CO. The SMAQMD CEQA guidelines provide carbon monoxide is of less concern because operational activities are not likely to generate substantial quantities of this air pollutant, and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin has been in attainment for these criteria air pollutants for multiple years (SMAQMD 2020). Impacts related to CO hotspots would be less than significant and would not exceed the significance determination in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No New Impact. Construction of the project would require the use of diesel-powered equipment which can be a temporary source of odors. Due to the temporary and intermittent nature of construction activities, and due to the distance to the nearest sensitive receptors (single-family homes approximately 0.36 mile south), construction of the project would not result in emissions leading to odors that would adversely affect substantial numbers of people. Long-term operation of the project would not be a substantial source of odors. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in emissions leading to odors that would adversely affect substantial numbers of people, and the impact would be less than significant and would not exceed the significance of the impact in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Result in a conversion of oak woodland that would have a significant effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The proposed project will be developed on a 36-acre site located within the Specific Plan Area on previously cleared and graded land along US Highway 50. The project site is vacant following previous grading and clearing activities associated with development of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. The potential project site is barren of native vegetation, and are bordered by US Highway 50 to the north

and cleared and graded open space to the east, west, and south. The surrounding land uses are characterized by existing and former industrial parcels, railroad, and mixed use and residential developments. Terrain in the area surrounding the project site is flat. Elevations on the project site are between approximately 9 feet and 12 feet from west to east. The site contains no natural biological communities, and is outside of any tidal marsh zones. Precipitation and municipal water are the only sources of water for the project site. Elevations are generally lowest in the westmost potential site, and there is no clear pattern of drainage. Developed habitat provides low-quality habitat for wildlife, typically supporting only transient individuals using the area for dispersal, because of the sparse vegetation and lack of species diversity. There are no trees located in or near the potential project site, and no trees would be added as part of the proposed project.

All portions of the Specific Plan Area, with the exception of 25-foot buffers around preserved wetlands, have been or will be subject to contour grading as part of the Specific Plan to achieve level ground for development. The proposed project location would not be situated within 25 feet of a preserved wetland, and would be located on a previously rough graded and contoured area.

Regulatory Framework Related to Biological Resources

Federal Requirements

Federal Endangered Species Acts

The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) enforces the provisions stipulated in the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA, 16 USC Section 1531 et seq.). Species identified as threatened or endangered (50 CFR Section 17.11, and 17.12) are protected from take, which is defined as direct or indirect harm, unless a Section 10 permit is granted to an entity other than a federal agency or a Biological Opinion with incidental take provisions is rendered to a federal lead agency via a Section 7 consultation. Pursuant to the requirements of the FESA, an agency reviewing a proposed project within its jurisdiction must determine whether any federally listed species may be present on the project site and determine whether the proposed project will have a potentially significant impact on them. Under the FESA, habitat loss is considered to be a potential impact to a species. In addition, the USFWS is required to determine whether the project is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species that is proposed for listing under the FESA or to result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat proposed to be designated for such species (16 USC 1536[3], [4]). Therefore, project related impacts to those species or their habitats would be considered significant and would require mitigation. Other federal agencies designate species of concern (species that have the potential to become listed), that are evaluated during environmental review although they are not otherwise protected under the FESA. Impacts to those species or their habitats would likewise be considered significant and would require mitigation.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 established federal responsibilities for the protection of nearly all species of birds, their eggs, and nests. The Migratory Bird Treaty Reform Act of 2004 further defined species protected under the act and excluded all non-native species. Section 16 U.S.C. 703–712 of the Act states “unless and except as permitted by regulations, it shall be unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture, or kill” a

migratory bird. A migratory bird is any species or family of birds that live, reproduce or migrate within or across international borders at some point during their annual life cycle. Currently, there are 836 migratory birds protected nationwide by the MBTA, of which 58 are legal to hunt. The US Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit (with jurisdiction over California) has ruled that the MBTA does not prohibit incidental take (952 F 2d 297 – Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit 1991).

State Requirements

California Endangered Species Act

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA; California Fish and Game Code Section 2050 to 2097) is similar to the FESA. The California Fish and Game Commission is responsible for maintaining lists of threatened and endangered species under the CESA. CESA prohibits the take of listed and candidate (petitioned to be listed) species. “Take” under California law means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch capture, or kill (California Fish and Game Code Section 86). The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) can authorize take of a state-listed species under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code if the take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, the impacts are minimized and fully mitigated, funding is ensured to implement and monitor mitigation measures, and CDFW determines that issuance would not jeopardize the continued existence of the species. A CESA permit must be obtained if a project will result in the take of listed species, either during construction or over the life of the project. For species listed under both the FESA and the CESA requiring a Biological Opinion under Section 7 of the FESA, CDFW may also authorize impacts to CESA species by issuing a Consistency Determination under Section 2080.1 of the Fish and Game Code.

California Code of Regulations and California Fish and Game Code

The official listing of endangered and threatened animals and plants is contained in the California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 670.5. A state candidate species is one that the California Fish and Game Code has formally noticed as being under review by CDFW for inclusion on the state list pursuant to Sections 2074.2 and 2075.5 of the California Fish and Game Code.

Legal protection is also provided for wildlife species in California that are identified as “fully protected animals.” These species are protected under Sections 3511 (birds), 4700 (mammals), 5050 (reptiles and amphibians), and 5515 (fishes) of the California Fish and Game Code. These statutes prohibit take or possession of fully protected species at any time. CDFW is unable to authorize incidental take of fully protected species when activities are proposed in areas inhabited by these species. CDFW has informed non-federal agencies and private parties that they must avoid take of any fully protected species. However, Senate Bill 618 (2011) allows CDFW to issue permits authorizing the incidental take of fully protected species under the CESA, so long as any such take authorization is issued in conjunction with the approval of a Natural Community Conservation Plan that covers the fully protected species (California Fish and Game Code Section 2835).

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), lead agencies analyze whether projects would have a substantial adverse effect on a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species (Public Resources Code Section 21001(c)). These “special-status” species generally include those listed under

the FESA and the CESA, and species that are not currently protected by statute or regulation, but would be considered rare, threatened, or endangered under the criteria included in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15380. Therefore, species that are considered rare are addressed regardless of whether they are afforded special protection through any other statute or regulation. CDFW, in consultation with the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), assigns a California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) to native species according to rarity; plants with a CRPR of 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, or 3 are generally considered special-status species under CEQA.

Although threatened and endangered species are protected by specific federal and state statutes, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15380(d) provides that a species not listed on the federal or state list of protected species may be considered rare if it can be shown to meet certain specified criteria. Those criteria have been modeled after the definition in FESA and the section of the California Fish and Game Code dealing with rare or endangered plants and animals. Section 15380(d) allows a public agency to undertake a review to determine if a significant effect on species that have not yet been listed by either the USFWS or CDFW (i.e., candidate species) would occur. Thus, CEQA provides an agency with the ability to protect a species from the potential impacts of a project until the respective government agency has an opportunity to designate the species as protected, if warranted.

California Native Plant Protection Act

The California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (California Fish and Game Code Section 1900-1913) empowers the Fish and Game Commission to list native plant species, subspecies, or varieties as endangered or rare following a public hearing. To the extent that the location of such plants is known, CDFW must notify property owners that a listed plant is known to occur on their property. Where a property owner has been so notified, the owner must notify CDFW at least 10 days in advance of any change in land use (other than changing from one agricultural use to another), in order that CDFW may salvage listed plants that would otherwise be destroyed. Currently, 64 taxa of native plants have been listed as rare under the act.

Nesting and Migratory Birds

California Fish and Game Code Subsections 3503 and 3800 prohibit the possession, take, or needless destruction of birds, their nests, and eggs, and the salvage of dead nongame birds. California Fish and Game Code Subsection 3503.5 protects all birds in the orders of Accipitriformes, Falconiformes, and Strigiformes (birds of prey). Fish and Game Code Subsection 3513 states that it is unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the MBTA or any part of such migratory nongame bird except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the MBTA. The Attorney General of California has released an opinion that the Fish and Game Code prohibits incidental take.

Regional Water Quality Control Board

Any action requiring a CWA Section 404 permit, or a Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 permit, must also obtain a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification. The State of California Water Quality Certification (WQC) Program was formally initiated by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in 1990 under the requirements stipulated by Section 401 of the federal CWA. Although the Clean Water Act is a federal law, Section 401 of the CWA recognizes that states have the primary authority and responsibility

for setting water quality standards. In California, under Section 401, the State and Regional Water Boards are the authorities that certify that issuance of a federal license or permit does not violate California's water quality standards (i.e., that they do not violate Porter-Cologne and the Water Code). The WQC Program currently issues the WQC for discharges requiring USACE's permits for fill and dredge discharges within Waters of the United States, and now also implements the State's wetland protection and hydromodification regulation program under the Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

On April 2, 2019, the SWRCB adopted a State Wetland Definition and Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State (Procedures), for inclusion in the forthcoming Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries and Ocean Waters of California. The Procedures consist of four major elements: 1) a wetland definition; 2) a framework for determining if a feature that meets the wetland definition is a water of the state; 3) wetland delineation procedures; and 4) procedures for the submittal, review, and approval of applications for Water Quality Certifications and Waste Discharge Requirements for dredge or fill activities. The Office of Administrative Law approved the Procedures on August 28, 2019, and the Procedures became effective May 28, 2020.

Under the Procedures and the State Water Code (Water Code §13050(e)), "Waters of the State" are defined as "any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state." Unless excluded by the Procedures, any activity that could result in discharge of dredged or fill material to Waters of the State, which includes Waters of the US and non-federal Waters of the State, requires filing of an application under the Procedures.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne Act, Water Code Section 13000 *et seq.*) is California's statutory authority for the protection of water quality in conjunction with the federal CWA. The Porter-Cologne Act requires the SWRCB and RWQCBs under the CWA to adopt and periodically update water quality control plans, or basin plans. Basin plans are plans in which beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and implementation programs are established for each of the nine regions in California. The Porter-Cologne Act also requires dischargers of pollutants or dredged or fill material to notify the RWQCBs of such activities by filing Reports of Waste Discharge and authorizes the SWRCB and RWQCBs to issue and enforce waste discharge requirements, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, Section 401 water quality certifications, or other approvals.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CDFW is a trustee agency that has jurisdiction under Section 1600 *et seq.* of the California Fish and Game Code. Under Sections 1602 and 1603, a private party must notify CDFW if a proposed project will "substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of streambeds...except when the department has been notified pursuant to Section 1601." Additionally, CDFW asserts jurisdiction over native riparian habitat adjacent to aquatic features, including native trees over four inches in dbh. If an existing fish or wildlife resource may be substantially adversely affected by the activity, CDFW may propose reasonable measures that will allow protection of those resources. If these measures are agreeable to the parties involved, they may enter into an agreement with CDFW identifying the approved activities and associated mitigation measures. Generally, CDFW recommends submitting an application for a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) for any work done within the lateral limit of water flow or the edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is greater.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

Biological Resources are discussed in Chapter 3A.3 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan. The EIR concludes that the amount of habitat loss and degradation is extensive and contributes significantly to the loss of this habitat type in the region, micro watersheds of aquatic resources retained on the site would not be preserved, wetland buffers from construction impacts would only be 25 feet in some cases and not more than 75 feet in many others, nearly 50 percent of the aquatic resources in the Specific Plan Area would be filled, and the magnitude of topographic modification that would occur across the site with project implementation is severe (City of Folsom 2010). The EIR concludes that all of these factors are likely to substantially diminish the natural communities on site, rendering direct impacts significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, 3A.3-2, 3A.3-3, 3A.3-4, 3A.3-5, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

The proposed project was evaluated for its potential to result in impacts identified in the EIR, as well as any potential impacts not identified in the EIR. Each potentially significant impact in the Specific Plan EIR is discussed below. No other potential impacts were identified for the proposed project that were not evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR.

Evaluation of Biological Resources

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

No New Impact.

Potential Impacts to Wildlife Associated with Vernal Pools

The areas in and surrounding the potential project sites have been rough graded, and only fine grading would be a part of the proposed project. There are no wetlands or vernal pools located on or near the project site, and no new roadways would be constructed as part of the proposed project. No new impact would occur.

Potential Impacts to Swainson's Hawk and Other Raptors

There are no trees or oak woodland on or near the potential project sites, and no trees would be removed as part of the proposed project. No new impact would occur.

Potential Impacts to Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle

No elderberry shrubs are located on or near any of the potential project sites (City of Folsom 2010). Thus, project activities would not result in impacts to Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle and no new impact would occur.

Potential Impacts to Tricolored Blackbird

Potential nesting habitat is limited on or near the potential project site as no vegetation that provides potential nesting habitat for nesting birds is present on or near the project site. Thus, project activities would not result in impacts to nesting birds and no new impact would occur.

Potential Impacts to Special-Status Bats

No abandoned mine shafts or trees are located on or near any of the project site, and the proposed project would not remove or add any trees. Therefore, no impacts to special-status bats are anticipated. No mitigation measures are necessary for special-status bats, and no new impact would occur.

Potential Impacts to Other Special-Status Species

No ponds would be filled as part of the proposed project, and the project site has been previously rough graded and cleared as part of the FPA Specific Plan. Habitat for special-status species is not present on the project site, and no mitigation measures are necessary for special-status species. No new impact would occur.

Potential Impacts to Special Status Plants

Habitat for special-status plants on the site is not present since the site has been disturbed from rough grading. Therefore, special-status plants are presumed absent from the project site, and no impacts to special-status plant species are anticipated. No mitigation measures are necessary for special-status plants, and no new impact would occur.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

No New Impact. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans is present on the project site. Therefore, no riparian habitat or other sensitive community would be impacted by the project, and no new impact would occur.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No New Impact. No seasonal wetlands are present on the project site. Therefore, no potential impact to State or federally jurisdictional areas would occur and neither notification of nor authorization from CDFW, RWQCB, or USACE is required. No protected wetlands would be impacted by the project, and no new impact would occur.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

No New Impact. The project site and surrounding area feature land uses that are currently under construction or planned for development. The project site does not provide important habitat for movement of any native species or a migratory wildlife corridor, nor would development of the project impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, there would be no impact, and no new impact would occur.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No New Impact. No protected trees are located on or near the project site, therefore there would be no impact to protected trees and no new impact would occur.

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No New Impact. The project site is not within a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan for the City of Folsom. Therefore, no impacts to an existing adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan would occur, and no new impact would occur.

V. CLIMATE CHANGE

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The potential climate change/greenhouse gas emission impacts associated with implementation of the Specific Plan were evaluated in Chapter 3A.4 of the EIR.

Climate Change Overview

Global climate change refers to changes in average climatic conditions over the entire Earth including temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms. Global temperatures are moderated by naturally occurring atmospheric gases. These gases are commonly referred to as greenhouse gases (GHG) because they function like a greenhouse by letting light in but preventing heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere. These gases allow solar radiation (sunlight) into the Earth's atmosphere but prevent radiative heat from escaping.

GHGs are emitted by natural processes and human (anthropogenic) activities. Anthropogenic GHG emissions are primarily associated with: (1) the burning of fossil fuels during motorized transport, electricity generation, natural gas consumption, industrial activity, manufacturing, and other activities; (2) deforestation; (3) agricultural activity; and, (4) solid waste decomposition.

Greenhouse Gases

The GHGs defined under California's Assembly Bill (AB) 32 include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes that range from one year to several thousand years. Long atmospheric lifetimes allow for GHG emissions to disperse around the globe. Because GHG emissions vary widely in the power of their climatic effects, climate scientists have established a unit called global warming potential (GWP). The GWP of a gas is a measure of both potency and lifespan in the atmosphere as compared to CO₂. For example, because methane and N₂O are approximately 25 and 298 times more powerful than CO₂, respectively, in their ability to trap heat in the atmosphere, they have GWPs of 25 and 298, respectively (CO₂ has a GWP of 1). CO₂e is a quantity that enables all GHG emissions to be considered as a group despite their varying GWP. The GWP of each GHG is multiplied by the prevalence of that gas to produce CO₂e. Typically, the GWP ratio corresponding to the warming

potential of CO₂ over a 100-year period is used as a baseline. The atmospheric lifetime and GWP of selected GHGs are summarized in Table 3, *Global Warming Potentials and Atmospheric Lifetimes*.

TABLE 2.
GLOBAL WARMING POTENTIALS AND ATMOSPHERIC LIFETIMES

Greenhouse Gas	Atmospheric Lifetime (years)	Global Warming Potential (100-year time horizon)
Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂)	50-200	1
Methane (CH ₄)	12	25
Nitrous Oxide (N ₂ O)	114	298
HFC-324a	14	1,430
PFC: Tetrafluoromethane (CF ₄)	50,000	7,390
PFC: Hexafluoroethane (C ₂ F ₆)	10,000	12,200
Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF ₆)	3,200	22,800

Source: IPCC 2007

HFC: hydrofluorocarbon; PFC: perfluorocarbon

GHG Emissions Regulatory Framework

California GHG Regulations

The primary legislation governing GHG emissions in California and directing the related actions taken by state and local agencies is AB 32, *California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*, and SB 32, *California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: emissions limit*.

AB 32 requires that CARB develop and enforce regulations for the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. CARB was directed to set a GHG emission limit, based on 1990 levels, to be achieved by 2020. The bill requires CARB to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions. As a follow-up to AB 32, SB 32 was passed by the California legislature in August 2016 to codify the Executive Order B-30-15 GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and requires the State to invest in the communities most affected by climate change.

On December 11, 2008, CARB adopted the Scoping Plan (CARB 2008) as directed by AB 32. The Scoping Plan proposes a set of actions designed to reduce overall GHG emissions in California to the levels required by AB 32. Measures applicable to development projects include those related to energy-efficiency building and appliance standards, the use of renewable sources for electricity generation, regional transportation targets, and green building strategy. Relative to transportation, the Scoping Plan includes nine measures or recommended actions related to reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle GHG emissions through fuel and efficiency measures. These measures would be implemented statewide rather than on a project-by-project basis.

In response to EO B-30-15 and SB 32, all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions were directed to implement measures to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 targets. CARB was directed to update the Scoping Plan to reflect the 2030 target (CARB 2014). The mid-term target is critical to help frame the suite of policy measures, regulations, planning efforts, and investments in clean technologies and infrastructure needed to continue driving down emissions. In

December 2017, CARB adopted the *2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, the Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target*, to reflect the 2030 target set by EO B-30-15 and codified by SB 32 (CARB 2017).

Regional and Local GHG Policies and Plans

Sacramento County's Board of Supervisors has approved the first phase of a climate action plan that will provide a framework for reducing GHG emissions. The first phase focuses on the County's overall strategy and goals for addressing climate change (Sacramento County 2022). Key goals in the first phase include a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita in the region; improving energy efficiency of all existing and new buildings; emphasizing water use efficiency as a way to reduce energy consumption; maximizing waste diversion, composting, and recycling through residential and commercial programs; and protecting important farmlands and open space from conversion and encroachment and maintaining connectivity of protected areas.

The City of Folsom developed a GHG reduction strategy as part of the City of Folsom General Plan EIR. The City of Folsom General Plan does not contain any goals or policies that relate directly to climate change or GHGs (City of Folsom 2021). The City is in the early stages of updating its General Plan, which will include multiple policies that directly address climate change and GHG emissions.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

Climate change is discussed in Chapter 3A.4 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan. The EIR concluded that the Specific Plan's contribution to regional GHG emissions would be significant and unavoidable. The FPA Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measures 3A.4-1, -2a, and -2b, however the impacts to climate change would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Evaluation of Climate Change

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

No New Impact. The proposed project would construct a single electronic readerboard within a portion of the Folsom Plan Area that is proposed for eventual development. The readerboard would not generate a significant number of emissions and would have no new impact.

Construction Emissions

Construction period emissions would be temporary and minimal, consisting only of light grading and construction of the electronic readerboard. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.4-1, impacts would be less than significant and no new impact would occur.

Operational Emissions

Operations at the electronic readerboard would consist only of occasional maintenance. There would be no new impact.

Mitigation Measure 3A.4-1: Implement Additional Measures to Control Construction-Generated GHG Emissions.

To further reduce construction generated GHG emissions, the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall implement all feasible measures for reducing GHG emissions associated with construction that are recommended by SMAQMD at the time individual portions of the site undergo construction. Such measures may reduce GHG exhaust emissions from the use of on-site equipment, worker commute trips, and truck trips carrying materials and equipment to and from the SPA, as well as GHG emissions embodied in the materials selected for construction (e.g., concrete). Other measures may pertain to the materials used in construction. Prior to releasing each request for bid to contractors for the construction of each discretionary development entitlement, the project applicant(s) shall obtain the most current list of GHG reduction measures that are recommended by SMAQMD and stipulate that these measures be implemented in the respective request for bid as well as the subsequent construction contract with the selected primary contractor. The project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application may submit to the City and SMAQMD a report that substantiates why specific measures are considered infeasible for construction of that particular development phase and/or at that point in time. The report, including the substantiation for not implementing particular GHG reduction measures, shall be approved by the City, in consultation with SMAQMD prior to the release of a request for bid by the project applicant(s) for seeking a primary contractor to manage the construction of each development project. By requiring that the list of feasible measures be established prior to the selection of a primary contractor, this measure requires that the ability of a contractor to effectively implement the selected GHG reduction measures be inherent to the selection process.

SMAQMD's recommended measures for reducing construction related GHG emissions at the time of writing the EIR are listed below and the project applicant(s) shall, at a minimum, be required to implement the following:

- Improve fuel efficiency from construction equipment:
 - reduce unnecessary idling (modify work practices, install auxiliary power for driver comfort);
 - perform equipment maintenance (inspections, detect failures early, corrections);
 - train equipment operators in proper use of equipment;
 - use the proper size of equipment for the job; and
 - use equipment with new technologies (repowered engines, electric drive trains)
- use alternative fuels for electricity generators and welders at construction sites such as propane or solar, or use electrical power
- use an ARB-approved d low-carbon fuel, such as biodiesel or renewable diesel for construction equipment. (Emissions of oxides of nitrogen [NOX] emissions from the use of

low carbon fuel must be reviewed and increases mitigated.) Additional information about low-carbon fuels is available from ARB's Low Carbon Fuel Standard Program (ARB 2009).

- Encourage and provide carpools, shuttle vans, transit passes and/or secure bicycle parking for construction worker commutes.
- Reduce electricity use in the construction office by using compact fluorescent bulbs, powering off computers every day, and replacing heating and cooling units with more efficient ones.
- Recycle or salvage non-hazardous construction and demolition debris (goal of at least 75% by weight).
- Use locally sourced or recycled materials for construction materials (goal of at least 20% based on costs for building materials, and based on volume for roadway, parking lot, sidewalk and curb materials).
- Minimize the amount of concrete used for paved surfaces or use a low carbon concrete option.
- Produce concrete on-site if determined to be less emissive than transporting ready mix.
- Use EPA-certified SmartWay trucks for deliveries and equipment transport. Additional information about the SmartWay Transport Partnership Program is available from ARB's Heavy-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Measure and EPA (EPA 2009).
- Develop a plan in consultation with SMAQMD to efficiently use water for adequate dust control. This may consist of the use of non-potable water from a local source.

In addition to SMAQMD-recommended measures, construction activity shall comply with all applicable rules and regulations established by SMAQMD and ARB.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

No New Impact. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases as it would not be generating a significant source of emissions, and impacts would not exceed the conclusions in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

VI. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in Section 21083.2 and 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in adverse effects on a historic property as defined per the Section 106 regulations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Regulatory Setting

State and federal legislation requires the protection of historical and cultural resources. In 1971, President's Executive Order No. 11593 required that all federal agencies initiate procedures to preserve and maintain cultural resources by nomination and inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In 1980, the Governor's Executive Order No. B-64-80 required that state agencies inventory all "significant historic and cultural sites, structures, and objects under their jurisdiction which are over 50 years of age and which may qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines specifies that projects that cause "...physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired" shall be found to have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). When a project could impact a resource, it must be determined whether the resource is an historical resource, which is defined as a resource that:

(A) is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and,

(B) Meets any of the following criteria: 1) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; 2) is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; 3) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or 4) has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. In addition, properties listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically considered eligible for the CRHR.

CEQA applies to archaeological resources when (1) the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a historical resource, or (2) the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a "unique archaeological resource." A unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site that has a high probability of meeting any of the following criteria:

- The archaeological resource contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- The archaeological resource has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- The archaeological resource is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Cultural Background

Following is a brief summary providing a context in which to understand the background and relevance of resources that may occur in the general project area. This section is not intended to be a comprehensive review of the current resources available; rather, it serves as a general overview. Further details can be found in ethnographic studies, mission records, and major published sources.

Archaeological Setting

The earliest well-documented entry and spread of humans into California occurred at the beginning of the PaleoIndian Period (10,000–6,000 years Before Present [B.P.]). Social units are thought to have been small and highly mobile. Known sites have been identified within the contexts of ancient pluvial lake shores and coastlines, as evidenced by the presence of such characteristic hunting implements as fluted projectile points and chipped stone crescent forms. Prehistoric adaptations over the ensuing centuries have been identified in the archaeological record by numerous researchers working in the area since the early 1900s, as summarized by Fredrickson (1974) and Moratto (1984). Because of the Central Valley's plentiful resources and temperate climate, the valley was well populated prehistorically and served as the location for some of the more substantial village sites known in California.

Lillard et al. (1939) and others conducted numerous studies that form the core of the current state of knowledge about early archaeology of the upper Central Valley. Little has been found archaeologically that dates to the Paleo-Indian or the Lower Archaic time periods (6000–3000 B.P.); however, archaeologists have recovered a great deal of data from sites occupied by the Middle Archaic period (3000–1000 B.P.). The lack of sites from earlier periods may be because of high sedimentation rates that have left the earliest sites deeply buried and inaccessible. During the Middle Archaic Period, the broad regional patterns of foraging subsistence strategies gave way to more intensive procurement practices. Subsistence economies were more diversified, possibly including the introduction of acorn processing technology. Human populations were growing and occupying more diverse settings. Permanent villages that were occupied throughout the year were established, primarily along major waterways. The onset of status distinctions and other indicators of growing sociopolitical complexity mark the Upper Archaic Period (1000–500 B.P.). Exchange systems become more complex and formalized. Evidence of regular, sustained trade between groups was seen for the first time.

Several technological and social changes characterized the Emergent Period (1800–200 B.P.). The bow and arrow were introduced, ultimately replacing the dart and atlatl. Territorial boundaries between groups became well established. It became increasingly common that distinctions in an individual's social status could be linked to acquired wealth. Exchange of goods between groups became more regularized with more goods, including raw materials, entering into the exchange networks. In the latter portion of this period, exchange relations became highly regularized and sophisticated. The clamshell

disk bead became a monetary unit for exchange, and increasing quantities of goods moved greater distances. Specialists arose to govern various aspects of production and exchange.

Three specific cultural manifestations are well represented in archaeological assemblages in the general vicinity of the SPA. These assemblages are discussed in detail in Moratto (1984) and summarized here:

The Windmill Pattern (3,000–1,000 B.P.) of archaeological assemblages included an increased emphasis on acorn use as well as a continuation of hunting and fishing activities. Ground and polished charmstones, twined basketry, baked-clay artifacts, and worked shell and bone were hallmarks of Windmill culture. Widely ranging trade patterns brought goods in from the Coast Range and trans-Sierran sources as well as from closer trading partners. Distinctive burial practices identified with the Windmill Pattern also appeared in the Sierra Nevada foothills, indicating possible seasonal migration into the Sierra Nevada.

The Berkeley Pattern (1,000–500 B.P.) represented a greater reliance on acorns as a food source than was seen previously. Distinctive stone and shell artifacts distinguished this pattern from earlier or later cultural expressions. The Berkeley Pattern appears to have developed in the San Francisco Bay Area and was spread through the migration of Plains Miwok groups. The later Augustine Pattern (500 B.P. to Historic Era) may have been stimulated by the southern migration of Wintuan people from north of the Sacramento Valley. Their culture was marked by a population increase resulting from more intensive food procurement strategies, as well as by a marked change in burial practices, increased trade activities, and a well-defined ceramic technology.

Ethnographic Setting

By virtue of its geographic position, the SPA and thus, the project site, lies within traditional Nisenan (sometimes referred to as the Southern Maidu) territory. The Nisenan belong to the Penutian linguistic family within which Kroeber (1925) recognized three Nisenan dialects—Northern Hill Nisenan, Southern Hill Nisenan, and Valley Nisenan. The Nisenan territory included the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American Rivers, and the lower drainages of the Feather River. The Nisenan ranged from the Sierra Nevada crest to nearly sea level at the Sacramento River.

Native Americans, including the Nisenan, of the western Sierra Nevada foothills lived in relatively permanent settlements, visiting the higher reaches primarily during the summer months (Moratto 1984). Permanent settlements ranged from a handful of people to several hundred, and tended to be situated near water, preferably on slightly raised ground. A major village might include dwellings, granaries, sweat houses, a headman's house, and dance house, or other ceremonial structures. The people of the villages would gather a wide variety of fruits, nuts, greens, bulbs, roots, and seeds, processing and storing many of them for winter. Fish, birds, deer, small game, and many other animals were hunted.

Sustained Nisenan contact with Euro-American groups came late in the vicinity of the SPA. Limited encounters with explorers and trappers during the late 18th and early 19th centuries left the Nisenan social, political, and economic systems relatively unaffected (Wilson and Towne 1978). Their lifeways remains largely intact until the 1833 “malaria” epidemic that swept through many Central Valley tribes including the Valley Nisenan. This was one of several major events to impact the tribe with another of the most significant being the discovery of gold and the start of the Gold Rush in 1848–1849. By 1860,

disease, violence, forced relocation, and environmental destruction had greatly affected Nisenan populations and traditional cultural systems. For the remainder of the 19th century and well into the 1900s the Nisenan people were largely a marginalized population. However, during the latter decades of the 20th century the Nisenan began to revitalize their culture. Through new-found economic, political, and social influence the Nisenan once again constitute a thriving native community reinvesting in traditional lifeways and culture.

Historic Setting – Early Settlement

The earliest Euro-Americans to venture into the project region included Gabriel Moraga and a group of Spanish explorers in 1806–1808 who ventured into the vicinity of Sacramento, and fur trappers and explorers associated with the Hudson’s Bay Company in the 1820s. Jedediah Smith, also with Hudson’s Bay Company at the time led a group of trappers along the edge of the foothills to the American River in search of a pass over the Sierra Nevada in 1826. Kit Carson and John C. Fremont crossed the mountains near Lake Tahoe and descended to Sutter’s Fort traveling along the South Fork of the American River in 1844. These expeditions, however, had little lasting impression on the landscape or the native inhabitants of the region.

Historic-era developments in the SPA vicinity appear to have been few prior to the discovery of gold at Sutter’s Mill in El Dorado County and the ensuing Gold Rush. The western portion of the SPA was originally part of the Rancho Rio de los Americanos Mexican land grant—more than eight leagues (about 35,500 acres) granted to William Leidesdorff and purchased by Joseph L. Folsom in 1848 after Leidesdorff’s death (Hoover et al. 1990:288). This grant extended from the eastern border of John Sutter’s New Helvetia settlement (east of Sacramento) along the south bank of the American River to the western edge of present-day Folsom (EDAW 2006: 6).

Historic Setting – Gold Rush Period

During the Gold Rush of 1848–1849 and the following years, local settlement and development activity skyrocketed and rich mining districts such as Folsom, Coloma, Shingle Springs, and Placerville were heavily worked and gave rise to thriving communities still in existence today. Following the discovery of gold at Coloma in January 1848, mining camps along the American River sprang up as numerous fortune-seekers traversed the area between Sacramento and the Sierra Nevada foothills. Additional gold discoveries in spring 1848, including at Mormon Island (in the northeast corner of Sacramento County), fueled the early, rapid, and diverse settlement of the foothill region.

Early mining focused on the gravels and sands of the American River, Alder Creek, and numerous waterways within the SPA. Mining camps arose along these waterways and river bars including “Negro Bar” where African American miners settled and started working local gravels as early as 1849. By 1850 the population of Negro Bar had reached 336 only to double again by the following year. However, flooding in 1852 forced the settlement to move east and above the river on bluffs at the site of present-day Folsom (Gudde 1975; Hoover et al. 1990:289). Just south of town was a north-south trending ridge of particularly rich gravels referred to as Willow Springs Hill at the south of which ran Alder Creek. It was along this creek and within the SPA that John P. Rhodes established his claim in 1848 after arriving in California via the “northern” route in 1846; having avoided the southern route from Salt Lake, Utah that proved longer and ultimately disastrous for the Donner-Reed party that same year. John Rhodes would

eventually help organize the first relief party that rescued several members of the ill-fated group (Wilson 1986:86).

Rhodes only arrived in the Folsom area in 1848 after purchasing a portion of the Rancho Omochumnes on the Cosumnes River with the intention of establishing a farm and ranch. However, once gold was discovered on his property he filed a claim on Alder Creek after which time the general area became known as Rhoad's Diggings (Wilson 1986:84). Rhoad's diggings, however, suffered from only a seasonal availability of enough water to work large claims and wash the placer gold from the local gravels. Although small individual operators could profitably work their claims in the area early on, large-scale mining had to wait until an extensive water-conveyance system could be built. This finally occurred in 1851 with the establishment of the Natoma Water Company (reorganized as the Natoma Mining Company in 1852) by Amos P. Catlin, an attorney from New York and a small group of investors. Although their chief aim was to "drain the lower end of Mormon Island and the upper end thereof by means of a race on the southern side of said island" (Castenada et al. 1984:28,30) for the purposes of supplying water to claims in Folsom, the company eventually branched out. In doing so, part of their system extended to Rhoad's Diggings with the Rhoads Branch Ditch that was completed by the summer of 1853 (Wilson 1986:84). With a reliable large source of water being transported to the Rhoad's Diggings, miners rushed into the area and by late 1853 the new town of Prairie City boasted a population of somewhere between 2,500 and 3,500 and over 100 buildings including 15 stores, 10 boarding houses, a school, and an express office (Hatheway and McKenna 1987:11–12).

By the mid-1850s, mining operations had expanded well beyond simple small-scale operations to placer mining on an industrial scale and the exploitation of rich quartz veins also present in the Rhoad's Diggings area. In 1855 John Gass and a Colonel Hagan constructed the first steam-powered stamp mill at the diggings and two years later a second, and larger, mill was established by a French company at a cost of \$50,000 (Wilson 1986:84, 88). However, as the easiest placer deposits began to diminish, most of the initial group of miners to arrive in the area began to move away; most returning to farming or other endeavors that many of them left at home in a search of easy riches. As their numbers decreased, the population of Chinese miners in particular began to rise as they started to work less accessible claims and the piles of tailings that still held a considerable amount of gold. By 1866, there were only 48 independent miners still working in the Prairie City Mining District (adjacent to Rhoad's Diggings) with 35 of them being of Chinese descent (Werner et al. 1994:57).

Historic Setting – Later Period: Large-Scale Mining

As individual miners and small operations began to be phased out with large companies consolidating multiple claims in and around the Alder Creek area, access to the deeper and/or more extensive gold deposits required the use of ground sluicing, low and high-pressure "hydraulicking", and drifting, all of which required the movement of large quantities of water. (Detailed information on these techniques including associated archaeological manifestations can be found in Lindstrom 1988, and 1989, and Maniery 1992. The most prominent firm working in the SPA and vicinity following the initial "rush" was The Natoma Mining Company whose ditch systems provided steady water supplies from the American River to the mining districts in and around present-day Folsom including those at Alder Creek. Also in the Folsom area, another large-scale mining technique commonly used originated fairly early on in the region. Miners, many probably Chinese (June Chan, personal communications with Mary Maniery, 1993: Crawford 1894:226 in Maniery 1994), began excavating deep tunnels and shafts into the banks of the American River in order to follow potentially rich gravel deposits. By the 1860s to the 1870s this practice

was in common usage and shafts and tunnels extended throughout the river terrace where the town of Folsom is located.

Drift and ground sluicing operations continued along with large-scale hydraulic and tunneling operations well into the 1890s. However, smaller drift and sluicing claims were still being worked by both Euro-American and Chinese miners employed by smaller independent companies. The Natoma Mining Company also employed Chinese on their lands during the mid-late 1800s. This included their operations on Mississippi Bar (north of the SPA), which they acquired in 1864 (Castenada et al. 1984). The Natoma Mining Company, through persistent claim acquisition and consolidation efforts, effectively ended small, independent mining company operations in the Folsom area. By the turn of the century the smaller drift and ground sluicing operations in the Folsom area had been primarily replaced by the larger dredging operations. The first mention of large-scale dredging was the Doan Mining Dredger that operated near Mississippi Bar in 1894. However, this operation was apparently short-lived (Crawford 1894:226 and 1896:316–318 in Maniery 1992:25). W. P. Bonright and Company was the first to establish a successful dredging operation at their newly acquired property at Mississippi Bar. This steam powered bucket line dredge manufactured by the Risdon Iron Works of San Francisco was constructed in 1898 and began operations in 1899.

The Natoma Mining Company, reorganized as Natomas Consolidated of California, acquired all of the smaller dredging operations by 1916 and operated until 1962, with a short period during World War II when operations were suspended. A 1950 aerial photograph depicts one of their dredges working the river gravels at the base of the bluffs, just north of Mississippi Bar. Other operations in the SPA and vicinity included those of Folsom #2 in the vicinity of the town of Folsom in the early 1900s, and those of the General Dredging company that operated a small “doodlebug” drag line dredge between 1938 and 1942, north of Willow Creek and south of Folsom.

Historic Setting – Agriculture and Transportation

The low, well-watered foothills of the SPA and vicinity were also the focus of ranching activities that supported the booming towns in the eastern Sacramento and western El Dorado County areas. When many of the early small-scale mining opportunities began to drop off in the late 1800s, disenchanted miners of the region turned to agriculture. To a certain extent, the small communities such as Clarksville, to the east of the SPA, White Rock, located to the south, and Prairie City to the west, served as support centers for local miners, ranchers, and farmers and as stops along Sacramento-Placerville Road (present White Rock Road) that extended from Sacramento to Placerville and the gold fields.

The early-to-mid 20th century saw relatively little change to the rural agricultural character of the area with the exception of some improved transportation elements (US Highway 50 [US 50]), regional mining (conversion from placer to dredge mining), and commercial development including that of Aerojet General Corporation that manufactured liquid and solid propellant rocket engines on their property west of the SPA beginning in the early 1950s (ECORP Consulting [ECORP] 2007:8). White Rock Road, which forms the southern boundary of the SPA, was designated as a portion of the Lincoln Highway, the nation’s first interstate automobile route, in the early decades of the 20th century and thus established the roadways of the area as some of the most traveled in the nation. (EDAW 2006: 6). The development of such transportation routes and the growth of Sacramento and its environs, however, are rapidly

changing the character of the Folsom area from rural to suburban with residential and commercial development increasing throughout the region.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

The EIR concludes that there are numerous identified prehistoric and historic-era cultural resources located within the FPA Specific Plan Area, with the densest concentration occurring in the northwest region. Thus, implementation of the FPA Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a, -1b, -2, and -3 were identified, however the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Evaluation of Cultural Resources

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in Section 21083.2 and 15064.5?
- b) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
- c) Result in adverse effects on a historic property as defined per the Section 106 regulations?

No New Impact. The proposed project site would not require Federal permitting and authorization, and thus is not required to follow Section 106 of the NHPA. Construction required for the proposed project would consist of minimal ground disturbance as the site has already been cleared and rough graded. Given the APE's disturbed setting and long history of industrial use, there is a low potential of identifying Native American and/or historic-period resources during activities associated with the proposed project. Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1b, 3A.5-2 and 3A.5-3 would apply and would ensure that the construction of the proposed project does not impact previously undiscovered cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b: Perform an Inventory and Evaluation of Cultural Resources for the CRHP, Minimize or Avoid Damage or Destruction, and Perform Treatment where Damage or Destruction Cannot be Avoided.

Management of cultural resources eligible for or listed on the CRHR under CEQA mirrors management steps required under Section 106. These steps may be combined with deliverables and management steps performed for Section 106 provided that management documents prepared for the PA also clearly reference the CRHR listing criteria and significance thresholds that apply under CEQA. Prior to ground-disturbing work for each individual development phase or off-site element, the applicable oversight agency (City of Folsom, El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Caltrans), or the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application, with applicable agency oversight, shall perform the following actions:

- Retain the services of a qualified archaeologist to perform an inventory of cultural resources within each individual development phase or off-site elements subject to approval under CEQA. Identified resources shall be evaluated for listing on the CRHR. The inventory report shall also identify locations that are sensitive for undiscovered cultural resources based upon the location of known resources, geomorphology, and topography. The inventory report shall specify the location of monitoring of ground-disturbing work in these areas by a qualified archaeologist, and monitoring in the

vicinity of identified resources that may be damaged by construction, if appropriate. The identification of sensitive locations subject to monitoring during construction of each individual development phase shall be performed in concert with monitoring activities performed under the PA to minimize the potential for conflicting requirements.

- For each resource that is determined eligible for the CRHR, the applicable agency or the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application (under the agency's direction) shall obtain the services of a qualified archaeologist who shall determine if implementation of the individual project development phase would result in damage or destruction of "significant" (under CEQA) cultural resources. These findings shall be reviewed by the applicable agency for consistency with the significance thresholds and treatment measures provided in this EIR/EIS.
- Where possible, the project shall be configured or redesigned to avoid impacts on eligible or listed resources. Alternatively, these resources may be preserved in place if possible, as suggested under California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Avoidance of historic properties is required under certain circumstances under the Public Resource Code and 36 CFR Part 800.
- Where impacts cannot be avoided, the applicable agency or the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application (under the applicable agency's direction) shall prepare and implement treatment measures that are determined to be necessary by a qualified archaeologist. These measures may consist of data recovery excavations for resources that are eligible for listing because of the data they contain (which may contribute to research). Alternatively, for historical architectural, engineered, or landscape features, treatment measures may consist of a preparation of interpretive, narrative, or photographic documentation. These measures shall be reviewed by the applicable oversight agency for consistency with the significance thresholds and standards provided in this EIR/EIS.
- To support the evaluation and treatment required under this mitigation measure, the archaeologist retained by either the applicable oversight agency or the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall prepare an appropriate prehistoric and historic context that identifies relevant prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic themes and research questions against which to determine the significance of identified resources and appropriate treatment.
- These steps and documents may be combined with the phasing of management and documents prepared pursuant to the PA to minimize the potential for inconsistency and duplicative management efforts.

Mitigation for the off-site elements outside of the City of Folsom's jurisdictional boundaries must be coordinated by the project applicant(s) of each applicable project phase with the affected oversight agency(ies) (i.e., El Dorado and/or Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans).

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-2: Conduct Construction Personnel Education, Conduct On-Site Monitoring if Required, Stop Work if Cultural Resources are Discovered, Assess the Significance of the Find, and Perform Treatment or Avoidance as Required.

To reduce potential impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources, the project applicant(s) of all project phases shall do the following:

- Before the start of ground-disturbing activities, the project applicant(s) of all project phases shall retain a qualified archaeologist to conduct training for construction workers as necessary based on the sensitivity of the project APE, to educate them about the possibility of encountering buried cultural resources, and inform them of the proper procedures should cultural resources be encountered.
- As a result of the work conducted for Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b, if the archaeologist determines that any portion of the SPA or the off-site elements should be monitored for potential discovery of as-yet-unknown cultural resources, the project applicant(s) of all project phases shall implement such monitoring in the locations specified by the archaeologist. USACE should review and approve any recommendations by archaeologists with respect to monitoring.
- Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or architectural remains be encountered during any construction activities, work shall be suspended in the vicinity of the find and the appropriate oversight agency(ies) (identified below) shall be notified immediately. The appropriate oversight agency(ies) shall retain a qualified archaeologist who shall conduct a field investigation of the specific site and shall assess the significance of the find by evaluating the resource for eligibility for listing on the CRHR and the NRHP. If the resource is eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP and it would be subject to disturbance or destruction, the actions required in Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b shall be implemented. The oversight agency shall be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation if it is determined to be feasible in light of the approved land uses, and shall implement the approved mitigation before resuming construction activities at the archaeological site.

Mitigation for the off-site elements outside of the City of Folsom's jurisdictional boundaries must be coordinated by the project applicant(s) of each applicable project phase with the affected oversight agency(ies) (i.e., El Dorado and/or Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans).

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3: Suspend Ground-Disturbing Activities if Human Remains are Encountered and Comply with California Health and Safety Code Procedures.

In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, including those associated with off-site elements, the project applicant(s) of all project phases shall immediately halt all ground-disturbing activities in the area of the find and notify the applicable county coroner and a professional archaeologist skilled in osteological analysis to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or public lands (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the NAHC

by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]).

After the coroner's findings are complete, the project applicant(s), an archaeologist, and the NAHC designated MLD shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting on notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in Section 5097.9 of the California Public Resources Code.

Upon the discovery of Native American remains, the procedures above regarding involvement of the applicable county coroner, notification of the NAHC, and identification of an MLD shall be followed. The project applicant(s) of all project phases shall ensure that the immediate vicinity (according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards and practices) is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD has taken place. The MLD shall have at least 48 hours after being granted access to the site to inspect the site and make recommendations. A range of possible treatments for the remains may be discussed: nondestructive removal and analysis, preservation in place, relinquishment of the remains and associated items to the descendants, or other culturally appropriate treatment. As suggested by Assembly Bill (AB) 2641 (Chapter 863, Statutes of 2006), the concerned parties may extend discussions beyond the initial 48 hours to allow for the discovery of additional remains. AB 2641(e) includes a list of site protection measures and states that the project applicant(s) shall comply with one or more of the following requirements:

- record the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center,
- use an open-space or conservation zoning designation or easement, or,
- record a document with the county in which the property is located.

The project applicant(s) or its authorized representative of all project phases shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance if the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD or if the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site. The project applicant(s) or its authorized representative may also reinter the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance if it rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. Ground disturbance in the zone of suspended activity shall not recommence without authorization from the archaeologist.

Mitigation for the off-site elements outside of the City of Folsom's jurisdictional boundaries must be coordinated by the project applicant(s) of each applicable project phase with the affected oversight agency(ies) (i.e., El Dorado and/or Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans).

VII. GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERALS

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Geology

The project site is located along the western margin of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range, and there are no active faults located within the Specific Plan area, including the proposed project site.

Soils

Soils on the project site were analyzed as part of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR Chapter 3A.7, which classified the soils as Argonaut-Auburn complex (NRCS 2007). A Geotechnical report was also prepared as part of the Specific Plan EIR.

Minerals

A small portion of the extreme western edge of the Specific Plan Area is classified by CDMG as MRZ-1, while the rest of the Specific Plan Area was classified as MRZ-3, “areas containing mineral deposits, the significant of which cannot be evaluated from existing data”. Based on a site visit performed as part of the FPA Specific Plan EIR and information contained in geotechnical reports submitted along with the EIR, the only area of the SPA that contains any substantial amount of aggregate resources (cobbles from dredger mining operations) is located in and around the Alder Creek drainage.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Certified EIR

Geology and soils are discussed in Chapter 3A.7 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan Area is not located within a known fault zone, or within or adjacent to any faults known to be active during Holocene time. Other faults that have been zoned as “active” by the California Geological Survey are located in the Coast Range or in the vicinity of Lake Tahoe. While geotechnical reports were created for parts of the Specific Plan Area, structures in the area could be subject to seismic ground shaking and thus impacts would be significant and unavoidable for Geology, Soils, and Minerals. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a, -1b, -3, -4, -5, -9, and -10, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Evaluation of Geology Soils, and Minerals

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?

No New Impact. The FPA Specific Plan EIR concludes that the SPA and off-site elements are not located within a known fault zone, or within or adjacent to any faults known to be active during Holocene time. Because no active earthquake faults transect the project site, there is no risk of ground rupture on the project site from known earthquake faults. Due to the relatively flat and rough graded topography of the

project site and surrounding area, the project site is not susceptible to landslides. However, because up-to-date geotechnical reports have not been prepared for the potential project site areas, the proposed project could have potential impacts to geology, soils, and minerals. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.7-1a and 3A.7-1b would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level and no new impact would occur.

FPA Specific Plan Mitigation Measure 3A.7-1a: Prepare Site-Specific Geotechnical Report per CBC Requirements and Implement Appropriate Recommendations.

Before building permits are issued and construction activities begin any project development phase, the project applicant(s) of each project phase shall hire a licensed geotechnical engineer to prepare a final geotechnical subsurface investigation report for the on- and off-site facilities, which shall be submitted for review and approval to the appropriate City or county department (identified below). The final geotechnical engineering report shall address and make recommendations on the following:

- Site preparation
- Soil bearing capacity
- Appropriate sources and types of fill
- Potential need for soil amendments
- Road, pavement, and parking areas
- Structural foundations, including retaining-wall design
- Grading practices
- Soil corrosion of concrete and steel
- Erosion/winterization
- Seismic ground shaking
- Liquefaction
- Expansive/unstable soil

In addition to the recommendations for the conditions listed above, the geotechnical investigation shall include subsurface testing of soil and groundwater conditions, and shall determine appropriate foundation designs that are consistent with the version of the CBC that is applicable at the time building and grading permits are applied for. All recommendations contained in the final geotechnical engineering report shall be implemented by the project applicant(s) of each project phase. Special recommendations contained in the geotechnical engineering report shall be noted on the grading plans and implemented as appropriate before construction begins. Design and construction of all new project development shall be in accordance with the CBC. The project applicant(s) shall provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the geotechnical report.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No New Impact. Construction activities on the project site would consist of fine grading and placement of an electronic readerboard on an already rough graded and cleared site adjacent to US Highway 50. As construction of the proposed project includes minimal grading, there would not be a significant impact

to erosion or loss of topsoil from wind or stormwater. Impacts related to soil erosion would be less than significant, and no new impact would occur.

- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

No New Impact. The FPA Specific Plan EIR Section 3A.07 includes a review of information contained in geotechnical engineering reports and published geologic maps and literature. This review concludes that: the Specific Plan Area is underlain by small amounts of Pleistocene-age alluvium and primarily by Jurassic-age bedrock formations, which generally are not subject to liquefaction; the area is underlain by a moderately deep groundwater table that is at least 100 feet below the surface; and the potential sources of seismic activity are a long distance away (approximately 50 miles). With implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a, there would be no new impacts.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No New Impact. The FPA Specific Plan concludes that, based on the NRCS soil survey, most of the project site elements in the Specific Plan Area consists of soils with a moderate to high shrink-swell potential and are thus expansive soils. While the project could be exposed to impacts caused by unstable soils, implementation of FPA Specific Plan Mitigation Measure 3A.7-1a and discussed under question a) of this section and adherence to the recommendations prescribed in the design-level geotechnical engineering investigation would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. No new impact would occur.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No New Impact. The proposed project would not need to connect to a municipal wastewater treatment system provided by the City of Folsom and would not require septic systems or an alternative waste disposal system. Therefore, there would be no impact, and no new impact would occur.

- f) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No New Impact. The project site is not located in a zone of known mineral or aggregate resources. No active mining operations are present on or near the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the extraction of any known mineral resources. Therefore, there would be no impact for question f). No new impact would occur.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Create a significant hazard to the public through use of explosive materials in grading or earth-moving activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose project residents to excessive electrical or magnetic fields?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Hazards and hazardous materials are discussed in Chapter 3A.08 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan. The Folsom Plan Area has two areas that were not covered by Phase I and/or Phase II Environmental Site Assessments. These areas are located in the southeast and southwest portion of the Specific Plan Area, and the proposed project is not located in either and thus has been covered by Phase 1 and/or Phase II Environmental Site Assessments. The project site has a history of being undeveloped

open space, and does not have a history of soil and groundwater contamination associated with previous land use.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

As discussed in Chapter 3A - 8 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan, because the project is required by law to implement and comply with existing hazardous material Folsom South of US Highway 50 Specific Plan EIR Hazards and Hazardous Materials 3A.8-20 City of Folsom and USACE regulations, direct and indirect impacts related to the creation of significant hazards to the public through routine, transport, use, disposal, and risk of upset are considered less-than-significant.

Evaluation of Hazardous Materials

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No New Impact. Because no existing structures would be demolished, alteration of existing electric distribution lines would not be expected, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed, the direct impact related to ACM, lead paint, and PCBs would be less than significant. No new impacts would occur for a), b), and c).

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No New Impact. The construction of the electronic readerboard would not result in substantial volumes of construction that would substantially increase traffic on existing roadways. Furthermore, no off-site water facilities would be constructed. Therefore, this alternative would not conflict with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans and there would be no new impacts.

- e) 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, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No New Impact. There are no airports or private airstrips located on or near any of the potential project sites or the Specific Plan Area. There would be no new impact for e) and f).

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No New Impact. The FPA Specific Plan EIR concluded that circulation plans for the Specific Plan Area include sufficient ingress and egress routes to ensure public safety in the event of an emergency. The proposed project would not alter any ingress or egress routes and thus would have no new impact.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No New Impact. The SPA and potential project sites are located within a state responsibility area designated as a moderate fire hazard severity zone. It is not near an area of high or extremely high fire hazard severity. Therefore, project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or residences are intermixed with wildlands.

- i) Create a significant hazard to the public through use of explosive materials in grading or earth-moving activities?

No New Impact. Construction of the proposed project would be limited to fine grading and construction of a 65-foot-tall electronic readerboard. No explosive materials would be used.

- j) Expose project residents to excessive electrical or magnetic fields?

No New Impact. The proposed project involves construction of an electronic readerboard and would not be located within 200 feet of the 230-kV, 69-kV, or 115-kV transmission lines. There would be no new impact.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Hydrology and water quality are discussed in Chapter 3A.09 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The project site is located within the Alder Creek Watershed, and the majority of the runoff from the SPA originates from this watershed before generally flowing east to west to eventually join the American River.

The SPA has been designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as Zone X, areas that have been determined to be outside the 100- and 500-year floodplains.

The Specific Plan is within the coverage area for the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES General Permit administered by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). The terms

of the permit usually provide requirements and standards for categories such as municipal maintenance, public outreach, illicit discharge controls, industrial and commercial discharge controls, and new development discharge controls.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan EIR

Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality are discussed in Section 3A.9 of the EIR prepared for the FPA Specific Plan. The EIR concluded that temporary-short-term construction-related disturbances at the SPA would still have the potential to result in the discharge of polluted and/or contaminated stormwater or sedimentation. Therefore, the direct and indirect project-related erosion and water quality impacts would be significant. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant(s) of all projects disturbing one or more acres (including phased construction of smaller areas which are part of a larger project) shall obtain coverage under the State Water Resource Control Board's NPDES Stormwater Permit. The proposed project would not disturb one or more acres, and thus would not require an NPDES Stormwater Permit.

Evaluation of Hydrology and Water Quality

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge?

No New Impact. Site clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities have the potential to impact water quality through soil erosion and increased silt and debris discharged via surface runoff. Additionally, the use of construction materials such as fuels, solvents, and paints may present a risk to surface water quality. Temporary storage of construction materials and equipment in work areas or staging areas could create the potential for a release of hazardous materials, trash, or sediment to the storm drain system. Since construction of the proposed project would not result in disturbance of an area greater than one acre, the project applicant would not be required to enroll for coverage under the Storm Water Construction General Permit for the NPDES program.

Additionally, the project site is within the existing urban area of the City served by urban stormwater facilities and would be subject to all of the conditions of the City's Municipal Code's requirements for new development and modifications of existing flood control systems. With compliance of all the City code conditions and requirements, water quality impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant. No new impact would occur.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

No New Impact. As described in the FPA Specific Plan EIR (City of Folsom 2010), soils in the SPA and surrounding area have a poor capacity for groundwater recharge, with most of the substantial recharge occurring along active stream channels. The project site is not located along an active stream channel and no new wells would be established, therefore there would be no new impacts to groundwater recharge.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site?

No New Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would increase impervious surfaces on-site, which could potentially increase stormwater generation and runoff from the project site. However, the proposed project would have a small footprint and would not substantially increase any existing impacts as it would be located immediately adjacent to US Highway 50. Additionally, following project construction and during the life of the project, areas would be landscaped which would stabilize soils. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no new impact would occur.

- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site?

No New Impact. Implementation of the project would not substantially increase impervious areas in the Specific Plan Area, and would not substantially alter the site's existing drainage pattern and percolation rates. Thus, impacts would be less than significant and no new impact would occur.

- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No New Impact. The proposed project would not need to install storm drainpipes or connect to existing City-owned storm drains. The proposed project site would have a footprint of approximately 180 square feet and would be located immediately adjacent to US Highway 50. Thus, stormwater from the proposed project would flow to the same drainage outfall that accommodate US Highway 50, which would ensure that there would be no new impact.

- g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No New Impact. The proposed project would not construct any housing, and is not located in a 100-year flood plain. The proposed project site is within the FPA Specific Plan area, which has been designated as Zone X, areas that have been determined to be outside the 100- and 500- year floodplains. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant for question g).

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No New Impact. The proposed project is within the FPA Specific Plan Area, which is located approximately 4.5 miles south of the Folsom Dam. While a relatively large portion of Sacramento County and the City of Folsom would be inundated with water in the event of a dam or dike failure, the SPA is outside of the mapped inundation area (City of Folsom 2010). Thus, the risk of dam failure is not considered a significant hazard to the project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no new impact would occur.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Land use in the project area is regulated by the City of Folsom through various plans and ordinances adopted by the City, including the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan and the City of Folsom Zoning Ordinance. Further, the FPA electronic readerboard project is included in the FPA Specific Plan. A summary of the existing land use designations and zoning for the project site is provided below:

- **Existing Specific Plan Land Use Designations:** The current Specific Plan land use designation for the project site is Regional Commercial (SP-RC).
- **Existing General Plan Land Use Designations:** The current General Plan land use designations for the project site is Regional Commercial (RC).
- **Existing Zoning:** The current City of Folsom zoning for the project site is Regional Commercial/Planned Development/ Specific Plan (SP-RC [PD]; SP 11-1). The City of Folsom Zoning Map from 2018 shows the entire project site is zoned as FPASP (City of Folsom 2023).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

Land Use is discussed in Chapter 3A.10 of the EIR certified for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The SPA was zoned by the city as an Overlay Specific Plan Combining District (SP-). This overlay district allows for zoning designations to be created that are unique to and only applicable to the SPA. The zoning districts for the project establish the desired zoning requirements of the SPA. On adoption of the specific plan, the property was pre-zoned consistent with Government Code Section 56375 and the Folsom General Plan. The EIR concluded that, although the project would result in a change in the project area, the development would be required to comply with the Design Guidelines in the Specific Plan that would complement the surrounding land uses and would be an extension of existing residential and commercial development in the vicinity. Therefore, the project would not disrupt or divide an established community.

Evaluation of Land Use and Planning

- a) Physically divide an established community?

No New Impact. The lots surrounding the project site are actively being developed in accordance with the Specific Plan, of which the FPA electronic readerboard project is a part. The proposed project would have a small footprint and be located adjacent to US Highway 50; it would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, there would be no impact, and no new impact would occur.

- b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No New Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would require a Specific Plan amendment. See below for a summary of the proposed amendment.

Specific Plan Amendment

The proposed project would construct a 65-foot-tall electronic readerboard in Parcel 61 of the FPA Specific Plan. Electronic readerboards are not currently an allowed use for the Regional Commercial designation. Therefore, the project applicant is seeking a Specific Plan Amendment to modify Table A.7 “Transportation, Communication & Infrastructure” (City of Folsom 2023) allowed uses to allow one electronic readerboard sign to be conditionally permitted within Parcel 61 along US Highway 50. The Specific Plan area designates the approximately 36-acre parcel for Regional Commercial, which allows for business, financial, professional, and general services as well as transportation, communication and infrastructure uses. The proposed project would amend the Specific Plan land use designations by adding electronic readerboard signage as a conditionally permitted use for the Specific Plan Regional Commercial designation under the “Transportation, Communication & Infrastructure” section of Table A.7. Pending approval of the proposed addendum, the electronic readerboard signage would become a permitted use with approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

Implementation of the proposed project would not cause an exceedance of the development thresholds planned for the Specific Plan and evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR as it would not add any residences, therefore there would be no new impact.

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No New Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan for the City of Folsom as it would be located on a previously rough-graded and barren site. No new impact would occur.

XI. NOISE

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in any applicable plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (including construction)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The noise and vibration impacts associated with implementation of the Specific Plan were evaluated in Chapter 3A.11 of the EIR. The existing noise environment surrounding the potential project site locations is influenced primarily by surface-transportation noise emanating from vehicular traffic attributed to US Highway 50.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

Noise and vibration impacts are discussed in Chapter 3A.11 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan. The EIR concluded that the Specific Plan area is not located within two miles of an airport or within an airport land use plan area and would not be exposed to excessive noise from aircraft, but would have potential and long-term impacts to ambient noise due to large-scale development of the area. The FPA Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measures 3A.11-1, -3, -4, and -5, however the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Evaluation of Noise

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in any applicable plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? And
- b) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? And
- c) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (including construction)?

No New Impact. There are no sensitive receptors within at least 1 mile of the proposed project, and operation of the proposed project would not result in a significant permanent impact to existing noise levels adjacent to US Highway 50. A temporary increase in noise at the project site would occur, however implementation of FPA Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3A.11-1 would ensure the project has no new impact.

Construction Noise

Construction activities would result in noise from the use of heavy construction equipment on the project site. The equipment to be used in construction of the project has not been determined, but could include backhoes, bulldozers, front loaders, scrapers, graders, compacting equipment, concrete saws, and jackhammers.

The City of Folsom Municipal Code establishes that noise sources associated with construction, provided such activities do not take place before 7 a.m. or after 6 p.m. on any day except Saturday or Sunday, or before 8 a.m. or after 5 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday, are considered exempt from the associated exterior noise provisions. Further, the proposed project site is not located within 850-feet of a sensitive receptor. Implementation of FPA Specific Plan Mitigation Measure 3A.11-1 would limit the construction activity to the hours between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. Therefore, the construction of the project would not result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and would not exceed the severity of the impact conclusions in the EIR. No new impact would occur.

Operational Noise

Operations for the electronic readerboard would consist of occasional maintenance, and thus would not result in noise levels higher than that anticipated in the EIR. There would be no new impact.

FPA Specific Plan Mitigation Measure 3A.11-1

To reduce impacts associated with noise generated during project-related construction activities, the project applicant(s) and their primary contractors for engineering design and construction of all project phases shall ensure that the following requirements are implemented at each work site in any year of project construction to avoid and minimize construction noise effects on sensitive receptors. The project applicant(s) and primary construction contractor(s) shall employ noise-reducing construction practices. Measures that shall be used to limit noise shall include the measures listed below:

- Noise-generating construction operations shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.
- All construction equipment and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses.
- All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.
- All motorized construction equipment shall be shut down when not in use to prevent idling.
- Individual operations and techniques shall be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete off-site instead of on-site).
- Noise-reducing enclosures shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., compressors and generators) as planned phases are built out and future noise sensitive receptors are located within close proximity to future construction activities.
- Written notification of construction activities shall be provided to all noise-sensitive receptors located within 850 feet of construction activities. Notification shall include anticipated dates and hours during which construction activities are anticipated to occur and contact information, including a daytime telephone number, for the project representative to be contacted in the event that noise levels are deemed excessive. Recommendations to assist noise-sensitive land uses in reducing interior noise levels (e.g., closing windows and doors) shall also be included in the notification.
- To the extent feasible, acoustic barriers (e.g., lead curtains, sound barriers) shall be constructed to reduce construction-generated noise levels at affected noise-sensitive land uses. The barriers shall be designed to obstruct the line of sight between the noise-sensitive land use and on-site construction equipment. When installed properly, acoustic barriers can reduce construction noise levels by approximately 8–10 dB (EPA 1971).
- When future noise sensitive uses are within close proximity to prolonged construction noise, noise attenuating buffers such as structures, truck trailers, or soil piles shall be located between noise sources and future residences to shield sensitive receptors from construction noise.
- The primary contractor shall prepare and implement a construction noise management plan. This plan shall identify specific measures to ensure compliance with the noise control measures specified above. The noise control plan shall be submitted to the City of Folsom before any noise-generating construction activity begins. Construction shall not commence until the construction noise management plan is approved by the City of Folsom. Mitigation for the two off-site roadway connections into El Dorado County must

be coordinated by the project applicant(s) of the applicable project phase with El Dorado County, since the roadway extensions are outside of the City of Folsom's jurisdictional boundaries.

- d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No New Impact.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not involve pile drivers or vibratory rollers, as it would only consist of fine grading and installation of the Electronic Readerboard. No new impact would occur.

- e) 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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No New Impact. There are no airports or private airstrips located within the FPA Specific Plan Area or near the project site, thus there would be no new impact for questions e) and f).

XII. PARKS AND RECREATION

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Include new recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities that might have a substantial adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Increase demand on existing neighborhood and community parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Recreation is discussed in Chapter 3A.12 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The project site is surrounded by undeveloped commercial space and US Highway 50. The nearest park is Handy Family Park, which is located approximately 0.68 miles north of the proposed project site. There are no trails or parks located in the proposed project site.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan EIR

The City of Folsom, which includes the FPA Specific Plan area and the proposed project, has a parkland acreage to population ratio of 5.3 acres per 1,000 people.

The Specific Plan EIR (City of Folsom 2010) concluded that the Specific Plan would meet the City of Folsom's requirement of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and thus would not increase the use or result in the deterioration of existing recreational resources.

Evaluation of Recreation

- a) Include new recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities that might have a substantial adverse physical effect on the environment?
- b) Increase demand on existing neighborhood and community parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No New Impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, and would not result in substantial deterioration of existing neighborhood or regional parks or require unplanned construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant for questions a) and b). No new impact would occur.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generate a substantial demand for new housing, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The proposed project would redevelop a portion of the approximately 36-acre site into a 65-foot-tall electronic readerboard. The proposed project assumes that the maintenance workers would be based locally.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan EIR

Population and Housing is discussed in Chapter 3A.13 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The EIR concluded that the project would not be expected to generate the need for substantial additional housing stock in Folsom or Sacramento County during construction, and that a temporary increase in population growth and housing demand associated with project construction is considered a less than significant impact, and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

Evaluation of Population and Housing

- a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No New Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any direct substantial unplanned population growth in an area as no new homes or businesses are proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce unplanned substantial growth in the City of Folsom, and impacts would be less than significant. No new impact would occur.

- b) Generate a substantial demand for new housing, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No New Impact. There are no existing residences on the project site. Therefore, neither housing units nor people would be displaced from implementation of the proposed project, and no replacement housing would be required. There would be no impact, and no new impact would occur for questions b) and c).

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
a) Would the project create a need for the development of new service facilities (e.g. fire, police, schools, and other public facilities), the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create circumstances where existing services and facilities could not meet established performance standards (i.e. response times, provider-per-resident ratios)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially impede existing services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The project site is in an area currently served by urban public services. Fire protection is provided by the Folsom Fire Department, and police protection is provided by the Folsom Police Department.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan EIR

Public Services are discussed in Chapter 3A.14 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The EIR concluded that ongoing construction activities associated with development of the Specific Plan Area could result in temporary lane closures, increased truck traffic, and other roadway effects that could slow or stop emergency vehicles, temporarily increasing response times and impeding existing services. Potential reduction of emergency response services during construction would be a direct, significant impact.

Evaluation of Public Services

- a) Would the project create a need for the development of new service facilities (e.g. fire, police, schools, and other public facilities), the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts?

No New Impact. The proposed project footprint does not exceed 3,600 sf and would not create a need for the development of new service facilities. The proposed project site is located adjacent to US Highway 50. There would be no new impact.

- b) Create circumstances where existing services and facilities could not meet established performance standards (i.e. response times, provider-per-resident ratios)?

No New Impact. No roads would be constructed or altered as part of the proposed project, and thus the project would have no new impact.

- c) Substantially impede existing services?

No New Impact. The project site is within the City of Folsom and is part of a larger planned development (Specific Plan) for which public services have been evaluated for service adequacy. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in service demands or render the current service levels to be inadequate. Therefore, the service demands for the proposed project are within the service demands projected for the buildout of the Specific Plan.

Additionally, the project applicant is required to involve the Sacramento County Fire Department in reviewing the project plans and incorporate the department's requirements into the final project design. Further, the project applicant is required to pay development impact fees for fire protection, police protection, and schools. By coordinating with the Sacramento County Fire Department and paying the appropriate developer fees, impacts to public services would be less than significant for questions a) through d). No new impact would occur with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2.

Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1: Incorporate California Fire Code; City of Folsom Fire Code Requirements; and EDHFD Requirements, if Necessary, into Project Design and Submit Project Design to the City of Folsom Fire Department for Review and Approval.

To reduce impacts related to the provision of new fire services, the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall do the following, as described below.

1. Incorporate into project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code, Folsom Fire Code (City of Folsom Municipal Code Title 8, Chapter 8.36), and other applicable requirements based on the City of Folsom Fire Department fire prevention standards. Improvement plans showing the incorporation automatic sprinkler systems, the availability of adequate fire flow, and the locations of hydrants shall be submitted to the City of Folsom Fire Department for review and approval. In addition, approved plans showing access design shall be provided to the City of Folsom Fire Department as described by Zoning Code Section 17.57.080 ("Vehicular Access Requirements"). These plans shall describe access-road length, dimensions, and finished surfaces for firefighting equipment. The installation of security gates across a fire apparatus access road shall be approved by the City of Folsom Fire Department. The design and operation of gates and barricades shall be in accordance with the Sacramento County Emergency Access Gates and Barriers Standard, as required by the City of Folsom Fire Code.
2. Submit a Fire Systems New Buildings, Additions, and Alterations Document Submittal List to the City of Folsom Community Development Department Building Division for review and approval before the issuance of building permits.

In addition to the above measures, the project applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall incorporate the provisions described below for the portion of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, if it is determined through City/El Dorado County negotiations that EDHFD would serve the 178-acre portion of the SPA.

3. Incorporate into project designs applicable requirements based on the EDHFD fire prevention standards. For commercial development, improvement plans showing roadways, land splits, buildings, fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, and other commercial building improvements shall be submitted to the EDHFD for review and approval. For residential development, improvement plans showing property lines and

adjacent streets or roads; total acreage or square footage of the parcel; the footprint of all structures; driveway plan views describing width, length, turnouts, turnarounds, radiuses, and surfaces; and driveway profile views showing the percent grade from the access road to the structure and vertical clearance shall be submitted to the EDHFD for review and approval.

4. Submit a Fire Prevention Plan Checklist to the EDHFD for review and approval before the issuance of building permits. In addition, residential development requiring automation fire sprinklers shall submit sprinkler design sheet(s) and hydraulic calculations from a California State Licensed C-16 Contractor.

The City shall not authorize the occupancy of any structures until the project applicant(s) have obtained a Certificate of Occupancy from the City of Folsom Community Development Department verifying that all fire prevention items have been addressed on-site to the satisfaction of the City of Folsom Fire Department and/or the EDHFD for the 178-acre area of the SPA within the EDHFD service area.

XV. TRANSPORTATION

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Transportation and Circulation were evaluated in Chapter 3A.15 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010), and were analyzed by looking at Level of Service (LOS), as the EIR was a 2010 EIR without an updated GHG analysis per new CEQA requirements.

Access

The proposed project site will be accessible directly from a maintenance road leading off of eastbound US Highway 50 near the East Bidwell Street off-ramp. The maintenance road would be constructed as part of the project to accommodate maintenance and construction vehicles.

Emergency Access

The City of Folsom identifies most major streets in the city as emergency evacuation routes. No aspect of the project would modify these streets or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan EIR

Transportation and Circulation were evaluated in Chapter 3A.15 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The EIR contains mitigation measures regarding where to add carpool lanes and where to place freeway off- and on-ramps in order to maintain an acceptable Level of Service (LOS). These measures have been implemented following the certification of the EIR, and thus would not be applicable to the proposed project.

Evaluation of Transportation

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

No New Impact. The proposed project is an Electronic Readerboard that would only need to be accessed by technicians for maintenance purposes. Car traffic at the project site is expected to be low, and no parking spaces would be included on-site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any plan or policy related to transportation, and impacts would be less than significant. No new impact would occur for questions a) and b).

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No New Impact. The nearest airfield is Cameron Airpark, located approximately 7.6 miles northeast of the proposed project location. The project would not result in modification to any air travel route, and there would be no impact. No new impact would occur.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No New Impact. The project would not require additional modifications to the roadways (e.g. construction of a maintenance road) other than those already identified in the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan that will be conducted by others through the Specific Plan buildout. Because the modifications to the roadways would be minor and compatible with the access in the vicinity, and the

overall Specific Plan area, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact, and no new impact would occur.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No New Impact. The proposed project would not modify streets currently used for emergency access or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. The project design has incorporated fire access elements to ensure adequate emergency access to the site, and the plans would be approved by the Sacramento County Fire Department prior to project implementation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No new impact would occur.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No New Impact. The project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The project also would not result in the decreased performance or safety of such facilities. No new impact would occur.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste beyond the capacity of existing landfills?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Violate Federal, state, or local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Electricity to the project site would be provided by SMUD, and no other connection to utilities would be constructed.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures from the FPA Specific Plan Certified EIR

Utilities are discussed in Chapter 3A.16 of the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan (City of Folsom 2010). The EIR concludes that the project would be required to comply with all Federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to utilities, and SMUD and other entities would provide new infrastructure to the Specific Plan Area if needed. Thus, the direct impacts were found to be less than significant.

Evaluation of Utilities and Service Systems

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water, wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

d) Generate solid waste beyond the capacity of existing landfills?

e) Violate Federal, state, or local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No New Impact. New wastewater treatment facilities would not be needed to support the proposed project, as the project is an electronic readerboard that would not require a connection to existing wastewater treatment utilities and would not generate solid waste. There would be no new impacts for questions a) through e).

f) Result in inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy?

No New Impact. The proposed project would not produce solid waste or wastewater, and thus would not have a greater impact than analyzed in the FPA Specific Plan EIR. There would be no new impacts.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	New Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Project- level Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No New Impact
The lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment and thereby require an EIR to be prepared for the project where there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that any of the following conditions may occur. Where prior to commencement of the environmental analysis a project proponent agrees to MMs or project modifications that would avoid any significant effect on the environment or would mitigate the significant environmental effect, a lead agency need not prepare an EIR solely because without mitigation the environmental effects would have been significant (per Section 15065 of the State CEQA Guidelines):				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

No New Impact. The preceding analysis indicates that the proposed FPA Electronic Readerboard project would not have a significant adverse impact on overall environmental quality, including the potential to reduce the habitat of fish and wildlife species, or contribute to lowering populations below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of

California history or prehistory. With implementation of the measures set forth in this Initial Study (and as previously analyzed in the EIR), potential impacts on overall environmental quality as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant. No new impact would occur.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?

No New Impact. While the project would indirectly contribute to cumulative impacts associated with increased urban development in the City and region, these impacts have previously been evaluated in the EIR prepared for the Specific Plan. The EIR concluded that development of the project site as allowed under the Specific Plan would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts. With implementation of the measures set forth in this Initial Study (and as previously analyzed in the EIR), cumulative impacts as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant. No new impact would occur.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No New Impact. As outlined in other sections of this Initial Study, the proposed project would adhere to mitigation measures previously prescribed in the Specific Plan EIR for potentially significant impacts to air quality, geology, and noise. These impacts have been reduced to a less-than-significant level at both the project and cumulative level through project design and mitigation measures. No new impact would occur.

9.0 REFERENCES

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf. Accessed on August 23, 2023.

2018a. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health>.

2018b. Federal Standard Area Designations. Available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/feddesig.htm>.

2014. First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/first_update_climate_change_scoping_plan.pdf.

2008. Climate Change Scoping Plan – A Framework for Change. December.

California Department of Conservation (CDC). 2021. California Important Farmland Finder Interactive Map. Accessed online on August 23, 2023 at <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2021. Map of Officially Designated Scenic Highways. Accessed at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>.

Folsom, City of. 2021. General Plan. Available at: <https://www.folsom.ca.us/government/community-development/planning-services/general-plan>.

2010. Folsom South of US 50 Specific Plan Project. Prepared by AECOM. Accessed on August 23, 2023 from <https://www.folsom.ca.us/government/community-development/planning-services/folsom-plan-area/maps-and-documents/-folder-178>.

2023. Folsom Municipal Code. Available at: <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom/#!/Folsom17/Folsom17.html>.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2021. FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Accessed on August 23, 2023 at <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>.

Fredrickson, D.A. 1974. Cultural Diversity in Early Central California: A View from the North Coast Ranges. *Journal of California Anthropology* 1(1):41-53.

Gudde, Erwin G., 1975. *California Gold Camps*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Hoover, Mildred B., Hero E. Rensch, and Ethel G. Rensch, 1990. Historic Spots in California. Third Edition by William N. Abeloe. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policymakers. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. February.
- Kroeber, A. L., 1925. Handbook of the Indians of California. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin No. 78.
- Lillard, J.B., R.F. Heizer, and F. Fenenga. 1939. An Introduction to the Archaeology of Central California. Sacramento Junior College, Department of Anthropology, Bulletin 2. Sacramento.
- Moratto, M.J. 1984. California Archaeology. San Diego. Academic Press.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2007. Web Soil Survey for the Folsom South of US Highway 50 Specific Plan EIR/EIS.
- Sacramento County. 2022. Climate Action Plan (CAP). Available at:
<https://planning.saccounty.gov/PlansandProjectsIn-Progress/Pages/CAP.aspx>.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020. Sac Metro Air District Attainment. Available at: <https://www.airquality.org/residents/air-quality-plans>.
2021. Construction Mitigation Tool. Available at: <https://www.airquality.org/residents/ceqa-land-use-planning/mitigation>.
- Wilson, N., and A. Towne 1978. Nisenan. In California, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 387-397. Handbook of the North American Indians, vol. 8, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

10.0 PREPARERS

City of Folsom, Community Development Department

Steve Banks, Senior Planner

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.

Robert Edgerton, Principal Planner/Project Manager

Lesley Owing, Deputy Project Manager

Anviti Singh, Environmental Planner