4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

This draft subsequent environmental impact report (SEIR) provides an analysis of cumulative impacts of the proposed City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Amendments for Increased Residential Capacity Project (project) taken together with other past, present, and probable future projects producing related impacts, as required by Section 15130 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines). The goal of such an exercise is two-fold: first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such projects would be cumulatively significant; and second, to determine whether the incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts by the project would be "cumulatively considerable" (and thus significant). (See State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15130[a]–[b], Section 15355[b], Section 15064[h], and Section 15065[c]; and *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* [2002] 103 Cal. App. 4th 98, 120.) In other words, the required analysis intends first to create a broad context in which to assess cumulative impacts, viewed on a geographic scale beyond the project site itself, and then to determine whether the project's incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts from all projects is itself significant (i.e., "cumulatively considerable").

Cumulative impacts are defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355 as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." A cumulative impact occurs from "the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time" (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355[b]).

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, the discussion of cumulative impacts in this draft SEIR focuses on significant and potentially significant cumulative impacts. Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides, in part, the following:

> [t]he discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

A proposed project is considered to have a significant cumulative effect if:

- the cumulative effects of development without the project are not significant and the project's additional impact is substantial enough, when added to the cumulative effects, to result in a significant impact; or
- the cumulative effects of development without the project are already significant and the project contributes measurably to the effect.

The term "measurably" is subject to interpretation. The standards used herein to determine measurability are that the impact must be noticeable to a reasonable person, or must exceed an established threshold of significance (defined throughout the resource sections in Chapter 3 of this Draft SEIR). This cumulative analysis also assumes that all mitigation measures identified in Chapter 3 to mitigate project impacts are adopted and implemented and that all elements of the design-build performance criteria that would minimize environmental effects are implemented.

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130) identify two basic methods for establishing the cumulative environment in which the project is to be considered: the use of a list of past, present, and probable future projects, or the use of adopted projections from a general plan, other regional planning document, or a certified EIR for such a planning document. This analysis uses a combination of the list and planning document approach, as described further below.

The cumulative impact analysis provided in this chapter evaluates whether the project could result in potentially new cumulatively considerable impacts or an increase in the severity of previously identified cumulative impacts that were identified in the General Plan EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(b).

4.2 CUMULATIVE SETTING

The City of Folsom 2035 General Plan is a broad framework for planning the future of the City. It is the official policy statement of the City Council that is used to protect and enhance Folsom's assets, guide Folsom's growth in the area south of Highway 50, strengthen existing neighborhoods, and provide a cohesive vision for the Folsom of 2035. The Planning Area for the General Plan includes the land within the City boundaries (17,301 acres) plus two areas totaling 5,600 acres outside the City limits south and southwest of the City, in Sacramento County.

Development within the current City limits is anticipated to generate a maximum of 43,247 dwelling units, 110,408 residents, and 64,573 jobs from buildout of the 2035 General Plan.

The General Plan was amended in August 2021 as part of the adoption of the 2021-2029 Housing Element. The Housing Element amended the General Plan Land Use Diagram and included implementation programs to consider increasing densities in key locations near transit stations, along the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay and within the Folsom Plan Area Town Center.

Probable future development projects in Folsom that were considered as part of this cumulative analysis include the following projects:

- Kaiser medical office expansion,
- Sutter Medical Facility Project,
- Folsom Corporate Center Project,
- Broadstone Villas Project,
- Mangini Place Apartments Project,
- Rowberry Overcrossing Project,
- Empire Ranch Interchange Project, and
- Alder Creek Apartments Project.

4.3 ANALYSIS OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Because the 2035 General Plan is essentially a set of guidelines for projects that could occur within the timeframe of the General Plan, the Plan itself represents the cumulative development scenario for the reasonably foreseeable future in the City. Therefore, the analysis presented in this draft SEIR generally represents a cumulative analysis of the City of Folsom as a whole over the General Plan planning horizon described above. In instances where other cumulative development in neighboring jurisdictions or within the region as a whole could contribute to impacts generated by the General Plan, those impacts, as well as the context, are discussed in the cumulative impact discussion that follows the project-specific impacts in each section.

As indicated above, CEQA requires that an EIR include an assessment of the cumulative impacts that could be associated with project implementation. This assessment involves examining project-related effects on the environment in the context of similar effects that have been caused by past or existing projects, as well as the anticipated effects of future projects. An EIR must discuss the cumulative impacts of a project when its incremental effect will be cumulatively considerable. Although project-related impacts may be individually minor, the cumulative effects of these impacts, in combination with the impacts of other projects, could be significant under CEQA and must be addressed (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130[a]). Section 15130(a)(3) states that an EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable, and

thus not significant, if a project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. Section 15130(b) indicates that the level of detail of the cumulative analysis need not be as great as for the project impact analyses; that it should reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence; and that it should be focused, practical, and reasonable.

The following sections contain a discussion of the cumulative effects anticipated from implementation of the project, together with related projects and planned development, for each of the environmental issue areas evaluated in this draft SEIR. The analysis herein analyzes whether, after implementation of project-specific mitigation that minimize environmental effects, the residual impacts of the project would cause a cumulatively significant impact or would contribute considerably to existing or anticipated (without the project) cumulatively significant effects that were identified in General Plan EIR. Where the project would contribute, additional mitigation is recommended where feasible.

4.3.1 Aesthetics

The General Plan EIR evaluated whether implementation of the 2035 General Plan, in addition to other reasonably foreseeable projects in the region, would transform the remaining rural character of the region that would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts on visual resources. The analysis noted that implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in development that would intensify the existing urban uses and would convert open space to urban land uses, which would cause permanent changes in the overall visual character and damage scenic resources in the Planning Area. Even though the City's design guidelines, Municipal Code, and 2035 General Plan policies would preserve the viewsheds and views from several designated scenic corridors, the impacts would still be significant with the buildout of the General Plan. Future land uses would also create new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the city. Specifically, development in the Folsom Plan Area would increase the amount of light and glare that would cause nighttime glow. The change in character and creation of new sources of light and glare associated with future development would result in significant impacts even with implementation of mitigation. Consequently, implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

As identified in Impacts 3.1-1 through 3.1-3 of this draft SEIR, the project planning area is in areas planned for urban development. The project would not change the development footprint analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Implementation of the project would result in increased residential development capacity in the project planning area. Future development associated with project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code, applicable design guidelines, objective design and development standards, and General Plan polices to ensure design compatibility with surrounding development and to address light and glare effects. Future development in the Folsom Plan Area would implement FPASP Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1, 3A.1-4, and 3A.1-5 to minimize impacts related to visual degradation and lighting by maintaining a landscaped corridor adjacent to Highway 50, locating construction staging areas and material away from sensitive land uses, and implementing a lighting plan. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to aesthetics resources beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

4.3.2 Air Quality

General Plan EIR evaluated whether implementation of the General Plan would have the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. The General Plan EIR determined that buildout of the General Plan would result in exposure of toxic air contaminants to sensitive receptors that could not be reduced to less than significant levels within the FPASP area. Additionally, buildout of the General Plan would result in odorous emissions from construction throughout the city. Consequently, implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

The geographic context for cumulative impacts related to air quality is regional for criteria pollutant and ozone precursors and includes the Sacrament county Valley Air Basin and Sacramento County within the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The context is local for toxic air contaminants and odors. As identified in Impact 3.2-1 and Impact 3.2-4 of this draft SEIR, the project would not generate construction emissions of any criteria air pollutants or precursors that would substantially increase local mobile-source emissions of carbon monoxide. Development would be required to comply with SMAQMD Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices and General Plan policies to reduce emissions. While construction would occur nearby existing and future sensitive receptors the project would be subject to General Plan policies and mitigation from the General Plan EIR to reduce emissions. Finally, the project would generate greater mass emissions than the land uses in the 2035 General Plan EIR, but the project would be more efficient on a per person basis. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative air quality impacts beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Despite this, the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would remain **cumulatively considerable**.

4.3.3 Cultural Resources

The General Plan EIR evaluated whether implementation of the General Plan would have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources, including archaeological and historic resources, as well as interred human remains. The General Plan EIR identified the geographic scope for cumulative effects to cultural resources is the City of Folsom. In addition, existing federal, state, and City regulations, in conjunction with mitigation measures applicable to the FPASP EIR/EIS, would ensure that development carried out under the proposed 2035 General Plan would have a less than significant impact from potential disturbance of human remains. Therefore, implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in a less-than-significant cumulative effect for these impacts. Even with implementation of existing regulations, as well as existing mitigation measures and 2035 General Plan policies, the environmental processes of review would not prevent the demolition of all historical and archaeological resources. Further, ground-disturbing work could still result in direct impacts to unknown archaeological resources, some of which would be considered "significant" under CEQA. Therefore, by definition, implementation of the 2035 General Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to these significant cumulative impacts.

HISTORICAL RESOURCES

As identified in Impacts 3.3-1 of this Draft SEIR, the proposed project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to historical resources throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Development associated with the project within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b requiring projects to perform an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources minimize or avoid damage or destruction and perform treatment where damage or destruction cannot be avoided. However, the environmental review would not prevent the demolition of all historical resources. Impacts would remain **cumulatively considerable**. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to historical resources.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As identified in Impacts 3.3-2 of this Draft SEIR, the proposed project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to unique archaeological resources throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Development associated with the project would be required to comply with adopted Mitigation Measure CUL-2 (develop a program for inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources) and development within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with Mitigation Measures 3.5A-1b (require projects to perform an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources minimize or avoid damage or destruction and perform treatment where damage or destruction cannot be avoided) and 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. However, the environmental process of review would not prevent the demolition of all unique archaeological resources. Impacts would remain **cumulatively considerable**. Nevertheless, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to unique archaeological resources.

HUMAN REMAINS

As identified in Impacts 3.3-4 of this Draft SEIR, the proposed project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to interred human remains throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Development associated with the project would be required to adhere to state regulations related to the handling of human remains. Additionally, development within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with adopted Mitigation Measure 3.5A-3 (suspend ground-disturbing activities if human remains are encountered and comply with California Health and Safety Code procedures) and would reduce impacts to less than significant. Impacts would remain **less than cumulatively considerable**. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to human remains.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

As identified in Impacts 3.3-3 of this Draft SEIR, the proposed project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to tribal cultural resources throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The results of the AB 52 consultation indicated that the project planning area is highly sensitive for tribal cultural resources. Implementation of projects contemplated in the proposed plan may require subsequent discretionary approvals and site-specific project-level analyses to fulfill CEQA requirements, which may include additional AB 52 consultation and identification of tribal cultural resources. However, the environmental process review would not prevent the demolition of all tribal cultural resources. Impacts would remain **cumulatively considerable**. However, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to tribal cultural resources.

4.3.4 Energy

The project would receive electricity service provided by SMUD. Natural gas services in Sacramento County are provided by PG&E. The project would also consume energy related to transportation (i.e., gasoline and diesel consumption for passenger vehicles, trucks, buses, and other vehicles) and construction. The project would be required to implement energy efficiency measures in accordance with the California Energy Code (i.e., Title 24), which includes the California Green Building Standards Code (i.e., CALGreen), to reduce energy demand from buildings and would likely implement transportation demand management strategies to reduce the number of vehicle trips and VMT, which would reduce fuel consumption.

According to Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. The impact discussion above concludes that the project would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy or transportation-related fuel. The project would increase energy demand during temporary construction activities for new buildings and facilities; however, construction activities would not increase long-term, ongoing demand for energy or fuel because project construction is anticipated to last 12 years and would be temporary. During operation, the project would be expected to require more energy overall when compared to the land uses evaluated in the General Plan EIR due to the increase in residential capacity. However, the project would result in increased population density in the project planning area, which would result in higher energy efficiency (less energy consumption per capita) compared to the energy that would be used for less dense land uses or single-family

residences. In addition, the project would comply with applicable energy efficiency requirements and would implement design features that meet or exceed current requirements per Title 24 and CALGreen. Because the project would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy and would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, the project would not result in a significant cumulative energy impact. The project's contribution to substantial effects related to energy would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

4.3.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are CO_2, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are found to be responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and leading to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth's climate, known as global climate change or global warming. Climate change is a global problem caused by global pollutants and is inherently cumulative. Therefore, the cumulative setting for climate change is global, which is experiencing an existing adverse cumulative condition.

The issue of global climate change is inherently a cumulative issue because the GHG emissions of individual projects cannot be shown to have any material effect on global climate. Therefore, the project's impact on climate change is addressed only as a cumulative impact. The impact analysis above concluded that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to both the generation of GHG emissions and conflict with an applicable GHG reduction regulation (i.e., AB 1279). Therefore, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures CC-1, CC-2, CC-3, and CC-4, according to the criterion set forth in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines meant to determine cumulative GHG impacts, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to GHG emissions would be **cumulatively considerable**.

4.3.6 Land Use and Planning

Cumulative land use and planning impacts, such as the potential for conflicts with adjacent land uses and consistency with adopted plans and regulations, are typically site- and project-specific. Subsequent projects allowed by the 2035 General Plan may result in site-specific land use conflicts and would be addressed during project-level environmental review under CEQA. Therefore, these effects are not anticipated to be cumulatively significant.

The project would amend the City's 2035 General Plan and Zoning Code to increase the minimum density and maximum floor area ratio standards in the project planning area to maintain multi-family and mixed-use land available to meet the target housing demand at all income levels for the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The project would also amend the FPASP to increase residential development capacity on the proposed rezone sites within the Folsom Plan Area. As identified in Impact 3.6-1, the project would be in compliance with State law requirements and meet the RHNA for the City. The project is consistent with applicable General Plan and FPASP policies related to environmental protections. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to land use and planning beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

4.3.7 Noise

CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION

Due to the programmatic nature of this project, all cumulative construction noise impacts are inherently addressed under Impact 3.7-1 of this noise chapter. As identified in under Impact 2.7-1, adherence to the construction noise requirements in the Standard Construction Specifications, the General Plan policies, and the FMC would avoid the generation of substantial temporary construction noise levels. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the

impact is not substantially more severe than identified in the General Plan EIR. Cumulative construction noise Impacts would be **less than significant**.

TRAFFIC NOISE

As shown in Table 3.7-14, the increase in traffic noise levels that would result from project implementation would not generate a substantial increase in traffic noise levels above those anticipated under the General Plan buildout. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not substantially more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. This impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

STATIONARY NOISE

Cumulative impacts related to on-site operational and stationary noise sources are site specific, dissipate with distance from the source, and typically result in cumulative impacts only when project-generated noise is located close to other off-site noise sources. The project would result in residential land uses that include stationary noise sources such as HVAC units and residential maintenance. Stationary noise sources are generally limited to the vicinity of individual project sites and would generally not combine with other stationary equipment in the overall area to result in a cumulative effect. In addition, as stated under Impact 3.7-4, adherence to the General Plan Policy 6.1.2 and implementation of applicable mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant stationary noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors to less than significant. Therefore, the project would not contribute substantially to a cumulative impact related to stationary noise and this impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable.**

4.3.8 Population and Housing

SACOG is the lead agency for developing the RHNA for the Sacramento region, which includes Sacramento County and the City. The project would ensure that the City has adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA and also provides additional sites to ensure that over the long-term, beyond the 2021-2029 RHNA period, that the City continues to have adequate sites to accommodate a range of housing needs. The project has been developed to accommodate the growth projections in the RHNA and is consistent with long-term regional growth projections. Therefore, implementation of the project would assist the City in accommodating its fair share of growth and housing needs under cumulative conditions. As identified in Impact 3.8-1 of this draft SEIR, the project would not induce substantial population growth above that which is already anticipated for the City and the region. Thus, the cumulative impact would not be significant. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative population growth beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to cumulative population growth would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

4.3.9 Public Services and Recreation

PUBLIC SERVICES

Under existing conditions, public services are provided in the project planning area and surrounding area by multiple agencies, including the Folsom Fire Department (FFD), Folsom Police Department (FPD), and California Highway Patrol. As described in Chapter 3.9, "Public Services and Recreation," FFD participates in the Statewide Master Mutual Aid System, including the Sacramento County Automatic Aid System. School services are provided by Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD). Cumulative development in the city would continue to increase the concentration of people and structures within the local public service jurisdictions which in turn increases demand for such services.

The increase in population under the project could continue the trend of increasing the demand for public services and could combine with other proposed development projects within the City to result in a cumulative increase in demand for public services such that new or physically altered governmental facilities would be required to maintain

acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. As noted in Section 3.9, "Public Services and Recreation," it is not anticipated that new or expanded public facilities would be required to accommodate development under the project. Further, new development and growth would occur within existing developed areas where adequate public services currently exist. To the extent that any potential expansion of public facilities is required to accommodate new development and growth in the area, it is reasonable to assume that these would be expansions of existing facilities, or new facilities in already developed areas which would typically be exempt from CEQA review as infill development. Future development projects would also be required to pay impact fees consistent with local jurisdiction requirements, including the City and FCUSD, to ensure the adequate provision of public services, including schools. Development in the City would be subject to General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan EIR, which would subsequently reduce physical environmental effects and provide additional police and fire protection services, as well as school facilities, as areas develop. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to public services beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to substantial effects related to public services would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

RECREATION

Past and present development has resulted in an increase in demand for recreation resources and a subsequent dedication of parklands and open space consistent with state and local plans and policies. This has increased the number of developed parklands, trails, and recreational facilities, and the amount of preserved open space within the city. As detailed in Section 3.9, "Public Services and Recreation," buildout of the project, as part of the 2035 General Plan would increase the level of recreational opportunities for local residents.

Nonetheless, the increase in population under the project would continue the trend of increasing the demand for recreational resources and could combine with other proposed development projects within the city to result in a cumulative increase in the use of existing recreational resources, which could be cumulatively significant. The Quimby Act, which applies to cities and counties in the context of approval of residential subdivisions, has a parkland standard of 5 acres per 1,000 persons. The City is subject to the standards of the Quimby Act, and the increase in recreational facilities/areas under the project would be consistent with the Quimby Act and would offset the incremental increase in recreational facility demand associated with implementation of the project.

As discussed in Section 3.9, the City would need a total of 552 acres of parkland to meet the parkland standard of 5.0 acres per 1,000 population with the buildout of the 2035 General Plan. Implementation of the project would result in an increase of 15,418 people in the city and would need a total of 629 acres of parkland to meet the parkland standard. The City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Department manages a total of 891 acres of parks and open space, consisting of 340 acres of developed parks, 500 acres of open space, and 51 acres of Class I Bike Trial (City of Folsom 2015). Therefore, there would be sufficient parkland to support the project buildout.

In addition, future development would also be subject to General Plan Policy LU 6.1.4 that requires open space in each residential development. FMC Chapter 3.130 establishes and imposes a specific plan infrastructure fee on new development within the Folsom Plan Area that equitably spreads the burden of public improvements and facilities and distributes the cost of public lands and community parkland to development projects within the Folsom Plan Area. Future tentative subdivision and tentative parcel maps under the project would be required to dedicate land or pay an in-lieu fee for the development of neighborhood and community parks, pursuant to FMC Chapter 16.32 and Chapter 4.10. Based on the discussion above, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to recreation beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to recreation would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

4.3.10 Transportation

The General Plan EIR identified no cumulatively considerable impacts related to transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic safety, impacts from buildout of the City. However, while the General Pla EIR did not assess vehicle miles traveled

(VMT) impacts, cumulative impacts from level of service were determined to be significant and unavoidable with implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation from the General Plan EIR.

TRANSIT, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

As described in Impact 3.10-1 of this Draft SEIR, implementation of the project would be subject to and implement General Plan policies applicable to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and service. Additionally, subsequent development projects under the project would be subject to all applicable City guidelines, standards, and specifications related to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

The discussion of VMT impacts associated with the project for Impact 3.10-2 is inherently a cumulative impact analysis as it compares the project to City VMT standards associated with buildout of the City. As detailed under Impact 3.10-2, the addition of project-generated total daily VMT within the City would not result in an exceedance of the established Citywide threshold of 7.51 VMT per capita. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to VMT would be **less than cumulatively considerable.**

HAZARDS DUE TO A DESIGN FEATURE OR INCOMPATIBLE USES

Implementation of the project would be subject to, and constructed in accordance with, applicable roadway design and safety guidelines and General Plan policies. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to design features or incompatible uses would be less **than cumulatively considerable**.

4.3.11 Utilities and Service Systems

The General Plan EIR evaluated whether implementation of the 2035 General Plan, in combination with other development, would contribute to cumulative demand for utilities and service systems, including water supply, wastewater, stormwater drainage, and solid waste. As noted in the General Plan EIR, buildout of the General Plan would increase urban demand for utilities and service systems. However, implementation of the General Plan policies and mitigation measures in Chapters 6 through 19 of the General Plan EIR would ensure that the provision of appropriately timed and sized utilities to serve new urban development would not result in significant impacts. Therefore, the General Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the less-than-significant cumulative effect.

WATER

As identified in Impact 3.11-1 of this draft SEIR, future development associated with the project would result in an increase in water demand. The project would result in water demands of approximately 1,275 acre-feet per year (AFY) and 55 AFY in the City of Folsom and El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service areas, respectively. Approximately 359 AFY of the 1,275 AFY increased water demand in the City of Folsom's service area would be located in the Folsom Plan Area. As summarized in Tables 3.11-2 through 3.11-4 in Section 3.11, "Utilities and Service Systems," of this Draft SEIR, City of Folsom would have at least 7,201 AFY of water surplus during normal year, single-dry year, and five-consecutive dry years through 2045. The City of Folsom would have adequate water surplus to meet the increased water demand (1,275 AFY) resulting from the project. Similarly, EID would have at least 11,100 AFY of water surplus during normal year, single-dry year, and five-consecutive dry years (Tables 3.11-5 through 3.11-7) through 2045. EID

would have adequate water surplus to meet the increased water demand (55 AFY) resulting from the project. Although the City of Folsom's water supply available to the Folsom Plan Area is restricted by a Water Supply Agreement, there would be approximately 778.53 AFY of water surplus in the Water Supply Agreement to accommodate the 359 AFY of water demand from the project in the Folsom Plan Area. The additional water demand from implementation of the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact regarding water supply than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to water service beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Thus, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to water service would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

WASTEWATER AND STORMWATER

Wastewater Conveyance Facilities

As identified in Impact 3.11-2 of this draft SEIR, the project would generate wastewater as a result of increased housing in the City and the existing wastewater conveyance infrastructure would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated additional wastewater. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.11-2a and 3.11-2b of the draft SEIR would increase the wastewater conveyance capacity in the 33-inch and 27-inch sheds to accommodate the additional flows from the project and offset its contribution to this cumulative impact. The discussion of wastewater conveyance impacts associated with the project for Impact 3.11-2 is inherently a cumulative impact analysis as the wastewater model includes existing and proposed future development as anticipated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.11-2a and 3.11-2b the project's contribution to substantial effects related to water service would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities

As identified in Impact 3.11-2 of this draft SEIR, the project would result in up to 6,046 additional residential units beyond the number assumed in the General Plan EIR, which could result in approximately 15,418 people. An additional 15,418 residents would generate additional wastewater beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Because the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWWTP) has been master planned to accommodate additional growth, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to wastewater beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to wastewater would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Stormwater Conveyance Facilities

As discussed in Impact 3.11-3 of this draft SEIR, the project would not change the development footprint and the amount of impervious surface analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The project would not result in additional stormwater water runoff that would result in relocation or construction of stormwater conveyance facilities in the city. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to stormwater conveyance facilities beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Thus, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to stormwater conveyance facilities would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

ELECTRICITY, NATURAL GAS, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

As identified in Impact 3.13-4 of this draft SEIR, the project's demand for electrical power, natural gas, and telecommunication services would be increased for residential use but would be decreased for non-residential use compared to what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. However, future development associated with the project would be following more stringent energy efficient standards, which would reduce the demand for energy use. In addition, compliance with General Plan Policies PFS 8.1.1 through PFS 8.1.5 would also ensure that adequate utilities services would be provided to the City's residents. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to dry utilities facilities beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Thus, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to dry utilities facilities would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.