CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION: Chair Ross Jackson, Vice Chair John Arnaz; Commissioners: Kelley Butcher, Marci Embree, Jennifer Lane, Brian Martell, and Thomas Scott

Any documents produced by the City and distributed to the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available at the Community Development Counter at City Hall located at 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California and at the table to the left as you enter the Council Chambers. The meeting is available to view via webcast on the City’s website the day after the meeting.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: The Planning Commission welcomes and encourages participation in City Planning Commission meetings, and will allow up to five minutes for expression on a non-agenda item. Matters under the jurisdiction of the Commission, and not on the posted agenda, may be addressed by the general public; however, California law prohibits the Commission from taking action on any matter which is not on the posted agenda unless it is determined to be an emergency by the Commission.

MINUTES

The minutes of April 20, 2016 will be presented for approval.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **PN 15-254, CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community, 2005 Iron Point Road - Planned Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, and Consideration of Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration**

A Public Hearing to consider a request from Maverick Partners West for approval of a Planned Development Permit, and Conditional Use Permit for development and operation of a 45-unit memory care community on a 1.91-acre site located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. The zoning classification for the site is C-3 PD and the General Plan land-use designation is RCC. An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The public review period begins April 6, 2016 and ends April 25, 2016. (Project Planner: Principal Planner, Steve Banks / Applicant: Elliot Alta Vista / Maverick Partners West)
2. **PN 14-279, Hillsborough Properties in the Folsom Plan Area**

A Public Hearing to consider a request by West Hillsborough Investors, LLC, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc., Hillsborough North, LLC, Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC, and Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC for approval of the Hillsborough Project located within the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (south of Highway 50, east of Prairie City Road and north of White Rock Road). The project includes a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment and a Development Agreement Amendment for development of 714 acres into a combination of single family, multi-family, commercial, industrial/office park, parks and an elementary school. The residential component of the project will include approximately 2,018 dwelling units. An Initial Study Checklist was prepared to analyze the proposed changes to the FPASP. The conclusion drawn from the analysis is that none of the changes or revisions proposed by the project would result in significantly new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, 15164, and 15168. Accordingly, an Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Environmental Impact Report has been prepared for this project. *(Project Planner: Consultant, George Djan, AICP / Applicant: West Hillsborough, LLC, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc., Hillsborough North, LLC, Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC, Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC)*

3. **PN 15-303, Folsom Heights Project in the Folsom Plan Area**

A Public Hearing to consider a request by Folsom Heights, LLC, for approval of the Folsom Heights Project located within the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (south of Highway 50, adjacent to the El Dorado/Sacramento County line). The project includes a General Plan Amendment and a Specific Plan Amendment for development of approximately 190 acres into a combination of single family, multi-family and commercial uses. The anticipated number of residential units is 530 dwelling units, which is the same under current approvals. An Initial Study Checklist was prepared to analyze the proposed changes to the FPASP. The conclusion drawn from the analysis is that none of the changes or revisions proposed by the project would result in significantly new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, 15164, and 15168. Accordingly, an Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Environmental Impact Report has been prepared for this project. *(Project Planner: Consultant, George Djan, AICP / Applicant: Folsom Heights, LLC)*

**Planning Commission / Planning Manager Report:**

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for **May 18, 2016**. Additional non-public hearing items may be added to the agenda; any such additions will be posted on the bulletin board in the foyer at City Hall at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Persons having questions on any of these items can visit the Community Development Department during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) at City Hall, 2nd Floor, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California, prior to the meeting. The phone number is 355-7222 and FAX number is 355-7274.

---

**NOTICE REGARDING CHALLENGES TO DECISIONS**

The appeal period for Planning Commission Action: Any appeal of a Planning Commission action must be filed, in writing with the City Clerk’s Office no later than ten (10) days from the date of the action pursuant to Resolution No. 8081. Pursuant to all applicable laws and regulations, including without limitation, California Government Code Section 65009 and or California Public Resources Code Section 21177, if you wish to challenge in court any of the above decisions (regarding planning, zoning and/or environmental decisions), you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing(s) described in this notice/agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the City at, or prior to, the public hearing.
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 20, 2016
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
6:30 P.M.
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION: Chair Ross Jackson; Vice Chair John Arnaz; Commissioners: Kelley Butcher, Marci Embree, Jennifer Lane, Brian Martell, Thomas Scott

ABSENT: Jennifer Lane

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: None

MINUTES: The minutes of March 16, 2016 and April 6, 2016 were approved as submitted.

CONTINUED ITEM

1. PN 16-050, The Island Subdivision Phase II, 405 Parkshore Drive – Tentative Subdivision Map Amendment and Planned Development Permit Modification (Continued from the April 6, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting)

A Public Hearing to consider a request from Lewis Planned Communities for approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map Amendment and a Planned Development Permit Modification for alterations to Phase II of the previously-approved Island Subdivision project located on a 15.1-acre site at 405 Parkshore Drive. The zoning is SP 93-2 with an underlying designation of RM PD and the General Plan is MLD. An Addendum to the 1992 Silverbrook Island EIR has previously been approved in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. (Project Planner: Principal Planner, Steve Banks / Applicant: Lewis Planned Communities)

COMMISSIONER JACKSON MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AMENDMENT CREATING 126 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS FOR PHASE II OF THE ISLAND SUBDIVISION PROJECT AS ILLUSTRATED ON ATTACHMENT 4;

AND

MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT MODIFICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF 126 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNITS AS ILLUSTRATED ON ATTACHMENTS 2 THROUGH 6 FOR PHASE II OF THE ISLAND SUBDIVISION PROJECT WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS:
GENERAL FINDINGS A & B; CEQA FINDING C; TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FINDINGS D – H; PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS I – O; CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL 1 – 66. ADDING CONDITION NO. 67 TO READ AS FOLLOWS, "THE OWNER/APPLICANT SHALL DEDICATE PUBLIC LANDSCAPE EASEMENTS FOR THOSE LOTS THAT WILL BE MAINTAINED BY THE EXISTING SILVERBROOK ISLAND LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING DISTRICT. THE LOTS ARE LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE PROJECT'S FRONTAGE OF PARKSHORE DRIVE. THE PUBLIC LANDSCAPE EASEMENTS SHALL BE SHOWN ON THE FINAL MAP."

COMMISSIONER EMBREE SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BUTCHER, SCOTT, ARNAZ, MARTELL, EMBREE, JACKSON
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: LANE

NEW BUSINESS

2. Appeal of PN 13-212: 659 Hancock Drive Design Review Approval

A Public Hearing to consider an appeal by Craig and Jane Yost of a Design Review approval for construction of a 3,000-square-foot single-family residence located at 659 Hancock Drive. The zoning designation for the site is R-1 ML (Single-Family Dwelling, Medium Lot District) and the General Plan designation is SF (Single Family). (Project Planner: Assistant Planner, Josh Kinkade / Applicant: American AAA and R Developer LLC)

COMMISSIONER SCOTT MOVED TO DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A 3,000-SQUARE-FOOT CUSTOM HOME LOCATED AT 659 HANCOCK DRIVE (PN 13-212) WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND MODIFIED CONDITIONS: GENERAL FINDING A; CEQA FINDING B; DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS C – E; CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL 1 – 11.

COMMISSIONER ARNAZ SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: EMBREE, JACKSON, BUTCHER, SCOTT, MARTELL, ARNAZ
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: LANE

REPORTS:
Planning Commission/Planning Manager Report:

None
RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Amanda Palmer, SECRETARY

APPROVED:

Ross Jackson, CHAIRMAN
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PROJECT TITLE
CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community

PROPOSAL
Request for approval of a Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit for development and operation of a 45-unit memory care residence

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Approve, based upon findings and subject to conditions

OWNER/APPLICANT
Elliott Alta Vista/Maverick Partners West

LOCATION
The 1.91-acre project site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (2005 Iron Point Road)

SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The project site, which has previously been disturbed by grading activity, is relatively flat and has a topography that is similar to the adjacent land. A large earthen berm, presumably left over from the construction of Iron Point Road, is situated in the central portion of the site. The site is vegetated primarily with ruderal herbaceous plant species and consists almost entirely of non-native grasses and forbs. The project site does not contain any trees and is completely outside of the nearby oak preserve and associated pond

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
RCC (Regional Commercial)

ZONING
C-3 PD (General Commercial, Planned Development District)
ADJACENT LAND USES/ZONING

North: Iron Point Road with the Vessona Condominiums Beyond (R-4 PD)
South: Undeveloped Commercially-Zoned Property (C-3 PD) with U.S. Highway 50 Beyond
East: Kaiser Permanente Medical Office Campus (M-L PD) with Commercial Development Beyond
West: Future Oak Avenue Parkway Extension with Commercial Development (C-3 PD) Beyond

PREVIOUS ACTION

Planning Commission approval of a Tentative Parcel Map and Planned Development Permit for development of a 71,800-square-foot commercial office and retail center (Broadstone Oaks Office/Retail Center) on March 18, 2009

FUTURE ACTION

Issuance of Grading and Building Permits

APPLICABLE CODES

FMC 17.22, Commercial Land Use Zones
FMC 17.38, Planned Development District
FMC 17.57, Parking Requirements
FMC 17.59, Signs
FMC 17.60, Use Permits

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration have been prepared for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

ATTACHED REFERENCE MATERIAL

1. Vicinity Map
5. Preliminary Site Details, dated January 18, 2016
6. Preliminary Retaining Wall and Fence Details
8. Building Elevations and Floor Plans, dated August 10, 2015
9. Color Building Elevations and Renderings
10. Project Narrative
11. Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
12. Site Photographs
BACKGROUND
In 1991, the City Council certified the Broadstone Master Plan EIR for 805 acres of development, including the subject 1.9-acre project site. The overall Master Plan consisted of approximately 1,092 single-family units, 672 multifamily units, in addition to commercial and office development. The project site has been designated for commercial development since the approval of the Broadstone Unit No. 2 Master Plan in 1991.

On March 18, 2009, the Planning Commission approved a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map and Planned Development Permit for development of a 71,800-square-foot office and retail center on a 12.7-acre site (included subject 1.9-acre parcel) located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. The aforementioned entitlements granted by the Planning Commission expired on March 18, 2011, and as a result, no development activity occurred on the subject property. It is important to note that development of the larger remainder of the project site (10.8-acres) will require approval by the Planning Commission at a future date.

As a result of recent interest from developers in providing senior housing opportunities in Folsom, City staff thought it would be helpful to provide an overview of the existing housing market and associated demographic trends. The City currently consists of approximately 27,000 dwelling units comprised of a combination of single family homes, condominiums, apartments, mobile homes, assisted living units, and skilled nursing units. Of the existing 27,000 dwelling units, a total of 822 units (3%) are dedicated to senior residents including 524 senior apartments (1.9%), 199 assisted living units (0.7%), and 99 skilled nursing units (0.4%). Taking into account the most recently-approved assisted living projects (Commons at Prairie City-131 units and Iron Point Retirement Community-126 units) and the subject project (CountryHouse at Broadstone-45 units); the number of assisted living units within the City would potentially increase from 199 units to 501 units (1.8% of total housing stock). Based on the aforementioned data, it would be fair to conclude that senior housing units (including assisted living communities) represent a very low percentage of the housing market in Folsom.

Utilizing the most recent information from the United States Census Bureau (2010), the City has 72,203 residents, 14,295 (19.8%) of which are over the age of 55. Between the years 2000 and 2010, the number of residents over the age of 55 in Folsom increased from 8,097 (15.6% of population) to 14,295 (19.8% of population), which translates to an increase of 4.2% over a ten year period. As a point of comparison, the number of residents over the age of 55 in Sacramento County increased from 230,536 (18.8%) in 2000 to 314,188 (22.1%) in 2010. Based on the aforementioned demographic information, it is apparent that the number of senior-aged residents within the City is increasing on a consistent basis, thus the need for senior housing opportunities will continue to grow in the future.

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL
The applicant, Maverick Partners West, is requesting approval of a Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit for development and operation of a 45-unit memory care community on a 1.91-acre site located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. The proposed development, which includes a one/two-story, 36,688-square-foot building, will accommodate up to 47 memory care residents within 45 individual rooms. The
The proposed one/two-story building will also include a commercial kitchen, dining rooms, activity rooms, offices, and nursing stations.

The CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community, whose focus is providing a variety of high quality living opportunities for senior memory care residents, will be licensed and monitored by the California Department of Social Services as a “Residential Care Facility of the Elderly.” The facility is specially designed extended care facility to provide services and support for those afflicted with neurological diseases and disorders such as Alzheimer’s disease and other forms of dementia. The facility, which will be staffed 24 hours per day, includes of full support system of management, programming, healthcare, dining, housekeeping, transportation, and maintenance employees. A detailed communication system will be in place for shift change issues, emergency response, and daily monitoring of the residents. The CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community will also maintain a detailed training program for all staff members including but not limited to training on residents' rights, safety and communication, wellness, health, and medication management.

The proposed memory care building, which includes one and two-story building elements, features a “Craftsman” style of architecture. The proposed design includes a variety of architectural features commonly found in Craftsman-style buildings including varied roof shapes and forms, extensive use of gables, roof eaves, architectural trim, and covered entries. The proposed project also includes materials typically found on Craftsman-style buildings such as horizontal siding, vertical siding, gable-end siding, wood trim and fascia elements, stone veneer, and composition shingle roof tiles. The proposed color scheme features a mixture of earth-tone colors (Khaki Shade, Grecian Ivory, Outer Banks, and Greek Villa) blended with a few richer colors (Attitude Grey and Turkish Coffee).

Access to the project site is provided by a new driveway located along the eastern edge of the property, approximately 480 feet east of the intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. The project driveway, which features STOP-sign control for vehicles exiting the site, will accommodate right-turns-in and right-turns-out only. Internal vehicle circulation consists of a private drive aisle that ties into a round-a-bout at the primary entrance to the proposed building. Pedestrian access is facilitated by a new sidewalk located along the frontage of Iron Point Road and internal pedestrian pathways that provide connectivity in and around the project site. Additional site improvements include: 24 on-site parking spaces, underground utilities, site lighting, site landscaping, retaining walls, a courtyard wall, a trash/recycling enclosure, and a monument sign.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CONSISTENCY
The General Plan land use designation for the project site is RCC (Regional Commercial) and the zoning designation is C-3 PD (General Commercial, Planned Development District). The proposed zoning designation corresponds with the proposed General Plan designation boundary lines. The project is consistent with both the proposed General Plan land use designation and the proposed zoning designation for the site, as senior residential developments are identified as a permitted land use within the proposed zoning designation for this site with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. In addition, the proposed project meets the development requirements established by the Folsom Municipal Code with respect to lot area, lot width, building coverage, and building setbacks.
LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The proposed project is located on an undeveloped, 1.91-acre commercially-zoned property situated at the southeast corner of the intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway within the Broadstone Master Planned Community. The project site is bounded by Iron Point Road to the north with multi-family residential development (Vessona Condominiums) and single-family residential development beyond, an open space parcel and undeveloped commercial land to the south with U.S. Highway 50 beyond, an open space parcel to the east with the Kaiser Permanente medical office building beyond, and the future Oak Avenue Parkway extension to the west with commercial development beyond.

As previously stated within this report, the Folsom Municipal Code (Section 17.22.030-2A) requires that senior residential developments obtain a Conditional Use Permit if the use is located within an area with a C-3 (Business and Professional) zoning designation. In this particular case, the applicant is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit to operate a 45-unit senior memory care community on the subject 1.91-acre site located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. In order to approve this request for a Conditional Use Permit, the Commission must find that the “establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use or building applied for will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood, or to the general welfare of the City.”

In reviewing the request for a Conditional Use Permit, staff also took into consideration the compatibility of the proposed land use in relation to the existing land uses in the immediate project vicinity. Potential noise impacts, potential traffic impacts, and potential aesthetic impacts were also analyzed and are addressed within separate sections of this report. As mentioned previously within this report, the project site is located on a major arterial roadway (Iron Point Road) and within a development intensive corridor populated with a mixture of commercial, residential, and retail land uses. The most prominent land uses in the immediate project area are professional office-related and include the Broadstone Business Center, Kaiser Permanente, Broadstone Park Professional Center, CAISO, Micron, and Safe Credit Union. Residential land uses in close proximity to the site include the Vessona Condominiums (approximately 150 feet north across Iron Point Road) and the Broadstone Unit No. 2 Subdivision (approximately 300 feet northwest across Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway). Medical-office related land uses in the project vicinity include the aforementioned Kaiser Permanente Medical Office facility and the Kaiser Permanente Surgery Center. The nearest retail commercial development (Folsom Gateway Shopping Center) is located approximately .75 miles to the east of the project site. Additional retail commercial development is located north of Iron Point Road (Palladio at Broadstone), approximately 1 mile east of the project site. Both retail commercial developments include grocery stores and a variety of retail shops.

As described above, the project site is situated in a unique location that includes a wide array of land uses including professional offices, medical offices, retail shopping, multi-family apartments, and single-family residences. As mentioned within the project description, the CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community is a residential care facility that will provide assisted memory care living opportunities for up to 47 senior residents. Given the residential nature of the proposed use, staff has determined that the proposed project will be complimentary to the existing multi-family and single-family residential land uses located in the immediate project vicinity. In addition, taking into account the unique needs of residential care facilities, staff has determined that
the proposed project is well-situated to take advantage of the services provided by the nearby medical offices and surgery center.

**PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT**
The purpose of the Planned Development Permit process is to allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. The Planned Development Permit process is also designed to encourage creative and efficient uses of land. In reviewing the applicant’s request for approval of a Planned Development Permit, staff considered a variety of factors including existing/proposed development standards, traffic/access/circulation, parking requirements, noise impacts, walls, site lighting, project signage, site landscaping, trash/recycling, grading/drainage, and architecture/design.

**Development Standards**
The applicant’s intent with the subject application is to create a unique set of development standards that will accommodate development of a one/two-story, 36,688-square-foot senior memory care community on the 1.91-acre project site. The following table outlines the existing and proposed development standards for the CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community:

| Iron Point Senior Retirement Community Development Standards Table |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                         | Lot Area | Lot Width | Building Coverage | Front Yard Setback | Rear Yard Setback | Side Yard Setbacks | Building Height limit |
| Folsom Municipal Code   | NA       | NA        | NA                | NA               | 12 feet          | NA             | 50 feet (four-stories) |
| Proposed Project        | 83,199 s.f | 480 feet | 27%               | 30 feet           | 22 feet          | 30 feet and 210 feet | 47 feet (three-stories) |

As shown on the development standards table, the proposed project meets or exceeds all development standards established for the subject site by the Folsom Municipal Code (Section 17.22.050). Parking is addressed separately within the parking section of this staff report.

**Traffic/Access/Circulation**

**Existing Roadway Network**
Significant roads in the project vicinity include Iron Point Road, Oak Avenue Parkway, McAdoo Drive, and Rowberry Drive. Iron Point Road, which is an east-west arterial roadway that extends from Empire Ranch Road to Folsom Boulevard, generally runs parallel to and just north of U.S. Highway 50. In the immediate vicinity of the project site, Iron Point Road is a four-lane, median-divided road with bike lanes and a 45 mph posted speed limit. Oak Avenue Parkway is a north-south, four-to-six lane arterial street that has Iron Point Road as its southern terminus. Near Iron Point Road, Oak Avenue Parkway has a 45 mph posted speed limit and two lanes in each direction (plus bike lanes) separated by a landscaped median. McAdoo Drive is a north-south roadway that runs from Iron Point Road to Riley Street. McAdoo Drive is a two-lane road with bike lanes and a 35 mph posted speed limit. Rowberry Drive is a two-lane residential collector street which connects Iron Point Road with Walden Drive.
Traffic Impacts
The traffic, access, and circulation analysis associated with the proposed project is based on the results of a Traffic Impact Analysis that was prepared on February 12, 2016 by MRO Engineers. The traffic study analyzed traffic operations in the vicinity of the project site under five scenarios: Existing Conditions, Construction Year No Project Conditions, Construction Year Plus Project Conditions, Cumulative No Project Conditions, and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. Potential impacts of the project were evaluated at three street intersections: Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway, Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive, and Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive.

The proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care project is expected to generate a total of 9 vehicle-trips during the weekday AM peak hour (6 inbound and 3 outbound) and 14 during the weekday PM peak hour trips (7 inbound and 7 outbound). In addition, the proposed project is projected to generate a total of 130 daily vehicle trips. Based on the relatively low volume of vehicle trips associated with the proposed project, no change in level of service (LOS) is projected during the AM or PM peak hour at any of the three study intersections under Construction Year Plus Project Conditions. In addition, no change in level of service (LOS) is projected during the AM or PM peak hour at any of the three study intersections under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions as a result of project-related vehicle trips. It is important to note that the Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway intersection will fail to conform to the City’s level of service policy (LOS C or better) during Cumulative No Project Conditions and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. However, the failure of this intersection to meet the City’s level of service policy is not related to impacts associated with the proposed project and therefore no mitigation is required.

Project Access and On-Site Circulation
As shown on the submitted site plan, vehicular access to and from the project site is provided by one new driveway located on Iron Point Road at the eastern edge of the project site. The project driveway, which is proposed to feature STOP-sign control, will be restricted to inbound and outbound right turns to and from Iron Point Road. Internal vehicle circulation consists of a private drive aisle that connects to a round-a-bout at the primary entrance to the proposed building. Pedestrian access is accommodated by a new sidewalk located along the frontage of Iron Point Road and internal pedestrian pathways that provide connectivity in and around the project site.

The traffic study prepared for the proposed project analyzed the operation and configuration of the project access system in terms of: Intersection level of service, intersection spacing, turn restrictions, sight distance, queuing, right-turn deceleration lane, pedestrian safety, and bicycle safety. Based on the configuration of the proposed project driveway, the physical characteristics of the access road, and the low volume of vehicle traffic, the study determined that the proposed driveway location conforms to the City’s practice regarding intersection spacing. In terms of sight distance, the study determined that adequate sight distance is available for all key driveway access-related movements.

In relation to minimum driveway throat depth, the study determined that an adequate queue length or distance is provided at the project driveway. Although a right-turn lane or taper for traffic entering the project site from Iron Point Road is not considered necessary under the City’s guidelines, a right-turn lane is proposed in connection with the project. This right-turn lane is considered a desirable feature, as it will increase safety for entering drivers. With regard to pedestrian circulation, the study determined that the addition of the sidewalk along Iron Point Road in conjunction with the proposed internal pedestrian connections with is adequate and that no
additional pedestrian facilities are necessary. Lastly, the study determined that the existing bicycle lanes located on Iron Point Road are adequate to accommodate the needs of bicyclists in the vicinity of the project site. To further ensure safe travel within the project site, staff recommends that the following measures be implemented (Condition No. 45):

- A “STOP” sign and appropriate pavement markings shall be installed at the project driveway located on Iron Point Road.

- A striped crosswalk shall be provided across the intersection of the project driveway and Iron Point Road.

- The project driveway shall be limited to right-turns-in and right-turns-out only. Appropriate signage and striping shall be provided accordingly.

- A right-turn lane with associated pavement markings shall be installed along the project frontage of Iron Point Road as shown on the submitted site plan.

Traffic Safety Committee
The proposed project was reviewed by the Traffic Safety Committee at its February 25, 2016 meeting. At the aforementioned meeting, the Committee discussed a number of traffic, access, and circulation-related topics associated with the proposed project including emergency vehicle access. In relation to emergency vehicle access, the Committee recommended that City staff work with the applicant to design an emergency vehicle access route that would provide adequate access into the project site from westbound Iron Point Road. Subsequently, City staff and the applicant worked together to design an acceptable emergency vehicle access route within the landscape median on Iron Point Road. To ensure that adequate emergency vehicle access is provided to the project site, staff recommends that the following measure be implemented (Condition No. 62):

- An Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) for fire apparatus shall be installed and maintained to allow immediate left-turn access into the project entrance across the existing median from west-bound Iron Point Road. The design of the EVA shall be approved by both the Fire Code Official and the City Engineer. The EVA shall be a paved surface that can support a gross vehicle weight of 80,000 pounds. The EVA shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13’6”.

Parking
The proposed project includes development of a one/two-story building (36,688-square-feet) that will accommodate up to 47 residents in 45 and memory care rooms. The Folsom Municipal Code (Section 17.57.040.12) requires that group care facilities and similar-type uses provide one parking space per two building-occupants based upon the maximum occupant load of the sleeping or dining area. As shown on the site plan, the proposed project meets the minimum parking requirement by providing 24 parking spaces whereas 24 parking spaces are required. The submitted site plan does not identify any bicycle parking spaces. Staff recommends five bicycle onsite parking spaces be provided in a location that is in close proximity to the building entrance. Condition No. 47 is included to reflect this requirement.
Based on the growing number of senior retirement and senior care facilities that have expressed an interest in locating within Folsom recently, City staff, with the assistance of MRO Engineers, conducted a supplemental parking assessment to further evaluate parking demands of these types of facilities. The parking assessment, which reviewed parking requirements established by nearby jurisdictions as well as information presented in the current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, determined that the peak parking demand for senior retirement and senior care facilities ranged from .21 to .76 parking spaces per unit (average peak parking demand of .41). As shown on the submitted site plan, the proposed project is providing a total of 24 parking spaces, which equates to .53 parking spaces per unit.

In relation to the proposed memory care community, the applicant has indicated that the residents are not capable of driving a vehicle due to physical and mental considerations, thus the parking provided will serve staff and visitors only. In terms of staffing of the memory care community, the applicant indicated that the largest shift (daytime shift) includes approximately ten employees. The submitted site plan includes 24 on-site parking spaces, which will accommodate parking for ten employees and 14 visitors. Based on the aforementioned information, staff has determined that sufficient parking is provided to serve the proposed project.

Noise
Based on the proximity of the project site to Iron Point Road, Oak Avenue Parkway, U.S. Highway 50, and existing commercial land uses to the east and west, acoustical measurements and modeling were prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX). The purpose of the noise analysis was to quantify existing noise levels associated with traffic on Iron Point Road, traffic on U.S. Highway 50, and nearby commercial activities, and to compare those noise levels against the applicable City of Folsom noise standards for acceptable noise exposure at residential land uses. Noise sources associated with the proposed project, including on-site parking/circulation and mechanical equipment noise, were also evaluated in the noise analysis.

As noted previously, the predominant existing noise sources in the vicinity of the project site are from vehicles on Iron Point Road, Oak Avenue Parkway, and U.S. Highway 50, as well as background noises from adjacent commercial land uses. Persons and activities potentially sensitive to noise in the project vicinity include residents within the Broadstone Unit No. 2 Subdivision to the north and northwest of the project site. Potential noise impacts associated with the CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community project can be categorized as those resulting from construction-related activities and those caused by operational activities. Construction-related noise would have a short-term effect, while operational noise would continue throughout the lifetime of the project.

Development of the 36,668-square-foot senior memory care community would temporarily increase noise levels in the project vicinity during the construction period, which would take approximately 12 to 15 months. Construction activities, including site clearing, excavation, grading, building construction, and paving, would be considered an intermittent noise impact throughout the construction period of the project. The City’s Noise Ordinance excludes construction activities from meeting the General Plan Noise Element standards, provided that all phases of construction are limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. To ensure compliance with the City’s Noise Control Ordinance and General Plan Noise Element, staff recommends that hours of construction operation be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays with no construction
permitted on Sundays or holidays. In addition, staff recommends that construction equipment be muffled and shrouded to minimize noise levels. Condition No. 48 is included to reflect these requirements.

The noise environment in the area of the project site is dominated by traffic noise generated by vehicles on Iron Point Road, Oak Avenue Parkway, and U.S. Highway 50. Additional noise is also generated to a lesser extent from adjacent commercial uses located to the east and west of the project site. Traffic noise levels were measured with respect to the outdoor activity areas associated with the project and also for interior spaces within the proposed three-story building. The noise analysis determined that the future greatest exterior noise level in the outdoor activity areas would be 57.9 dBA, thus complying with the 60 dBA noise level standard established by the City for residential developments. Traffic noise levels were also calculated for the interior spaces within the proposed residential building. The noise analysis determined that the greatest interior noise level would be 56 dBA, thus exceeding the 45 dBA interior noise level standard. To address the interior noise level impacts, staff recommends that the following measures be implemented (Condition Nos. 50 and 51):

- Interior building noise levels for the proposed project shall not exceed 45 CNEL. Once specific building plan information is available, additional exterior-to-interior noise analysis shall be conducted to demonstrate that interior levels do not exceed 45 CNEL. The information in the analysis shall include wall heights and lengths, room volumes, window and door tables typical for a building plan, as well as information on any other openings in the building shell. With this specific building plan information, the analysis shall determine the predicted interior noise levels at the planned on-site building. If predicted noise levels are found to be in excess of 45 CNEL, the report shall identify architectural materials or techniques that could be included to reduce noise levels to 45 CNEL in habitable rooms. Standard measures such as glazing with Sound Transmission Control (STC) ratings from a STC 22 to STC 60, as well as walls with appropriate STC ratings (34 to 60), should be considered.

- Appropriate means of air circulation and provision of fresh air would be provided to allow windows to remain closed for extended intervals of time so that acceptable interior noise levels can be maintained. The mechanical ventilation system would meet the criteria of the International Building Code (Chapter 12, Section 1203.3 of the 2001 California Building Code).

Operational noises generated by the proposed project include sounds associated with new vehicle trips, vehicles parking, and mechanical equipment associated with the memory care facility. Based on the limited volume or project-generated vehicle trips, vehicle noise exposure would increase only slightly as compared to existing conditions in the project vicinity. There would also only be slight noise increase from activities occurring in the parking lot area. To minimize operational noise impacts associated with the operation of the mechanical equipment, staff recommends that roof-mounted mechanical equipment not extend above the height of the parapet walls. In addition, staff recommends that ground-mounted mechanical equipment be shielded by landscaping or trellis-type features. Condition No. 49 is included to reflect these requirements.
Fencing/Walls
The applicant is proposing to install a combination of decorative walls and fences around the memory garden area located on the south side of the proposed building in order to provide a safe and secure environment for the residents of the memory care community. A six-foot-tall decorative wall with intermittent stone columns is proposed along the southern boundary of the memory care garden, while six-foot-tall decorative metal view fencing is proposed to enclose the remainder of the memory garden. In addition, a rockery retaining wall which ranges from three to eight feet in height is proposed along the southern boundary of the project site. Staff has determined that the design of the proposed fencing and walls is complimentary to the architecture and design of the proposed building. However, staff does recommend that the final location, design, height, materials, and colors of the walls, fencing, and retaining walls be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. Condition No. 54 is included to reflect this requirement.

Site Lighting
The applicant is proposing to use a combination of free-standing parking lot lights, building-attached lights, and ground-mounted landscape lighting. The free-standing parking lot lights, which are located in the parking lot area on the east side of the project site, are 25 feet in height and feature a contemporary design. Specific details regarding the building-attached and landscape lighting have not been provided as this time. To minimize potential lighting-related impacts, staff recommends that all free-standing parking lot lights and building-attached lights be screened, shielded, and directed downward to minimize glare towards the surrounding properties. In addition, staff recommends that the final design of the building-attached lights be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. Condition No. 26 is included to reflect these requirements.

Trash/Recycling Enclosure
The proposed project includes a single trash/recycling enclosure which is located next to the round-a-bout driveway on the southern boundary of the project site. The proposed six-foot-tall trash/recycling enclosure, which measures 20 feet in width by 10 feet in depth, includes a design that features concrete masonry unit (CMU) split-face blocks, a CMU wall-cap, and a metal gate. The applicant is proposing to paint the trash-recycling enclosure an earth-tone color to match the colors utilized on the proposed building. Staff recommends that the final location, orientation, design, materials, and colors of the trash/recycling enclosure is subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. Condition No. 53 is included to reflect this requirement.

Signage
The proposed project includes a single monument sign that will be located within a landscape area on the west side of the project driveway on Iron Point Road. The proposed double-sided monument sign, which is four-feet tall, is enhanced by four stone pilasters and a decorative trim cap element. The proposed sign features raised metal lettering that reads “CountryHouse Memory Care” as well as the project address on Iron Point Road. Staff has determined that the design of the proposed monument sign is complimentary to the design of the proposed memory care building. In addition, staff has determined that the proposed sign is consistent with the requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code, (Section 17.59.040) with regarding to maximum sign area (24-square-feet) and maximum sign height (6 feet).
Existing and Proposed Landscaping
The 1.91-acre project site, which has previously been disturbed by grading activity is vegetated primarily with ruderal herbaceous plant species and consists almost entirely of non-native grasses and forbs. The project site does not contain any trees and is completely outside of the nearby oak preserve and associated pond. A 30-foot-wide landscape easement is located along the project’s frontage with Iron Point Road; however, no landscape improvements have been constructed at this time.

The preliminary landscape plan includes development of a 30-foot landscape buffer adjacent to Iron Point Road. Proposed landscape improvements include a variety of drought-tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcover. Among the proposed trees are; Chinese Pistache, Crape Myrtle, Red Maple, Red Oak, and Strawberry Tree. Proposed shrubs and groundcover include; Australian Bluebell Creeper, Azalea, Blue Oats Grass, Crown Jewel Gardenia, Daylily, Deer Grass, Heavenly Bamboo, Indian Hawthorne, Photinia, Sword Fern, and Winter Blooming Berginia. The preliminary landscape plan meets the City shade requirement (40%) by providing 45% shade in the parking lot area within fifteen (15) years. Staff recommends that the final landscape plans be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department. Condition No. 33 is included to reflect this requirement.

Grading and Drainage
The preliminary grading plan shows the finished pad grade at 317 for the proposed one/two-story building, with the surrounding site elevations ranging from 315 feet to 319 feet. As noted earlier within the report, a rockery retaining wall (3-8 feet tall) is proposed along the southern boundary of the project site. Development of the project site is anticipated to require moderate movement of soils (including filling and leveling) and the compaction of said materials. The applicant will be required to provide a complete geotechnical report before the design of the interior road, parking lot areas, and building foundations are finalized. Condition No. 14 is included to reflect this requirement.

Public storm drainage facilities are provided to accommodate runoff for the surrounding commercial land uses, but no infrastructure currently exists within the project site itself. The nearest storm drainage infrastructure is located adjacent to the site, within the Iron Point Road right-of-way. Because no storm drainage facilities are provided within the project site, storm water quality treatment controls will be provided by the existing BMP or will be required to be incorporated into the site design, and connected to the existing City storm drainage facilities. Staff recommends the storm drain swale or onsite improvement plans provide for “Best Management Practices” that meet the requirements of the water quality standards of the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. Condition No. 28 is included to reflect this requirement.

Biological Resources
The 1.91-acre project, which has been previously disturbed by grading activity, does not contain any trees and is completely outside of a nearby oak preserve and pond. The site is vegetated primarily with ruderal herbaceous plant species and consists almost entirely of non-native grasses and forbs as would be expected of a site characterized by past soil disturbances. The regulatory framework that is relevant to the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) review process for this project include; Federal Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, California Endangered Species Act, CDFG Species of Concern, California Native Plant Society, State Jurisdiction, Jurisdictional Water of the United States, and CEQA Significance Criteria. The
evaluation of biological resources and the potential environmental effects of implementing the proposed project are based on a Biological Resource Assessment that was prepared by HELIX.

The Biological Resource Assessment determined that no riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, protected habitats, or potential waters of the United States occur on the project site. The Assessment also determined that the proposed project would not affect special-status species. However, common bird species protected by the MBTA and/or Fish and Game Code may nest on or near the project site. The aforementioned oak woodland and riparian vegetation located near the project site provide potential nesting habitat for a variety of common bird species, which are protected from disturbance during the nesting season. If active nests are present at the time of construction, construction activities may result in injury or death of individual birds (e.g., if trees or limbs containing active nests are removed), or harassment which may cause nesting birds to abandon active nests resulting in the loss of eggs or young. The loss of foraging habitat in the vicinity of an active nest may result in the reduced health and vigor of eggs and/or nestlings, resulting in reduced survival rates. Any harassment, injury, or death of nesting birds, their nestlings, or eggs would be considered a significant impact. To minimize potential impacts to nesting birds, staff recommends that the following measure be implemented (Condition No. 37):

- If construction activities occur during the typical bird nesting season (February 15 through August 31), pre-construction nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 500-foot radius of proposed construction areas, where access is available, no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction. An additional survey shall be conducted within 48 hours prior to commencement of construction.

- If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.

- If active nests are identified in these areas, the City shall coordinate with CDFW to develop measures to avoid disturbance of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities, or construction could be delayed until the young have fledged. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a buffer zone and monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist until the young have fledged the nest and are independent of the site. If a buffer zone is implemented, the size of the buffer zone shall be determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFW and shall be appropriate for the species of bird and nest location.

No riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or other protected habitats are located on the project site; however, an oak preserve and pond exists adjacent to the southern boundary of the project site. To avoid and minimize potential impacts to the oak tree preserve and the pond south of the project site, staff recommends that the following measure be implemented (Condition No 38):

- The project shall adhere to standard construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent off-site water quality impacts to the adjacent oak preserve and pond. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be prepared for the project and will include measures to prevent stormwater runoff from leaving the site and entering adjacent sensitive habitats.
- Environmentally sensitive area (ESA) fencing shall be installed along the southern site limits to prevent intrusion into the oak preserve and pond by construction equipment and personnel. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be off-limits to construction personnel. Signs shall be placed at 100 foot intervals along the ESA fencing indicating that the oak preserve and pond are a sensitive habitat and off-limits to construction personnel and equipment. The ESA fencing and signage shall be maintained in good condition throughout construction and removed once construction is complete.

- The project shall comply with City standard practices regarding night lighting (see Attachment No. 11), minimizing potential impacts from light spillage or glare into off-site sensitive habitats.

**Architecture and Design**
As referenced previously within this report, the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community project includes development of a one/two-story, 36,688-square-foot building. The proposed building, which includes a combination of one and two-story building elements, features a “Craftsman” style of architectural. The proposed design includes a variety of architectural features commonly found in Craftsman-style buildings including varied roof shapes and forms, extensive use of gables, roof eaves, architectural trim, and covered entries. The proposed project also utilizes materials typically found on Craftsman-style buildings such as horizontal siding, vertical siding, gable-end siding, wood trim and fascia elements, stone veneer, and composition shingle roof tiles. The proposed color scheme features a mixture of earth-tone colors (Khaki Shade, Grecian Ivory, Outer Banks, and Greek Villa) blended with a few richer colors (Attitude Grey and Turkish Coffee).

As illustrated on the submitted building elevations and color renderings, the proposed building incorporates many of the key design features commonly found in Craftsman Style architecture including utilization of multiple gable elements, eave overhangs, covered entries, exposed rafters, and prominent utilization of wood siding. As shown on the material and colors board, the proposed building also incorporates building materials that are frequently associated with Craftsman Style design including the extensive use of stone veneer, exposed wood trim elements, wood siding, and architectural-grade composition shingle roof tiles. Craftsman Style colors have historically included complimentary earth tones (earthy browns; muted greens, stone-like blues). In staying with this traditional theme, the applicant is proposing to utilize four different earth tone colors (Khaki Shade, Grecian Ivory, Outer Banks, and Greek Villa) blended with two darker colors (Attitude Grey and Turkish Coffee).

Based on the aforementioned analysis, staff has determined that the proposed building accurately reflects the design, materials, and colors identifiable with Craftsman Style architecture. The proposed project is subject to the Broadstone Unit No. 2 Design Guidelines. The Design Guidelines, in respect to overall architectural design concepts, are intended to provide a framework for design, while not restricting creativity. The following are design parameters recommended by the Design Guidelines to ensure a high level quality of development:

- Buildings should be responsive to views from all four elevations
• Building masses should be made human in scale, present varied elevations, and use accent materials to add variety

• Building materials such as tile, stone, glass, metal panels, and concrete should be utilized together to reflect the area’s modernity, diversity, and traditions.

• Building entries shall be distinguished with accent materials such as stone, slate, color metal panels, or concrete.

Upon review of the submitted building elevations in association with the color and materials board, staff determined that the design of the proposed building accurately reflects the intent of the Broadstone Unit No. 2 Design Guidelines. Specifically, the proposed project utilizes many unique design features including varied roof shapes and forms, gables, wood accent elements, and a prominent entry. In addition, the proposed building materials, which include extensive use of stone veneer, wood siding, and architectural grade roof tiles, are consistent with the recommendations of the Design Guidelines. Lastly, the proposed earth tone color scheme blends well with the existing residential and commercial buildings in the project area and with the natural setting of the project site. As a result, staff recommends approval of the applicant’s design with the following conditions:

1. This approval is for a one/two-story, 36,688-square foot building associated with the CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community project. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated August 10, 2015 and the color building renderings.

2. The design, materials, and colors of the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community building shall be consistent with the submitted building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

3. Brick pavers, stamped asphalt or another type of colored masonry material (ADA compliant) shall be used to designate pedestrian crosswalks on the project site, in addition to where pedestrian paths cross drive aisles, and shall be incorporated as a design feature at the driveway entrance at Iron Point Road.

4. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment, including satellite dish antennas, shall not extend above the height of the parapet walls. Ground-mounted mechanical equipment shall be shielded by landscaping or trellis type features.

5. Final exterior building and site lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval by Community Development Department for location, height, aesthetics, level of illumination, glare and trespass prior to the issuance of any building permits. Lighting shall be designed to be shielded and directed downward onto the project site and away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way. Lighting shall be equipped with a timer or photo condenser.
These recommendations are included in the conditions of approval (Condition No. 52) presented for consideration by the Planning Commission.

Public Service Response
In reviewing the proposed project, City staff considered the potential impact the project may have in terms of Emergency Medical Responses (EMS) given nature of the proposed use as a memory care facility. Based on historic information provided by the Fire Department indicates that proposed project is expected to generate approximately 70 EMS responses on an annual basis. As a point of reference, the City had a total of 3,485 EMS response calls during 2014. Based on this information, staff determined that the proposed project would have a minor impact (2.0% overall increase) on EMS resources that are deployed in the field on a daily basis. In addition, Fire Chief Ron Phillips has concluded that the current emergency medical service delivery model is equipped to manage the emergency medical service response calls projected to be generated by the proposed project.

ENERGY AND WATER CONSERVATION
To reduce impacts in terms of energy and water consumption, the proposed project is required to meet the 2014 Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards. The project will be allowed to achieve this performance standard through a combination of measures to reduce energy use for heating, cooling, water heating and ventilation. Because energy use for each different system type (i.e., heating, cooling, water heating, and ventilation) as well as appliances is defined, this method will also easily allow for application of individual measures aimed at reducing the energy use of these devices in a prescriptive manner.

In an effort to address water conservation, the proposed project includes a number of measures aimed at reducing on-site water usage. As discussed within the Landscape section of this staff report, the proposed project has been designed to achieve an overall water efficient landscape rating utilizing primarily low water use plant materials. The concepts of utilizing plant materials that are compatible in their water use requirements together within the same irrigation zones, are to be applied with all planting and irrigation design. In addition, all proposed landscape areas will have automatically controlled irrigation systems that incorporate the use of spray, subsurface in-line emitters, and other high efficiency drip-type systems. To further ensure water conservation is being achieved, the proposed project is required to comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s Declarations, and restrictions including but not limited to: Executive Order B-29-15 issued by the Governor of California on April 1, 2015 relative to water usage and conservation, requirements relative to water usage and conservation established by the State Water Resources Control Board, and water usage and conservation requirements established within the Folsom Municipal Code, (Section 13.26 Water Conservation), or amended from time to time. Condition No 69 is included to reflect these requirements.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
Staff has prepared an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment 11) for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regulations and determined that with the proposed mitigations, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. The Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and noticed for public comment on the project, and mitigation measures have been included as Conditions of Approval. To date, no written comments have been received from the public during the Mitigated Negative Declaration public review period.
RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

MOVE TO ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM PREPARED FOR THE COUNTRYHOUSE AT BROADSTONE MEMORY CARE COMMUNITY PROJECT (PN 15-254) PER ATTACHMENT 11;

AND

MOVE TO APPROVE A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRYHOUSE AT BROADSTONE MEMORY CARE COMMUNITY PROJECT, WHICH INCLUDES A ONE/TWO-STORY, 36,668-SQUARE-FOOT BUILDING AS ILLUSTRATED ON ATTACHMENTS 2 THROUGH 9;

AND

MOVE TO APPROVE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW THE COUNTRYHOUSE AT BROADSTONE MEMORY CARE COMMUNITY TO OPERATE AT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF IRON POINT ROAD AND OAK AVENUE PARKWAY (APN NO. 072-2680-008) WITH THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS (NO. 1-69).

GENERAL FINDINGS

A. NOTICE OF HEARING HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER REQUIRED BY STATE LAW AND CITY CODE.


CEQA FINDINGS

C. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA.

D. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED THE PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION BEFORE MAKING A DECISION REGARDING THE PROJECT.

E. ON THE BASIS OF THE WHOLE RECORD BEFORE IT, THE PLANNING COMMISSION FINDS THAT THERE IS NOT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT THE PROJECT WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

F. THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION REFLECTS THE INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM.
G. THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION HAS DETERMINED THAT THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT WITH MITIGATION MEASURES.

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS

H. THE PROPOSED PROJECT COMPLIES WITH THE INTENT AND PURPOSES OF CHAPTER 17.38 (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT) OF THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE AND OTHER APPLICABLE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY.

I. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE CITY.

J. THE PHYSICAL, FUNCTIONAL AND VISUAL COMPATIBILITY BETWEEN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND EXISTING AND FUTURE ADJACENT USES AND AREA CHARACTERISTICS IS ACCEPTABLE.

K. THERE ARE AVAILABLE PUBLIC FACILITIES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WATER, SEWER AND DRAINAGE TO ALLOW FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT SITE IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THIS PROPOSAL.

L. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT CAUSE UNACCEPTABLE VEHICULAR TRAFFIC LEVELS ON SURROUNDING ROADWAYS, AND THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL PROVIDE ADEQUATE INTERNAL CIRCULATION.

M. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND GENERAL WELFARE OF THE PERSONS OR PROPERTY WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT SITE, AND THE CITY AS A WHOLE.

N. ADEQUATE PROVISION IS MADE FOR THE FURNISHING OF SANITATION SERVICES AND EMERGENCY PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES TO THE DEVELOPMENT.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDING

O. THE ESTABLISHMENT, MAINTENANCE, OR OPERATION OF THE USE OR BUILDING APPLIED FOR WILL NOT, UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PARTICULAR CASE, BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY, PEACE, MORALS, COMFORT AND GENERAL WELFARE OF PERSONS RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF SUCH PROPOSED USE, OR BE DETRIMENTAL OR INJURIOUS TO PROPERTY AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, OR TO THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THE CITY BECAUSE THE PROPOSED LAND USE WILL NOT HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT.
Submitted,

DAVID E. MILLER, AICP
Public Works and Community Development Director

CONDITIONS
See attached tables of conditions for which the following legend applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>WHEN REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>I  Prior to approval of Improvement Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>M  Prior to approval of Final Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>B  Prior to issuance of first Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>O  Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>G  Prior to issuance of Grading Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>DC During construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>OG On-going requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE COUNTRYHOUSE AT BROADSTONE MEMORY CARE COMMUNITY PROJECT (PN 15-254)
### PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
### SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF IRON POINT ROAD AND OAK AVENUE PARKWAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.                 | The applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:  
  - Preliminary Site Plan, dated January, 2016  
  - Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated January 18, 2016  
  - Preliminary Site Details, dated January 18, 2016  
  - Preliminary Retaining Wall and Fence Details  
  - Preliminary Access and Circulation Plan, dated August 18, 2015  
  - Building Elevations and Floor Plans, dated August 10, 2015  
  - Color Building Elevations and Renderings  
  The project is approved for the development and operation of the CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community project, which includes a one/two-story, 36,668-square-foot building. Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above-referenced items as modified by these conditions of approval. | B             | CD (P)(E)              |
| 2.                 | Building plans, and all civil engineering and landscape plans, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval to ensure conformance with this approval and with relevant codes, policies, standards and other requirements of the City of Folsom. | I, B         | CD (P)(E)(B)           |
| 3.                 | The project approval granted under this staff report shall remain in effect for two years from final date of approval (May 4, 2018). Failure to obtain the relevant building (or other) permits within this time period, without the subsequent extension of this approval, shall result in the termination of this approval. | B             | CD (P)                 |
### Conditions of Approval for the Countryhouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community Project (PN 15-254)

**Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit**

**Southeast Corner of the Intersection of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>If the Community Development Director finds evidence that conditions of approval for the Countryhouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community have not been fulfilled or that the use has resulted in a substantial adverse effect on the health, and/or general welfare of users of adjacent or proximate property, or have a substantial adverse impact on public facilities or services, the Director will refer the use permit to the Planning Commission for review. If, upon such review, the Planning Commission finds that any of the above-stated results have occurred, the Commission may modify or revoke the Conditional Use Permit.</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>CD (P)(B)(E) PW, PR, FD, PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.                | The owner/applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the City or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative body concerning the project. The City will promptly notify the owner/applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. The City may, within its unlimited discretion, participate in the defense of any such claim, action or proceeding if both of the following occur:  
  - The City bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and  
  - The City defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith  
  
The owner/applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement of such claim, action or proceeding unless the settlement is approved by the owner/applicant. | OG           | CD (P)(E)(B) PW, PR, FD, PD     |
<p>| 6.                | The owner/applicant shall be required to participate in a mitigation monitoring and reporting program pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 2634 and Public Resources Code 21081.6. The mitigation monitoring and reporting measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project have been incorporated into these conditions of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. These mitigation monitoring and reporting measures are identified with a check mark (✓) in the mitigation measure column. | G, I         | CD (P)(E)                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall pay all applicable taxes, fees and charges at the rate and amount in effect at the time such taxes, fees and charges become due and payable.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If applicable, the owner/applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The City, at its sole discretion, may utilize the services of outside legal counsel to assist in the implementation of this project, including, but not limited to, drafting, reviewing and/or revising agreements and/or other documentation for the project. If the City utilizes the services of such outside legal counsel, the applicant shall reimburse the City for all outside legal fees and costs incurred by the City for such services. The applicant may be required, at the sole discretion of the City Attorney, to submit a deposit to the City for these services prior to initiation of the services. The applicant shall be responsible for reimbursement to the City for the services regardless of whether a deposit is required.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If the City utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the project, the applicant shall reimburse the City for actual costs it incurs in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for City personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the improvement plans or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>This project shall be subject to all City-wide development impact fees, unless exempt by previous agreement. This project shall be subject to all City-wide development impact fees in effect at such time that a building permit is issued. These fees may include, but are not limited to, fees for fire protection, park facilities, park equipment, Quimby, Humbug-Willow Creek Parkway, Light Rail, TSM, capital facilities and traffic impacts. The 90-day protest period for all fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions imposed on this project has begun. The fees shall be calculated at the fee rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E), PW, PK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The project is subject to the Housing Trust Fund Ordinance, unless exempt by a previous agreement.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant agrees to pay to the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District the maximum fee authorized by law for the construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities. The applicable fee shall be the fee established by the School District that is in effect at the time of the issuance of a building permit. Specifically, the owner/applicant agrees to pay any and all fees and charges and comply with any and all dedications or other requirements authorized under Section 17620 of the Education Code; Chapter 4.7 (commencing with Section 65970) of the Government Code; and Sections 65995, 65995.5 and 65995.7 of the Government Code.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit, the owner/applicant shall have a geotechnical report prepared by an appropriately licensed engineer that includes an analysis of site suitability, proposed foundation design for all proposed structures, and roadway and pavement design.</td>
<td>G, B</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Public and private improvements, including roadways, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, bicycle lanes and trails, streetlights, underground infrastructure and all other improvements shall be provided in accordance with the current edition of the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards. All necessary rights-of-way and/or easements shall be dedicated to the City of Folsom for these improvements.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The applicant/owner shall submit water, sewer and drainage studies to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department and provide sanitary sewer, water and storm drainage improvements with corresponding easements, as necessary, in accordance with these studies and the current edition of the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The improvement plans for the required public and private improvements, including but not limited to frontage improvements for Iron Point Road, shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department prior to issuance of a building permit for the project.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Final lot and building configurations may be modified to allow for overland release of storm events greater than the capacity of the underground system.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall coordinate the planning, development and completion of this project with the various utility agencies (i.e., SMUD, PG&amp;E, etc.).</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall be responsible for replacing any and all damaged or hazardous public sidewalk, curb and gutter along the site frontage and/or boundaries, including pre-existing conditions and construction damage, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>For any improvements constructed on private property that are not under ownership or control of the owner/applicant, a right-of-entry, and if necessary, a permanent easement shall be obtained and provided to the City prior to issuance of a grading permit and/or approval of improvement plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The on-site water and sewer systems shall be privately owned and maintained. The fire protection system shall be separate from the domestic water system. The fire system shall be constructed to meet the National Fire Protection Association Standard 24. The domestic water and irrigation system shall be metered per City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall coordinate the planning, development and completion of this project with the various utility agencies (i.e., SMUD, PG&amp;E, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Any reimbursement for public improvements constructed by the applicant shall be in accordance with a formal reimbursement agreement entered into between the City and the owner/applicant prior to approval of the improvement plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall dedicate a 12.5-foot-wide public utility easement for underground facilities and appurtenances adjacent to all public rights-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Final exterior building and site lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval by Community Development Department for location, height, aesthetics, level of illumination, glare and trespass prior to the issuance of any building permits. All lighting, including but not limited to free-standing parking lot lights, building-attached lights, and landscape lights shall be designed to be screened, shielded, and directed downward onto the project site and away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way. The final design of the building-attached lights shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. Lighting shall be equipped with a timer or photo condenser. In addition, pole-mounted parking lot lights shall utilize a low-intensity, energy efficient lighting method.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STORM WATER POLLUTION/CLEAN WATER ACT REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The owner/applicant shall be responsible for litter control and sweeping of all paved surfaces in accordance with City standards. All on-site storm drains shall be cleaned immediately before the commencement of the rainy season (October 15).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>The storm drain swale or onsite improvement plans shall provide for “Best Management Practices” that meet the requirements of the water quality standards of the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be incorporated into construction plans. These measures shall conform to the City of Folsom requirements and the County of Sacramento <em>Erosion and Sedimentation Control Standards and Specifications</em> - current edition and as directed by the Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The proposed development is considered commercial land use and will add over 1 acre of new impervious area to the site; therefore, stormwater quality treatment shall be provided. The City requires developers to utilize the <em>Guidance Manual for On-Site Stormwater Quality Treatment Control Measures</em> (January 2000) (&quot;On-Site Manual&quot;) in selecting and designing source control and post-construction facilities to treat runoff from the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDSCAPE/TREE PRESERVATION REQUIREMENTS**

| 31. | The owner/applicant shall be responsible for on-site landscape maintenance throughout the life of the project to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. Vegetation or planting shall not be less than that depicted on the final landscape plan, unless tree removal is approved by the Community Development Department because the spacing between trees will be too close on center as they mature. | B | CD (P)(E) |
| 32. | Final landscape plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. | I, B | CD (P)(E) |
| 33. | Final landscape plans and specifications for site development shall be prepared by a registered landscape architect and approved by the City Arborist and City staff prior to the approval of improvement plans. Said plans shall include all on-site landscape specifications and details, and shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping. Landscaping of the parking area shall meet shade requirements as outlined in the Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.57. The landscape plans shall comply and implement water efficient requirements as adopted by the State of California (Assembly Bill 1881) (State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) until such time the City of Folsom adopts its own Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance at which time Owner Applicant shall comply with any new ordinance. Shade and ornamental trees shall be maintained according to the most current American National Standards for Tree Care Operations (ANSI A-300) by qualified tree care professionals. Tree topping for height reduction, sign visibility, light clearance or any other purpose shall not be allowed. Specialty-style pruning, such as pollarding, shall be specified within the approved landscape plans and shall be implemented during a 5-year establishment and training period. | I | CD(P)(E) |

| 34. | In the event that buried historic resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The owner/applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Historic resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, wood, or shell artifacts, structural remains, privies, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria. | G, I | CD (P)(E) |
|   |   | In the event that archaeological resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The owner/applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to, excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Archaeological resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria. | G, I | CD (P)(E) |
In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5; Health and Safety Code § 7050.5; Public Resources Code § 5097.94 and § 5097.98 must be followed. If during the course of project development there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

- There shall be no further excavation or disturbance within a 100-foot radius of the potentially human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work within 48 hours, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98.

- Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendant or on the project site in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:
  - The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendant or the most likely descendant failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission.
  - The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.
  - The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendations of the descendant, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.
| 37. | √ | If construction activities occur during the typical bird nesting season (February 15 through August 31), pre-construction nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 500-foot radius of proposed construction areas, where access is available, no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction. An additional survey shall be conducted within 48 hours prior to commencement of construction.  
  
- If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.  
- If active nests are identified in these areas, the City shall coordinate with CDFW to develop measures to avoid disturbance of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities, or construction could be delayed until the young have fledged. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a buffer zone and monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist until the young have fledged the nest and are independent of the site. If a buffer zone is implemented, the size of the buffer zone shall be determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFW and shall be appropriate for the species of bird and nest location. | G, I | CD (E) |
To avoid and minimize potential impacts to the oak tree preserve and the pond south of the project site, the following measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department:

- The project shall adhere to standard construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent off-site water quality impacts to the adjacent oak preserve and pond. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be prepared for the project and will include measures to prevent stormwater runoff from leaving the site and entering adjacent sensitive habitats.

- Environmentally sensitive area (ESA) fencing shall be installed along the southern site limits to prevent intrusion into the oak preserve and pond by construction equipment and personnel. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be off-limits to construction personnel. Signs shall be placed at 100 foot intervals along the ESA fencing indicating that the oak preserve and pond are a sensitive habitat and off-limits to construction personnel and equipment. The ESA fencing and signage shall be maintained in good condition throughout construction and removed once construction is complete.

- The project shall comply with City standard practices regarding night lighting (see 8.1 Aesthetics, Question D), minimizing potential impacts from light spillage or glare into off-site sensitive habitats.

### AIR QUALITY REQUIREMENTS

| 39. | In compliance with Rule 201 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the applicant/developer of the project shall verify with SMAQMD if a permit is required before equipment capable of releasing emissions to the atmosphere are used at the project site. The applicant/developer shall comply with the approved permit or provide evidence that a permit is not required. | G, I, B | CD (P)(E)(B) |

<p>| 40. | In compliance with Rule 442 of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), the applicant/developer of the project shall use architectural coatings that comply with the volatile organic compound content limits specified in the general rule. | G, I, B | CD (P)(E)(B) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dust generated on the project site shall be controlled by selective watering of exposed areas, especially during clearing and grading operations. All unpaved areas of the project site that are being graded, excavated or used as construction haul roadways shall be sprayed with water as often as is necessary to assure that fugitive dust does not impact nearby properties. Stockpiles of soil or other fine materials being left for periods in excess of one day during site construction shall be sprayed and track walked after stockpiling is complete.</th>
<th>I, B</th>
<th>CD (P)(E)(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Paving shall be completed as soon as is practicable to reduce the time that bare surfaces and soils are exposed. In areas where construction is delayed for an extended period of time, the ground shall be revegetated to minimize the generation of dust.</td>
<td>G, I, B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Street sweeping shall be conducted to control dust and dirt tracked from the project site onto any of the surrounding roadways. Construction equipment access shall be restricted to defined entry and exit points to control the amount of soil deposition.</td>
<td>G, I, B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)(B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control of fugitive dust is required by District Rule 403 and enforced by SMAQMD staff. The owner/applicant shall implement the following measures as identified by the SMAQMD:

- 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 [required by California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. 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 running in proper condition before it is operated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TRAFFIC, ACCESS, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td></td>
<td>To further ensure safe travel within the project site, the following measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A “STOP” sign and appropriate pavement markings shall be installed at the project driveway located on Iron Point Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A striped crosswalk shall be provided across the intersection of the project driveway and Iron Point Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The project driveway shall be limited to right-turns-in and right-turns-out only. Appropriate signage and striping shall be provided accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A right-turn lane with associated pavement markings shall be installed along the project frontage of Iron Point Road as shown on the submitted site plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 24 on-site parking spaces shall be provided for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 5 on-site bicycle parking spaces shall be provided for the project at a location in close proximity to the primary building entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOISE REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with Noise Control Ordinance and General Plan Noise Element shall be required. Hours of construction operation shall be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction is permitted on Sundays or holidays. Construction equipment shall be muffled and shrouded to minimize noise levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall not extend above the height of the parapet walls. In addition, ground-mounted mechanical equipment shall be shielded by landscaping or trellis-type features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50.</strong></td>
<td>Interior building noise levels for the proposed project shall not exceed 45 CNEL. Once specific building plan information is available, additional exterior-to-interior noise analysis shall be conducted to demonstrate that interior levels do not exceed 45 CNEL. The information in the analysis shall include wall heights and lengths, room volumes, window and door tables typical for a building plan, as well as information on any other openings in the building shell. With this specific building plan information, the analysis shall determine the predicted interior noise levels at the planned on-site building. If predicted noise levels are found to be in excess of 45 CNEL, the report shall identify architectural materials or techniques that could be included to reduce noise levels to 45 CNEL in habitable rooms. Standard measures such as glazing with Sound Transmission Control (STC) ratings from a STC 22 to STC 60, as well as walls with appropriate STC ratings (34 to 60), should be considered.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51.</strong></td>
<td>Appropriate means of air circulation and provision of fresh air would be provided to allow windows to remain closed for extended intervals of time so that acceptable interior noise levels can be maintained. The mechanical ventilation system would meet the criteria of the International Building Code (Chapter 12, Section 1203.3 of the 2001 California Building Code).</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>The project shall comply with the following architecture and design requirements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>This approval is for a one/two-story, 36,688-square foot building associated with the CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community project. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached building elevations dated August 10, 2015 and the color building renderings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The design, materials, and colors of the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Community building shall be consistent with the submitted building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Brick pavers, stamped asphalt or another type of colored masonry material (ADA compliant) shall be used to designate pedestrian crosswalks on the project site, in addition to where pedestrian paths cross drive aisles, and shall be incorporated as a design feature at the driveway entrance at Iron Point Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Roof-mounted mechanical equipment, including satellite dish antennas, shall not extend above the height of the parapet walls. Ground-mounted mechanical equipment shall be shielded by landscaping or trellis type features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Final exterior building and site lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval by Community Development Department for location, height, aesthetics, level of illumination, glare and trespass prior to the issuance of any building permits. Lighting shall be designed to be shielded and directed downward onto the project site and away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way. Lighting shall be equipped with a timer or photo condenser.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I, B | CD (P) |

| 53. | The final location, orientation, design, materials, and colors of the trash/recycling enclosure shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. |

<p>| I, B | CD (P)(E) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The final location, height, design, materials, and colors for the proposed walls, fencing, and retaining walls shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department.</th>
<th>I, B</th>
<th>CD (P)(E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADING REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall locate and remediate all antiquated mine shafts, drifts, open cuts, tunnels and water conveyance or impoundment structures existing on the project site, with specific recommendations for the sealing, filling or removal of each that meet all applicable health, safety, and engineering standards. Recommendations shall be prepared by an appropriately licensed engineer or geologist. All remedial plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENT</strong></td>
<td>Prior to the approval of the final facilities design and the initiation of construction activities, the applicant shall submit an erosion control plan to the City for review and approval. The plan shall identify protective measures to be taken during excavation, temporary stockpiling, any reuse or disposal, and revegetation. Specific techniques may be based upon geotechnical reports, the Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook of the State of California Department of Conservation, and shall comply with all updated City standards.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall obtain all required State and Federal permits and provide evidence that said permits have been obtained, or that the permit is not required, subject to staff review and approval of any grading or improvement plan.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td>The building shall have illuminated addresses visible from the street or drive fronting the property. Size and location of address identification shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of any improvement plans or building permits, the Community Development and Fire Departments shall review and approve all detailed design plans for accessibility of emergency fire equipment, fire hydrant flow location, and other construction features.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Fire Department-approved all-weather emergency access roads shall be provided for every facility or building, when any portion of the facility or any portion of an exterior wall of the first story of a building is located more than 150 feet from fire department vehicle access measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. (CFC 503.1.1). The Fire Code Official shall approve all alternative materials and methods (AM&amp;M) of construction designs that are at least equivalent to the intent of the provisions of this code requirement. AM&amp;M may include, but are not limited to, fire hose water supply standpipe systems, fire-rated construction separating the building into separate smoke compartments, areas of refuge separated by fire-rated construction, early-warning smoke and fire detection systems, etc.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Turns on the emergency access driveways and entrances shall be designed to accommodate Fire Department apparatus. Use inside turning radii of 25 feet and outside turning radii of 50 feet.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>An Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) for fire apparatus shall be installed and maintained to allow immediate left-turn access into the project entrance across the existing median from west-bound Iron Point Road. The design of the EVA shall be approved by both the Fire Code Official and the City Engineer. The EVA shall be a paved surface that can support a gross vehicle weight of 80,000 pounds. The EVA shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13'6&quot;.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall provide a sight distance analysis for use of the EVA in consideration of westbound traffic on Iron Point Road.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>All fire protection devices shall be designed to be located on site: fire hydrants, fire department connections, post indicator valves, etc. off-site devices cannot be used to serve the building. A water model analysis that proves the minimum fire flow will be required before any permits are issued. The fire sprinkler riser location shall be inside a Fire Control Room (5' X 7' minimum) with a full-sized 3'-0&quot; door. This room can be a shared with other building utilities. The room shall only be accessible from the exterior.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>An approved fuel modification plan (FMP) with mitigation measures consistent with the unique problems resulting from the flammable vegetation and topography of the adjacent open space areas. Open space areas shall be maintained to allow reasonable access and defensible space for firefighting operations. The FMP shall address defensible space, fuel management, access, building resistance and fire resistance. The FMP shall secure annual funding, an annual maintenance schedule and access rights into the open space to provide the annual fuel modification.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>All-weather emergency access roads and fire hydrants (tested and flushed) shall be provided before combustible material or vertical construction is allowed on site. All-weather access is defined as 6” of compacted AB from May 1 to September 30 and 2” AC over 6” AB from October 1 to April 30.</td>
<td>I, B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>POLICE/SECURITY REQUIREMENT</strong></td>
<td>FD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 67. | The owner/applicant shall consult with the Police Department in order to incorporate all reasonable crime prevention measures. The following security/safety measures shall be required:  
- A security guard shall be on-duty at all times at the site or a six-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas. (This requirement shall be included on the approved construction drawings).  
- Security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances shall be employed.  
- Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting. | G, I, B |
|   | **MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS** | PD |
| 68. | All signage shall be consistent with the requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code (Section 17.59.040). | B |
| 69. | The proposed project shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s Declarations, and restrictions including but not limited to: Executive Order B-29-15 issued by the Governor of California on April 1, 2015 relative to water usage and conservation, requirements relative to water usage and conservation established by the State Water Resources Control Board, and water usage and conservation requirements established within the Folsom Municipal Code, (Section 13.26 Water Conservation), or amended from time to time. | I, B, OG |
|   |   | CD (P)(E) |
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Vicinity Map
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Preliminary Site Plan, dated January, 2016
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Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated January 18, 2016
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Preliminary Site Details, dated January 18, 2016
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Preliminary Retaining Wall and Fence Details
Countryhouse @ Broadstone retaining walls are proposed to be dry stacked rockery walls similar to the existing walls on Iron Point Road adjacent to the project and pictured herein.
6' TALL OPEN FENCING

- 2" POSTS
- 1-1/2" RAILS
- 3/4" PICKETS
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Preliminary Access and Circulation Exhibit
Dated August 18, 2015
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Building Elevations and Floor Plans, dated August 10, 2015
Trim, Fascia, Brackets
Greek Villa SW 7551

Gable End Siding
Attitude Gray SW 7060

Board & Batten
Outerbanks SW 7534

Horizontal Siding
Khaki Shade SW 7533

Entry Doors
Turkish Coffee
SW 6076

Stucco Body
Grecian Ivory SW 7541

Concrete Roofing
Brown Range 4089

Roofing Manufacturer: Eagle

Stone Manufacturer: Eldorado Stone

Color and Materials Recommendation

UBORA
Maverick Partners West

BROADSTONE OAKS CCRC
City of Folsom, California
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Color Building Elevations and Renderings
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Project Narrative
Overview:
The CountryHouse at Broadstone is a proposed memory care facility to be located on a 1.91± acre site located at the southeast corner of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue. The project proposes an extended care medical facility for patients suffering from Alzheimer’s and Dementia. The building is proposed to be one and two story, with a first floor footprint of approximately 22,216 sq. ft., a second floor of approximately 14,472 sq. ft. for a total of approximately 36,688 sq. ft. The memory care facility will provide 45 rooms (47 beds due to 2 rooms having two beds), a commercial kitchen and dining area, offices and stations for staff, and various programming/activity rooms. The facility provides services to meet the varying needs of those with dementia, throughout the aging process, including end of life (hospice) services.

Operation:
The ongoing business is engaged in providing diagnostic services and medical treatment; the establishment will have an organized medical staff, rooms, and equipment and facilities to provide health care including the storage and dispensation of medicine. The ongoing operation is a residential establishment providing nursing and health related care, where care is less than that provided by an acute care facility.

The facility is a specially designed extended care facility to provide 24/7 services and support for those afflicted with neurological diseases and disorders such as Alzheimer’s disease and other forms of dementia. It is a secure facility; security measures include door alarms, fencing, and nurse call systems.

The facility is staffed 24/7. Facility staff include: management, healthcare, dining, housekeeping, transportation, programming, and maintenance. All employees report to an Executive Director. Healthcare staff are CNAs and Medtechs operating under the oversight of a fulltime on-site Director of Nursing. A local physician will serve as the Medical Director of the facility.

The daytime shift is typically the largest shift with 10± employees. The Site Plan proposes 24 parking spaces, which will provide 10 spaces for daytime visitors. Agemark Corporation will own and operate this facility and based on their 25+ years of experience this will be sufficient parking; people suffering from dementia do not drive, so parking will only be for staff and visitors. There may be a delivery van for kitchen and medical supplies up to once a day (typically 2 to 3 times per week). Trash pick-up is anticipated to occur once a week.

Existing Site Condition:
The site has previously been graded relatively flat and currently has a stockpile of earth material stored on it. Ecorp has reviewed the site and has determined that no jurisdictional wetlands exist within the property limits. Utilities have been stubbed to the property.

Proposed Construction:
To provide ADA access most of the site will be graded except for a portion of the existing southerly slope adjacent to the creek. An eight-foot tall +/- rockery retaining wall is proposed along a portion of the southerly boundary of the site to create a buffer and a view opportunity of the existing creek. On-site drainage swales and LID areas are proposed in the landscaped setback areas south of Iron Point Road and east of Oak Avenue right of way to treat urban run-off and provide an opportunity for on-site absorption. Roof downspouts will be disconnected so that storm water can flow to these locations prior to entering the underground storm drainage system. Underground storm water treatment facilities will be included to capture and treat runoff from the parking lot area prior to discharge.
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ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial evaluation that follows:

☐ I find that the proposed project WOULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, the project impacts were adequately addressed in an earlier document or there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made that will avoid or reduce any potential significant effects to a less than significant level. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant 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 MMs 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.

☐ 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 or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or MMs that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

__________________________  ____________________________
Signature                      Date

__________________________  ____________________________
Printed Name                   Date
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INITIAL STUDY AND
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

Project Title: CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility

Entitlements Requested: Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit

Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

Contact Person and Phone Number: Steve Banks, Principal Planner
(916) 355-7385

Project Applicant: Maverick Partners West
1700 Eureka Road, Suite 110
Roseville, CA 95661
(916) 773-7340

General Plan Designation: Regional Commercial (RCC)

Existing Zoning: General Commercial, Planned Development District (C-3 PD)
1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study addresses the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility project (proposed project) and whether it may cause significant effects on the environment. These potential environmental effects are further evaluated to determine whether they were examined in the Folsom General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR; 1988) as amended by Code (PRC) §21083.3, this Initial Study focuses on any effects on the environment which are specific to the proposed project, or to the parcels on which the project would be located, which were not analyzed as potentially significant effects in the General Plan EIR as amended by the EIR for the East Area Facilities Plan, or for which substantial new information shows that identified effects would be more significant than described in the previous EIRs. For additional information regarding the relationship between the proposed project and the previous EIRs, see Section 6 of this Initial Study.

The Initial Study is also intended to assess whether any environmental effects of the project are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or by other means [§15152(b)(2)] of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. If such revisions, conditions, or other means are identified, they will be identified as mitigation measures (MMs).

This Initial Study relies on State CEQA Guidelines Sections §§15064 and 15064.4 in its determination of the significance of environmental effects. According to §15064, the finding as to whether a project may have one or more significant effects shall be based on substantial evidence in the record, and that controversy alone, without substantial evidence of a significant effect, does not trigger the need for an EIR.

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The following project specific technical reports quantified analysis and or surveys were used in preparation of this Initial Study and are incorporated by reference:

- Air Quality Analysis: CalEEMod.2013.2.2 Construction Phase Emissions Model Input, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX).
- Biological reconnaissance of project site for biological resources and trees conducted on September 18, 2015 and February 5, 2016 by Helix biologists.
- Cultural Resources records search and pedestrian survey, performed by HELIX archeologist (February 2016)
- Noise Analysis prepared by HELIX
- Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by MRO Engineers, Inc. (February 2016)
3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

3.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site consists of a 1.91-acre parcel situated in south/central City of Folsom in northeastern Sacramento County, California. The project site is located on the south side of Iron Point Road, east of the intersection with Oak Avenue Parkway. The street address is currently unnumbered, but the parcel is identified as Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 072-2680-008. Refer to Figure 1 and Figure 2 for the project location and Figure 3 for the APNs and parcel boundaries on an aerial image (Appendix A).

3.2 PROJECT SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

The project site is currently undeveloped and is bound by Iron Point Road to the north, commercial and business centers to the east and west, an open space parcel containing ponds and oaks to the south. Multi-family residential development is located north of Iron Point Road, and U.S. Highway 50 (US-50) is located approximately 1,100 feet south of the project site. The more regional setting is primarily characterized by built-out portions of the City to the west, north, and east, including dense commercial business centers, medium to high density residential development, and extensive undeveloped lands south of US-50. Neighboring land uses are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Iron Point Drive, residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Open space, commercial/office buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Commercial/office buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terrain in the immediate vicinity of the site is primarily flat to rolling hills. The site is on an area that has been graded relatively flat and is topographically similar to the surrounding lands. A stockpile of soil material is stored on the site as a berm near the center of the site. The site’s elevation ranges from approximately 320 feet above mean sea level (msl) in the northeastern portion of the project site to approximately 315 feet amsl in the western portion of the project site. The berm reaches approximately 323 feet amsl at its highest point. A portion of an existing sidewalk, and an asphalt driveway segment are located in the northwest portion of the site. Utilities are located in the City right-of-way along Iron Point Road.

3.3 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project includes the construction of a new memory care facility on the 1.91-acre parcel. The retirement community would consist of a one and two-story facility, with a first floor footprint of approximately 22,216 square feet, and a second floor of approximately 14,472 square feet for a total building size of approximately 36,688 square feet. Off-site improvements include portions of the driveway access that would be constructed on/overlap
adjacent, off-site parcels (refer to Parking and Circulation, below). The project would require a Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit.

Additional proposed improvements include a new access road, parking, underground utilities, driveways, drive aisles, sidewalks and walkways, lighting, landscaping, retaining walls, drainage swales, a trash/recycling enclosure, and a monument sign. The project features are summarized in Table 2 and are described in detail in the following paragraphs. Refer to Figures 4 – 7 in Appendix A for project design features, including parking/circulation and proposed landscaping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT FEATURE</th>
<th>UNITS/SPACES</th>
<th>SITE COVERAGE (ACRES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory care facility (multi-story building totals 36,688 square feet)</td>
<td>45 units</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>24 spaces</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped/hardscaped</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Site Coverage</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>1.91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CountryHouse at Broadstone Site Plans by UBORA Engineering & Planning, dated January 2016

**Residential Building**

The proposed memory care facility would provide 45 rooms (47 beds due to two rooms having two beds), a commercial kitchen and dining area, offices and stations for staff, and various programming/activity rooms. The building would be set back a minimum of 30 feet from Iron Point Road, and the western project site boundary, and well over 30 feet from the main entrance along the eastern project site boundary.

The building layout would be comprised of an “L” shaped one- and two-story building with verandas, and a courtyard. The main entrance and a covered vanpool drop-off would be located at the eastern end of the building. Two additional exits would be provided at the south side of the building (away from Iron Point Road) providing access to the outside amenities. The eastern portion of the building would be one story, and the western segment of the building would feature two stories.

The building would be constructed in a western prairie style design with broad roof eaves. The primary building materials would include textured stucco, stone veneer, and siding, with concrete roofing. The building colors would include warm browns, greens, and gray. The roof would be weathered brown tones, and the trim, and fascia would be white. The doors would be brown.
Parking and Circulation

Vehicle Access and Circulation

The project site would be accessed via a driveway along the eastern project site boundary. The driveway would include a dedicated right-turn lane on Iron Point Road. A portion of the driveway would be constructed off-site on an adjacent parcel, within an existing private access and utility easement. The driveway would access the parking area, which would be located in the eastern portion of the project site. The parking area includes circular access via a 27-foot-wide drive to the covered vanpool drop-off at the main entrance to the building.

The City plans to extend Oak Avenue Parkway south of Iron Point Road, adjacent to the western project site boundary. The extension is not part of the proposed project; and the project does not include vehicular access to the Oak Avenue Parkway extension from the project site. As described below, the project includes pedestrian access to the future Oak Avenue Parkway extension.

Parking

The proposed project includes a total of 24 surface parking spaces for use by staff members and visitors, the residents are not anticipated to have vehicles. Parking would include 17 standard stalls, five compact stalls, one disabled parking stall, and the covered vanpool drop-off (24 parking sites).

Pedestrian Access and Circulation

Pedestrian access would be continuous throughout the project site. The existing sidewalk in the northwest corner of the project site would be extended across the entire project site frontage with Iron Point Road, and would connect to walkway access to the building entrance and parking areas. A walkway would follow the southern perimeter of the parking area, and meandering walkways would be constructed in the outside area/garden located between the building and the open space area to the south, and would provide access to the future extension of Oak Avenue Parkway to the west.

Bike racks would be located near the main entrance to provide alternate transportation options for employees and visitors.

Emergency Vehicle Access and Emergency Abatement

The driveway along the eastern project site boundary would provide emergency vehicle access for the site.

Grading and Drainage

To provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access, most of the site would be graded, except for the southern portion of the project site that contains slopes to the ponds south of the project site. An approximately 8-foot high retaining wall is proposed along a portion of the southern project site boundary to create a buffer while allowing views of the off-site open space.
A landscaped low impact development drainage swale is proposed along the northern and western perimeter of the building. The drainage swale is intended to treat the urban run-off and provide an opportunity for on-site absorption. Roof downspouts would be disconnected to allow storm water to flow to the drainage swale, providing percolation and groundwater recharge rather than flowing directly into the underground storm drainage system. Overflows from the swale would flow to the underground storm water drainage system at the southwest corner of the project site. Underground storm water treatment facilities would be installed to capture and treat runoff from the parking area prior to discharge to the open space south of the project site.

Utilities
Utility stubs for water, sewer, and electricity exist on the project site. An existing fire hydrant is located near Iron Point Road. Tie-ins to the existing City of Folsom water and sewer lines would be installed. Sewer lines (8 inches in diameter) and water lines (12 inches in diameter) would be installed in the project site. The fire hydrant would be relocated to south of its current location to accommodate the proposed turn lane and walkway along Iron Point Road.

Trash/Recycling Enclosure
A new trash/recycling enclosure would be located southwest of the circular drive, south of the covered vanpool drop-off. The trash/recycling facility is intended to serve the proposed project only. The enclosure would feature 6-foot-high, tan colored walls constructed of rebar frame with plaster finish and a plaster cap.

Lighting
The lighting design includes pole-mounted parking lot lighting, and bollard lights along the walkways on the project site. All lighting would be designed to minimize light/glare impacts to the adjacent properties by ensuring that all exterior lighting and pole-mounted parking lot and driveway lighting be shielded and directed downward. Light-emitting diode (LED) luminaires would be used for all of the proposed outdoor lighting.

Landscaping
The applicant proposes a landscaping plan that includes a variety of trees, shrubs, and groundcover. Smaller, ornamental trees would be placed around the perimeter of the building, and large, shade trees would be placed around the perimeter of the parking lot. All unpaved areas of the project site would be planted with shrubs and groundcover.

Outdoor Amenities
The proposed project includes outdoor amenities, consisting of patios and meandering walkways (as previously described) through a garden and interactive area between the building and the open space area to the south. The outdoor area would include various planting areas including mounded plantings, planter boxes, a sensory garden, and a trellis walkway. Additional amenities would include benches, a paved overlook to the open space, a fabric sail, and a kinetic art piece.

Fencing
A 6-foot-high steel picket fence would follow the retaining wall from the western project site boundary to the eastern edge of the building.
Signage
One monument sign is proposed at the main access driveway, near the eastern project site boundary.

3.4 CONSTRUCTION AND PHASING
Initial site preparation and grading activities are anticipated to begin in November of 2016. Building construction is anticipated to begin January of 2017 with construction anticipated to last for approximately 12-18 months. The project would be constructed in one phase.

Construction activities would take place during daytime hours between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays and between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays, in accordance with Section 8.4.2.060 of the City’s Municipal Code (Noise Ordinance). No construction would take place on Sundays or holidays.

3.5 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION AND ZONING
The project site is designated as Regional Commercial (RCC) in the City of Folsom General Plan, and the current zoning for the project site is General Commercial, Planned Development District (C-3 PD). A Planned Development Permit would be required because the proposed project is sited within a planned development overlay zoning designation. The Planned Development Permit would allow the City to review the site plan and associated project site details to ensure the project meets the standards and requirements beneficial to the City and its residents as defined in Section 17.38.100 of the Zoning Code.

3.6 CITY REGULATION OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
3.6.1 General Plan
The City of Folsom updated and adopted its current comprehensive General Plan in October 1988. The General Plan is a long-term planning document that guides growth and land development in the City. It provides the foundation for establishing community goals and supporting policies, and directs appropriate land uses for all land parcels within the City. As previously described, the General Plan land use designation for the project site is RCC, and assisted care facilities are identified as a permitted use with approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

3.6.2 Zoning Ordinance
Developed land uses in the City of Folsom are regulated specifically by the City’s Zoning Code (Title 17 of the City’s Municipal Code), in addition to the other adopted regulations and programs that apply to all proposed development within the City. In more detail than the General Plan, the Zoning Code regulates land uses on a parcel-by-parcel basis throughout the City. In order to achieve this regulation, the City assigns each parcel within the City to a zoning district, such as a district for single-family homes. Regulations for each district apply equally to all properties within the district.

Chapter 17.22 and 17.38 of the Zoning Code outlines use standards for C-3 PD. While all types of commercial activities are permitted in C-3, the purpose of the zone is to designate areas appropriate for heavy commercial activities. Residential care homes for adults (for over six
people) are a permitted land use in this zone, but only upon the issuance of a minor Conditional Use Permit by the Planning Commission. The PD designation requires a review by the planning commission for design review purposes. The proposed project will require approval of both a Conditional Use Permit and a Planned Development Permit by the Planning Commission. These entitlements may be processed concurrently at the Planning Commission, where possible.

Chapter 17.22 and 17.38 also outlines development standards for C-3 PD which establishes a building height limitation of 50 feet, and allows the building to project over the rear yard (minimum 12 feet), provided that a 14-foot-clear vertical distance from the ground level is maintained. The proposed building is a two-story and would not exceed 50 feet in height. At its closest point, the building is 22.2 feet from the edge of the fenced portion of the rear yard (the rear property boundary extends beyond the fenced portion of the yard).

3.7 OTHER CITY REGULATION OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The City of Folsom further regulates urban development through standard construction conditions and through mitigation, building, and construction requirements set forth in the Folsom Municipal Code. Required of all projects constructed throughout the City, compliance with the requirements of the City’s standard conditions and the provisions of the Municipal Code avoids or reduces many potential environmental effects. City procedures to minimize negative environmental effects and disruptions include an analysis of existing features, responsible agency and public input to the design process, engineering and design standards, and construction controls. The activities that mitigate typical environmental impacts to be implemented by the City during the project review, design, and construction phases are described in greater detail below.

3.7.1 Community Development Department Standard Construction Conditions

The City’s standard construction requirements are set forth in the City of Folsom, Community Development Standard Construction Specifications published in May 2004. A summary of these requirements is set forth below, and hereby incorporated by reference into the project description as though fully set forth herein. Copies of these documents may be reviewed at the City of Folsom, Community Development Department, 50 East Natoma Street; Folsom, California 95630.

The Department’s standard construction specifications are required to be adhered to by any contractor constructing a public or private project within the City.

Use of Pesticides – Requires contractors to store, use, and apply a wide range of chemicals consistent with all local, state, and federal rules and regulations.

Air Pollution Control – Requires compliance with all Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) and City air pollution regulations.

Water Pollution – Requires compliance with City water pollution regulations, including National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) provisions.
Noise Control – Requires that all construction work comply with the Folsom Noise Ordinance (discussed further below), and that all construction vehicles be equipped with a muffler to control sound levels.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos – Requires compliance with all SMAQMD and City air pollution regulations, including preparation and implementation of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan consistent with the requirements of Section 93105 of the State Government Code.

Weekend, Holiday, and Night Work – Prohibits construction work during evening hours, or on Sunday or holidays, to reduce noise and other construction nuisance effects.

Public Convenience – Regulates traffic through the work area, operations of existing traffic signals, roadway cuts for pipelines and cable installation, effects to adjacent property owners, and notification of adjacent property owners and businesses.

Public Safety and Traffic Control – Regulates signage and other traffic safety devices through work zones.

Existing Utilities – Regulates the relocation and protection of utilities.

Preservation of Property – Requires preservation of trees and shrubbery, and prohibits adverse effects to adjacent property and fixtures.

Cultural Resources – Requires that contractors stop work upon the discovery of unknown cultural or historic resources, and that an archaeologist be retained to evaluate the significance of the resource and to establish mitigation requirements, if necessary.

Protection of Existing Trees – Specifies measures necessary to protect both ornamental and native oak trees.

Clearing and Grubbing – Specifies protection standards for signs, mailboxes, underground structures, drainage facilities, sprinklers and lights, trees and shrubbery, and fencing. Also requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control erosion and siltation of receiving waters.

Reseeding – Specifies seed mixes and methods for reseeding of graded areas.

3.7.2 City of Folsom Municipal Code

The City regulates many aspects of construction and development through requirements and ordinances established in the Folsom Municipal Code. These requirements are summarized in Table 3, and hereby incorporated by reference into the Project Description as though fully set forth herein. Copies of these documents may be reviewed at the City of Folsom, Office of the City Clerk, 50 East Natoma Street; Folsom, California 95630.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE SECTION</th>
<th>CODE NAME</th>
<th>EFFECT OF CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>Noise Control</td>
<td>Establishes interior and exterior noise standards that may not be exceeded within structures, including residences; establishes time periods for construction operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>Stormwater Management and Discharge Control</td>
<td>Establishes conditions and requirements for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm-drainage system; requires preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials Disclosure</td>
<td>Defines hazardous materials; requires filing of a Hazardous Material Disclosure Form by businesses that manufacture, use, or store such materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances</td>
<td>Establishes standards for the construction and monitoring of facilities used for the underground storage of hazardous substances, and establishes a procedure for issuance of permits for the use of these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>Tree Preservation</td>
<td>Regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>Water Conservation</td>
<td>Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>Green Building Standards Code</td>
<td>Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2010 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4 and A5, published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>Grading Code</td>
<td>Requires a grading permit prior to the initiation of any grading, excavation, fill or dredging; establishes standards, conditions, and requirements for grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage, and revegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>Flood Damage Prevention</td>
<td>Restricts or prohibits uses that cause water or erosion hazards, or that result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights; requires that uses vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage; controls the modification of floodways; regulates activities that may increase flood damage or that could divert floodwaters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objective of the proposed project is to develop a senior assisted living residential community with the appropriate supporting facilities and infrastructure in the City of Folsom. The objective of providing the residential development must be achieved while minimizing environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable and while meeting the requirements of the General Plan, as amended.

5.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS

A listing and brief description of the regulatory permits and approvals required to implement the proposed project is provided below. This environmental document is intended to address the environmental impacts associated with all of the following decision actions and approvals:

- **Conditional Use Permit**: A residential care facility is only permitted within the C-3 District if it complies with special conditions, and is approved by the Planning Commission.

- **Planned Development Permit**: Because the proposed project would be sited within a PD overlay zoning designation, the project requires a Planned Development Permit. This designation requires review by the Planning Commission from design review purposes.

The City of Folsom has the following discretionary powers related to the proposed project:

- **Certification of the environmental document**: The Folsom City Council will act as the lead agency as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and will have authority to determine if the environmental document is adequate under CEQA.

- **Approval of project**: The Folsom City Council will consider approval of the project and all entitlements as described above.

The following agencies would be

California Department of Fish and Wildlife consultation would be required if active nests are found for species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

6.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

6.1 CITY OF FOLSOM GENERAL PLAN

The EIR for the City of Folsom General Plan (1988) as amended by approval of the East Area Facilities Plan (1992) provides relevant policy guidance for this environmental analysis. Even though the site is not located within the boundaries of the East Area, the East Area Facilities Plan EIR was designed to update the EIR for the General Plan and the whole city. Thus, the East Area Facilities Plan EIR updated and revised the environmental conclusions of the General Plan EIR so that the East Area Facilities Plan EIR provides the foundation environmental document for evaluating development throughout this part of the City.
6.2 TIERING

"Tiering" refers to the relationship between a program-level EIR (where long-range programmatic cumulative impacts are the focus of the environmental analysis) and subsequent environmental analyses such as the subject document, which focus primarily on issues unique to a smaller project within the larger program or plan. Through tiering a subsequent environmental analysis can incorporate, by reference, discussion that summarizes general environmental data found in the program EIR that establishes cumulative impacts and mitigation measures, the planning context, and/or the regulatory background. These broad based issues need not be reevaluated subsequently, having been previously identified and evaluated at the program stage.

Tiering focuses the environmental review on the project-specific significant effects that were not examined in the prior environmental review, or that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions or by other means. Section 21093(b) of the Public Resources Code requires the tiering of environmental review whenever feasible, as determined by the Lead Agency.

In the case of the proposed project, this Initial Study tiers from the EIR for the Broadstone 3 Specific Plan, the EIR for the Empire Ranch Specific Plan, and the EIR for the City of Folsom General Plan as amended by approval of the East Area Facilities Plan. The Folsom General Plan, as amended, is a project that is related to the proposed project and, pursuant to §15152(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, tiering of environmental documents is appropriate. State CEQA Guidelines §15152(e) specifically provides that:

"[w]hen tiering is used, the later EIRs or Negative Declarations shall refer to the prior EIR and state where a copy of the prior EIR may be examined. The later [environmental document] should state that the Lead Agency is using the tiering concept and that the [environmental document] is being tiered with the earlier EIR."

The above mentioned EIRs can be reviewed at the following location:

City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 East Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
Contact: Mr. Steve Banks, Principal Planner
(916) 355-7385

6.3 INCORPORATION OF THE FOLSOM GENERAL PLAN AND EAST AREA FACILITIES PLAN EIRS BY REFERENCE

The EIRs for the Folsom General Plan and the East Area Facilities Plan are comprehensive documents. Due to various references to the Folsom General Plan and East Area Facilities Plan EIRs in this proposed project, and to its importance relative to understanding the environmental analysis that has occurred to date with respect to development in the Folsom area, both documents are hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15150.
6.4 SUMMARY OF FOLSOM GENERAL PLAN EIR AS AMENDED BY THE EAST AREA FACILITIES PLAN EIR

The Folsom General Plan EIR as amended by the EIR for the East Area Facilities Plan analyzed the environmental impacts associated with adoption of the City of Folsom General Plan allowing for development, open space preservation, and provision of services for approximately 13,100 acres of land in and adjacent to the City of Folsom.

Buildout of the area subject to the Folsom General Plan envisions construction of up to 29,290 dwelling units and 2,466 acres of commercial and industrial uses. The Folsom General Plan contemplates the full range of land uses that would constitute a balanced community, including residential uses at a variety of densities, as well as commercial, office, employment, and open space uses. Additionally, public or quasi-public uses are contemplated by the Folsom General Plan, including schools, parks, fire stations, government offices, and other uses.

The East Area Facilities Plan EIR evaluated the environmental impacts associated with the above-described development of the Folsom General Plan planning area on a comprehensive basis, including discussion of the full range of impacts that would occur due to future development.

The East Area Facilities Plan EIR identified Citywide impacts arising from urban development pursuant to the General Plan for the following issue areas:

- Land Use – Conversion of agricultural and grazing lands to urban uses;
- Transportation/Circulation – Levels of Service below City of Folsom, El Dorado County, and Caltrans standards for area streets and highways;
- Air Quality – Air pollutant emissions and concentrations in excess of local, state, and federal thresholds;
- Noise – Increase in roadway noise for existing and future residential areas, and other sensitive uses;
- Visual Resources – Extension of the edge of the metropolitan Sacramento region into an apparently rural area;
- Housing – Lack of low- and moderate- income housing units;
- Biological Resources – Conversion of wildlife habitat and loss of special status species of plants and animals;
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity – Exposure to seismic hazards, loss of mineral resources, construction on steep slopes, exposure to constrained soils, increase in erosion;
- Hydrology, Flooding, Drainage, and Water Quality – Exposure to localized drainage and flood hazards, and water quality degradation;
- Domestic Water – Demand would exceed supply;
- Sewer – Flow would exceed the capacity of the Folsom interceptor;
- Police Protection Services – Additional, unfunded police officers would be needed;
- Fire Protection Services – Additional, unfunded fire personnel and equipment would be needed;
- Schools – School capacities would be exceeded;
- Parks and Recreation – Park facilities would be over capacity;
- Light and Glare – Increase in urban light and glare in Folsom and adjacent El Dorado County;
- Cultural Resources – Loss or degradation of cultural and historic resources; and
- Library Services – Library facilities would be over capacity.
7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
8.0 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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 included in Section 8.18.

8.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is currently undeveloped and has previously been graded relatively flat and currently has a stockpile of earth materials stored on it. Multi-family residences are located north of the project, across from Iron Point Road. Several office buildings are located west of the site and the future Oak Avenue Parkway Extension while Kaiser Permanente Medical offices and associated parking are located directly east and southeast. The south is almost completely open space with a small un-named tributary flowing towards Alder Creek.
8.1.2 Evaluation of Aesthetics

Question A: No Impact

A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive view of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. Neither the project site nor the surrounding areas are considered to be scenic vistas due to the existing development and suburban environment typical of the area. Further, neither the project site, nor views to or from the project site, have been designated an important scenic resource 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. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

Question B: No Impact

There are no state or locally designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the proposed project (Caltrans 2016). Implementation of the proposed would not adversely affect scenic resources within a designated scenic highway. No impact would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

Question C: Less than Significant Impact

The existing visual character of the area surrounding the project site is primarily defined by commercial, business offices, residential, transportation, and open space. The project site is currently undeveloped and has been previously cleared and graded. The site is prepared for development consistent with surrounding urban land uses. The project site is clearly visible by motorists and pedestrians travelling along Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. Residence north of Iron Point Road have clear views of the project site and may experience a slightly natural feel from being across an undeveloped lot that faces open space with an un-named tributary and pond. Implementation of the project would result in a one and two-story assisted care facility with parking areas, courtyards, and landscaping, altering the exiting visual character to slightly more urban development character of the landscape than is currently experienced by viewers.

While the proposed project would result in a change in visual character on site, the proposed land uses are consistent with the overall urban development of the vicinity, and the proposed developments are expected to integrate into the existing and planned development in the area. A less than significant impact to visual character would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Question D: Less than Significant Impact

Any new lighting associated with development within the project area would be subject to City standard practices regarding night lighting that would be made a condition of approval of the Planned Development Permit. Consistent with the City’s practices, the lighting shall be sited and designed to avoid light spillage and glare on adjacent properties, with timers or photo-electric cells for turning the lights on and off within one-half hour after dusk and one-half hour prior to dawn. Lighting would be low level as necessary for safety and security. The lighting design includes pole-mounted parking lot lighting, and bollard lights along the walkways on the project site. All lighting would be designed to minimize light/glare impacts to the adjacent properties by
ensuring that all exterior lighting and pole-mounted parking lot and driveway lighting be
shielded and directed downward. Light-emitting diode (LED) luminaires would be used for all
of the proposed outdoor lighting. Because existing City practices would limit light spillover and
intensity, this would be a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is necessary.
8.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In determining whether impacts to agriculture resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agriculture Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

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?  

| □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  

| □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section  

| □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
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12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526 (g)), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g))? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

| ☐                              | ☐                                             | ☐                           | ☑         |

8.2.1 Environmental Setting

No agricultural activities or timber management occur on the project site or in adjacent areas and the site is not designated for agricultural or timberland uses. The California Important Farmlands Map prepared for Sacramento County by the California Resources Agency classifies the project site as grazing land surrounded by urban and built up (California Department of Conservation 2016a). Urban and built up land is land occupied by structures or infrastructure to accommodate a building density of at least one unit to one and one-half acres, or approximately six structures to 10 acres; grazing land is land on which vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock (Department of Conservation 2016b).

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey report generated for the project site (NRCS 2016) indicates that no Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance occurs on the project site.

8.2.2 Evaluation of Agriculture and Forestry Services

Questions A, B, E: Less than significant

The project site has been identified as grazing land surrounded by urban and built-up land. This area is considered to be highly disturbed with marginal grazing opportunities due to its proximity to a main road and surrounding urban development. Because no important agricultural resources
or activities exist on the project site, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

**Questions C, D, E: No Impact**

Because no portion of the City or the project site are zoned for forest land, timberland, or zoned Timberland Production, no impact would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.
## 8.3 AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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? □ □ □ □

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

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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? □ □ □ □

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? □ □ □ □

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? □ □ □ □
8.3.1 Environmental Setting

Climate in the Folsom area is characterized by hot, dry summers and cold, rainy winters. During summer's longer daylight hours, plentiful sunshine provides the energy needed to fuel photochemical reactions between Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) and Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG), which result in Ozone (O3) formation. High concentrations of O3 are reached in the Folsom area due to intense heat, strong and low morning inversions, greatly restricted vertical mixing during the day, and daytime subsidence that strengthens the inversion layer. At this time, the greatest pollution problem in the Folsom area is from NOx.

The City of Folsom lies within the eastern edge of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws in the project area. As required by the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), SMAQMD has published various air quality planning documents as discussed below to address requirements to bring the District into compliance with the federal and state ambient air quality standards. The Air Quality Attainment Plans are incorporated into the State Implementation Plan, which is subsequently submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the federal agency that administers the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended in 1990.

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) for seven 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 California Air Resources Board (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.

The EPA designates areas for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen dioxide (NO2) as either “Does not meet the primary standards”, “Cannot be classified”, or “Better than national standards”. For sulfur dioxide (SO2), areas are designated as “Does not meet the primary standards”, “Does not meet the secondary standards”, “Cannot be classified”, or “Better than national standards”. The air quality attainment status of the SVAB, including the City of Folsom, is shown in Table 4.
The Sacramento County/Sacramento Metropolitan Area portion of the SVAB is currently in nonattainment for federal and/or state ozone, PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ standards. Concentrations of all other pollutants meet state and federal standards.

Ozone is not emitted directly into the environment, but is generated from complex chemical reactions between ROG, or non-methane hydrocarbons, and NO$_X$ that occur in the presence of sunlight. ROG and NO$_X$ generators in Sacramento County include motor vehicles, recreational boats, other transportation sources, and industrial processes. PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ arise from a variety of sources, including road dust, diesel exhaust, fuel combustion, tire and brake wear, construction operations and windblown dust.

8.3.2 Air Quality Monitoring

CARB's air quality monitoring network provides information on ambient concentrations of air pollutants in the SVAB. SMAQMD operates a monitoring station in Folsom, where the air quality data for ozone and PM$_{2.5}$ were obtained. Other data are reported from one additional location in Sacramento County. Table 5 compares a three-year summary of the highest annual criteria air pollutant emissions collected at these monitoring stations with applicable CAAQS, which are more stringent than the corresponding NAAQS. The concentrations of the pollutants ozone, PM$_{2.5}$, and PM$_{10}$ are expected to be fairly representative of the project site, due to the regional nature of these pollutants.
Table 5
Summary of Annual Air Quality Data for Folsom Area
Air Quality Monitoring Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLLUTANT</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ozone (O3) 1-hour:</strong> Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Exceeding State Standard (1-hr avg. 0.09 ppm)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ozone (O3) 8-hour:</strong> Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Exceeding State Standard (8-hr avg. 0.070 ppm)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Exceeding National Standard (8-hr avg. 0.075 ppm)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM10:</strong> Monitoring location: Sacramento – Branch Center Road 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum State 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Exceeding State Standard (Daily Standard 50 µg/m³)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Federal 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Exceeding Federal Standard (Daily Standard 150 µg/m³)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM2.5:</strong> Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum National 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Exceeding National 2006 Standard (Daily Standard 35 µg/m³)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Insufficient data to determine the value

As indicated in Table 5, ozone and PM₁₀ standards have been exceeded in Folsom over the past three years. Although no data are available for PM₂.₅ at the Folsom monitoring station, data collected regionally at the Sacramento Health Department monitoring site on Stockton Boulevard in Sacramento show that there have been exceedances for this pollutant as well over the last five years.

Air Quality Attainment Planning

In order to work towards attainment for ozone, PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅, the EPA Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards requires that each state containing nonattainment areas develop a written plan for cleaning the air in those areas. The plans developed are called State Implementation Plans (SIP). Through these plans, states outline efforts they will make to try to correct the levels of air pollution and bring their areas back into attainment. The status of air quality attainment planning for the Sacramento area is:

- The Sacramento region was classified by the EPA as a “serious” nonattainment area on June 15, 2004 for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, with an attainment deadline of June 15, 2013. Emission reductions needed to achieve the air quality standard were identified using an air quality modeling analysis: An evaluation of proposed control measures and associated ROG and NOₓ emission reductions concluded that no set of
feasible controls were available to provide the needed emission reductions before the attainment deadline year. Given the magnitude of the shortfall in emission reductions, and the schedule for implementing new control measures, the earliest possible attainment demonstration year for the Sacramento region is determined to be the “severe” area deadline of 2019. Section 181(b)(3) of the Clean Air Act permits a state to request that the EPA reclassify a nonattainment area to a higher classification and extend the time allowed for attainment. This process is appropriate for areas that must rely on longer-term strategies to achieve the emission reductions needed for attainment. The EPA approved this request on May 5, 2010.

- On May 9, 2011, EPA proposed to determine that California is no longer required to implement or submit a CAA Section 185 fee program for 1-hour ozone as a revision to the SIP for the Sacramento Metro 1-hour ozone nonattainment area. EPA has also taken an “interim final” action to stop sanctions from applying to the Sacramento Metro Area.

- In March 2002, the EPA officially determined that Sacramento County had attained the PM$_{10}$ standards. In November 2010, the SMAQMD formally requested that the EPA redesignate Sacramento County from nonattainment to attainment for PM$_{10}$. The EPA approved this request effective October 28, 2013. The SMAQMD additionally adopted a PM$_{10}$ Maintenance Plan. The plan establishes PM$_{10}$ Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets.

- The Sacramento PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment area designation met the PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS by December 31, 2011. On May 9, 2012, CARB submitted a request that EPA find the Sacramento region in attainment for the 2006 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. EPA issued a proposed rule for Determination of Attainment for the Sacramento Nonattainment Area on October 26, 2012 and a final rule for Determination of Attainment on July 15, 2013. EPA used the updated 2010-2012 ambient air quality data for determination and the final rule became effective on August 14, 2013 (SMAQMD 2015a) (EPA 2013).

- On September 26, 2013 EPA provided Final Approval of the PM$_{10}$ Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for Sacramento (SMAQMD 2015b).

8.3.3 Evaluation of Air Quality

While the final determination of whether or not a project has a significant effect is within the purview of the lead agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b), SMAQMD recommends that its air pollution thresholds be used to determine the significance of project emissions. The criteria pollutant thresholds and various assessment recommendations are contained in SMAQMD’s Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (2009, revised), and are discussed under the checklist questions below.

**Question A: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

In accordance with SMAQMD’s Guide, construction-generated NO$_X$ and operational-generated ROG and NO$_X$ (all ozone precursors) are used to determine consistency with the Ozone Attainment Plan. The Guide states:

> By exceeding the District’s mass emission thresholds for operational emissions of ROG or NO$_X$ the project would be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the District’s air quality planning efforts.
As shown in the discussion for questions b and c below, the project would not exceed construction generated NO$_X$, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ or the operational generated ROG and NO$_X$ thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant and no additional mitigation would be necessary.

**Question B: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

**Construction Emissions**

**Regional Emissions**

SMAQMD’s Guide includes a construction screening level to determine if a project would exceed the NO$_X$ threshold of significance. However, because the proposed project includes cut-and-fill operations, the NO$_X$ construction screening level is not recommended for use. As such, the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2013.2.2 was used to quantify project-generated construction emissions. The analysis methodology, assumptions, and CalEEMod output are provided in Appendix B. Construction of the project is anticipated to begin November 2016 and be completed by May 2018.

The SMAQMD does not have a recommended threshold for construction-generated ROG; therefore, the maximum daily emissions of NO$_X$ are analyzed below. As shown in Table 6, the proposed project would generate less than significant levels of the ozone precursor NO$_X$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Estimated Project Construction NO$_X$ Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION YEAR</td>
<td>NO$_X$ (lbs./day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of emissions: CalEEMod output (Appendix B)
Source of Threshold: SMAQMD 2009

**Local Emissions**

The SMAQMD utilizes the same screening level as the NO$_X$ emission screening level to assist a project proponent or lead agency in determining if PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$ emissions from constructing a project in Sacramento County will exceed the SMAQMD’s construction significance thresholds. As with the NO$_X$ screening presented above, because the proposed project includes cut-and-fill operations, the PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ construction screening level is not recommended for use. As such, CalEEMod was used to quantify project-generated construction emissions as discussed previously. The analysis methodology, assumptions, and CalEEMod output are provided in Appendix B.
The maximum daily emissions of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ are analyzed below. As shown in Table 7, the proposed project would generate less than significant levels of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. Impacts related to construction-generated PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION YEAR</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$ (lbs./day)</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ (lbs./day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of emissions: CalEEMod output (Appendix B)
Source of Threshold: SMAQMD 2009

Operational Emissions

Regional Emissions

SMAQMD provides screening levels to identify when additional analysis is necessary to determine potential significance for operational ROG, NO$_X$, PM$_{10}$, or PM$_{2.5}$ emissions. The operational screening levels represent the development size at which the operational emissions thresholds of significance would not be exceeded. The proposed residential care facility would qualify as the CalEEMod Land Use of a hospital under the general land use category of commercial. According to the screening thresholds, if a proposed hospital is less than 229,000 square feet in size, then the facility would not have the potential to exceed SMAQMD’s recommended mass emission thresholds for NO$_X$ or ROG. The PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ screening level is 610,000 square feet. The proposed project includes 36,688 square feet of residential care facilities, which is less than the screening levels. Therefore, the proposed project would generate less than significant quantities of operational ROG, NO$_X$, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$, and project-specific modeling for operational emissions is not required.

Local Emissions

The primary pollutant of localized concern is mobile-source CO. Local mobile-source CO emissions near roadway intersections are a direct function of traffic volume, speed, and delay. Long-distance transport of CO is extremely limited because it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. Under specific meteorological conditions and traffic conditions, CO concentrations at receptors located near roadway intersections may reach unhealthy levels, when combined with background CO levels.

The SMAQMD’s two-tiered screening criteria identifies when a project has the potential to contribute to a CO hotspot and if CO dispersion modeling is necessary. According to the first screening tier, the proposed project will result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality for local CO if:
1. Traffic generated by the proposed project will not result in deterioration of intersection level of service (LOS) to LOS E or F; and
2. The project will not contribute additional traffic to an intersection that already operates at LOS E or F.

As detailed in the Traffic Impact Analysis, the proposed project would not result in the deterioration of any intersection to LOS E or F (MRO Engineers 2016). Because the first tier of screening criteria is met, there would be no potential for a CO hotspot or exceedance of State or federal CO ambient air quality standard. The impact would be less than significant and no MMs are required.

**Question C: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

The Sacramento region is in non-attainment for ozone (NOX and ROG) and particulate matter (PM₂.₅ and PM₁₀). As discussed above, no exceedance of the District’s emission thresholds for criteria pollutants would be expected for the proposed project. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant. A less than significant impact would result, and no additional mitigation would be necessary.

**Questions D and E: Less than Significant**

Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project include nearby residents to the north and Gold Ridge Elementary School approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the project site. Other than emissions from vehicle trips by residents, and potential emissions from natural gas used for space heating, no other air emissions or odors would be released during operation of the proposed development. Normal activities associated with operation of the development would not result in the release of any odors or toxic substances into the air. Similarly, emissions of criteria air pollutants during project construction would be expected to be less than significant. Thus, overall air emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors. This would be a less than significant impact and no mitigation would be necessary.
8.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?

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?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.1 **Environmental Setting**

The project site is an undeveloped lot located between office buildings, commercial development, and Iron Point Road. Open space, which includes an existing pond and oak preserve, is situated directly south of the project and extends to US-50. An un-named tributary flows south of the project through the oak preserve and pond, connecting with Alder Creek south of US-50. The pond is primarily surrounded by deciduous trees including willows (*Salix* spp.), Fremont’s cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), valley oak (*Quercus lobata*) and white alder (*Alnus rhombifolia*). The majority of the remaining open space is largely characterized by gentle hills with blue oak woodland and an annual-grass understory.

The majority of the project site has been previously disturbed and contains a large earthen mound, presumably left over from the construction of Iron Point Road and the surrounding development. The project site does not contain any trees and is completely outside of the oak preserve and pond. The site is vegetated primarily with ruderal herbaceous plant species and consists almost entirely of non-native grasses and forbs as would be expected of a site characterized by past soil disturbances. Other signs of disturbance include some shallow depressions and tire ruts north of the earthen mound and several utility stubs.

8.4.2 **Regulatory Framework Related to Biological Resources**

The City of Folsom regulates urban development through standard construction conditions and through mitigation, building, and construction requirements set forth in the Folsom Municipal Code. Required of all projects constructed throughout the City, compliance with the requirements of the City’s standard conditions and the provisions of the Municipal Code avoids or reduces many potential environmental effects. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan has been approved for the City of Folsom.

**State and Federal Endangered Species Acts**

Special status species are protected by state and federal laws. The California Endangered Species Act (CESA; California Fish and Game Code Sections 2050 to 2097) protects species listed as threatened and endangered under CESA from harm or harassment. This law is similar to the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA; 16 USC 1531 et seq.) which protects federally threatened or endangered species (50 CFR 17.11, and 17.12; listed species) from take. For both
laws, take of the protected species may be allowed through consultation with and issuance of a permit by the agency with jurisdiction over the protected species.

**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 § 670.5. A state candidate species is one that the California Fish and Game Code has formally noticed as being under review by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for inclusion on the state list pursuant to Sections 2074.2 and 2075.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. CDFW also designates Species of Special Concern that are not currently listed or candidate species.

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. The CDFW is unable to authorize incidental take of fully protected species when activities are proposed in areas inhabited by these species. The CDFW has informed non-federal agencies and private parties that they must avoid take of any fully protected species. However, Senate Bill (SB) 618 (2011) allows the 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 Native Plant Protection Act**

The California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1900 to 1913) requires all state agencies to use their authority to implement programs to conserve endangered and otherwise rare species of native plants. Provisions of the act prohibit the taking of listed plants from the wild and require notification of CDFW at least 10 days in advance of any change in land use other than changing from one agricultural use to another, which allows CDFW to salvage listed plants that would otherwise be destroyed.

**Nesting and Migratory Birds**

Nesting birds are protected by state and federal laws. California Fish and Game Code (§3503, 3503.5, and 3800) prohibits the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of any bird nests or eggs; Fish and Game Code §3511 designates certain bird species “fully protected” (including all raptors), making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USF §703-711), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs that are on the federal list (50 CFR §10.13) are protected from injury or death, and project-related disturbance must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting cycle.

**City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance**

Requirements related to biological resources also include protection of existing trees and specifies measures necessary to protect both ornamental and native oak trees. Chapter 12.16 of
the Folsom Municipal Code, the Tree Preservation Ordinance, further regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; and establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees (City of Folsom 2000). The Tree Preservation Ordinance establishes policies, regulations, and standards necessary to ensure that the City will continue to preserve and maintain its “urban forests.” Anyone who wishes to perform “Regulated Activities” on “Protected Trees” must apply for a permit with the City. Regulated activities include:

- Removal of a Protected Tree
- Pruning/trimming of a Protected Tree
- Grading or trenching within the Protected zone

Protected trees include:

- Native oak trees with a diameter of 6 inches or larger for single trunk trees 20 inches or larger combined diameter of native oak multi-trunk trees
- Heritage oak trees - native oaks with a trunk diameter of 19 inches or greater and native oaks with a multi-trunk diameter of 38 inches or greater
- Landmark trees identified individually by the City Council through resolution as being a significant community benefit
- Street trees within the tree maintenance strip

**Jurisdictional Waters**

Any person, firm, or agency planning to alter or work in “waters of the U.S.,” including the discharge of dredged or fill material, must first obtain authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Section 401 requires an applicant for a federal license or permit that allows activities resulting in a discharge to waters of the U.S. must obtain a state certification that the discharge complies with other provisions of the CWA. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) administers the certification program in California. The RWQCB also regulates discharges of pollutants or dredged or fill material to waters of the State which is a broader definition than waters of the U.S.

**8.4.3 Methods**

Biological studies conducted in preparation of this Initial Study included a desktop review of regionally-occurring special-status species and habitats with the potential to occur in the project site and/or be affected by the proposed project, and biological reconnaissance surveys. The results of the biological database and records searches for the project site, as well as a list of species observed during the biological reconnaissance, are compiled in Appendix C.

Species were considered to be special-status if they fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Listed as endangered or threatened under the FESA (including candidate species and species proposed for listing);
- Listed as endangered or threatened under the CESA (including candidate species and species proposed for listing);
- Designated as a Species of Special Concern by the CDFW; and/or,
- Designated by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) as California Rare Plant Rank 1 or 2.

To determine the potential for special-status species or their habitats to occur in the project site and vicinity, the most current lists of regionally-occurring special-status species known to occur or having the potential to occur on the “Folsom, CA” U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle were obtained from the following databases: the CNDDB database maintained by CDFW (CDFW 2016), the CNPS database (CNPS 2016), and the Information for Planning and Conservation online system maintained by the USFWS (USFWS 2016). These lists were then reviewed to determine which of the regionally-occurring special-status species have the potential to occur in the project site and vicinity and/or be affected by the proposed project (refer to Appendix C for the species lists). The potential for each regionally-occurring special-status species to occur in the project site and vicinity and/or be affected by the proposed project was determined based on a comparison of the life history requirements, known ranges (geographic and/or elevational), and reported occurrences of the special-status species to the habitats on the project site noted during the biological reconnaissance survey as well as other factors such as local knowledge of such species distribution(s) and professional judgement by HELIX biologists.

A biological reconnaissance was conducted by professional biologist Stephen Stringer and environmental planner Jameson Honeycutt, of HELIX, on February 22 and 23, 2016, to assess current conditions at the project site, and the current presence/location, and/or extent of biological resources in the project site. An arborist survey was not conducted because the site does not contain any trees.

The biological reconnaissance survey was accomplished by walking meandering transects through the project site in order to obtain 100 percent visual coverage of the site. Habitats present in the project site were classified based on the dominant plant species present and identifiable at the time of the survey. The site was also reviewed for aquatic features exhibiting characteristics indicating the potential for waters of the U.S. or State, including the presence of hydrophytic vegetation, bed and bank, or depressional topography.

8.4.4 Biological Communities/Land Cover Types

Biological communities/land cover types (hereafter referred to as “habitat types”) present on the project site is almost exclusively ruderal/disturbed. This habitat type is described below. Habitat nomenclature is from the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships System used by the CDFW as referenced on the Internet at: [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cwhr/wildlife_habitats.asp].

Ruderal/Disturbed

Ruderal/disturbed habitat is heavily disturbed land that retains a soil substrate but no longer supports a recognizable vegetation community or species assemblage. Ruderal/disturbed habitat occurs throughout the project site and is associated with areas that have been previously cleared and graded. The density of the vegetative cover in the ruderal/disturbed habitat varies depending
on the depth of the soils, and level of disturbance (areas of fill that generally lack native soils, or that have been graded have less dense vegetative cover).

Vegetation is fairly uniform on the site. The ruderal/disturbed habitat is dominated by non-native grasses and forbs such as a variety of bromes (*Bromus* spp.), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), medusa head (*Taeniatherum caput-medusae*), yellow star thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), filaree (*Erodium* sp.), tarweed (*Deinandra* sp.), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), wild radish (*Raphanus sativa*), and vetch (*Vicia sativa, V. villosa*). This habitat extends off-site to the east and west to the edges of the surrounding development and to the south to the limits of riparian/wetland vegetation around the stream corridor. The only woody vegetation on site is two coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*) shrubs that are present on top of the earthen mound.

8.4.5 Wildlife

The project site provides habitat for disturbance-tolerant wildlife species typical of urban and suburban areas. Very little wildlife was observed in the project site during the biological reconnaissance; species observed include black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), and great egret (*Ardea alba*). These bird species were foraging in or flying over the site. Numerous small mammal burrows and tunnels in the herbaceous vegetation associated with voles were observed on the site. Bird species observed utilizing the adjacent riparian corridor and wetlands include belted kingfisher (*Megaceryle alcyon*), common goldeneye (*Bucephala clangula*), and American robin (*Turdus migratorius*).

8.4.6 Special-Status Species with the Potential to Occur

The CDFW, USFWS, and CNPS lists included a total of 24 regionally-occurring special-status species that were reviewed for the potential to occur on the project site or otherwise be impacted by the proposed project (Appendix C). A CNDDDB records search does not show any special-status species in or within the immediate vicinity of the project site, including the oak preserve and pond. These regionally-occurring special-status species are typically associated with aquatic habitats including perennial waterbodies, wetlands, and/or vernal pools, or are associated with relatively undisturbed contiguous stands of oak or riparian woodland. The project site is heavily disturbed and lacks any of these aquatic or woodland habitats. Species expected to use the site would be highly adaptable common species tolerant of disturbance and urban areas.

No special-status wildlife species are expected to occur on the project site with the possible exception of a special-status bird using the project site as a temporary stopover in transit to or from more suitable habitats. Three regionally-occurring special-status bird species that could potentially use low-quality habitat in the project site on an intermittent basis are burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsonii*), and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*). These species are discussed in detail below.

**Burrowing Owl (Athene cunicularia)**

**Federal Status** – None

**State Status** – Species of Special Concern

**Other** – Designated as a Migratory Bird under the MBTA (50 CFR §10.13)
Burrowing owls are often found in open, dry grasslands, agricultural and range lands, and desert habitats. They can also inhabit grass, forb, and shrub stages of pinyon and ponderosa pine habitats. Burrowing owls occur at elevations ranging from 200 feet below mean sea level to over 9,000 feet amsl. In California, the highest elevation where burrowing owls are known to occur is 5,300 feet amsl in Lassen County. In addition to natural habitats, burrowing owls can be found in urban habitats such as at the margins of airports and golf courses and in vacant urban lots. Burrowing owls nest in underground burrows and commonly perch on nearby fence posts or mounds. The owls also use ground squirrel burrows, badger dens or artificial burrows such as abandoned pipes or culverts.

Although the more northern burrowing owl populations migrate seasonally, burrowing owls are year-round residents in much of California. The nesting season for burrowing owl can begin as early as February 1 and continues through August 31. Burrowing owls forage in adjacent grasslands and other suitable habitats primarily for insects and small mammals, and less often for reptiles, amphibians, and other small birds.

The CNDDB contains three reported occurrences of burrowing owls within approximately 3 miles of the project site from the winters of 2006 and 2010. All observations were in undeveloped areas south of US-50, with no reported occurrences of burrowing owl in suburban areas within the City of Folsom. There are no historic records of the species occurring in the City of Folsom north of US-50.

While the project site is disturbed, this species is highly unlikely to occur on the project site other than as a brief transient due to the small size of the project site and level of human disturbance on the site in combination with the abundance of high quality habitat south of US-50.

**Swainson’s Hawk (Buteo swainsonii)**

**Federal status** – None  
**State status** – Threatened  
**Other** – Designated as a Migratory Bird under the MBTA (50 CFR §10.13)

Swainson’s hawk is an uncommon breeding resident and migrant in the Central Valley, Klamath Basin, Northeastern Plateau, Lassen County, and the Mojave Desert. There has been very limited Swainson’s hawk breeding reported from Lanfair Valley, Owens Valley, Fish Lake Valley, Antelope Valley, and in eastern San Luis Obispo County. Swainson’s hawk breeds in stands with few trees in juniper-sage flats, riparian areas, and in oak savannah in the Central Valley and forages in adjacent grasslands or suitable grain or alfalfa fields, or livestock pastures. Swainson's hawks breed in California and winter in Mexico and South America. Swainson’s hawks usually arrive in the Central Valley between March 1 and April 1, and migrate south between September and October.

Swainson’s hawks usually nest in trees adjacent to suitable foraging habitat, which may include trees near the edges of riparian stands, in lone trees or groves of trees in agricultural fields, and in mature roadside trees. Valley oak, Fremont cottonwood, walnut, and large willow with an average height of about 58 feet, and ranging from 41 to 82 feet, are the most commonly used nest trees in the Central Valley. Suitable foraging areas for Swainson’s hawk include native grasslands or lightly grazed pastures, alfalfa and other hay crops, idle land, certain grain and row
croplands, and ruderal lands. Swainson’s hawks primarily feed on voles; however, they will feed on a variety of prey including small mammals, birds, and insects.

The CNDDDB contains three reported occurrences of nesting Swainson’s hawks within 4 miles south of the project site; these are the closest reported occurrences of nesting Swainson’s hawk to the project site. The records are from the springs of 2011 and 2012, when Swainson’s hawks were reported nesting or exhibiting nesting behavior in undeveloped areas south of US-50. Areas where Swainson’s hawks have been reported are within a larger expanse of higher quality suitable habitat including oak savannah and large pastures and other open fields. There are no reported occurrences in the CNDDDB of Swainson’s hawk nesting north of US-50 in the suburban areas within the City of Folsom.

There is no suitable nesting habitat for Swainson’s hawk on the project site and the ruderal/disturbed habitat on the site provides very low quality foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk, at best. While Swainson’s hawk could potentially pass over the project site in transit to or from higher quality habitat, the project site provides very limited foraging and is not considered a suitable forage source for this species. Swainson’s hawk is highly unlikely to use the project site due to its small size and location in a developed area other than potentially as a brief stopover.

**White-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus)**

Federal status – none

State status – Fully Protected

Other – Designated as a Migratory Bird under the MBTA (50 CFR §10.13)

White-tailed kite is a common to uncommon, yearlong resident in coastal and valley lowlands and is rarely found away from agricultural areas. The species does, however, inhabit herbaceous and open stages of most habitats, mostly in cismontane California. The main prey of white-tailed kite is voles and other small, diurnal mammals, but it occasionally preys on birds, insects, reptiles, and amphibians. White-tailed kite forages in undisturbed, open grasslands, meadows, farmlands and emergent wetlands. Nest is made of loosely piled sticks and twigs and lined with grass, straw, or rootlets and placed near the top of a dense oak, willow, or other tree stand; usually 6-20 meters (20-100 feet) above ground. Nest is located near open foraging areas in lowland grasslands, agricultural areas, wetlands, oak-woodland and savannah habitats, and riparian areas associated with open areas.

The closest reported occurrences of white-tailed kite to the project site are 2.3 and 3.2 miles northeast, 3.2 northwest on the north shore of Lake Natoma, 3.2 miles west, and 3.2 miles south. All of these records are over 25 years old. There are no recent records of white-tailed kite nesting in the project region.

It is unlikely that white-tailed kite would use the riparian trees adjacent to the project site for nesting because this species typically uses dense-topped trees where nests can be obscured, especially when nesting in urban areas, and nests are placed near suitable foraging habitat. While the disturbed habitat could potentially be used as foraging for white-tailed kite, the small size of the site and level of disturbance preclude the project site from being considered a suitable forage source. White-tailed kite is highly unlikely to occur on the project site other than as a brief transient due to the small size of the project site and level of human disturbance.
Other Migratory Birds and Nesting Birds

While no special-status bird species are expected to nest on the project site, habitat is present on and adjacent to the site for a variety of common bird species that nest in trees and shrubs or on the ground in urban and suburban areas. No bird nests were observed on the project site; however, there is a low probability that birds could occupy the shrubs or nest on the ground in the project site prior to construction. A variety of bird species may use the mature trees adjacent to the site for nesting. A fairly large stick nest that appeared to have been built by a raptor last nesting season was present in a willow tree in the riparian habitat less than 100 feet south of the site.

8.4.6 Protected Trees

The project site contains no protected trees species under the City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance.

8.4.7 Jurisdictional Waters

The site was evaluated for the presence of potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. or State during the biological survey. No wetlands or other waters of the U.S. or State are present on the site. Several low spots along the north side of the earthen mound on the site hold water periodically during the wet months as a result of soil compaction associated with prior and ongoing site disturbances including vehicle access for the purpose of utility maintenance. This was evidenced by some ponding of water and soil saturation. These areas were examined in the field and determined to not qualify as wetlands as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State Water Resources Control Board. A review of historic aerial imagery (Google Earth 2016) and Natural Resource Conservation Service soil mapping (NRCS 2016) confirmed that the site did not historically contain wetlands and the native soil on the site would not support wetland communities.

8.4.8 Evaluation of Biological Resources

Question A: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

The proposed project would not affect special-status species. However, common bird species protected by the MBTA and/or Fish and Game Code may nest in or near the project site. The oak woodland and riparian vegetation located near the project site provide potential nesting habitat for a variety of common bird species, which are protected from disturbance during the nesting season by the MBTA and/or Fish and Game Code. If active nests are present at the time of construction, construction activities may result in injury or death of individual birds (e.g., shrubs or other vegetation containing active nests are removed), or harassment which may cause nesting birds to abandon active nests resulting in the loss of eggs or young. The loss of foraging habitat in the vicinity of an active nest may result in the reduced health and vigor of eggs and/or nestlings, resulting in reduced survival rates. Any harassment, injury, or death of nesting birds, their nestlings, or eggs would be considered a significant impact.

The following mitigation measures should be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to potentially nesting birds:
Mitigation Measures BIO-01: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Nesting Birds

If construction activities occur during the typical bird nesting season (February 15 through August 31), pre-construction nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 500-foot radius of proposed construction areas, where access is available, no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction. An additional survey shall be conducted within 48 hours prior to commencement of construction.

- If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.
- If active nests are identified in these areas, the City shall coordinate with CDFW to develop measures to avoid disturbance of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities, or construction could be delayed until the young have fledged. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a buffer zone and monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist until the young have fledged the nest and are independent of the site. If a buffer zone is implemented, the size of the buffer zone shall be determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFW and shall be appropriate for the species of bird and nest location.

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, potential impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

**Question B: Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

No riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or other protected habitats are located on the project site; however, an oak preserve and pond exists adjacent to the southern boundary of the project site. The following mitigation measures should be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to the oak preserve and pond south of the site:

**Mitigation Measures BIO-02: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Off-Site Oak Preserve and Pond**

- The project shall adhere to standard construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent off-site water quality impacts to the adjacent oak preserve and pond. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be prepared for the project and will include measures to prevent stormwater runoff from leaving the site and entering adjacent sensitive habitats.

- Environmentally sensitive area (ESA) fencing shall be installed along the southern site limits to prevent intrusion into the oak preserve and pond by construction equipment and personnel. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be off-limits to construction personnel. Signs shall be placed at 100 foot intervals along the ESA fencing indicating that the oak preserve and pond are a sensitive habitat and off-limits to construction personnel and equipment. The ESA fencing and signage shall be maintained in good condition throughout construction and removed once construction is complete.

- The project shall comply with City standard practices regarding night lighting (see 8.1 Aesthetics, Question D), minimizing potential impacts from light spillage or glare into off-site sensitive habitats.
Question C: No Impact

No potential waters of the U.S. occur on the project site. Therefore, no impact will occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

Question D: Less than significant

The project site is primarily surrounded by development with some open space to the south containing oak woodland and riparian habitats. The oak woodland and riparian zone south of the project may provide a corridor for species moving in the near vicinity, but the existing urban development and US-50 provide existing barriers to wildlife attempting to move through the area. The project would not affect the existing open space south of the project, so would not affect the features most likely to be used by wildlife using the area for movement. No native wildlife nursery sites would be affected. The project would result in less than significant impacts to the movement of native resident wildlife or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and no mitigation necessary.

Question E: No Impact

The project does not contain any trees nor does it propose to remove any trees; therefore, no impact will occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

Question F: No Impact

No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan has been approved 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 will occur, and no mitigation is necessary.
8.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

d) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in §21074?

8.5.1 Environmental Setting

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. 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 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. 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. The City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications were developed and approved by the City of Folsom in May 2004 and updated in December 2014. They include Article 11 - Cultural Resources, which provides direction on actions to be taken in the event that materials are discovered that may ultimately be identified as a historical or archaeological resource, or human remains (City of Folsom 2014).

8.5.2 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.

Southern Maidu

At the time of European contact, the Southern Maidu tribe of California Native Americans, previously referred to as the Nisenan, occupied the project vicinity. The Southern Maidu occupied the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers and the lower drainages of the Feather River, bounded by the west bank of the Sacramento River to the west, the crest of the Sierra Nevada to the east, a few miles south of the American River to the south. The northern boundary is not well established due to the Southern Maidu’s linguistic similarity with neighboring groups, but extended somewhere between the Feather and Yuba rivers (Kroeber 1925; Wilson and Towne 1978).

The Southern Maidu constructed villages on natural rises along streams and rivers ranging in size from three to fifty houses. The houses were typically dome or conical shaped and covered with earth, tule mats, or grasses, and major villages contained a semi-subterranean dance house structure covered by earth, tule, and brush (Wilson and Towne 1978). The Southern Maidu subsistence base varied and included gathering seeds and seasonal plant resources, hunting, and fishing. The Southern Maidu were not dependent on one staple, as their territory provided abundant year-round sources of different food. Acorns were a primary food source and were stored in granaries, in addition to buckeye nuts,igger and sugar pine nuts, and hazelnuts. Ethnographic reports indicate the Southern Maidu obtained large game such as deer, antelope, tule elk, mountain lions, and black bears, by game drives, snares, decoys, deadfalls, and bows and arrows. Rabbits and other small game were hunted with sticks, blunted arrows, traps, snares, nets, fire, and rodent hooks.
The Southern Maidu political organization was centered on the tribelet and each village was governed by a headman who served as an advisor and whose position was typically passed on patrilineally, although some chiefs were chosen by the villagers (Beals 1933; Wilson and Towne 1978). Very little contact existed for the Southern Maidu outside of their tribelet area, and outside contact was typically only for ceremonies, trade, and warfare (Beals 1933). Southern Maidu disposed of their dead by cremation and then burial, usually on the morning after the person died. The deceased person’s property would be burned and their house moved or destroyed. After the cremation, the bones and ashes would be gathered and buried in the village cemetery. When a death occurred away from the person’s village, they would be cremated where they died and their remains returned to their village to be buried (Wilson and Towne 1978).

Historic Background

The history of the northern Central Valley and Sierra Nevada foothills can be divided into several periods of influence; pertinent historic periods are briefly summarized below.

Spanish Period

The arrival and expansion of the Spanish did not have a significant effect on the Southern Maidu way of life, as contact with the Spanish was limited, and only in the southern edge of their territory. Spanish exploration of the greater Southern Maidu territory occurred when José Canizares explored the adjacent Plains Miwok territory in 1776. There is no recorded history of any Southern Maidu being removed and forced into the Spanish Mission system as neophytes, unlike their Miwok neighbors (Wilson and Towne 1978). There are numerous accounts of neophytes fleeing the missions, and a series of “Indian Wars” broke out when the Spanish tried to return them to the missions (Johnson 1978). The Southern Maidu received some of the escaped mission neophytes and felt pressure on their southern borders from displaced Miwok villages.

Mexican Period

With the declaration of Mexican independence in 1821, Spanish control of Alta California ended, although little change actually occurred. Political change did not take place until mission secularization in 1834, when Native Americans were released from missionary control and the mission lands were granted to private individuals. Shoup and Milliken (1999) state that mission secularization exposed Native Americans to further exploitation by outside interests, often forcing them into a marginal existence as laborers for large ranchos. Following mission secularization, the Mexican population grew as the native population continued to decline. Anglo-American settlers began to arrive in Alta California during this period and often married into Mexican families, becoming Mexican citizens, which made them eligible to receive land grants. In 1846, on the eve of the U.S.-Mexican War (1846 to 1848), the estimated population of Alta California was 8,000 non-natives and 10,000 Native Americans. However, these estimates have been debated. Cook (1976) suggests the Native American population was 100,000 in 1850; the U.S. Census of 1880 reports the Native American population as 20,385.
European Expansion

Jedediah Smith was the first to explore the Central Valley in 1828, but other fur-trapping expeditions soon followed. In the late 1820s, American trappers, as well as ones from the Hudson’s Bay Company, began establishing camps in the Southern Maidu territory to trap beavers, an occupation that was said to have been peaceful (Wilson and Towne 1978). During this period, Native American populations were declining rapidly, due to an influx of Euro-American diseases. In 1832, a party of trappers from the Hudson’s Bay Company, led by John Work, traveled down the Sacramento River unintentionally spreading a malaria epidemic to Native Californians. This epidemic wiped out much of the Southern Maidu, and survivors moved into the hills. Four years later, a smallpox epidemic decimated local populations, and it is estimated that up to 75 percent of the Southern Maidu population died (Cook 1955).

After the upheaval of the Bear Flag Revolt in 1846, John Sutter sent James Marshall to construct a sawmill in the Sierra Nevada foothills at Coloma in 1847 (Severson 1973). In January of 1848, Marshall discovered gold near the Southern Maidu village of “Culloma”, (Coloma) which marked the start of the Gold Rush. The influx of miners and entrepreneurs increased the population of California, not including Native Californians, from 14,000 to 224,000 in just four years. This, in turn, stimulated commercial growth in the Sacramento Valley as eager entrepreneurs set up businesses to support the miners and mining operations. When the Gold Rush was over, many miners settled in the area and established farms, ranches, and lumber mills.

City of Folsom

The City of Folsom’s history can be traced back to 1847 when William Leidesdorff traveled to the Sacramento area to see the 35,000 acres he had purchased years earlier. Following Leidesdorff’s death in 1848, US Army Captain Joseph Folsom purchased the land from Leidesdorff’s heirs and with the help of Theodore Judah established a town site near the Negro Bar mining spot on the American River. Naming the town Granite City, the original plans were for a railroad terminus although at that time there were no railroad trains in northern California. Folsom died before the first railroad arrived in 1856 but the name of the town was changed Granite City to “Folsom” in his honor.

The town soon began to prosper with new hotels and businesses but the real boost to local economy came with the establishment of Folsom Prison in 1880 and the Folsom Powerhouse in 1895. Plans for Folsom Prison moved forward when the wealthy, Robert Livermore family offered to donate land in exchange for prison labor to build a hydro-electric dam across the American River to power a sawmill. Although the sawmill was never established, the family soon realized that force of the dammed water could be used to provide power to Sacramento and in 1895, Folsom made history when the first long-distance transmission of electricity spanned 22 miles from Folsom to Sacramento.

As Folsom continued to grow in size, bridges were constructed across the American River including the Truss Bridge in 1895 and the Rainbow Bridge in 1919. In 1945, the City of Folsom was incorporated and in 1955, Folsom Dam was constructed to provide hydroelectric power and recreation for the burgeoning local population. In the mid-1960s, Johnny Cash made the City of Folsom famous with his hit single “Folsom Prison Blues” coinciding with a time
when the city’s economy was centered around the prison. A huge economic boom came to Folsom in 1984 when Intel opened its vast campus and established itself as the largest private employer in the Sacramento area. In the 1990s, Folsom grew rapidly as a suburb community to Sacramento and it continues to grow today as an upscale community.

8.5.3 Record Searches and Pedestrian Survey Results

This section describes the existing cultural resource setting and potential effects from project implementation on the project site and its surrounding area. The results are based on record searches at the North Central Information Center and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and a pedestrian field survey conducted on September 21, 2015. This section assesses potential impacts related to historic resources, archaeological resources, and human remains.

*North Central Information Center Record Search*

To determine the presence of cultural and historical resources within the project area and a 0.25-mile radius, a record search was conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) on October 9, 2015. The record search included a review of National Register of Historic Places (NR), the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL) list, the California Points of Historical Interest list, the California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) listings for Sacramento County, and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility (ADOE). Historic maps were also examined to gain insights into past developments and changes within the project area and its surroundings.

The NCIC results indicate that 44 historic resources have been recorded within the 0.25-mile search radius; two cross through or near the project area. The historic resources are primarily mining related and include mining ditches, tailings and quarries but there are also foundations and structures, roads, trails, walls and fences and water conveyance systems. The two recorded sites that appear to have been recorded as traversing thru portions of the project include the Natomas Ditch (P-34-000461) and Rhoads’ Branch Ditch (P-34-001480). A watercourse was noted outside the southern project boundary; however, map research indicates that this is probably part of a drainage associated with Alder Creek and not either of the recorded ditches. Archival map research indicates that it is probable that the portions of both the Natomas Ditch and the Rhoads Branch Ditch are no longer extant due to the extensive development in this area. In addition, the project area is uphill and north of the observed watercourse and therefore there would be no impact to the watercourse from project development.

Thirteen reports have been prepared within the search radius, two of which included the project area (Table 8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT NUMBER</th>
<th>AUTHOR; YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003036</td>
<td>Mary L. Maniery, Keith Syda, and Kristin Boice; 1996</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Investigations of the Bradshaw, Sunrise, and Folsom East Interceptors Project Sacramento County, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003840</td>
<td>Tordoff, Judy; 1994</td>
<td>Proposed Interchange and Auxiliary Lanes Highway 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003925</td>
<td>Derr, Eleanor; 1990</td>
<td>The Broadstone Master Plan Project: Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003925B</td>
<td>ASI; 1995</td>
<td>Broadstone II Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003942</td>
<td>Windmiller, Ric; 1997</td>
<td>Evaluation of Cultural Resources Willow Springs Development, Folsom, Sacramento County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004521</td>
<td>Novle, Daryl; 1994</td>
<td>HPSR for Proposed Interchange Hwy 50 in Eastern Sacramento County, 03-SAC-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008736</td>
<td>Windmiller, Ric; 2006</td>
<td>Carpenter Ranch Cultural Resources Inventory, Folsom, Sacramento County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009185</td>
<td>Jones, Deborah, et al; 1991</td>
<td>A Cultural Resources Study for the Folsom East Area Facilities Plan and Portions of the Sewer and Water Line System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009579</td>
<td>Losee, Carolyn; 2008</td>
<td>Submission Packet FCC Form 621 for existing Telecommunications Facility, Folsom AT&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011136</td>
<td>Billat, Lorna; 2012</td>
<td>Collocation Submission Packet FCC Form 621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011161</td>
<td>Crawford, Kathleen; 2012</td>
<td>Direct APE Historic Architectural Assessment for T-Mobile Candidate SC06934A, Folsom, Sacramento County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011164</td>
<td>Wills, Carrie; 2012</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Record Search and Site Visit for T-Mobile Candidate SC06934A, Folsom, Sacramento County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Native American Heritage Commission and AB 52 Consultation

On February 19, 2016, HELIX sent a request to the NAHC for a search of their Sacred Lands File. As of this date, no response has been received.

Pedestrian Survey

On February 25, 2016, HELIX Senior Archaeologist, Carrie Wills, M.A., RPA, conducted a pedestrian survey of the proposed project area. The project is approximately 1.91 acres in size and is located south of Iron Point Road between Oak Avenue Parkway and Vessona Circle and north of Highway 50. The project is within an open grassy area that has previously been mass graded with a remnant stockpile of earthen material present.

The survey consisted of walking 10- to 15-meter transects within the project area, where possible. Ground surface visibility was fair to poor depending on the density of the grassy vegetation. Roughly, 80-90 per cent of the project area had poor visibility, as the newly sprouted grassy vegetation was dense and ankle deep in some locations. In the central portion of the project area was an area that had been graded and stockpiled. In addition, there were piles of broken concrete and piping. A portion of what is believed to be part of Alder Creek was noted downslope and south of the southern project boundary. Since it was outside the project area, it was not included in the field survey.

During the course of the pedestrian survey, no pre-contact or historic era resources were discovered.

Review of historic aerial maps dating from 1952 through 1999 indicate there were no structures within or adjacent to the project area at that time. In addition, no watercourses other than Alder Creek appear on the aerial maps. However, it is possible that small ditches would not have shown up in the aerial maps. The first structures in close proximity to the project area appear to the northwest in 1998 but no structures are within the project area even at this date in time.

8.5.3 Evaluation of Cultural Resources

Question A: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Although no historic-age resources, were discovered during the course of the field survey, there is always the possibility that previously unknown historic resources exist below the ground surface. Therefore, implementation of standard cultural resource construction mitigation (Mitigation Measure CUL-1) would ensure that this impact is less than significant.

Standard Construction Specifications were developed and approved by the City of Folsom on May 25, 2004. They include Article 11 – Cultural Resources, which provides direction on actions to be taken in the event that materials are discovered that may ultimately be identified as a historical or archaeological resource or human remains (City of Folsom 2004).
Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Avoid and minimize impacts to previously unknown historic resources.

- It is always possible that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown, buried historic resources. In the event that buried historic resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The City shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Historic resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, wood, or shell artifacts, structural remains, privies, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.

Question B: Less than Significant with Mitigation

No pre-contact resources have been recorded within a 0.25-mile radius of the project. Therefore, the project area does not appear to be sensitive for Native American resources. In addition, no pre-contact resources were discovered during the course of the field survey within the project area.

However, it is possible that subsurface excavation activities may encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources. The implementation of standard cultural resource construction mitigation (Mitigation Measure CUL-2) would ensure that this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Avoid and minimize impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources.

- It is always possible that ground-disturbing activities during project development may uncover previously unknown archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The City shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Archaeological resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.
Question C: Less than Significant with Mitigation

No human remains are known to exist within the project area nor were there any indications of human remains found during the field survey. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as trenching and grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. Accordingly, this is a potentially significant impact. However, if human remains are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Avoid and minimize impacts related to accidental discovery of human remains.

- In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5; Health and Safety Code § 7050.5; Public Resources Code § 5097.94 and § 5097.98 must be followed. If during the course of project development there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

  1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance within a 100-foot radius of the potentially human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work within 48 hours, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98.

  2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendant or on the project site in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:

     o The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendant or the most likely descendant failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission.

     o The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.

     o The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.
Question D: Less than Significant

Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 amended CEQA to mandate consultation with California Native American tribes during the CEQA process to determine whether or not the proposed project may have a significant impact on a Tribal Cultural Resource, and that this consideration be made separately from cultural and paleontological resources.

Recognizing that California tribes are experts in their tribal cultural resources and heritage, AB 52 requires that CEQA lead agencies carry out consultation with tribes at the commencement of the CEQA process to identify Tribal Cultural Resources. Furthermore, because a significant effect on a Tribal Cultural Resource is considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, consultation is required to develop appropriate avoidance, impact minimization, and mitigation measures.

If there is a Tribal Cultural Resource within the project area that would sustain a significant impact, the consultation efforts between the City and the appointed Native American representative would provide reasonable mitigation measure(s) that may result in a less than significant impact.

On January 6, 2016, the City of Folsom provided a Notice of Opportunity to Consult Letter to the Wilton Rancheria and the United Auburn Indian Community regarding the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care project. In accordance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) and Section 21080.3.1(b) of the California Public Resources Code (PRC), the City was responding to specific requests from the Wilton Rancheria and the United Auburn Indian Community to be notified of projects in the City's jurisdiction that will be reviewed under CEQA. In the aforementioned letter, it was stated that in accordance with Section 21080.3.1(b) of the California Public Resources Code, each of the tribes was given 30 days from the receipt of the letter to either request or decline consultation in writing for this project. City staff did not receive any written communication from either of the tribes within the required 30-day time period, thus no consultation occurred.
8.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
iv) Landslides?

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

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?

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?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
1) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

8.6.1 Environmental Setting

Geology

The project area is at the base of the western Sierra Nevada foothills, and is underlain by metamorphic rocks.

The Foothill fault system is located along the western slope of the Sierra Nevada, and is the nearest source of seismic activity to the project site. The Bear Mountain Fault, four miles east of Folsom, is a potentially active trace of the Foothills fault system. Although historic seismic activity has been minor along this fault, the potential for strong ground shaking is present. An earthquake on the Bear Mountain fault could cause bedrock accelerations up to 0.35 g (acceleration of gravity).

The State Division of Mines and Geology has published a map of maximum potential earthquake intensities for California. The project area is within seismic risk Zone 3. A maximum credible earthquake (Richter scale magnitude 6.5) on the Bear Mountain Fault could cause groundshaking of modified Mercalli scale intensity VII or greater, and subsequently cause major damage to structures and injury to people (Folsom, USBR 1992).

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures designed for human occupancy. The purpose of the Act is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. No active or potentially active faults are located within the project site or in the project vicinity as mapped under the Act (California Department of Conservation 2016c).

Soils

Soils on the project site are mapped entirely as an Argonaut-Auburn complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes (Map Unit 107; NRCS 2016). The permeability of the B horizon is moderately slow, and the soil is well drained. The Argonaut-Auburn complex developed on erosional remnants of the Copper Hill volcanic and metasediments of the Mariposa Formation, which form low-rounded hills. Because of the site's nearly level topography, runoff rates are low, and therefore, the erosion hazard is low. Because of limited permeability, runoff rates are moderate, but the heavy texture of the soil makes the erosion hazard low.

City Regulation of Geology and Soils

The City of Folsom regulates the effects of soils and geological constraints on urban development primarily through enforcement of the California Building Code, which requires the implementation of engineering solutions for constraints to urban development posed by slopes, soils, and geology. The City as additionally adopted a Grading Code (Folsom Municipal Code Section 14.29) that regulates grading citywide to control erosion, stormwater drainage, revegetation, and ground movement.
8.6.2 Evaluation of Geology and Soils

Question A(i): No Impact

There are no active or potentially active faults located within the project site, or in the project vicinity as mapped under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act. Because no faults underlie the project site, no impact would result and no mitigation would be necessary.

Question A(ii): Less than Significant Impact

The project area is within seismic risk Zone 3, and a maximum credible earthquake on the Bear Mountain Fault could cause groundshaking of modified Mercalli scale intensity VII or greater, and subsequently cause major damage to structures and injury to people within the project area. While earthquake-induced groundshaking could occur in the project vicinity, historically, seismic activity in the Folsom area has been limited. Further, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with standards imposed by the City of Folsom through the Grading Code, and in compliance with California Building Code requirements. Potential impacts would be reduced to levels considered acceptable in the City and region. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects of seismic events. This would be a less than significant impact and no mitigation would be required.

Question A (iii): Less than Significant Impact

Liquefaction is a process by which water-saturated materials, such as soil and sediment, lose strength and fail during ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs when granular material is transformed from a solid state into a liquefied state as a consequence of increased water pressure. Liquefaction is most commonly induced by strong ground shaking associated with earthquakes.

Factors that contribute to liquefaction potential include soil type, the level and duration of seismic ground motions, the type and consistency of soils, and the depth to groundwater. Liquefaction can occur where unconsolidated sediments and a high water table coincide. Loose sands and peat deposits are susceptible to liquefaction, while clayey silts, silty clays, and clays deposited in fresh water environments are generally stable under the influence of seismic ground shaking. According to the soils mapping for the site, the Argonaut-Auburn complex soils onsite have a depth to the water table greater than 80 inches (NRCS 2016). The soils on the project site do not contain the characteristics typical of soils most susceptible to liquefaction, and because the depths to groundwater are more than 80 inches below the ground surface, it is unlikely that the proposed project would be exposed to liquefaction hazards. Further, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with standards imposed by the City through the Grading Code, and in compliance with California Building Code requirements. Compliance with these regulations would further reduce potential impacts related to liquefaction. Impacts as a result of seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction hazard at the project site would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Question A (iv): Less than Significant Impact

There is a potential that the proposed project could be exposed to the effects of earthquake-induced ground shaking; however, standards imposed by the City of Folsom through the Grading
Code, and compliance with California Building Code requirements, would reduce this potential impact to levels considered acceptable in the City and region. Likewise, the moderate potential effects from weak soils and water erosion hazards would be minimized through implementation of these standards. There would be no potential for impacts associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault, and less than significant impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, landslides, soil erosion or loss of topsoil, unstable soils, and expansive soils. Overall impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

**Question B: Less than Significant Impact**

Soils on the project site are well drained; however, have a high runoff potential, which would indicate a higher potential for water erosion. Ground disturbing activities during construction of the project would further increase the potential for soil erosion.

The California Building Code and the City’s Grading Code and standard conditions for approval contain requirements to minimize or avoid potential effects from water erosion hazards. As a condition of approval, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the City would require the applicant to prepare a soils report, a geotechnical report, a detailed grading plan, and an erosion control plan by a qualified and licensed engineer. The soils and geotechnical reports would identify soil hazards, including potential impacts from erosion. The City would be required to review and approve the erosion control plan based on the State of California Department of Conservation’s “Erosion and Control Handbook.” The erosion control plan would identify protective measures to be implemented during excavation, temporary stockpiling, disposal, and revegetation activities.

Further, projects resulting in one or more acre of ground disturbance require a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and a National Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Use of the permit requires the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for approval by the SWRCB. The plan would contain best management practices to reduce potential impacts to water quality during construction of the project. Compliance with the City’s regulations, the California Building Code requirements, and implementation of the SWPPP would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion from water to less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

**Question C: Less than Significant Impact**

The project site is mapped as Argonaut-Auburn complex (Unit 107), and NRCS does not have information regarding the stability of this soil type (NRCS 2016). The project area is not noted for unstable geologic formations susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Compliance with the City’s regulations and the California Building Code would minimize potential impacts from weak or unstable soils. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils would be less than significant, and no additional mitigation would be necessary.
Question D: Less than Significant Impact

Expansive soils shrink and swell in response to changes in moisture levels. The changes in soil volumes can result in damage to structures including building foundations, and infrastructure, if the project design does not appropriately accommodate the changing soil conditions. The project site is mapped as Argonaut-Auburn complex (Unit 107), and NRCS does not have information regarding the shrink-swell of this soil type (NRCS 2016). The proposed project would be designed to meet seismic safety requirements specified in the California Building Code, including standards to minimize impacts from expansive soils. Therefore, impacts related to the potential hazards of construction on expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Question E: No Impact

The proposed project would be served by a community wastewater system and no on-site wastewater disposal would occur. No significant impacts from or to geophysical features or hazards would occur with implementation of the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

Question F: Less than Significant

Because the project site would involve ground disturbance, construction activities could reveal unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features. Implementation of standard construction mitigation as described under Cultural (Mitigation Measure CUL-2) would ensure that this impact is less than significant.
8.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

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

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

8.7.1 Environmental Setting

Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate, such as average temperature, precipitation, or wind patterns over a period of time. Climate change may result from natural factors, natural processes, and human activities that change the composition of the atmosphere and alter the surface and features of the land. Significant changes in global climate patterns have recently been associated with global warming, which is an average increase in the temperature of the atmosphere near the Earth’s surface; this is attributed to an accumulation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the atmosphere. GHGs trap heat in the atmosphere which, in turn, increases the Earth’s surface temperature. Some GHGs occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes, while others are created and emitted solely through human activities. The emission of GHGs through fossil fuel combustion in conjunction with other human activities appears to be closely associated with global warming.

GHGs, as defined under California’s Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). General discussions on climate change often include water vapor, ozone, and aerosols in the GHG category. Water vapor and atmospheric ozone are not gases that are formed directly in the construction or operation of development Projects, nor can they be controlled in these Projects. Aerosols are not gases. While these elements have a role in climate change, they are not considered by either regulatory bodies, such as CARB, or climate change groups, such as the Climate Registry, as gases to be reported or analyzed for control. Therefore, no further discussion of water vapor, ozone, or aerosols is provided.

GHGs vary widely in the power of their climatic effects; therefore, 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, since CH₄ 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). Carbon dioxide equivalent (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. The atmospheric lifetime and GWP of selected GHGs are summarized in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREENHOUSE GAS</th>
<th>ATMOSPHERIC LIFETIME (years)</th>
<th>GLOBAL WARMING POTENTIAL (100-year time horizon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)</td>
<td>50.0–200.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane (CH₄)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrous Oxide (N₂O)</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-134a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC: Tetrafluoromethane (CF₄)</td>
<td>50,000.0</td>
<td>7,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC: Hexafluoroethane (C₂F₆)</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF₆)</td>
<td>3,200.0</td>
<td>22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)</td>
<td>50.0–200.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane (CH₄)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrous Oxide (N₂O)</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-134a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HFC: hydrofluorocarbons; PFC: perfluorocarbons
Source: IPCC 2007

Regulatory Framework Relating to Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, recognizes that California is a source of substantial amounts of GHG emissions. The statute states that:

Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic wellbeing, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California. The potential adverse impacts of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.

In order to help avert these potential consequences, AB 32 established a State goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, which is a reduction of approximately 16 percent from forecasted emission levels, with further reductions to follow (CARB 2011).
8.7.2 Evaluation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

While the final determination of whether or not a project has a significant effect is within the purview of the lead agency pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b), SMAQMD recommends that its GHG thresholds be used to determine the significance of project emissions. The GHG thresholds and various assessment recommendations are contained in SMAQMD’s 2009 Guide, and are discussed under the checklist questions below.

**Question A: Less than Significant Impact**

**Construction**

Construction GHG emissions are generated by vehicle engine exhaust from construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips. Construction GHG emissions were calculated by using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2; the model is described in Section III, Air Quality. Input details are provided in Appendix B. The results are output in metric tons of CO₂e (MT CO₂e) for each year of construction. The estimated construction GHG emissions for the project are shown in **Table 10**. The proposed project would generate less than significant levels of the GHGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EMISSIONS (MT CO₂e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD Threshold</td>
<td><strong>1,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10**

**Estimated Annual GHG Emissions from Project Construction**

MT CO₂e: metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent

**Operation**

Operational GHG emissions for the proposed project are estimated by including purchased electricity; natural gas use for space and water heating; the electricity embodied in water consumption; the energy associated with solid waste disposal; and mobile source emissions. CalEEMod incorporates local energy emission factors and mitigation measures based on the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s (CAPCOA’s) publication Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures (CAPCOA 2010) and the California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol (CCAR 2009). CalEEMod data sheets and details of the electricity and water use calculations are included in Appendix A. The results of the calculations are shown in **Table 11**. As shown therein, the total operational GHG emissions at buildout of the proposed project are estimated at 432 MT CO₂e/yr which is less than the SMAQMD threshold of significance. Therefore, the project’s impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.
Table 11
Estimated Annual GHG Emissions from Project Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>EMISSIONS (MT CO₂e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MT CO₂e: metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent

Question B: Less than Significant Impact

In accordance with SMAQMD’s Guide, project emissions should be evaluated with respect to consistency with the following plans that have been adopted to reduce GHG emissions:

1. AB 32 and the Scoping Plan; and,
2. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

The SMAQMD’s recommended thresholds and mitigation measures were developed to show consistency with AB 32 and the Scoping Plan. As discussed in response to Question VII(a) above, project generated emissions would be below the SMAQMD significance threshold. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with AB 32 and the Scoping Plan.

The MTP/SCS relies on information from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), including projected growth in the County. The SACOG growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and by the County. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by SACOG would be consistent with the MTP/SCS. The Project is a memory care facility that does not extend infrastructure to previously undeveloped areas, nor is the project of a magnitude, either in terms of employment (e.g., construction and leasing/operations) or number of available units, that would cause significant numbers of people to relocate to the area solely for the purpose of being close to the site. Based on these considerations, the Project would not induce population growth in the community that exceeds the levels anticipated in plans adopted by the County. Therefore, the Project would not exceed SACOG’s population, housing, or employment projections. The proposed Project is considered consistent with the MTP/SCS.
8.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

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?

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?

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

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.8.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is currently undeveloped and has no past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites. The schools located nearest to the project site are Folsom High School, located approximately 0.9 mile west of the project site, Sandra J. Gallardo Elementary School located approximately 1.15 mile west of the project site, and Gold Ridge Elementary School located 0.05 miles north of the project site.

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the U.S. EPA’s Envirofacts website database (EPA 2016a); California Department of Toxic Substance Control’s Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2016); and the U.S. EPA’s Superfund National Priorities List (EPA 2016b). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, the project site is not listed as a hazardous waste site.

Federal and state laws include provisions for the safe handling of hazardous substances. The federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) administers requirements to ensure worker safety. Construction activity must also be in compliance with the California OSHA regulations (Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970).

8.8.2 Evaluation of Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Questions A, B, C: Less than Significant Impact

No existing hazardous materials have been identified on the project site, and the site has no history of past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites. Development of the project site from undeveloped to residential land uses would result in an increase in the generation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes. During project construction, oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, paints, solvents, and other hazardous materials may be used. If spilled, these substances could
pose a risk to the environment and to human health. Following construction, household hazardous materials such as various cleansers, paints, solvents, pesticides, pool chemicals, and automobile fluids would be expected to be used. The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to local, state, and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure. The potential risk of exposure or impacts from transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials to schools and other nearby sensitive receptors would be minimized by implementation of the regulations. Further, the City has set forth its hazardous materials goals and policies in the Hazardous Materials Element of the General Plan. The policies protect the health and welfare of residents of Folsom through management and regulation of hazardous materials in a manner that focus on preventing problems. The potential for risks associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials during routine transport, use, or disposal would be less than significant.

**Question D: No Impact**

The project site is not included on the lists of hazardous materials sites compiled by Sacramento County pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2015) or the U.S. EPA (EPA 2016a), or the U.S. EPA’s Superfund National Priorities List (EPA 2016b). Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or environment would result with project implementation. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

**Questions E and F: No Impact**

The project site is not located in an Airport Land Use Plan area, and no public or private airfields are within two miles of the project site; therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

**Question G: Less than Significant Impact**

Consistent with the City’s Multi-Hazard Emergency Management Plan, the City of Folsom maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes along major streets and thoroughfares (City of Folsom 2005). No aspect of the proposed project would modify these streets or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. The proposed project would not result in an increased concentration of large numbers of persons in any at-risk location, and the proposed project would not have a significant impact on any emergency plans. Thus, no significant impact would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

**Question H: Less than Significant Impact**

The project site is located in the City of Folsom, and it is provided urban levels of fire protection by the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the risk of wildland fires. No significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.
8.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

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

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 (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)?

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?

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?

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?
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

|                               |                                               |                             | [ ]       |

i) 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?

|                               |                                               | [ ]                          |          |

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

|                               |                                               | [ ]                          |          |

8.9.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is a wetland with a history of past hydrologic manipulation. The site has been previously cleared and graded with earth material stored on it. South of the project is mostly open space with an existing pond and oak preserve.

Precipitation is the only apparent source of surface water for the project site. No developed storm drainage features are constructed on the project site. Because the project site is currently undeveloped, implementation of the project would result in an increase of impervious surface area and channelization of storm water runoff, the rates and volumes of which would increase. However, this is a normal consequence associated with development, and as shown in the preliminary grading plans for the project, the drainage patterns would be designed so as to not impact adjoining properties. The project proposes a drainage swale to treat urban run-off and provide on-site absorption. Overflows from the swale would flow to the underground storm water drainage system. Underground storm water treatment facilities would be installed to capture and treat runoff from the parking area prior to discharge to the open space south of the project site. The project would incorporate standard best management practices (BMP) to maintain existing water quality in accordance with City regulations.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps were reviewed for the project’s proximity to a 100-year floodplain. The proposed project is on FEMA panel 06067C0119H, effective 8/16/2012. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.
The site is not located in an area of important groundwater recharge. Domestic water in the City is provided solely by surface water sources. The City is the purveyor of water to the area in which the project is located.

8.9.2 Regulatory Framework Relating to Hydrology and Water Quality

The City is a signatory to the Sacramento Countywide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program (NPDES) permit for the control of pollutants in urban stormwater. Since 1990, the City has been a partner in the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership, along with the County of Sacramento and the Cities of Sacramento, Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. These agencies are implementing a comprehensive program involving public outreach, construction and industrial controls (i.e., BMPs), water quality monitoring, and other activities designed to protect area creeks and rivers. This program would be unchanged by the proposed project, and the project would be required to implement all appropriate program requirements.

In addition to these activities, the City maintains the following requirements and programs to reduce the potential impacts of urban development on stormwater quality and quantity, erosion and sediment control, flood protection, and water use. These regulations and requirements would be unchanged by the proposed project.

Standard construction conditions required by the City include:

- **Water Pollution** – requires compliance with City water pollution regulations, including NPDES provisions.

- **Clearing and Grubbing** – specifies protection standards for signs, mailboxes, underground structures, drainage facilities, sprinklers and lights, trees and shrubbery, and fencing. Also requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control erosion and siltation of receiving waters.

- **Reseeding** – specifies seed mixes and methods for reseeding of graded areas.

Additionally, the City enforces the following requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code as presented in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE SECTION</th>
<th>CODE NAME</th>
<th>EFFECT OF CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>Stormwater Management and Discharge Control</td>
<td>Establishes conditions and requirements for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm-drainage system; requires preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>Water Conservation</td>
<td>Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>Green Building Standards Code</td>
<td>Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2010 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4 and A5, published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>Grading Code</td>
<td>Requires a grading permit prior to the initiation of any grading, excavation, fill or dredging; establishes standards, conditions, and requirements for grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage, and revegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>Flood Damage Prevention</td>
<td>Restricts or prohibits uses that cause water or erosion hazards, or that result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights; requires that uses vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage; controls the modification of floodways; regulates activities that may increase flood damage or that could divert floodwaters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>Hillside Development</td>
<td>Regulates urban development on hillsides and ridges to protect property against losses from erosion, ground movement and flooding; to protect significant natural features; and to provide for functional and visually pleasing development of the city’s hillsides by establishing procedures and standards for the siting and design of physical improvements and site grading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Folsom Municipal Code, July 2011

8.9.3 Evaluation of Hydrology and Water Quality

Questions A, F: Less than Significant Impact

Ground disturbing activities associated with construction of the proposed project, would include additional clearing and grading the project site. Modifications to the existing drainage patterns may result in localized flooding, and an increase in impervious surfaces may result in an increase in the total volume and peak discharges of stormwater runoff which may contribute to downstream erosion and flooding. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to degrade water quality associated with urban runoff. Ground disturbing activities would expose soil to erosion and may result in the transport of sediments which could adversely affect water quality. Modifications to the onsite drainage resulting in on-or off-site erosion, pollutants, flooding, and/or otherwise substantially degrade water quality would be a potentially significant impact. The proposed project would be required to comply with various State and local water quality standards which would ensure the proposed project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge permits, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project would be subject to NPDES permit conditions which include the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. As described above, the proposed project would also be subject to all of the City’s standard Code requirements (see Table 10), including conditions for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm drainage system, and restrictions on uses that cause water or erosion hazards. Further, prior to the issuance of grading and
building permits, the applicant would be required to submit to the City a drainage plan that shows how project Best Management Practices (BMPs) capture storm water runoff during project operations. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that water quality standards and discharge requirements are not violated, and water quality is protected. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

**Question B: Less than Significant Impact**

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the use of groundwater, because domestic water in the City is provided solely from surface water sources from the Folsom Reservoir. While the proposed project would result in additional impervious surfaces on the site that could affect groundwater recharge, the site is not known to be important to groundwater recharge. Further, because the proposed project would not rely on groundwater for domestic water and irrigation purposes, and the site is not an important area of groundwater recharge, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

**Questions G, H: No Impact**

Because the project site is located outside of a 100-year floodplain, development of the proposed project would not place persons or structures at risk from flood hazards, nor would it interfere with existing floodway capacity. Thus, no impacts would occur and no mitigation would be necessary.

**Question I: Less than Significant Impact**

The proposed project would not expose new development to inundation in the event of the failure of a dam. Should either of the City’s two main dams (Folsom Lake and Mormon Island) fail, failure would most likely occur with adequate warning to evacuate residents. The project is required to adhere to City established evacuation plans reviewed by the Reclamation District that establish protocol in the event of the dam failure. With implementation of the evacuation plan, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

**Question J: Less than Significant Impact**

The City of Folsom is located approximately 95 miles from the Pacific Ocean, at elevations ranging from approximately 140 to 828 feet amsl. Because of this, there would be no possibility of inundation by tsunami. The City is located adjacent to Folsom Lake, a reservoir of the American River impounded by a main dam on the river channel and wing dikes. Areas of the City adjacent to the wing dikes could be adversely affected by a seiche as a result of an earthquake, either through sloshing within a full reservoir or by a massive landslide or earth movement into the lake. Although historic seismic activity has been minor, the potential for strong ground shaking is present and the possibility exists of a strong earthquake occurring when lake levels are high. This could create a large enough wave to overtop or breach the wing dikes although this is considered to be a remote possibility.
Mudslides and other forms of mass wasting occur on steep slopes in areas having susceptible soils or geology, typically as a result of an earthquake or high rainfall event. Slopes associated with the edges of the building pads are located on the project site; however, City grading standards, including requirements to evaluate slope stability and implement slope stabilizing measures as necessary, would prevent this potential effect. In summary, there would be no potentially significant effect from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow and no mitigation would be necessary.
8.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.10.1 Environmental Setting

Land use in the project area is regulated by the City of Folsom through the various plans and ordinances adopted by the City. These include the City of Folsom General Plan and the City of Folsom Municipal Code, including the Zoning Code. The General Plan currently identifies the project site as Regional Commercial (RCC). The current zoning for the project site is General Commercial, Planned Development District (C-3 PD). A Planned Development Permit would be required because the proposed project is sited within a planned development overlay zoning designation. The Planned Development Permit would allow the City to review the site plan and associated project site details to ensure the project meets the standards and requirements beneficial to the City and its residents as defined in Section 17.38.100 of the Zoning Code. Residential care homes for adults (for over six people) are a permitted land use in this zone, but only upon the issuance of a minor Conditional Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

8.10.2 Evaluation of Land Use and Planning

Question A: No Impact

Existing residential developments are north of the project the site, and commercial developments and open space is located west, east, and south of the project site. Development of the project site would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation required.
Question B: No Impact

The development standard in the City Municipal Code for Commercial (C-3) allows for the highest intensity commercial activities with no restrictions on lot area, width, or coverage. Building height limitation is 4 stories but not to exceed 50 feet. The development standard for planned development (PD) is that the proposed development project must be designed to provide open space, circulation, off-street parking and other conditions in such a way as to form a harmonious, integrated project of sufficient quality to justify exceptions to the normal regulations of this title. The project would comply with these standards and not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project; therefore, the project would have no impact and require no mitigation.

Question C: No Impact

No Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan has been approved for the project area. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any conservation plan. No impact would occur and no mitigation is necessary.
8.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) 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?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

8.11.1 Environmental Setting

The Folsom area regional geologic structure is defined by the predominantly northwest- to southeast-trending belt of metamorphic rocks and the strike-slip faults that bound them. The structural trend influences the orientation of the feeder canyons into the main canyons of the North and South Forks of the American River. This trend is interrupted where the granodiorite plutons outcrop (north and west of Folsom Lake) and where the metamorphic rocks are blanketed by younger sedimentary layers (west of Folsom Dam) (California Department of Conservation 2016c). The four primary rock divisions found in the area are: ultramafic intrusive, metamorphic, granodiorite intrusive, and volcanic mud flows.

The presence of mineral resources within the City has led to a long history of gold extraction, primarily placer gold. No areas of the City are currently designated for mineral resource extraction.

8.11.2 Evaluation of Mineral Resources

Questions A, B: No Impact

The proposed project is not located in a zone of known mineral or aggregate resources. No active mining operations are present on or near the site. Implementation of the project would not interfere with the extraction of any known mineral resources. Thus, no impacts would result, and no mitigation would be necessary.
8.12 NOISE

Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (including construction)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.12.1 Environmental Setting

The predominant existing noise sources in the vicinity of the proposed project site are vehicles on adjacent streets. No commercial airports are located within two miles of the project site, though occasional overflights and associated noise occur from aircraft landing at Sacramento Mather Airport Air Force Base or McClellan Air Force Base (located approximately 10 and 13 miles west of the project site, respectively).

Potential noise impacts as a result of the proposed project are those resulting from project construction and operational activities. Construction noise would be temporary; operational noise would continue throughout the lifetime of the project.

8.12.2 Regulatory Framework

Noise Element

The City of Folsom General Plan Noise Element establishes land use compatibility criteria for transportation noise sources such as roadways. For these sources, the City establishes a noise level criterion of 60 dBA L_{DN/CNEL} \(^1\) or less in outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses (NSLU), and 45 dBA L_{DN/CNEL} or less for interior noise levels of NSLUs. A memory care facility would be considered an NSLU.

Noise Ordinance

For stationary noise sources, the City has adopted a Noise Ordinance as Section 8.42 of the Folsom Municipal Code (City of Folsom 2011). The Noise Ordinance establishes hourly noise level performance standards that are most commonly quantified in terms of the one-hour average noise level (L_{EQ}). Using the limits specified in Table 8.42.040 of the Noise Ordinance, noise levels generated by the project would be significant if they exceeded 50 dBA L_{EQ} from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dBA L_{EQ} from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. at the residential property boundary.

The City has also established Standard Construction Specifications as published in May 2004 (City of Folsom 2004). The standard construction specifications are required to be adhered to by any contractor constructing a public or private project within the City. Standards regarding the noise environment are summarized below.

- **Noise Control** – Requires that all construction work comply with the City Noise Ordinance, and that all construction vehicles be equipped with a muffler to control sound levels.

---

\(^1\) The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is a 24-hour average, where noise levels during the evening hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. have an added 5 dBA weighting, and sound levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. have an added 10 dBA weighting. Similarly, the Day-Night sound level (L_{DN}) is a 24-hour average with an added 10 dBA weighting on the same nighttime hours but no added weighting on the evening hours.
• *Weekend, Holiday, and Night Work* – Prohibits construction work during evening hours, or on Sunday or holidays, to reduce noise and other construction nuisance effects.

### 8.12.3 Evaluation of Noise

#### Question A: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Construction Noise**

Construction of the project would generate elevated noise levels that may disrupt nearby NSLUs including the nearby multi-family residences across Iron Point Road to the north. The magnitude of the impact would depend on the type of construction activity, equipment, duration of each construction phase, distance between the noise source and receiver, and any intervening structures.

Construction activities for the project include grading, which is typically significantly louder than other activities and has the greatest potential to create noise impacts to off-site NSLUs. Grading involves the ripping of materials using a dozer and an excavator, and a dump truck to haul the materials.

A dozer and an excavator may be working on the site simultaneously, but would not be working in close proximity to one another at a given time due to the nature of their respective operations. Therefore, a dozer with a dump truck and an excavator with a dump truck were analyzed for construction noise impacts in isolation, using construction models to determine the worst-case construction noise levels at nearby residential receptors.

For modeling purposes using the Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), these pieces of equipment were assumed to operate at 200 feet from the nearest NSLUs and be in operation for 40 percent of an 8-hour construction day. Based on these assumptions, the highest impact level for a dozer and a dump truck at the nearest NSLU is 66.8 dBA L$_{EQ}$ and an excavator and a dump truck is 66.1 dBA L$_{EQ}$.

Construction noise would be regulated by Section 8.4.2.060 of the City’s Municipal Code (Noise Ordinance), which states that construction activities are exempt from noise standards if they take place during daytime hours between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays and between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays. Project construction would only occur during these exempted hours. Further, all construction vehicles be equipped with a muffler to control sound levels, in accordance with the City’s standard construction requirements. Therefore, construction noise impacts are less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

**Operational Noise**

**Noise Exposure in Excess of Standards**

Noise modeling for on-site transportation noise was conducted with Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5 and used average daily traffic numbers from the long-term scenario (i.e.,
"Cumulative + Project") described in the project’s traffic impact analysis (MRO Engineers 2016).

The noise environment in the project site area is characterized by low-level intermittent traffic noise from vehicles on Iron Point Road. Oak Avenue Parkway would also contribute traffic noise, particularly once the extension of the parkway from Iron Point Road to US-50 is built. This extension was included in the modeling. Outdoor use areas include the garden and walkway area south of the memory care facility. The building would provide noise shielding from traffic noise generated by Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. Taking into account the noise shielding from the building, the highest measured receiver in this location was modeled at 57.9 CNEL. This noise level would be below the City noise standard of 60 CNEL for outdoor activity areas, and impacts to exterior areas from on-site transportation noise would be less than significant. See Table D-1 of Appendix D for detailed noise levels of the outdoor area receivers.

Noise levels at the building façade facing Iron Point Road were modeled as high as 71.0 CNEL. Traditional architectural materials are normally able to reduce exterior to interior noise by up to 15 dBA. Based on these exterior noise levels, traditional architectural materials would not be expected to attenuate interior noise to a level of 45 CNEL. Therefore, impacts to interior noise would be potentially significant. See Table D-2 of Appendix D for detailed noise levels of the building façade receivers.

The following mitigation measure would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to interior noise:

**Mitigation Measure NOI-01: Exterior-to-interior noise level limit.**

- Interior building noise levels for the proposed project shall not exceed 45 CNEL. Once specific building plan information is available, additional exterior-to-interior noise analysis shall be conducted to demonstrate that interior levels do not exceed 45 CNEL. The information in the analysis shall include wall heights and lengths, room volumes, window and door tables typical for a building plan, as well as information on any other openings in the building shell. With this specific building plan information, the analysis shall determine the predicted interior noise levels at the planned on-site building. If predicted noise levels are found to be in excess of 45 CNEL, the report shall identify architectural materials or techniques that could be included to reduce noise levels to 45 CNEL in habitable rooms. Standard measures such as glazing with Sound Transmission Control (STC) ratings from a STC 22 to STC 60, as well as walls with appropriate STC ratings (34 to 60), should be considered.

- Appropriate means of air circulation and provision of fresh air would be provided to allow windows to remain closed for extended intervals of time so that acceptable interior noise levels can be maintained. The mechanical ventilation system would meet the criteria of the International Building Code (Chapter 12, Section 1203.3 of the 2001 California Building Code).
Off-site Transportation Noise

Off-site traffic noise impacts were analyzed for existing and long term (2035) conditions without and with project traffic, based upon traffic data from the project’s traffic impact analysis. The roadways analyzed were Iron Point Road, from Oak Avenue Parkway to McAdoo Drive and from Oak Avenue Parkway to Rowberry Drive, and Oak Avenue Parkway, from Iron Point Road to Halidon Way. The nearest NSLUs to each roadway are approximately 100 feet from the roadway centerline (single- and multi-family residences).

A general rule of thumb is that a significant increase would be a 3 dBA increase (a doubling in noise). Existing noise levels for the nearest NSLUs range from 64.3 CNEL for Oak Avenue Parkway to 67.7 CNEL for Iron Point Road. As the project would only add 14 peak hour trips to roadways ranging from 2,897 to 3,497 peak hour trips, it would have a minor impact on the near-term noise levels, with no modeled increase to noise on Iron Point Road and a 0.1 dBA increase on Oak Avenue Parkway.

The increase from the existing to the long term condition that would exceed 3 dBA would be the Oak Avenue Parkway segment, with a 4.3 dBA increase to 68.6 CNEL. It is assumed that for a project to result in a cumulatively considerable impact, the project would need to contribute more than 1 dBA to the increase. The project was modeled to have no measurable increase to noise on Oak Avenue Parkway in the long term condition. Therefore, project traffic would not cause a cumulatively considerable increase and impacts to off-site NSLUs would be less than significant. Detailed results are presented in Table A-3 of Appendix A.

HVAC

The project includes the outdoor installation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units on the roof of the proposed project building. The units would have visual screening provided by a parapet wall of equal or greater height to the HVAC unit, which would provide some noise screening. Specific planning information is not available for the HVAC units at this time; modeling assumed the use of Carrier 16-ton packaged HVAC units (50PG03-16) with a manufacturer’s Sound Power Rating of 91.4 dBA SWL, which would be typical for a project of similar size. The total building area (across two floors) is provided as approximately 36,688 square feet and normal HVAC planning assumes one ton of HVAC for every 325 to 350 square feet of habitable space. This equals 105 tons of HVAC or 7 HVAC units. This would have a probable worst case (all units in simultaneous operation) of 39.3 dBA L_{eq} at the multifamily residential property lines to the north. Therefore, noise levels from HVAC units would not exceed the City’s day (50 dBA L_{eq}) and night (45 dBA L_{eq}) maximum acceptable noise levels; impacts would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not required.

Question B: Less than Significant Impact

An on-site source of vibration during project construction would be a vibratory roller (primarily used to achieve soil compaction as part of the foundation and paving construction), which is expected to be used within 200 feet of the nearest occupied residence. A vibratory roller creates approximately 0.210 inches per second peak particle velocity (PPV) at a distance of 25 feet.
The City does not state specific standards in the General Plan or Municipal Code. Caltrans standards for construction vibration impacts use a criterion of 0.4 inches per second PPV at 25 feet (Caltrans 2013). Using these standards, the approximately 0.210 inches per second PPV vibration impact would be less than what is considered a “severe” impact. Therefore, although vibration may be perceptible by nearby residences, temporary impacts associated with the vibratory roller (and other potential equipment) would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Question C: Less than Significant Impact**

See Question A. Operational noise from the project (traffic and HVAC) would not exceed significance thresholds. No mitigation measures are required.

**Question D: Less than Significant Impact**

See Question A. Construction of the proposed project would not exceed applicable thresholds and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Question E, F: No Impact**

Since the project site is not located in an area for which an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan has been prepared, and no public or private airfields are within two miles of the project area, the residents of the proposed project would not be exposed to adverse levels of noise due to aircraft overflight. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation would be necessary.
8.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

8.13.1 Evaluation of Population and Housing

Question A: Less than Significant

Implementation of the project would result in the construction of 45 rooms for an estimated 47 residents (2 rooms will have two beds in it). Because the project is a small, extended care medical facility, there would be relatively few residents and employees associated with the project. Further, it is assumed that the majority of the individuals transitioning to the medical facility and the majority of the employees would be from the area. Existing infrastructure and roads in the area would not be expanded or extended as a result of the project. The proposed project would not induce substantial growth in the City of Folsom. The impact would not be significant and no mitigation would be required.

Questions B, C: No Impact

The proposed project would affect a currently undeveloped site that is proposed for development with residential land uses. There are no existing residences on the project site; therefore, neither housing units nor people would be displaced, and no replacement housing would be required. There would be no impact and no mitigation would be necessary.
8.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Than</th>
<th>Less Than</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Significant Impact</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fire protection?
- Police protection?
- Schools?
- Parks?
- Other public facilities?

8.14.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed project is in an area currently served by urban levels of all utilities and services. Public services provided by the City of Folsom in the project area include fire, police, school, library, and park services. The site is served by all public utilities including domestic water, wastewater treatment, and stormwater utilities.

The City of Folsom Fire Department provides fire protection services. There are four stations within the City of Folsom. Station 37 is nearest to the project site. It is located at 70 Clarksville Road, approximately 2 miles north of the project site. The Fire Department responds to over 6,000 requests for service annually with an average of 16.4 per day. The City of Folsom Police Department is located at 46 Natoma Street, approximately 3.4 miles north of the project site.

The project site is located within the Folsom Cordova Unified School District, and is within the attendance area for the Gold Ridge Elementary School, Sutter Middle School, and Folsom High School. There are several parks in the vicinity of the project site, including Livermore Community, John Kemp Community Park, and Willow Hills Reservoir Community Park.

The Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) would supply electricity to the project site. PG&E provides natural gas to the area, and provide natural gas to the project site.
The City of Folsom has a program of maintaining and upgrading existing utility and public services within the City. Similarly, all private utilities maintain and upgrade their systems as necessary for public convenience and necessity, and as technology changes.

8.14.2 Evaluation of Public Services

Questions A, B, C, D, E: Less than Significant

The project site is within the urban area of Folsom, and there is no indication that public services are inadequate. Because there are no unique aspects of the project that would increase service demands or render the current service level to be inadequate, no new public facilities would be necessary to serve the proposed project. The impact of the project would be less than significant and mitigation would not be necessary.
8.15 RECREATION

Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.15.1 Environmental Setting

The Folsom Parks and Recreation Department provides and maintains a full range of recreational activities and park facilities for the community. There are several parks in the vicinity of the project site, including the Livermore Community Park, John Kemp Community, and Willow Hills Reservoir Community Park. The facility will include outdoor courtyards and landscaping for use by the residents.

8.15.2 Evaluation of Recreation

Question A: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The employees and residents of the medical facility are likely to be relocating from the general area and would not result in a substantial increase in relation to the overall City of Folsom; therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the use or demand for neighborhood or regional parks. Further, the proposed project includes an outside area with courtyards and landscaping for use by residents. Impacts on existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation is necessary.

Question B: Less than Significant

The proposed project includes construction of an outside area and a courtyard with landscaping for use by the residents. These facilities are for use by the residents of the medical facility and would not be open to the public. Construction and operation of the facilities would not have an adverse impact on the environment, and construction of the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of other recreational facilities that might have an adverse impact.
on the environment. The proposed project would not include recreation facilities, nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse impact on the environment. There would be no impact and mitigation would not be necessary.
### 8.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

- [ ]
- [x]
- [ ]
- [ ]

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?

- [x]
- [ ]
- [x]
- [ ]

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?

- [x]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

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

- [ ]
- [x]
- [x]
- [ ]

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- [ ]
- [x]
- [x]
- [ ]

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

- [ ]
- [x]
- [x]
- [ ]
safety of such facilities?

Transportation and traffic were evaluated in a project specific traffic impact analysis as attached in Appendix E (MRO Engineers 2016).

8.16.1 Environmental Setting

Parking and Access

The project site is undeveloped and does not contain existing access to the roadway system. Vehicular access to and from the proposed project would be a single right-turn only driveway on Iron Point near the east edge of the site. A total of 24 parking stalls are proposed, with 17 standard stalls (9’x19’), 5 compact stalls (9’x16’), 1 disabled parking, and 1 covered vanpool drop-off.

Roadway System

Brief descriptions of the key roadways serving the project site are provided below.

Iron Point Road is an east-west arterial roadway that generally runs parallel to and just north of U.S. Highway 50. It extends from Folsom Boulevard on the west to the City limit east of Empire Ranch Road. In the immediate vicinity of the project site, it is a six-lane, median-divided road with bike lanes and a 45 MPH speed limit.

Oak Avenue Parkway is a north-south, four-to-six lane arterial street that has Iron Point Road as its southern terminus. Near Iron Point Road, Oak Avenue Parkway has a 45 MPH speed limit and two lanes in each direction (plus bike lanes) separated by a landscaped median. Long-term plans call for extending Oak Avenue Parkway to the south, where it will have an interchange with U.S. Highway 50.

McAdoo Drive is a north-south roadway that runs from Iron Point Road on the south to Riley Street on the north. It is a two-lane road with bike lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit that primarily provides access to residential areas. McAdoo Drive meets Iron Point Road at a signal-controlled intersection.

Rowberry Drive is a two-lane residential collector street, which connects Iron Point Road with Walden Drive. Sidewalks are provided along the residential frontages, but no on-street bike lanes are present. Instead, an off-street (Class I) bike path exists along the northwest side of Rowberry Drive, beginning at its intersection with Walden Drive, then curving behind the houses on that side of the street. No speed limit is posted.
Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

The City maintains a network of pedestrian and bike trails throughout the city, in addition to a network of on-street bike lanes. Currently, there are only partial sidewalks on the east and western portion of the project.

On street (“Class II”) bike lanes exist along the project frontage on Iron Point Road. An existing bus stop is located along the north side of Iron Point Road, west of Oak Avenue Parkway.

Airports

No private or public airports are located within the City of Folsom. The nearest public airfield is Mather Airport, located approximately 12 miles southwest of the project site. Cameron Airpark is a public use airport located approximately 10 miles northeast of the project site. Neither airport is a commercial service airport.

Emergency Access

The City of Folsom identifies most major streets in the city as emergency evacuation routes. No aspect of the proposed project would modify these streets in a way that would preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. The minimum width available for driving or turning movements through the parking lot is 27 feet, to provide sufficient access for fire trucks.

Existing Traffic Volumes

MRO Engineers, Inc., conducted AM and PM peak-period turning movement counts at Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive on Thursday, November 12, 2015, while Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway was counted on Tuesday, June 9, 2015 and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive was counted on Wednesday, May 13, 2015. Data collection was specifically scheduled on typical school days, to ensure a conservative analysis of traffic operations:

- Iron Point Road/McAdoo;
- Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway; and,
- Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive.

8.16.2 Existing Intersection Operations

Existing intersection delay and level of service (LOS) calculated for the study intersections are presented in Table 13. The intersection LOS definitions and evaluation criteria are described the “Analysis Methodology” section of the traffic study.
Table 13
Level of Service Summary\(^1\)
Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Oak Avenue Pkwy.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MRO Engineering 2016
Notes:
\(^2\) Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).
\(^3\) Level of service.

All study intersections operate at LOS B during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, thereby meeting the City’s General Plan policy for acceptable levels of service (under the current General Plan, LOS A, B, and C are considered acceptable, while LOS D, E, and F are considered unacceptable).

8.16.3 Existing Plus Project Conditions

Trip Generation

The AM and PM peak-hour trip generation estimates for the proposed project were developed using information presented in the Trip Generation Manual (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Ninth Edition, 2012). The ITE document does not have a specific land use category for memory care, so two options were investigated – treating it as a nursing home or as an assisted living facility. Because the assisted living category has slightly higher peak-hour trip generation rates, that option was selected. This choice results in a conservative analysis of traffic impacts because, at a memory care facility, only employees and visitors generate trips. Unlike an assisted living facility, residents do not drive, so no trips are associated with them.

Table 14 summarizes the resulting trip generation estimates for the proposed Country House at Broadstone project. The proposed project is expected to generate a total of 9 AM peak-hour trips, with 6 inbound and 3 outbound. The PM peak hour trip generation is estimated to be 14 trips, with 7 inbound and 7 outbound. About 130 daily trips are projected, evenly split between inbound and outbound.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips Rate</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Care²</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45 DU³/47 Beds)</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MRO Engineers 2015
Notes:
2 ITE Land Use Code 254 – Assisted Living.
3 Dwelling Units
4 Trips per occupied bed.

### Trip Distribution and Assignment

The geographic distribution of the project-generated traffic was based on existing traffic patterns in the vicinity of the proposed project, as well as information presented in previous traffic studies for nearby projects. About 45 percent of the project-generated traffic is expected to be oriented to/from the west on Iron Point Road. An additional 35 percent is expected to travel to and from the east, while 20 percent will be oriented to/from the north on Oak Avenue Parkway.

### Project Traffic Assignment

The peak-hour traffic volumes generated by the proposed project were added to the “Construction Year No Project” traffic, with the result being the “Construction Year Plus Project” scenario. Those estimated traffic volumes are shown on Figure 7, which also illustrates the assumed intersection lane configurations. No changes in intersection lane configurations are assumed, as the City of Folsom has no planned or programmed roadway system improvements at the study intersections.

### Intersection Level of Service

Table 15 the AM and PM peak hour levels of service at each study intersection under Construction Year Plus Project conditions.
### Table 15
Level of Service Summary  
Construction Year Plus Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Year No Project</td>
<td>Construction Year + Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay 2</td>
<td>LOS(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ McAdoo Dr</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ Oak Avenue Pkwy</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ Rowberry Dr</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ Project Access</td>
<td>SIDE-ST STOP(^4)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MRO Engineers 2016  
Notes:  
2. Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).  
3. Level of service.  
4. Delay value represents the worst case movements/approach.

#### Weekday AM Peak Hour

Addition of the project-generated traffic will cause little change in the delay values at the study intersections, and no change in level of service is projected. The delay values will be unchanged at Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive. At Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway, the delay will increase by 0.3 seconds/vehicle. The project access intersection will be at LOS B, and will not meet the “Peak Hour” signal warrant. Thus, all of the study intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service and the project-related impact will be less than significant.

#### Weekday PM Peak Hour

The PM peak hour results are very similar to the AM peak hour findings. Again, the delay values will be unchanged at Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive, while at Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway, the delay will increase by 0.5 seconds/vehicle. The Iron Point Road/Project Access intersection will be at LOS C; it will have insufficient traffic...
to meet the minimum requirements of the “Peak Hour” signal warrant. Thus, all four intersections will conform to the City’s level of service standards.

In summary, the project-related impact is projected to be less than significant in the PM peak hour.

**Mitigation Measures**

The project-related impact at all of the study intersections is less than significant, as described above. Therefore, no off-site mitigation measures are recommended in conjunction with the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility.

**8.16.4 Evaluation of Transportation/Traffic**

**Questions A, B: Less than Significant Impact**

Under the General Plan, LOS A, B, and C are considered acceptable levels of operation, while LOS D, E, and F are considered unacceptable. Existing plus project intersection delay and LOS were calculated for the study intersections and compared against existing conditions. Under existing conditions, all study intersections operate at LOS B (refer to Table 13). For the construction year without the project, all study intersections would operate at LOS B in the AM and PM, except for the Iron Point Rd. and Rowberry Dr., which would operate at LOS C in the PM. This scenario is expected to be the same under the proposed project, with no significant increases in traffic volumes. While implementation of the proposed project would result in a slight increase in traffic volumes at one of the study intersections in the PM, all study intersections would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. The project would not conflict with City street operational standards, or result in substantial increase in traffic congestion. This would be less than significant impact, and no mitigation necessary.

**Question C: No Impact**

No private or public airports are located within the City of Folsom. The nearest public airfield is Mather Airport, located approximately 12 miles from the proposed project. The Cameron Park Airfield is located approximately 10 miles northeast of the project site. The proposed project would not result in modification to any air travel route. There would be no impact and no mitigation would be required.

**Question D: Less than Significant Impact**

The proposed project would construct one new driveway accessing the proposed project site off Iron Point Rd. An unmarked, dedicated right-turn lane exists on Iron Point Rd in front of the project site, and would be slightly improved to allow access to the project driveway. Because there is an existing lane, and improvements would be minor and compatible with existing use of the roadway, the project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation would be necessary.
Question E: Less than Significant Impact

Consistent with the City of Folsom’s Multi-Hazard Emergency Management Plan, the City maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes along major streets and thoroughfares. No aspect of the proposed project would modify these streets or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. No aspect of the proposed project would modify these streets or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. The emergency access road on the eastside of the building has a roundabout turn around radius of 50-feet wide with 27-feet fire lanes, providing sufficient access for movement of fire trucks. The plans would be approved by the Fire Department prior to project implementation; therefore, no significant impact to fire protection would occur and no mitigation would be necessary.

Question F: Less than Significant Impact

The project would not result in any modification of, or interference with, any existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facility. Existing on-street Class II bike lanes on both sides of Iron Point Road were determined to adequately meet the needs of bicyclists in the vicinity of the project. The proposed project would enhance existing pedestrian facilities by connecting a partially existing sidewalk along Iron Point Rd and would improve pedestrian circulation in the area. Because the project would not result in the modification of any existing facility, and would not result in any interference with such facilities, this would be a less than significant impact and no mitigation would be necessary.
### 8.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Project-level Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.17.1 Environmental Setting

Existing utilities on the project site include SMUD for electricity, PG&E underground gas lines, AT&T underground telephone lines, City of Folsom for solid waste disposal, and City of Folsom water and sewer facilities. The City of Folsom employs a design process that includes coordination with potentially affected utilities as part of project development. Identifying and accommodating existing utilities is part of the design process, and utilities are considered when finalizing public project plans. The City of Folsom coordinates with the appropriate utility companies to plan and implement any needed accommodation of existing utilities, including water, sewer, telephone, gas, electricity, and cable television lines. Based on the results of an initial request for comments from the utility providers, all utility services are able to accommodate the proposed project.

8.17.2 Evaluation of Utilities and Service Systems

Questions A, B, E (Wastewater): No Impact

The City of Folsom is responsible for managing and maintaining its wastewater collection system, including 267 miles of pipeline and nine lift stations. This system ultimately discharges into the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District interceptor sewer system. Wastewater is treated at the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, located in Elk Grove.

In compliance with the 2006 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, the City of Folsom adopted a Sewer System Management Plan on July 28, 2009. The plan outlines how the municipality operates and maintains the collection system, and the reporting of all Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) to the SWRCB’s online SSO database. Because the City has sufficient capacity to accommodate any additional demand that could result from implementation of the proposed project, and because the City is in compliance with statutes and regulations related to wastewater collection and treatment, there would be no impact and mitigation would not be necessary.

Question C: Less than Significant Impact

Folsom’s Public Works Department handles all stormwater management issues for the City, from design and construction of the storm drain system to operation and maintenance, and urban runoff pollution prevention. Stormwater drains would be installed throughout the site, and curb and gutter would be installed along the parking lot to collect stormwater flows and prevent flooding or ponding. Stormwater facilities would need to be expanded to connect to existing stormwater drainage facilities; 12-inch drains would be installed to carry stormwater to the existing storm drain line in Iron Point Road. With implementation of these measures, environmental impacts from expanding the stormwater facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

Question B, D (Water): Less than Significant Impact

Water Supply

Folsom’s Water Treatment Plant has a capacity of 50 million gallons per day. According to the City of Folsom General Plan Housing Element, the combination of treated and untreated water
demands (through the time frame of the Housing Element which is 2021) are not anticipated to exceed the City’s current water entitlements of 34,000 acre-feet annually (City of Folsom 2013). Because sufficient supplies are available, no additional facilities would need to be constructed or expanded and impacts would be less than significant.

**Water Supply and the Drought**

While the General Plan identifies sufficient water supplies for build out of projects identified in the General Plan (including the proposed project), the State has been in a severe drought and continued growth in the City has generated concern from many residents. Folsom City Manager, Evert Palmer explained that “Folsom has rights to 34,000 acre feet of water from Folsom Lake, and consumes less than two percent of the water that passes through Folsom Dam each year. Last year, the City used just over half of its allocated supply. Folsom’s new housing demand, including the development south of [US-]50, is also relatively low, comprising just four percent of the planned housing in the entire Sacramento region through 2036” (Newell 2015). Implementation of the project would result in the construction of 45 residential units for an estimated 47 (2 rooms will have 2 beds). This increase in residents would not result in a substantial increase in water demand on the City.

**Water Conservation Efforts**

The City actively implements water conservation actions in response to the drought. Standards and regulations issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that came into effect June 1, 2015, require the City to reduce water consumption by 32 percent. In response, the City developed a water reduction plan to reduce water consumption, and conserve water in the City.

City actions include reducing watering in parks by one third, removing turf and retrofitting irrigation in more than 30 medians citywide, turn off irrigation in ornamental streetscapes that do not have trees, prohibiting new homes and buildings from irrigating with potable water unless water-efficient drip systems are used, replacing and upgrading sprinklers and irrigation systems with water-efficient systems, suspending operation of water features throughout the City. The City also implemented water restrictions and rebate programs for residents of the City. Folsom residents successfully reduced water consumption by 21 percent in 2014. The City reduced water consumption in parks by 27 percent, and 31 percent in Landscape and Lighting Districts. This was among the highest conservation rates statewide (Brainerd 2015).

**Questions F and G: No Impact**

The City of Folsom provides solid waste, recycling, and hazardous materials collection services to its residential and business communities. In order to meet the State mandated 50 percent landfill diversion requirements stipulated under AB 939, the City has instituted several community-based programs. The City offers a door-to-door collection program for household hazardous and electronic waste, in addition to six “drop off” recycling locations within the City.

After processing, solid waste is taken to the Kiefer Landfill, the primary municipal solid waste disposal facility in Sacramento County. The landfill facility sits on a site of 1,084 acres in the community of Sloughhouse. Currently 250 acres, the State permitted landfill is 660 acres in size, and is of sufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs of the City of
Folsom. Because the landfill serving the project area is of sufficient capacity to accommodate solid waste needs, there is no impact and no mitigation would be necessary.
8.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 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?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question A: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

The preceding analysis indicates that the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect biological and cultural resources. See Sections 8.4 and 8.5 of this Initial Study for discussion of the proposed project’s potential impacts on these environmental issue areas. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those Sections, and compliance with City programs and requirements identified in this report, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. No significant or potentially significant impacts would remain.

**Question B: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

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 by the City and considered in development of the City’s General Plan as set forth in this Initial Study. Key areas of concern are discussed in detail below.

*Evaluation of cumulative aesthetic impacts:* Implementation of the proposed project, with continued cumulative growth within Folsom and implementation of the East Area Folsom Plan and the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan, would contribute to the urbanization of the area because the project would involve conversion of an undeveloped area to developed uses. The regional landscape would continue to develop a more urban visual character than is currently experienced by viewers.

By implementing the proposed design elements that tie in the proposed building and landscaping to the adjacent land uses, the proposed project is not expected to substantially contribute to the cumulative impacts on the regional visual character. The surrounding areas are largely already
developed, and the project is within an existing mixed-use retail/commercial, residential, and business area with multi-story buildings. The proposed project would not result in significant cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources, and no mitigation measures would be needed.

**Evaluation of cumulative biological resources impacts:** Implementation of the proposed project, with continued growth within Folsom and implementation of the East Area Folsom Plan and the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan, would contribute to continued loss of habitat for biological resources by converting undeveloped area to developed uses. No special status species have the potential to occur in the project site. The project site contains potentially suitable nesting habitat for common birds protected under the MBTA. Cumulative impacts to nesting birds may result in an overall effect on the viability of certain species. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially cumulative effects would be avoided. The proposed project would not directly impact sensitive natural communities or protected habitats; however, the project is located near and oak preserve and pond. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, potential impacts to the oak preserve and pond would be minimized As a result, with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and -2, the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative impacts to protected biological resources, and no additional mitigation measures would be needed.

**Evaluation of cumulative noise impacts:** Noise and vibrations are localized occurrences and rapidly decrease in magnitude as the distance between the source and receptors increases; therefore, when determining whether the overall noise (and vibration) impacts from related projects would be cumulatively significant and whether the project’s incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts would be cumulatively considerable, only projects in the direct vicinity of the project and those that are considered influential in regards to noise and vibration would have the potential to be considered in a cumulative context with the project’s incremental contribution.

The adjacent areas have largely been previously developed consistent with the City of Folsom General Plan. Projects in the vicinity of the proposed project that may contribute to a cumulative noise impact include the existing Specific Plan, the existing and planned elements of the Empire Ranch Development. The proposed project, along with adjacent existing development and planned development in the vicinity (the East Area Folsom Plan) would contribute to increases in the overall noise environment, primarily through traffic level increases. Development of the currently undeveloped parcel east of the project site may contribute to temporary cumulative noise and vibration impacts during construction.

All projects within the City of Folsom are subject to the City of Folsom Noise Ordinance, and are considered based on the land use compatibility criteria included in the Noise Element of the General Plan. Through evaluation and mitigation consistent with the City’s noise regulations, cumulative impacts would be expected to be less than significant. The proposed project would result in a less than significant substantial cumulative impact.

**Evaluation of cumulative transportation impacts:** Cumulative transportation impacts were evaluated in the traffic impact analysis prepared for the project (MRO Engineers 2016). The
year 2035 traffic volumes for Cumulative No Project conditions were derived from traffic forecasts developed as part of the Folsom Sphere of Influence Project. The project’s contribution to the Cumulative No Project traffic conditions were evaluated. The proposed project is expected to generate 9 AM peak hour trips (6 inbound and 3 outbound) and 14 PM peak hour trips (7 inbound and 7 outbound). Overall, the project would not result in a change to the future trip distribution, intersection traffic volumes, and LOS. Under the Cumulative No Project, Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr and Iron Point Rd./Oak Ave Parkway operate at a LOS B, and Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr. operate at a LOS C for AM and PM Peak hours. Under the proposed project, Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr and Iron Point Rd./Oak Ave Parkway would continue to operate at LOS B, and Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr. would continue to operate at LOS C. All study intersections including the project access would operate at an acceptable LOS of either B or C. The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to traffic operations at the study intersection under cumulative conditions. Refer to Table 16 for the cumulative level of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative No Project</td>
<td>Cumulative + Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ McAdoo Dr</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ Oak Avenue Pkwy</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ Rowberry Dr</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd/ Project Access</td>
<td>SIDE-ST STOP²</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MRO Engineers 2016

Notes:
2. Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).
3. Level of service.
4. Delay value represents the worst case movements/approach.

**Question C: Less than Significant Impact**

Because of site conditions, existing City regulations, and regulation of potential environmental impacts by other agencies, the proposed project would not have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings as demonstrated in the detailed evaluation contained in this Initial Study.
9.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared by the City per Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines and is presented in Appendix F.

10.0 INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

City of Folsom
Steve Banks, Principal Planner

HELIx Environmental Planning, Inc.
Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Project Manager
David Claycomb, AICP, Quality Assurance/Quality Control
Stephen Stringer, Senior Biologist
Catherine Silvester, Biologist/Planner
Jameson Honeycutt, GIS Specialist/Planner
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Appendix D

Noise: Acoustical Data
### Appendix D
ACOUSTICAL DATA

#### Table D-1
FUTURE OUTDOOR ON-SITE NOISE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Noise Levels (CNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest corner of garden/walkway area</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center of garden/walkway area</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast corner of garden/walkway area</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Noise levels in table are for the long term ("Project + Cumulative") condition.*

#### Table D-2
FUTURE BUILDING FAÇADE ON-SITE NOISE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Noise Levels (CNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western side of building</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern side of building, west of center</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern side of building, east of center</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern side of building</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern side of building</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Noise levels in table are for the long term ("Project + Cumulative") condition.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway/Segment</th>
<th>Distance to Nearest NSLU (ft)</th>
<th>Existing CNEL</th>
<th>70 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>65 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>60 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>Existing + Project CNEL</th>
<th>70 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>65 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>60 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>Long Term CNEL</th>
<th>70 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>65 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>60 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>Long Term + Project CNEL</th>
<th>70 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>65 CNEL (RL)</th>
<th>60 CNEL (RL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Road</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue Parkway to McAliston Drive</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue Parkway to Rowberry Drive</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-2
Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1

--- Receptor #1 ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baselines (dBA)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Spec Lmax</th>
<th>Actual Lmax</th>
<th>Receptor Distance</th>
<th>Estimated Shielding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Device</td>
<td>Usage(%)</td>
<td>(dBA)</td>
<td>(dBA)</td>
<td>(feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculated (dBA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>*Lmax</th>
<th>Leq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.
--- Receptor #1 ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baselines (dBA)</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homes Residential</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Impact Device</th>
<th>Usage(%)</th>
<th>Actual Lmax (dBA)</th>
<th>Receptor Distance (feet)</th>
<th>Estimated Shielding (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>*Lmax</th>
<th>Leq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated Lmax is the Loudest value.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study addresses the traffic impacts associated with the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility in Folsom, California. The 36,688-square-foot project would consist of 45 individual units with a total of 47 beds. It would be located on a 1.91-acre site in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway. Vehicular access will be via a single driveway on Iron Point Road, near the eastern edge of the site.

The study evaluates weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic operations in the vicinity of the project site under the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions,
- Construction Year No Project Conditions,
- Construction Year Plus Project Conditions,
- Cumulative No Project Conditions, and
- Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.

Impacts of the project were evaluated at three key existing intersections in the immediate vicinity of the project site. In addition, a detailed analysis of the project’s proposed access system was conducted.

Existing Conditions

- AM Peak Hour: All of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service; all are at LOS B.
- PM Peak Hour: All of the study intersections again operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B).

Construction Year No Project Conditions

- The traffic associated with 31 previously-approved (or reasonably foreseeable) developments was added to the study area roadway system to evaluate traffic operations under Construction Year No Project conditions.
- AM Peak Hour: All of the intersections will continue to operate at LOS B and will conform to the City’s level of service standard. Addition of the related projects traffic will result in no change in level of service at the study intersections.
- PM Peak Hour: The intersection of Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive is projected to operate at LOS C, while the other two study locations will be at LOS B. All three intersections will operate acceptably under the City of Folsom level of service policy.

Construction Year Plus Project Conditions

- The proposed memory care facility is expected to generate a total of 9 AM peak-hour trips (6 inbound, 3 outbound). The PM peak hour trip generation is estimated to be 14 trips (7 inbound, 7 outbound). About 130 daily trips are projected, evenly split between inbound and outbound.
City of Folsom
Community Development Department
Country House at Broadstone
Memory Care Facility

- AM Peak Hour: No change in level of service is projected, and all of the study intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B). The STOP-sign-controlled project access intersection will also operate at LOS B, and will fail to meet the minimum requirements of the “Peak Hour” signal warrant.

- PM Peak Hour: The study intersections will continue to operate acceptably at LOS B or C, with the project traffic causing little or no increase in vehicular delay. The project driveway intersection will be at LOS C. Traffic volumes at the driveway intersection will again be insufficient to meet the “Peak Hour” signal warrant requirements.

- The project-related impacts at all of the study intersections are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are needed to resolve off-site traffic impacts.

**Cumulative No Project Conditions**

- The cumulative conditions analysis reflects the level of development anticipated in the City of Folsom and throughout the Sacramento region through the year 2035. The traffic volume projections employed in this analysis are based on information presented in the environmental documentation for the Folsom Plan Area.

- The following major transportation system improvements are reflected in the future year traffic forecasts used in this analysis:
  - Construction of a new interchange at U.S. Highway 50/Oak Avenue Parkway,
  - Construction of the U.S. Highway 50/Empire Ranch Road interchange,
  - Addition of a third through lane in both directions on Iron Point Road (where necessary), and
  - Addition of a third through lane in each direction on East Bidwell Street (where necessary).

- In addition, the traffic projections reflect completion of all roadway system improvements within the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, as well as the regional transportation system improvements identified in the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

- AM Peak Hour: All three study intersections are expected to operate at LOS C, which conforms to the City’s General Plan standard.

- PM Peak Hour: Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway is projected to operate at LOS D, which falls short of the City’s standard. As in the AM peak hour, Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive will be at LOS C, which is acceptable under City of Folsom policies.

**Cumulative + Project Conditions**

- AM Peak Hour: All of the study intersections will operate acceptably under the City of Folsom level of service standard, as they will continue to be at LOS C. Further, the project-related impact on vehicular delay will be minimal. The project access intersection will operate at LOS B and will have insufficient traffic to meet the minimum requirements of the “Peak Hour” signal warrant.
PM Peak Hour: No change in level of service is projected at any of the study intersections. Although Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway is projected to be at LOS D, the project-related incremental increase in vehicular delay will be less than the City’s significance threshold of 5.0 seconds/vehicle. The Iron Point Road/Project Access intersection will be at LOS C; it will not meet the requirements of the “Peak Hour” signal warrant.

The project-related impact is less than significant, and no mitigation measures are recommended.

**Project Access Analysis**

- A single STOP-sign controlled vehicular access point will serve project-generated traffic. It will be located on Iron Point Road near the eastern property line, and will be restricted to inbound and outbound right turns.

- The project access intersection will operate at acceptable levels of service under both construction year and cumulative conditions.

- Because the driveway intersection has insufficient traffic to meet the minimum requirements of the “Peak Hour” warrant, it should be controlled by a STOP sign on the driveway approach.

- The driveway location conforms to City of Folsom practice regarding intersection spacing.

- Drivers exiting the project site will have adequate sight distance along Iron Point Road, so the outbound right turn can be made safely.

- The proposed “right turns only” restriction at the driveway is appropriate; no further turn restrictions are necessary.

- Adequate throat depth is proposed at the driveway.

- Although a right-turn lane or taper for entering traffic is not considered necessary under the City’s guidelines, a right-turn lane is proposed in connection with the project. This is desirable, as it will increase safety for entering drivers.

- Construction of a sidewalk is proposed along the project’s Iron Point Road frontage. This amenity will safely serve the needs of pedestrians in that area. No additional pedestrian facilities are considered necessary.

- On-street (“Class II”) bike lanes exist on both sides of Iron Point Road, including along the project frontage. These lanes should adequately meet the needs of bicyclists in the vicinity of the project, and no additional bicycle facilities are recommended.

- Figure ES-1 illustrates the access system recommendations.
- STOP-sign control on project driveway
- Right turns in and out only
- Adequate sight distance
- Adequate throat depth
- Provide right-turn lane, as proposed
INTRODUCTION

This study addresses the traffic impacts associated with the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility in Folsom, California. The 36,688-square-foot project would consist of 45 individual units with a total of 47 beds. It would be located on a 1.91-acre site in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway. Vehicular access will be via a single driveway on Iron Point Road, near the eastern edge of the site.

As directed by City of Folsom staff, this study analyzed detailed traffic operations under the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions,
- Construction Year No Project Conditions,
- Construction Year Plus Project Conditions,
- Cumulative No Project Conditions, and
- Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.

Impacts of the project were evaluated at three key existing intersections in the immediate vicinity of the project site. In addition, a detailed analysis of the project’s proposed access system was conducted.

This report presents the analysis procedures as well as the findings and recommendations resulting from the evaluation.

Project Description

According to information supplied by the project applicant, the proposed project would be an extended care medical facility for patients suffering from Alzheimer’s disease and dementia. It would consist of 45 individual units with a total of 47 beds (i.e., two rooms will have two beds). The project also includes a commercial kitchen, a dining area, offices for staff, and various activity rooms. A total of 24 parking spaces will be provided, including 10 spaces for visitors.

As illustrated on Figure 1, the proposed project is to be located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway.

Vehicular access to and from the proposed project would be provided at a single right-turn-only driveway on Iron Point Road near the east edge of the site. In consultation with the City of Folsom Fire Department, the applicant has agreed to make various on-site improvements to meet fire protection needs. These improvements negate the need for a second emergency access location.

Figure 2 presents the proposed project site plan.
Study Area

Based on discussions with City of Folsom staff, the off-site impacts of the proposed project were evaluated at the following intersections:

- Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive,
- Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway, and
- Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive.

Analysis Methodology

In accordance with the analysis procedures generally accepted in the City of Folsom, the following techniques were employed in conducting this study.

Intersection Operations

Intersection operations are typically described in terms of level of service (LOS), which is reported on a scale from LOS A (representing free-flow conditions) to LOS F (which represents substantial congestion and delay). The level of service designations are based on a quantitative calculation of average vehicular delay at the intersection. The specific approach to estimating delay is based on procedures documented in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2000).

Signalized Intersections

The signalized study intersections were analyzed using the "operational analysis" methodology presented in Chapter 16 of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (*HCM 2000*). This methodology determines signalized intersection level of service by comparing the "average control delay per vehicle" to the thresholds shown in Table 1. Control delay represents the delay directly associated with the traffic signal. For this analysis, the level of service calculations were performed using the *Synchro 8* software package, which implements the intersection analysis procedures documented in the *HCM 2000*. The *HCM 2000* methodology was used rather than the more-recent *Highway Capacity Manual 2010* (Transportation Research Board, Fifth Edition, 2010) because each of the study intersections has a substantial volume of U-turns, and the *HCM 2010* methodology does not adequately account for U-turns at signal-controlled intersections.
Table 1
Level of Service Definitions
Signalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Control Delay (Seconds/Vehicle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Very low delay. Most vehicles do not stop</td>
<td>≤ 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Slight delay. Generally good signal progression.</td>
<td>10.1 - 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Increased number of stopped vehicles. Fair signal progression.</td>
<td>20.1 - 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Noticeable congestion. Large proportion of vehicles stopped.</td>
<td>35.1 - 55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Operating conditions at or near capacity. Frequent cycle failure.</td>
<td>55.1 - 80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Oversaturation. Forced or breakdown flow. Extensive queuing.</td>
<td>&gt; 80.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Unsignalized Intersections

The analysis of the unsignalized project access intersection was conducted using the method documented in Chapter 19 of the HCM 2010. This method calculates average control delay for each minor movement but, in the case of “two-way-STOP-control” intersections (such as the study location), not for the intersection as a whole. For unsignalized intersections, control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. Level of service results reported for this intersection are based upon the average control delay per vehicle for the worst-case minor movement, based on the criteria set forth in Table 2. The unsignalized study intersection was also analyzed using the Synchro 8 software package, which performs level of service calculations in accordance with the HCM 2010 procedures.

The unsignalized intersection analysis also considered whether the study location would meet the minimum requirements for installation of a traffic signal. The need for installation of a traffic signal at a given location is judged relative to a defined set of traffic signal “warrants.” The warrants applied in the State of California were established by Caltrans, based on essentially similar requirements documented in the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The current signal warrants are documented in “Part 4 – Highway Traffic Signals” of the *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, dated November 7, 2014. Nine such warrants have been defined, although not all warrants are relevant to each case. This analysis was conducted using Warrant 3, the “Peak Hour” signal warrant.
Table 2
Level of Service Definitions
Unsignalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Control Delay (Seconds/Vehicle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Little or no conflicting traffic for minor movements.</td>
<td>≤ 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Drivers on minor movements begin to notice absence of available gaps.</td>
<td>10.1 – 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Drivers on minor movements begin to experience delays waiting for adequate gaps.</td>
<td>15.1 – 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Queuing occurs on minor movements due to a reduction in available gaps.</td>
<td>25.1 – 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Extensive minor movement queuing due to insufficient gaps.</td>
<td>35.1 – 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Insufficient gaps of adequate size to allow minor movement traffic demand to be accommodated.</td>
<td>&gt; 50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sight Distance

To ensure that drivers will be able to exit the site safely at the project access location, a stopping sight distance analysis was conducted using parameters documented in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 6th Edition, 2011) and the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (California Department of Transportation, March 7, 2014).

Queueing/Storage Length

To minimize the potential for queuing problems at the project driveway, the minimum recommended throat depth (MRTD) at the project access point was calculated using the probability-based methodology accepted by the City of Folsom. The intent of this analysis is to ensure that outbound vehicles have enough stacking distance, so that internal circulation aisles are not blocked. This minimizes the possibility that inbound vehicles will queue back onto the street. The queue length estimates considered here were developed within the intersection level of service calculation process, as described above.

Evaluation Criteria

Policy 17.17 of the City of Folsom General Plan identifies the minimum acceptable level of service for traffic operations at signalized intersections in the City. Specifically, this policy states:

The City should strive to achieve at least a traffic Level of Service "C" throughout the City. During the course of Plan buildout it may occur that temporarily higher Levels.
of Service result where roadway improvements have not been adequately phased as development proceeds. However, this situation will be minimized based on annual traffic studies and monitoring programs.

The City has defined appropriate standards of significance to reflect this policy, including criteria that address situations where the intersection level of service is worse than LOS C under “no project” conditions. Those standards of significance are as follows:

- If the “no project” level of service is LOS C or better and the project-generated traffic causes the intersection level of service to degrade to worse than LOS C (i.e., LOS D, E, or F), then the proposed project must implement mitigation measures to return the intersection to LOS C or better.

- If the “no project” level of service is worse than LOS C (i.e., LOS D, E, or F) and the project-generated traffic causes the overall average delay value at the intersection to increase by five seconds or more, then the proposed project must implement mitigation measures to improve the intersection to the “no project” condition or better. It is not necessary to improve the intersection to LOS C.

- If the “no project” level of service is worse than LOS C (i.e., LOS D, E, or F) and the project-generated traffic causes the overall average delay value at the intersection to increase by less than five seconds, then the traffic impact is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

At the STOP-sign controlled study intersections, a significant impact is defined to occur if the project-generated traffic is sufficient to cause the intersection to operate at worse than LOS C (as described above), while also meeting the minimum traffic volume requirements associated with the “Peak Hour” signal warrant, as defined in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section describes the roadway network serving the proposed project, as well as existing traffic operations at the key intersections in the vicinity of the project site.

Key Roadways

The existing transportation system in the vicinity of the project site is illustrated on Figure 3. Shown there are the traffic lanes on the adjacent roadways, as well as existing facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists. Brief descriptions of the key roadways serving the project site are provided below.

*Iron Point Road* is an east-west arterial roadway that generally runs parallel to and just north of U.S. Highway 50. It extends from Folsom Boulevard on the west to the City limit east of Empire Ranch Road. In the immediate vicinity of the project site, it is a six-lane, median-divided road with bike lanes and a 45 MPH speed limit.

*Oak Avenue Parkway* is a north-south, four-to-six lane arterial street that has Iron Point Road as its southern terminus. Near Iron Point Road, Oak Avenue Parkway has a 45 MPH speed limit and two lanes in each direction (plus bike lanes) separated by a landscaped median. Long-term plans call for extending Oak Avenue Parkway to the south, where it will have an interchange with U.S. Highway 50.

*McAdoo Drive* is a north-south roadway that runs from Iron Point Road on the south to Riley Street on the north. It is a two-lane road with bike lanes and a 35 MPH speed limit that primarily provides access to residential areas. McAdoo Drive meets Iron Point Road at a signal-controlled intersection.

*Rowberry Drive* is a two-lane residential collector street, which connects Iron Point Road with Walden Drive. Sidewalks are provided along the residential frontages, but no on-street bike lanes are present. Instead, an off-street (Class I) bike path exists along the northwest side of Rowberry Drive, beginning at its intersection with Walden Drive, then curving behind the houses on that side of the street. No speed limit is posted.

Existing Traffic Volumes

MRO Engineers, Inc., conducted AM and PM peak-period turning movement counts at Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive on Thursday, November 12, 2015, while Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway was counted on Tuesday, June 9, 2015 and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive was counted on Wednesday, May 13, 2015. Data collection was specifically scheduled on typical school days, to ensure a conservative analysis of traffic operations. The peak-hour traffic volumes and existing intersection lane configurations are shown on Figure 4.
Existing Intersection Level of Service

Table 3 summarizes the AM and PM peak hour levels of service at the existing study intersections. Appendix A contains the technical calculation sheets.

**AM Peak Hour**

All of the study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service. Specifically, all three locations operate at LOS B.

**PM Peak Hour**

In the PM peak hour, all of the study intersections again operate at acceptable levels of service and, again, they all are at LOS B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay²</td>
<td>LOS¹</td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>LOS¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Oak Avenue Pkwy.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2 Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).
3 Level of service.
CONSTRUCTION YEAR NO PROJECT CONDITIONS

This section documents traffic operations in the anticipated construction year for the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone project, excluding the traffic generated by the project itself. This scenario includes the traffic associated with other previously-approved (or reasonably foreseeable) developments throughout the City of Folsom, as identified by City staff.

Related Projects

To develop a meaningful estimate of “construction year” traffic conditions, MRO Engineers, Inc., estimated the volume of peak-hour traffic to be generated by a number of related projects in the vicinity of the proposed project, as directed by City of Folsom staff. The specific land use assumptions for each of the related projects were confirmed with City of Folsom staff prior to initiating the detailed analyses. Table 4 lists the 31 projects included in this analysis scenario.

As summarized in Appendix B, the related projects listed below will generate a total of about 5,180 AM peak hour trips and 7,140 PM peak hour trips. Where possible, the related project trips were distributed and assigned to the City of Folsom road network in accordance with information presented in previous traffic analyses conducted within the city. Of course, not all of the related project-generated trips will pass through the study area for this analysis. Furthermore, based on discussions with City staff, it was determined that little, if any, development would be complete in the Folsom Plan Area (i.e., the annexation area south of Highway 50) within the construction year time frame. Consequently, while the Russell Ranch traffic was conservatively included in this analysis, none of the traffic associated with the Mangini Ranch project or the Hillsborough Subdivision was added to the study intersections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Pointe Highway Commercial</td>
<td>Highway Commercial Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>East side of East Bidwell St., south of Iron Point Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone Park Professional Center</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>15,000 SF</td>
<td>South side of Iron Point Road east of McAdoo Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladio at Broadstone</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>220,000 SF</td>
<td>Bounded by Iron Point Road, East Bidwell Street, and Broadstone Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island at Parkshore</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>315 DU</td>
<td>Southwest of Parkshore Dr. in Silverbrook Island area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone Crossing Parcel 1</td>
<td>One Hotel</td>
<td>114 Rooms</td>
<td>Southwest quadrant of Iron Point Road/Cavitt Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Restaurants</td>
<td>22,230 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Collina dal Lago</td>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>30 DU</td>
<td>East Natoma Street west of Blue Ravine Road/Green Valley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Ranch</td>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>200 DU</td>
<td>East Natoma Street east of Blue Ravine Road/Green Valley Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montara Grove</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>32,000 SF</td>
<td>South side of East Natoma Street at Prison Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masjid Bilal Mosque</td>
<td>Church and School</td>
<td>31,668 SF</td>
<td>Southeast corner of Sibley Street/Levy Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Services Unit Office &amp; Treatment Facility</td>
<td>Medical Facility</td>
<td>17,395 SF</td>
<td>California State Prison - Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Women’s Facility</td>
<td>Correctional Facility</td>
<td>403 Female Offenders</td>
<td>Folsom State Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Place</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>10 DUa</td>
<td>Southeast quadrant of Sibley Street/Glenn Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Rain Mixed-Use Building</td>
<td>Retail, Office &amp; Condominiums</td>
<td>8,313 SF</td>
<td>607 Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treehouse West Commercial Center</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3,595 SF</td>
<td>Southwest Quadrant of Iron Point Road and Barnhill Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 Bidwell Street Commercial Center</td>
<td>Office &amp; Retail</td>
<td>7,791 SF</td>
<td>701 Bidwell Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Villages H1 &amp; H2</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>16 DU</td>
<td>North side of Silberhorn Drive, west of Golf Links Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Commons at Prairie City</td>
<td>Senior Residential Facility</td>
<td>131 Units</td>
<td>Southeast quadrant of Prairie City Road/Willard Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone Dental Center</td>
<td>Medical Office</td>
<td>14,000 SF</td>
<td>2301 East Bidwell Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Fitness</td>
<td>Fitness Facility</td>
<td>116,636 SF</td>
<td>110 Serpa Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canyon</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>11 DU</td>
<td>Northwest corner -- Orangevale Avenue and American River Canyon Drive South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leidesdorff Village</td>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>56 DU</td>
<td>1108 Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Self Storage</td>
<td>Self-Storage Facility</td>
<td>124,310 SF</td>
<td>7700 Folsom-Auburn Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Subdivision</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>116 DU</td>
<td>North Side of East Natoma Street across from Bowen Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Ranch Subdivision</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>875 DU</td>
<td>Folsom Plan Area (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangini Ranch Subdivision</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>826 DU</td>
<td>Folsom Plan Area (West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Subdivision</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>2,103 DU</td>
<td>Folsom Plan Area (Central)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veranda Subdivision</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>63 DU</td>
<td>Southwest quadrant of East Natoma Street/Golf Links Drive/ Bonhill Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone Apartments</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>300 DU</td>
<td>Southwest corner - Broadstone Parkway and Cavitt Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Related Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Retirement Community</td>
<td>Assisted Living</td>
<td>126 DU</td>
<td>Iron Point Road, south side near Rowberry Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pique at Iron Point Apartments</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>327 DU</td>
<td>Iron Point Road between Serpa Way and Carpenter Hill Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cresleigh Ravine/Campus at Iron Point</td>
<td>Single-Family and Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>53 SF 230 MF</td>
<td>Willard Drive at Iron Point Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Reference: City of Folsom, Community Development Department
2. Three unbuilt pads (two restaurants and one retail building).
3. Square feet.
4. Approximate unoccupied square footage.
5. Dwelling units.
6. Approximate number of unbuilt dwelling units.

Planned Roadway System Improvements

Consultation with the City of Folsom Traffic Engineer revealed that the City has no planned or programmed road improvements at any of the study intersections. Therefore, the study intersection lane configurations for the “construction year” traffic analyses are identical to existing conditions.

Construction Year No Project Traffic Volumes

The peak-hour traffic generated by the related projects listed above was added to the road system in the vicinity of the project site to develop a “Construction Year No Project” traffic scenario. Figure 5 illustrates the result of adding the traffic associated with the related projects to the existing traffic volumes for both the AM and PM peak hours.

Intersection Level of Service

Table 5 summarizes the results of the level of service calculations for the study intersections under Construction Year No Project conditions. Appendix C contains the technical calculations.

AM Peak Hour

All of the intersections will conform to the City’s level of service standard. Addition of the related projects traffic will result in no change in level of service at any of the study intersections; all will continue to operate at LOS B.

PM Peak Hour

Iron Point Road’s intersections at McAdoo Drive and Oak Avenue Parkway will continue to operate at LOS B, while Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive will be at LOS C. All three locations will operate acceptably under City of Folsom policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay$^2$</td>
<td>LOS$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Oak Avenue Pkwy.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:


2 Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).

3 Level of service.
CONSTRUCTION YEAR PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

This section documents the impacts of the proposed project on traffic conditions in the assumed construction year. To evaluate off-site impacts, the volume of traffic generated by the proposed project was estimated and that traffic was assigned to the adjacent street system. The levels of service at the study intersections were then analyzed for the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Project Description

As noted above, the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility would be located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway. It will consist of 45 residential units (47 beds total) serving patients suffering from Alzheimer’s disease and dementia. The project also includes a commercial kitchen, a dining area, offices for staff, and various activity rooms. A total of 24 parking spaces will be provided, including 10 spaces for visitors.

Vehicular access to and from the proposed project would be provided by way of a single STOP-sign-controlled driveway on Iron Point Road near the east property line. Primarily because of its proximity to Oak Avenue Parkway, the driveway would be restricted to right-turns only, both inbound and outbound. This means that drivers approaching the site from the east on Iron Point Road will be required to make a U-turn at Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway. Similarly, exiting drivers desiring to travel to the west will need to make a U-turn after departing the site.

Trip Generation

The AM and PM peak-hour trip generation estimates for the proposed project were developed using information presented in the Trip Generation Manual (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Ninth Edition, 2012). The ITE document does not have a specific land use category for memory care, so two options were investigated—treating it as a nursing home or as an assisted living facility. Because the assisted living category has slightly higher peak-hour trip generation rates, that option was selected. This choice results in a conservative analysis of traffic impacts because, at a memory care facility, only employees and visitors generate trips. Unlike an assisted living facility, residents do not drive, so no trips are associated with them.

Table 6 summarizes the resulting trip generation estimates for the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone project. The proposed project is expected to generate a total of 9 AM peak-hour trips, with 6 inbound and 3 outbound. The PM peak hour trip generation is estimated to be 14 trips, with 7 inbound and 7 outbound. About 130 daily trips are projected, evenly split between inbound and outbound.
Table 6
Trip Generation Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Care</td>
<td>Trip Rate</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45 DU³ / 47 Beds)</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. ITE Land Use Code 254 – Assisted Living.
3. Dwelling units.
4. Trips per occupied bed.

**Trip Distribution**

The geographic distribution of the project-generated traffic was based on existing traffic patterns in the vicinity of the proposed project, as well as information presented in previous traffic studies for nearby projects. About 45 percent of the project-generated traffic is expected to be oriented to/from the west on Iron Point Road. An additional 35 percent is expected to travel to and from the east, while 20 percent will be oriented to/from the north on Oak Avenue Parkway. The trip distribution is illustrated on Figure 6.

**Project Traffic Assignment**

The peak-hour traffic volumes generated by the proposed project were added to the “Construction Year No Project” traffic, with the result being the “Construction Year Plus Project” scenario. Those estimated traffic volumes are shown on Figure 7, which also illustrates the assumed intersection lane configurations. No changes in intersection lane configurations are assumed, as the City of Folsom has no planned or programmed roadway system improvements at the study intersections.

**Intersection Level of Service**

Table 7 presents the AM and PM peak hour levels of service at each study intersection under Construction Year Plus Project conditions. Appendix D contains the technical calculation worksheets.

**AM Peak Hour**

Addition of the project-generated traffic will cause little change in the delay values at the study intersections, and no change in level of service is projected. The delay values will be unchanged at Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive. At Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway, the delay will increase by 0.3 seconds/vehicle. The project access intersection will be at LOS B, and will not meet the “Peak Hour” signal warrant. Thus, all of the study intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service and the project-related impact will be less than significant.
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### Table 7
**Level of Service Summary\(^1\)**
**Construction Year Plus Project Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Year</td>
<td>Construction Year</td>
<td>Construction Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>+ Project</td>
<td>No Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay(^2)</td>
<td>LOS(^3)</td>
<td>Signal Warrant?(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>18.4 B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Oak Avenue Pkwy.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>17.0 B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>14.9 B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Project Access</td>
<td>Side-St. STOP(^5)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
\(^2\) Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).
\(^3\) Level of service.
\(^5\) Delay value represents the worst-case movement/approach.
PM Peak Hour

The PM peak hour results are very similar to the AM peak hour findings. Again, the delay values will be unchanged at Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive, while at Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway, the delay will increase by 0.5 seconds/vehicle. The Iron Point Road/Project Access intersection will be at LOS C; it will have insufficient traffic to meet the minimum requirements of the “Peak Hour” signal warrant. Thus, all four intersections will conform to the City’s level of service standards.

In summary, the project-related impact is projected to be less than significant in the PM peak hour.

Mitigation Measures

The project-related impact at all of the study intersections is less than significant, as described above. Therefore, no off-site mitigation measures are recommended in conjunction with the proposed CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility.
CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

This section describes the results of the analysis of study area traffic operations under cumulative conditions in the weekday AM and PM peak hours. This analysis reflects the level of development anticipated throughout the City of Folsom (including the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) annexation area) and the entire Sacramento region, through the year 2035. The traffic volume projections were based on a modified version of the SACMET travel demand forecasting model developed and maintained by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).

Analyses are presented for two scenarios: Cumulative No Project conditions and Cumulative Plus Project conditions, reflecting the addition of the traffic generated by the proposed project to the “no project” volumes. To ensure consistency with other ongoing or recently-conducted traffic analyses in Folsom, the future year traffic forecasts employed in this analysis are based on information developed in connection with the traffic analysis for the FPASP annexation process. The FPASP traffic analysis is presented in the environmental documentation for the annexation project. (Reference: AECOM and RMC Water and Environmental, Public Draft EIR/EIS – Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan Project, June 2010.)

**Planned Roadway Improvements**

Between now and the year 2035, a variety of major transportation system improvements will be implemented in the Folsom area. These improvements, which are reflected in the future year traffic forecasts used in this analysis, include the following:

- Construction of a new interchange at U.S. Highway 50/Oak Avenue Parkway,
- Construction of the U.S. Highway 50/Empire Ranch Road interchange,
- Addition of the third through lane in both directions on Iron Point Road (where necessary), and
- Addition of a third through lane in each direction on East Bidwell Street (where necessary).

In addition, the traffic projections reflect completion of all roadway system improvements within the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, as well as the regional transportation system improvements identified in the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

The planned construction of the new freeway interchange at Oak Avenue Parkway will alter traffic flow patterns in the study area. This shift in traffic is reflected in the traffic volume forecasts employed in this analysis.
Land Use Forecasts

The travel demand forecasts developed for the FPASP annexation project, which serve as the basis for the future traffic volumes used in this analysis, assumed the following land uses in the FPASP area:

- 1,477 acres of residential uses (10,210 residential dwelling units),
- 363 acres of office/business/professional and retail/commercial uses,
- 301 acres of schools and City parks, and
- 1,053 acres of open space.

In addition, the future year land use estimates for the Sacramento region included in the SACMET travel demand forecasting model were assumed.

Cumulative No Project Conditions

Figure 8 illustrates the Cumulative No Project peak hour traffic volumes employed in this study. Also shown are the intersection lane configurations assumed for cumulative conditions. Based on information presented in the FPASP traffic analysis, the following intersection improvements were assumed:

- Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway
  - A third eastbound and westbound through lane,
  - Dual westbound left-turn lanes,
  - A dedicated eastbound right-turn lane,
  - Two southbound through lanes, and
  - A northbound approach with dual left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a dedicated right-turn lane.

- Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive
  - A third eastbound and westbound through lane.

In addition, as noted above, construction of a new U.S. Highway 50 interchange at Oak Avenue Parkway is expected to occur in this time frame. In conjunction with that major improvement, Oak Avenue Parkway will be extended to the south from Iron Point Road with two through lanes in each direction.
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Intersection Level of Service

Table 8 summarizes the AM and PM peak hour intersection level of service results for Cumulative No Project conditions. The technical calculation worksheets are presented in Appendix E.

Weekday AM Peak Hour

All three study intersections are expected to operate at LOS C, which conforms to the City’s General Plan standard.

Weekday PM Peak Hour

In the PM peak hour, Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway is projected to operate at LOS D, which falls short of the City’s standard. As in the AM peak hour, Iron Point Road/McAdoo Drive and Iron Point Road/Rowberry Drive will be at LOS C, which is acceptable under City of Folsom policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay^1</td>
<td>LOS^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Oak Avenue Pkwy.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).
3. Level of service.
4. Shaded cell denotes unacceptable level of service.
Cumulative (2035) Plus Project Conditions

The following sections address the effects of adding the project-generated traffic to the Cumulative No Project volumes derived above.

Project Trip Generation

As described in the “construction year” conditions section, the proposed project is expected to generate 9 AM peak hour trips (6 inbound and 3 outbound) and 14 PM peak hour trips (7 inbound and 7 outbound).

Project Trip Distribution

With construction of the U.S. Highway 50/Oak Avenue Parkway freeway interchange in close proximity to the project site and extension of Oak Avenue Parkway to the south into the FPASP area, project-related traffic patterns are expected to change somewhat. Figure 9 illustrates the project trip distribution for cumulative conditions. Fifteen percent of the project-generated traffic is projected to be oriented to and from the south on the new extension of Oak Avenue Parkway, while an additional fifteen percent will travel to and from the north on that road. Forty percent of the project traffic will be oriented to/from the west on Iron Point Road, with thirty percent to and from the east.

Intersection Traffic Volumes

Using the project trip generation and trip distribution information described above, the project-related trips were assigned to the future road network and added to the Cumulative No Project volumes. The Cumulative Plus Project traffic volumes for the weekday AM and PM peak hours are illustrated on Figure 10.

Intersection Level of Service

Table 9 presents the results of the intersection level of service analysis for the Cumulative Plus Project scenario. Appendix F contains the level of service calculation worksheets.

Weekday AM Peak Hour

As under Cumulative No Project conditions, all of the study intersections will operate acceptably under the City of Folsom level of service standard, as they will continue to be at LOS C. Further, the project-related impact on vehicular delay will be minimal. The project access intersection will operate at LOS B and will have insufficient traffic to meet the minimum requirements of the “Peak Hour” signal warrant.

In summary, the project’s cumulative impact is considered less than significant in the AM peak hour.
### Table 9
Level of Service Summary¹
Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative No Project</td>
<td>Cumulative + Project</td>
<td>Cumulative No Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay²</td>
<td>LOS³</td>
<td>Signal Warrant⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./McAdoo Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Oak Avenue Pkwy.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Rowberry Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Point Rd./Project Driveway</td>
<td>Side-St. STOP⁵</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Average control delay (seconds per vehicle).
3. Level of service.
5. Delay value represents the worst-case movement/approach.
6. Shaded cell denotes unacceptable level of service.
Weekday PM Peak Hour

Addition of the project-generated traffic would result in no change in level of service at any of the study intersections. The Iron Point Road intersections at McAdoo Drive and Rowberry Drive will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS C). Although Iron Point Road/Oak Avenue Parkway is projected to be at an unacceptable LOS D, the project-related incremental increase in vehicular delay (0.1 seconds/vehicle) will be less than the City’s significance threshold of 5.0 seconds/vehicle. Consequently, the project’s impact is considered less than significant at that location. The project access intersection will be at LOS C, and it will not meet the requirements of the “Peak Hour” signal warrant.

As in the AM peak hour, the project’s impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

As described above, in both peak-hour periods, The CountryHouse at Broadstone Memory Care Facility is expected to result in less-than-significant impacts to traffic operations at the study intersections under cumulative conditions. Although one study intersection is projected to fall short of the City’s level of service standard in the PM peak hour, the incremental increase in delay at that location is less than the City’s adopted significance threshold of 5.0 seconds/vehicle. The other study intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service, even with the addition of project-generated traffic. Therefore, no off-site mitigation measures are recommended.
PROJECT ACCESS ANALYSIS

This section describes the analysis of the proposed project's vehicular access system. As described below, a single driveway would be provided to serve the needs of project traffic.

Project Access Plan

As proposed, the project driveway would be located near the site's eastern property line. It would be restricted to right-turns-only, both inbound and outbound, and would be STOP-sign-controlled.

Access Analysis

Analyses were performed to address the operation and configuration of the project access driveway. Those analyses addressed:

- Intersection level of service,
- Driveway traffic control (i.e., STOP sign or traffic signal),
- Intersection spacing,
- Sight distance,
- Turn restrictions,
- Queuing/Minimum Recommended Throat Depth,
- Right-turn deceleration lanes,
- Pedestrian safety, and
- Bicycle safety.

Intersection Level of Service

Intersection level of service calculations were performed for the project access intersection for both Construction Year Plus Project and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. As described earlier, the intersection would operate at acceptable levels of service under all scenarios analyzed. Under the Construction Year Plus Project scenario, it would be at LOS B in the AM peak hour and LOS C in the PM peak hour. Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, similar levels of service would prevail.

Driveway Traffic Control

This section considers how traffic should be controlled at the project access location, including whether traffic-signal control or STOP-sign control would be preferable. The level of service tables presented earlier (i.e., Tables 7 and 9) summarized the results of signal warrant analyses for the project access intersection. As shown there, the intersection would have insufficient traffic to warrant installation of a signal under either Construction Year Plus Project or Cumulative Plus Project conditions.

Thus, STOP-sign control on the driveway approach to Iron Point Road will be appropriate for the project access intersection.


**Intersection Spacing**

The centerline of the project driveway would be approximately 600 feet east of the centerline of Oak Avenue Parkway. This spacing conforms to City of Folsom practice and is, therefore, considered acceptable.

**Sight Distance**

Iron Point Road has a posted speed limit of 45 MPH adjacent to the proposed project. Furthermore, the most recent radar speed survey conducted on that street (September 2010) indicated that the 85th-percentile speed was 49 MPH (i.e., 85 percent of drivers were traveling at or below 49 MPH) and the average speed was 44 MPH.

Based on criteria established in *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 2011), a 45 MPH travel speed calls for 360 feet of clear stopping sight distance. In recognition of the 85th-percentile speed cited above, this analysis has assumed a design speed of 50 MPH, which requires 425 feet of clear sight distance for vehicles turning right from the project access road to Iron Point Road.

Field investigations at the driveway location indicated that drivers making an outbound right turn and looking to the west will be able to see past Oak Avenue Parkway. Thus, they will have well over 600 feet of clear sight distance, which is equivalent to the minimum sight distance for speeds in excess of 60 MPH. Thus, this maneuver can be made safely.

**Turn Restrictions**

Due primarily to the proximity of the project driveway to Oak Avenue Parkway, the driveway is proposed to be restricted to right-turns-only, both inbound and outbound. This restriction is appropriate and no further limitations are necessary.

**Minimum Recommended Throat Depth**

The minimum recommended throat depth (MRTD) for outbound traffic under “Cumulative Plus Project” conditions was estimated at the proposed project driveway. Adequate throat depth is necessary on the internal roadways to provide enough stacking distance for exiting vehicles so that the first on-site driveway or cross street is not blocked. This minimizes the possibility of entering vehicles queuing back onto the public streets.

An analysis was conducted to determine the expected “95th-percentile” queue length (i.e., there is a 95 percent probability that the actual queue at the driveway will be equal to or shorter than the projected queue). Specifically, the MRTD was derived from the *Highway Capacity Manual 2010* intersection capacity calculations. That analysis found that, given the relatively low project trip generation, the queue would rarely exceed one vehicle. Therefore, adequate throat depth is projected at the project driveway.
Right-Turn Deceleration Lanes

The following guidelines are typically used in the City of Folsom for consideration of the need for right-turn deceleration lanes or tapers at private driveways located on roads with travel speeds of 45 miles per hour or greater, such as Iron Point Road:

- If the peak-hour right-turn volume into a private driveway is projected to be less than 10 vehicles per hour, no improvements are necessary.
- If the right-turn volume into a private driveway is projected to be 10 - 50 vehicles per hour, a right-turn deceleration taper should be constructed.
- If the right-turn volume into a private driveway is projected to be more than 50 vehicles per hour, a right-turn deceleration lane should be constructed.

Although the City has not formally adopted these guidelines, they are consistent with standards used by other jurisdictions in the area. Applying these guidelines to the proposed project access location on Iron Point Road indicates that no right-turn taper or deceleration lane is needed. However, the project site plan indicates that a right-turn lane is proposed in conjunction with the project. Having a right-turn lane will increase safety for motorists entering the site, particularly as traffic volumes increase in the future.

Pedestrian Safety

Potential pedestrian safety issues that might arise in connection with the proposed project were also considered. Although no sidewalk currently exists along the project’s Iron Point Road frontage, the project proposes to construct one. This added amenity will safely serve the needs of pedestrians in that area. No additional pedestrian facilities are considered necessary.

Bicycle Safety

On-street (“Class II”) bike lanes exist on both sides of Iron Point Road, including along the project frontage. These lanes should adequately meet the needs of bicyclists in the vicinity of the project, and no additional bicycle facilities are recommended.

Access System Recommendations

Key findings and recommendations resulting from the access analysis described above include the following:

- The project driveway will operate at an acceptable level of service under all conditions analyzed.
- STOP-sign control should be employed at the project driveway.
- The project driveway is appropriately spaced from other intersections along Iron Point Road.
- The driveway will have adequate sight distance for exiting drivers.
- No additional turn restrictions are necessary at the driveway; the proposed right-turn-only limitation is appropriate.
• The site plan provides adequate throat depth at the driveway.
• Although a right-turn lane or taper for entering traffic is not considered necessary under the City’s guidelines, a right-turn lane is proposed in connection with the project. This will increase safety for entering drivers.

These findings and recommendations are illustrated on Figure 11.

**Transportation System Recommendations**

Figure 12 illustrates the proposed transportation system in the immediate vicinity of the project site, including the proposed sidewalk construction along the project’s Iron Point Road frontage, as well as the future lane configurations at the Iron Point Road/Pak Avenue Parkway intersection.
- STOP-sign control on project driveway
- Right turns in and out only
- Adequate sight distance
- Adequate throat depth
- Provide right-turn lane, as proposed
PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

FIGURE 12

Legend:
- Sidewalk / Crosswalk
- Bike Lane
- Median
- Proposed Sidewalk / Crosswalk
- Traffic Signal
Appendix F

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

COUNTRYHOUSE AT BROADSTONE MEMORY CARE FACILITY

Purpose of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program: The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, requires that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be established upon completing findings. CEQA stipulates that “the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation.”

This MMRP has been prepared in compliance with Section 21081.6 of CEQA to ensure that all required mitigation measures are implemented and completed according to schedule and maintained in a satisfactory manner during the construction and operation of the project, as required. A table (attached) has been prepared to assist the responsible parties in implementing the MMRP. The table identifies individual mitigation measures, monitoring/mitigation timing, the responsible person/agency for implementing the measure, and space to confirm implementation of the mitigation measures. The numbering of mitigation measures follows the numbering sequence found in the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The City of Folsom (City) is the lead agency for the project under CEQA and shall administer and implement the MMRP. The City is responsible for review of all monitoring reports, enforcement actions, and document disposition. The City shall rely on information provided by the project site observers/monitors (e.g., construction manager, project manager, biologist, archaeologist, etc.) as accurate and up-to-date and shall provide personnel to field check mitigation measure status, as required.

Project Description: The CountryHouse at Broadstone is a proposed memory care facility to be located on 1.91 acre site located at the southeast corner of Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue Parkway. The Project proposes an extended care medical facility for patients suffering from Alzheimer's and Dementia. The building is proposed to be one and two story, with a first floor footprint of approximately 22,216 sq. ft., a second floor of approximately 14,472 sq. ft. for a total of approximately 36,688 sq. ft. The memory care facility will provide 45 rooms (47 beds due to 2 rooms having tow beds), a commercial kitchen and dining area, offices and stations for staff, and various programming/activity rooms. The facility provides services to meet the varying needs of those with dementia, throughout the aging process, including end of life (hospice) services.

Entitlements for the proposed project include a Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit.
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM CHECKLIST FOR THE COUNTRYHOUSE AT BROADSTONE MEMORY CARE FACILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring / Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Nesting Birds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If construction activities occur during the typical bird nesting season (February 15 through August 31), pre-construction nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 500-foot radius of proposed construction areas, where access is available, no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction. An additional survey shall be conducted within 48 hours prior to commencement of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• if no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• if active nests are identified in these areas, the City shall coordinate with CDFW to develop measures to avoid disturbance of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities, or construction could be delayed until the young have fledged. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a buffer zone and monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist until the young have fledged the nest and are independent of the site. If a buffer zone is implemented, the size of the buffer zone shall be determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFW and shall be appropriate for the species of bird and nest location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This mitigation measure shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction that occurs between February 15 and August 31. Pre-construction surveys for the presence avian species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist 14 days prior to the start of construction, with an additional survey 48 hours prior to the start of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Folsom Planning Department and Qualified Biologist and CDFW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Monitoring / Mitigation Timing</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures BIO-02: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Off-Site Oak Preserve and Pond</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project shall adhere to standard construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent off-site water quality impacts to the adjacent oak preserve and pond. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be prepared for the project and will include measures to prevent stormwater runoff from leaving the site and entering adjacent sensitive habitats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmentally sensitive area (ESA) fencing shall be installed along the southern site limits to prevent intrusion into the oak preserve and pond by construction equipment and personnel. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be off-limits to construction personnel. Signs shall be placed at 100 foot intervals along the ESA fencing indicating that the oak preserve and pond are a sensitive habitat and off-limits to construction personnel and equipment. The ESA fencing and signage shall be maintained in good condition throughout construction and removed once construction is complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project shall comply with City standard practices regarding night lighting (see 8.1 Aesthetics, Question D), minimizing potential impacts from light spillage or glare into off-site sensitive habitats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Monitoring / Mitigation Timing</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Avoid and minimize impacts to previously unknown historic resources.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction – this mitigation measure shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Planning Department and Archeologist or Qualified Cultural Resource Monitor and Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is always possible that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown, buried historic resources. In the event that buried historic resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The City shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Historic resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, wood, or shell artifacts, structural remains, privies, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) S23 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Monitoring / Mitigation Timing</td>
<td>Reporting / Responsible Party</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Avoid and minimize impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources.</strong></td>
<td>Prior to and during construction – this mitigation measure shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Planning Department and Archeologist or Qualified Cultural Resource Monitor and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is always possible that ground-disturbing activities during project development may uncover previously unknown archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The City shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to, excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Archaeological resources could consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.
Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Avoid and minimize impacts related to accidental discovery of human remains.

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5; Health and Safety Code § 7050.5; Public Resources Code § 5097.94 and § 5097.98 must be followed. If during the course of project development there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance within a 100-foot radius of the potentially human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work within 48 hours, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98.

2) Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendant or on the project site in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:
   - The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission.
   - The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation.
   - The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring / Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to and during construction – this mitigation measure shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Planning Department and Archeologist or Qualified Cultural Resource Monitor and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Initials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring / Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure GEO-01: Avoid and minimize impacts to previously unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction – this mitigation measure shall be included in all construction documents for implementation during construction.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Planning Department and Archeologist or Qualified Cultural Resource Monitor and Construction Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is always possible that ground-disturbing activities during project development may uncover previously unknown paleontological resources or unique geologic features. In the event that paleontological resources or unique geologic features are discovered during construction, construction operations shall stop within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The City shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The archaeologist shall make recommendations concerning appropriate measures that will be implemented to protect the resources, including but not limited to, excavation and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Paleontological resources or unique geologic features could consist of, but are not limited to, fossil remains such as bones, teeth, shells, leaves and wood. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring / Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Reporting / Responsible Party</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOISE

Mitigation Measure NOI-01: Exterior-to-interior noise level limit.

- Interior building noise levels for the proposed project shall not exceed 45 CNEL. Once specific building plan information is available, additional exterior-to-interior noise analysis shall be conducted to demonstrate that interior levels do not exceed 45 CNEL. The information in the analysis shall include wall heights and lengths, room volumes, window and door tables typical for a building plan, as well as information on any other openings in the building shell. With this specific building plan information, the analysis shall determine the predicted interior noise levels at the planned on-site building. If predicted noise levels are found to be in excess of 45 CNEL, the report shall identify architectural materials or techniques that could be included to reduce noise levels to 45 CNEL in habitable rooms. Standard measures such as glazing with Sound Transmission Control (STC) ratings from a STC 22 to STC 60, as well as walls with appropriate STC ratings (34 to 60), should be considered.

- Appropriate means of air circulation and provision of fresh air would be provided to allow windows to remain closed for extended intervals of time so that acceptable interior noise levels can be maintained. The mechanical ventilation system would meet the criteria of the International Building Code (Chapter 12, Section 1203.3 of the 2001 California Building Code).
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PROJECT TITLE
Hillsborough GPA/SPA

PROPOSAL
Request for approval of: Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Final EIR/EIS, General Plan Amendment, Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendment, Amendment to Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Folsom Area Specific Plan, and Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Development Agreement

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Approve, based upon findings

OWNER / APPLICANT
West Hillsborough Investors, LLC
Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc.
Hillsborough North, LLC
Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC
Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC

Mike McDougall, MJM Properties, LLC
Project Representative

LOCATION
The project site comprises two properties located at the western edge of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP). Property #1 is located at the southeast corner of US Highway 50 and Prairie City Road. Property #2 is located at the northeast corner of Prairie City Road and White Rock Road.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The project site is situated near the base of the Sierra Nevada foothills. The topography is gently rolling hills covered in non-native and naturalized grasslands. Alder Creek borders the northern property. The southern property is bisected by a 400-foot electric transmission corridor right-of-way with a north-south alignment. Historically, the site has been used for grazing, farming, and mining and is currently vacant.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS
SF Single Family
SFHD Single Family High Density
MLD  Multifamily Low Density
MMD  Multifamily Medium Density
MHD  Multifamily High Density
IND/OP  Industrial/Office Park
CC  Community Commercial
P  Parks
P-QP  Public /Quasi Public
OS  Open Space

ZONING

SP-SF  Single Family
SP-SFHD  Single Family High Density
SP-MLD  Multifamily Low Density
SP-MMD  Multifamily Medium Density
SP-MHD  Multifamily High Density
SP-IND/OP  Industrial/Office Park
SP-CC  Community Commercial
SP-P  Parks
SP-P/QP  Public /Quasi Public
SP-OS1  Preserve Open Space
SP-OS2  Passive Open Space

ADJACENT LAND USES / ZONING:
North:  US Highway 50
East:  Vacant lands zoned Single Family High Density Residential, Open Space, Multifamily Low Density and Industrial Office Park.
South:  White Rock Road and Sacramento County vacant lands zoned for Agriculture and Aerojet Special Planning Area.
West:  Vacant, Oak Woodlands and Aerojet Facilities

PREVIOUS ACTIONS

1. Local Agency Formation Commission approval of Annexation of 3500 acres to Folsom in 2011
2. Approval of Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in 2011
3. Approval of Tier 1 Development Agreement in 2011
4. Approval of Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan in 2014
5. Approval of First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement in 2014

FUTURE ACTIONS

1. Approval of Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan
2. Approval of Open Space Management and Financing Plan
3. Approval of and Recordation of Subdivision Maps
4. Issuance of Improvement Plans
5. Issuance of Grading and Building Permits

ATTACHED REFERENCE MATERIAL

1. General Plan Amendment Exhibit
2. Specific Plan Amendment Exhibit
3. Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendment Hillsborough Properties (April 2016)
4. Water Demand Comparison Chart
5. Sanitary Sewer Demand Comparison Chart
6. Ordinance No. An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and West Hillsborough Investors, LLC Relative to The Folsom South Specific Plan
7. Ordinance No. An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. Relative to The Folsom South Specific Plan
8. Ordinance No. An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Hillsborough North, LLC Relative to The Folsom South Specific Plan
9. Ordinance No. An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC Relative to The Folsom South Specific Plan
10. Ordinance No. An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC Relative to The Folsom South Specific Plan
11. Environmental Checklist and Addendum for Hillsborough Specific Plan Amendment

PROJECT PLANNER

George Djan, AICP, Contract Planner
BACKGROUND

The subject sites are located in the Folsom Plan Area and are generally located at the southeast corner of Highway 50 and Prairie City Road and White Rock Road and Prairie City Road. The region, later known as the Folsom Mining District, was extensively placer mined during the Gold Rush. Since the early 20th century, the property has been used for grazing.

The proposed project site is part of the approved Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP), which is a comprehensively planned community that proposes new development based upon principles of “Smart Growth” and Transit Oriented Development. The FPASP area is generally bounded by Prairie City Road on the west, Highway 50 (US 50) on the north, and White Rock Road on the south and the Sacramento County/El Dorado County boundary on the east. The adopted FPASP includes 10,210 residential units at various densities on a total of 1,477.2 acres; 362.8 acres designated for commercial and industrial use, including a regional shopping center; public/quasi- public uses; elementary, middle, and high schools on 179.3 acres; 121.7 acres of community and neighborhood parks; storm water detention basins; 1,053.1 acres of open-space areas and open- space preserves; and major roads with landscaping.

On December 7, 2012, the City approved an Addendum to the EIR for the FPASP for purposes of analyzing an alternative water supply for the project. The revisions to the “Water” component of the FPASP project included: (1) leak fixes, (2) implementation of metered rates, (3) exchange of water supplies, and (4) new water conveyance facilities. The City concluded that, with implementation of certain mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR’s “Water” sections, the water supply and infrastructure changes would not result in any new significant impacts, substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed impacts, or involve any of the other conditions related to changed circumstances or new information that can require a subsequent or supplemental EIR. The analysis in portions of the FPASP EIR’s “Water” sections that have not been superseded by the Addendum are still applicable.

In August 2014, the Folsom City Council approved an amendment to the FPASP (Resolution No. 9420) relative to the alignment and design guidelines for the future Capital Southeast Connector (White Rock Road).

On May 12, 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Russell Ranch Specific Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9566), the Final Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 9564) and a General Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9566) for the Russell Ranch Project. The approved SPA reduced the Plan Area residential area by approximately 17.8 acres and 264 dwelling units and reduced the commercial, office park/industrial and mixed-use area by approximately 59.5 acres and .65 million square feet of potential building area.

On September 22, 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Westland Eagle Specific Plan Amendment, an Amendment to the Folsom General Plan (Resolution No. 9655) and an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environment Impact Statement (Resolution No. 9654) for the Westland Eagle project. The approved SPA increased the residential dwelling unit count by 922 units and decreased the amount of commercial, office
park/industrial and mixed-use area by approximately 82.5 acres and 1.4 million square feet of potential building area.

At the time of processing and approval of the FPASP in 2011, Aerojet Rocketdyne had previously offer to dedicate an approximate 80-acre parcel to a private school entity. Since then, however, the private school has opted not to construct on the parcel; therefore, the site reverted back to its original owner and is now incorporated into the project. The project site now encompasses approximately 715 acres in the western portion of the FPASP adjacent to Prairie City Road; with approximately 635 acres of the site under the ownership of Westland Capital Partners, L.P. and approximately 80 acres under the ownership of Aerojet.

Following the status change of the private school property, the applicants are requesting a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program amendments, and Development Agreement Amendment.

**APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL**

The applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, and Development Agreement Amendment to develop 714 acres into approximately 2,018 dwelling units, 737,000 square feet of office/industrial/retail uses, parks and schools.

The requested entitlements would result in changes to the layout of land uses and specific plan land use designations throughout the project site. In general, these changes include roadway realignments, relocation and resizing of commercial land uses within the site, relocation of multifamily land uses, and construction of single-family, high-density land uses in the area previously designated as public/quasi-public for the private school site. The proposed redesigned land use plan for the Hillsborough site includes the same land uses as the approved FPASP (minus the private school site) but locations and housing land use types have been revised and adjusted by the applicant to respond to needs of the current, and expected future, Folsom housing market. Specific amendments include:

1. Conversion of 48.7 acres of PQP land for Country Day School into residential, parks and open space uses.
2. Inclusion of 394 additional housing units with approximately 65 additional acres of residential uses, approximately 49 fewer acres of public/quasi-public uses, approximately 16 acres less open space, approximately five additional acres of park space, and approximately four fewer acres of community commercial land uses compared to that approved as part of the FPASP.
3. Slight re-alignments in both Oak Avenue and Street A to better conform to the existing land contours and to emphasize the major vehicular routes through the community.
4. Maintaining Prairie City Road, which traverses the west edge of the planning area, in its current location and reversing the previous plan of re-aligning Prairie City Road in the FPASP.
5. Re-locating the community commercial site from the corner of White Rock Road and Prairie City Road (where site access is restricted) to the corner of Street A and Prairie City Road.
6. Co-location of a 2.3-acre neighborhood park and elementary school site in the center of the plan area in generally the same location as shown in the approved FPASP land use map, however slightly reconfigured to increase the sites' visibility and accessibility within the project.

7. Relocation of 10 acres of neighborhood park land to the previous private school site in the southeast project area, adjacent to natural open space.

8. Redesign of storm drainage, water, and wastewater facilities to accommodate the changes to the land uses. These changes would be enacted if the proposed changes to the specific plan for Hillsborough area are adopted.

9. Open space areas and individual resources have been further evaluated throughout the site to better protect and preserve water and biological resources on-site. Some uses, including the community commercial and multi-family residential uses have been shifted in location and the circulation design has been refined.

Table 1 below shows the adopted land use summary in the approved FPASP, Table 2 shows the proposed land use summary for the proposed project, and Table 3 shows the difference in land use acreage, dwelling units, population, and commercial square footage that would result from the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/acre)</th>
<th>Target DU</th>
<th>Percent of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SFT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>126.3</td>
<td>17.68%</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>12 to 20</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>477</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>257.3</td>
<td>36.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use District (MU)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9 to 30</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (IND/OP)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>547,549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>189,486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial (RC)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>737,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community West (P)</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community East (P)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Neighborhood (P)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Local (P)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School-Middle School (PQP)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (PQP) ES</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Day School (PQP)</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Parks and Schools</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>16.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>238.27</td>
<td>33.35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Major Circulation</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hillsborough</td>
<td>714.30</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>737,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use falls within the specified density range and the range and the total residential unit count does not exceed the FPISP area maximum of 10,210 dwelling units.
2. Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multi family unit.
3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 5,199,009 SFT is not exceeded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/acre)</th>
<th>Target DU (^1)</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population (^2)</th>
<th>Target FAR (^3)</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>202.2</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>12 to 20</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>322.3</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use District (MU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 to 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (IND/OP)</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>547,549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>142,659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial (RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>690,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community West (P)</td>
<td>50.9(^4)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Neighborhood (P)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Local</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School-Middle School (PQPMSHS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (PQPES)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Day School (PQP)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Parks and Schools</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Major Circulation</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hillsborough</td>
<td>714.3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>690,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Numbers may not sum exactly because of small rounding errors.  
1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use falls within the specified density range and the total residential unit count is consistent with 11,211 dwelling units.  
2. Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multifamily unit.  
3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 3,336,612 sf is not exceeded.  
4. 2.8 acres of Community Park West are not credited towards Quimby parkland requirements.
The attached document entitled, “Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendment, Hillsborough Properties April 2016” outlines the proposed amendments to the adopted 2011 version of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Attachment No. 3). The language included within the attachment only describes the amendments and is not meant to supersede the current specific plan language in its entirety unless the entire section is re-written within the attachment. The staff report below follows the outline of the attachment.

**Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Summary**

This summary is being updated to reflect City Council approval of amendments to the FPASP subsequent to the 2011 adoption. Included are the Capitol Southeast Connector, Russell Ranch and Hillsborough. The land use summary table is also updated.

**Section 1.3 – Project History**

This section is also updated to include the Capitol Southeast Connector, Russell Ranch and Hillsborough approvals by the City Council. The land use summary table is also updated.

**Section 2.5 – Existing Ownership**

This section is updated to reflect the current ownership of Hillsborough project
Section 2.6 – Annexation Area

This section is updated to reflect the current state of the annexation – project has been annexed into the City of Folsom.

Figures 1 and 2 – Ownership

Figures depict existing and new ownership of Hillsborough

Section 4.2 Land Use Objectives and Policies

In addition to changes to the land use map, the applicant is also proposing changes to specific FPASP policies. While the number of dwelling units has increased the commercial square footage has decreased significantly which reduced environmental impacts within the Plan Area with fewer average daily trips. Adopted Policy 4.6 established the total number of dwelling units for the FPASP at 10,210. While variations within individual land use categories were anticipated and are allowed, the 10,210 dwelling unit count acts as a cap. Subsequent amendments to Russell Ranch, Mangini Ranch and Westland Eagle increased the total residential units to 10,817. The proposed project will further increase the amount of residentially designated property, and the total number of dwelling units. The new proposed total number of dwelling units plan wide is 11,211.

The applicant also requests to modify Policy 4.6 to clarify that the total number of dwelling units and commercial square footage shall not be exceeded without subsequent CEQA clearance.

Amendments to Policies 4.7 and 4.24 change the total number of dwelling units to the new total of 11,211. The general purpose of the two policies remains unchanged.

4.3 Land Use Designations

Figures 3 and 4 of the SPA document depict the adopted land use designation and the proposed amendment for the Hillsborough properties. The more notable changes to the land use designations are as follows:

a. Conversion of 48.7 acres of PQP land for Country Day School into residential, parks and open space uses.

b. Inclusion of 394 additional housing units with about 65 additional acres of residential uses, approximately 49 fewer acres of public/quasi-public uses, approximately 16 acres less open space, approximately five additional acres of park space, and approximately four fewer acres of community commercial land uses compared to that approved as part of the FPASP.

c. Slight re-alignments in both Oak Avenue and Street A to better conform to the existing land contours and to emphasize the major vehicular routes through the community.

d. Keeping Prairie City Road, which traverses the west edge of the planning area, in its current location and reversing the previous plan of re-aligning Prairie City Road in the FPASP.
e. Re-locating the community commercial site from the corner of White Rock Road and Prairie City Road (where site access is restricted) to the corner of Street A and Prairie City Road.

f. Co-location of a 2.3-acre neighborhood park and elementary school site in the center of the plan area in generally the same location as shown in the approved FPASP land use map, however slightly reconfigured to increase the sites' visibility and accessibility within the project.

g. Relocation of 10 acres of neighborhood park land to the old private school site in the southeast project area, adjacent to natural open space.

h. Redesign of storm drainage, water, and wastewater facilities to accommodate the changes to the land uses. These changes would be enacted if the proposed changes to the specific plan for the Hillsborough area are adopted.

i. Open space areas and individual resources have been further evaluated throughout the site to better protect and preserve water and biological resources on-site. Some uses, including the community commercial and multi-family residential uses have been shifted in location and the circulation design has been refined.

**SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT**

Sections 4.4 through Appendix A amend the specific plan.

**4.4 Specific Plan Zoning**

Consistent with the Folsom Municipal Code, the entire plan area has been zoned Specific Plan District. The SP categories implement the provisions of the general plan land use designations. The FPASP categories are unique and apply only to the Plan Area. Additionally, the proposed amendment will establish a Planned Development District designation over all SP-SF, SP-SPHD, SP-MLD, SP-MMD, SP-MHD, SP-GC, SP-CC and SP-RC zoned parcels within the Specific Plan Amendment area. The proposed amendments are designed to refine the provisions and not to make wholesale changes.

**4.5 Residential Land Use Descriptions**

**Subsections 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.5.3, 4.5.4, and 4.5.5**

The proposed amendments to these sections reflect the new acreages and potential dwelling unit counts for each category.

**4.7 Transfer of Residential Units**

The proposed amendment to this section updates the maximum number of dwelling units in the FPASP to 11,211.
4.8 Non-Residential Land Use Descriptions

Subsection 4.8.3

The proposed amendments to these sections reflect newly proposed locations and the new acreages for each category.

Figures 3 & 4

Figures depict the adopted FPASP land uses for Hillsborough and the proposed land uses.

Figures 5 & 6

Figures depict the adopted FPASP zoning designations for Hillsborough and the proposed zoning.

Tables 4-1 & 4-1A

Table 4-1 depicts the adopted FPASP land use summary plus the proposed Hillsborough. Table 4.1A depicts the Hillsborough land use summary.

Section Five - Housing Strategies

5.3 Housing Concept. This section updates the percentage of housing units included in Mixed Use and Multi-family categories.

5.7 Residential Sites Inventory

Subsections 5.7.2, 5.7.3, 5.7.5.

The proposed amendments to these sections reflect the new acreages and potential dwelling unit counts for each category.

Section Seven-Circulation

7.4.2, 7.4.4

Landscape corridors substituted for natural parkway on Street A and Prairie City Road (see Figures 9 and 10).

7.7.1 Entry/Collector Streets

Natural parkway substituted for landscape corridors on south side of collector street linking Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue. (see Figures 9 and 10).

7.9.2, 7.9.3 Sidewalks and Trails, Bikeways

Proposed land use changes require adjustments to location and alignments of Class 1 Bike Paths and paved trails (see Figures 11 and 12)
Figures 7 and 8: RHNA Multi-Family High Density Sites

Figures have been modified to reflect new location of MHD sites.

Figures 9 and 10: Circulation

Figures have been modified to reflect modifications to circulations.

Figures 11 and 12: Bikeway Plan

Figures have been modified to reflect new Class 1 Bike Paths.

Section Eight – Open Space

Section 8.1

Section modified to reflect revised open space acreage from 1,063 acres to 1,057 acres.

Section 8.2 – Measure W

Section modified to reflect revised open space acreage from 1,063 acres to 1,057 acres.

Figures 13 and 14

Figure 13 depicts the adopted Open Space plan for the SPA area. Figure 14 depicts the proposed open space plan for the same area.

Section Nine - Parks

9.3.1 Community Park West

Modified to clarify that approximately 2.8 acres of park will be used for park activities but will not qualify for Quimby parkland dedication credit.

9.3.2 Neighborhood Parks

Language added to explain action of the Parks and Recreation Commission to relocate previous 10-acre park adjacent to Elementary School site to a new location occupying the previous Country Day School site.

9.3.3 Local Parks

Language added to explain action of the Parks and Recreation Commission to locate a new 2.3 acre park in previous location of 10-acre park adjacent to Elementary School site.

Figures 15 and 16

Figure 15 depicts the adopted parks for Hillsborough. Figure 16 depicts the proposed parks for Hillsborough.

Tables 9.3 and 9.4

Table 9.3 shows required parkland dedication; Table 9.4 shows parkland dedication provided for the existing project plus the SPA.
Section Eleven-Public Services

The amendments to Section 11 are primarily related to the planning of schools. With an increase in the number of residents, there is a slight increase in the number of students generated by the project. The plan includes 5 elementary school sites and one combined middle/high school. The amended language retains the five elementary school sites although the exact number will be determined as the project develops. Tables 11.2, and 11.3 have been updated to reflect the new numbers. Figure 17 depicts the adopted Public Services and Facilities plan for the SPA area. Figure 18 depicts the proposed Public Services and Facilities plan for the same area. The primary difference between the two is the elimination of Country Day School.

Section Thirteen - Implementation

Suggested amendment language for Section 13 includes the requirement that all properties in the Amendment area, except for P-PQP, OS and P parcels, be included in a Planned Development District to allow for greater flexibility in development standards.

Appendix A – Development Standards

All of the uses listed in Table A.8 and A.13 are the same as the adopted except for the CC land use which has been added

A.2.5 Planned Development District

All SF, SFHD, MLD, MHD, MU, IND/OP, CC, GC AND RC parcels included within the SPA boundaries shall be included in a Planned Development District as well.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

General Plan & Specific Plan Amendments

The following is staff’s evaluation of the applicant’s proposed land use changes.

1. Conversion of 48.7 acres of PQP land for Country Day School into residential, parks and open space uses. The most significant element of the land use changes is the conversion of the 49-acre Country Day site into residential, parks and open space. At the time of approval of the FPASP, Aerojet Rocketdyne had proposed to dedicate an approximate 80-acre parcel to a private school entity. Since then however, the private school has opted not to construct on the parcel, therefore, the site reverted back to its original owner. The land was designated for a specific purpose which is no longer needed or wanted. The proposed land uses are compatible with the proposed surrounding uses. Additionally, the conversion has been evaluated in terms of service and utility needs and there is ample capacity for the conversion. Staff recommends approval of the land use changes for the Country Day site.
2. **Total Dwelling Units.** Adopted Policy 4.6 established the total number of dwelling units for the FPASP at 10,210. Subsequent amendments to Russell Ranch, Mangini Ranch and Westland Eagle increased the total residential units to 10,817. The proposed project will further increase the amount of residentially designated property, and the total number of dwelling units. The new proposed total number of dwelling units plan wide is 11,211. According to information provided by the applicant, there is adequate water, sewer, schools, parks and other services to accommodate the proposed increase in dwelling units. Additionally, there is an offset to increased water and public services from the elimination of other non-residential land uses such as commercial and the Country Day School.

3. **Residential land use changes.** In addition to the conversion of the Country Day School site to other uses, the applicant is shifting around residential land uses, including a reduction of 40.8 acres in the SF designation and a corresponding increase in the SFHD designations. The applicant cites current and future market trends as the reasons for the proposed changes. The MHD parcel has been relocated away from White Rock Road with its restricted access and moved further north where access opportunities will be provided from Prairie City Road and also through the Commercial Center access on Street A. The proposed revisions seem logical in terms of land use compatibility and staff recommends approval of the residential land use changes.

4. **Non-Residential land use changes.** The Community Commercial (CC) parcel is proposed to be relocated away from the corner of Prairie City Road and White Rock Road with its restricted access and moved further north where access opportunities will be provided from Prairie City Road and Street A. The 10-acres neighborhood park land is proposed to be relocated to the previous private school site in the southeast project area, adjacent to natural open space. This location is more central and accessible to more residences than the previous location, especially in light of the re-designation of the Country Day site to residential uses. Staff supports the proposed land use changes.

5. **Roadway Realignments.** The proposed project involves slight re-alignments in both Oak Avenue and Street A to better conform to the existing land contours and to emphasize the major vehicular routes through the community. It also includes keeping Prairie City Road, which traverses the west edge of the planning area, in its current location and reversing the previous plan of re-aligning Prairie City Road. City’s Traffic Consultants, (MRO), Public Works and Planning staff have reviewed the proposed realignments and found them to be acceptable. The Prairie City Road alignment is consistent with the alignment and design guidelines for the future Capital Southeast Connector (White Rock Road).

6. **Open Space.** The proposed plan will decrease the amount of open space in the Hillsborough Plan area by 15.9 acres, compared to the original plan approval. Section 7.08C of the City Charter (also known as Measure W) requires 30% of the FPASP area to be maintained as natural open space to preserve oak woodlands and sensitive habitat areas. Section 7.08C also restricts the definition of open space: “Natural open space
shall not include active park sites, residential yard areas, golf courses, parking lots, and their associated landscaping. The 30% requirement is implemented on a plan area-wide basis. The original FPASP showed 238.2 acres or 30.3% of open space in Hillsborough. The proposed plan will decrease the open space to 222.3 acres or 30.2% of land area in Hillsborough. Table 2 shows the plan area OS acreage at the time of original approval, and the current snapshot of OS acreage, based on recent SPA approvals and pending approvals. Assuming the pending projects are approved, there will be a net gain of 3.3 acres of OS compared to the 2011 original approval in the FPASP. This means, with the Hillsborough reduction of OS, the FPASP still complies with the open space requirements in Measure W, as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project / Application</th>
<th>Change in OS Acres from 2011</th>
<th>Acres of Plan Area Open Space</th>
<th>% of Plan Area Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPASP 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,063.3</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved Russell Ranch</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1,072.9</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved Mangini Ranch Phase 1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1,075.2</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved Westland/Eagle SPA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,075.2</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed Hillsborough SPA</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>1,059.3</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed While Rock Springs Ranch</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,060.6</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Carr Trust</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1,060.9</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed Broadstone Estates</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,062.5</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed Folsom Heights</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1,066.6</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total FPASP</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1,066.6</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2011 FPASP Plan Area Acreage: 3,513.4

The Specific Plan provides two distinct open space categories within the open space land use designation. The first zone, preserve open space (SP-OS1), is the more restrictive of the two and is intended to preserve and protect wetlands, vernal pools, ponds, creeks and tributaries under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed plan shows a reduction of 4.5 acres of SP-OS1, reflecting updated acreages of wetland and other regulated biological resources within the Hillsborough property. The second zone, passive open space (SP-OS2) is less restrictive and is intended to provide passive recreational uses and buffers, including trails. The proposed plan shows a decrease of 11.4 acres of SP-OS2. The refinement to OS boundaries and acreages is intended preserve open space resources, including hillsides.
7. **Land Use Compatibility.** The properties surrounding the project site include primarily residential land uses to the east and north and open space and Aerojet facilities to the west and south. The proposed land uses are compatible with within the Hillsborough property and with the surrounding land uses.

**Parkland Dedication.**
Under the proposed project, the population of the Hillsborough site would be 1,109 more persons than what was identified for this area in the approved FPASP. However, the project includes more dedicated parkland than what was approved in the FPASP. Using the City’s standard of five acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, the project must provide at least 26.8 acres of parkland on-site. The proposed site plan would provide 60.4 acres of parkland, which substantially exceeds the City’s parkland requirements. The landowners in the Folsom Plan Area have internal agreements that allow them to equalize the obligations for parkland and other public land dedications.

**Private Recreational Amenities/Entry Features.**
Prior to the applicant purchasing the subject property, staff was in the process of reviewing the proposed land plan and subdivision design requested by the Easton Development Company. That plan contained numerous private open space areas as well as landscape entry features that created an overall subdivision design unique to Folsom. Ultimately, the subject site was purchased by the applicant and the new applicant started fresh with a new land plan.

The applicant is requesting an increase in the number of residential units from 1,624 to 2,018 (394 units) which translates to an approximately 25% increase in density within the project boundaries. Given this increase, staff has raised the issue with the applicant of softening the future lotting pattern with increased private open space in the form of entry features and perhaps private amenities. With the additional small lot units in the plan area, the provision of private amenities is would assist in meeting the recreational needs of families. Parks in Folsom are typically geared toward youth sports or organized adult sports leagues which does not serve all of the population of Folsom. The projects listed below include recreational amenities that complement the Parks in Folsom. Several developments have provided or will provide such amenities for large subdivisions as shown below:

- Lennar in Empire Ranch North Subarea. A total of 333 lots and private clubhouse with swimming pool.
- The Silverbrook Island Project. Approximately 300 lots and includes private amenity with clubhouse and swimming pool.
- Harvest Subdivision Project. A total of 116 lots that includes a historical themed park.
- Russell Ranch Subdivision. A total of 828 lots that includes a clubhouse and swimming pool.
- Gragg Ranch VTSM. A total of 395 lots and includes a private amenity parcel.

Dialogue with the developer continues on this topic, and granting this entitlement will not foreclose on any opportunity to agree upon, or condition the project for, inclusion of any such amenities.
**Services and Utilities.**

**Sewer.** A technical memo was prepared in March 2016 (MacKay & Somps 2011b) that compared the sanitary sewer demand of the Hillsborough site under the approved FPASP to the demand under the project. The project would decrease demand on sanitary sewer by 0.03 million gallons per day. Therefore, the revised project will have ample sewer capacity as envisioned in the original FPASP.

**Water.** In October 2015, MacKay & Somps evaluated the water demand of the project in comparison to the approved FPASP for the Hillsborough project. MacKay & Somps determined that, with the changes to land uses, the water demand would be decreased to 1,245 acre-feet per year compared to the approved plan (1,249 acre-feet per year) because the school was estimated to have a higher water demand than what would be required by the additional residential units proposed under the project. With the proposed land use changes (and a reduction of 4 acre-feet per year), the total water demand for the entire Folsom Plan Area will not exceed 5,600 AFY, as shown in the Water Demand Comparison Chart (Attachment 4). Therefore, the project would not exceed water demands estimated in the Folsom Specific Plan Area SB 610 Water Assessment prepared for the FPASP, and sufficient water supplies are available to meet the project’s long-term water demands. Finally, the project would continue to comply with mitigations recommended in the FPASP.

In November 2012, the City considered and adopted an addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS that assessed the environmental impacts of changing the approved water supply for the FPASP to the Revised Proposed Off-Site Water Facility Alternative, which would use water obtained through the City’s conservation activities and exchange of supplies with the City’s east area (City of Folsom 2012). The addendum concluded that water supplies under the Off-Site Water Facility Alternative would be more secure than the originally considered water supply plan, and landowners in the FPASP would be required to implement the previously adopted mitigation measures, which require submittal of proof of surface water supply availability and adequate water service infrastructure prior to approval of new development (Water Addendum, pp. 3-18 to 3-19.) Thus, with these mitigation measures in place, it is reasonable to conclude that development in the FPASP, including this project, would not outpace the City’s available water supplies.

The City has reviewed its water supply extensively to ensure that the City will meet its diversion in "dry" and “extremely dry” conditions”, such as is being experienced in the current drought. The City has considered and analyzed in its most recent Urban Water Management Plan (adopted June 14, 2011) the effects of implementing conservation measures in increasingly stricter stages that are designed to reduce water use City-wide.

Consistent with its commitments under the Water Forum Agreement and the Water Conservation Act of 2009, the City has undertaken several water conservation and management improvements in recent years, including approval of the Water System Optimization Review (SOR) Project in 2012, which provides for leak detection, repairs to the City’s existing water transmission and distribution facilities. The SOR project is being implemented, and the water savings achievable through these repairs will make available a recovered surplus sufficient to supply the FPASP area with the 5,600 acre-feet per year that
development within the Folsom Plan Area (which includes the Hillsborough project’s demand) is currently estimated to demand. As indicated above, the impacts of implementing these system improvements and providing the surplus water to the FPASP area were reviewed in an Addendum to the FPASP EIR and considered and approved by the City Council in 2012.

As outlined in detail in the Addendum to the FPASP EIR regarding water, the proposed project would be served by the savings in existing City water supplies achieved through the SOR program described above. The water savings achieved through the SOR Program provides new water supplies, which is in addition to the present and forecasted demands of the City’s existing water users. These new water supplies could be made available by the City for other beneficial uses within the City limits, including the FPASP. This is further described in the Water Supply and Facilities Financing Plan and Agreement between the City and certain landowners in the FPASP, approved with the Addendum to the FPASP EIR in 2012 noted above.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, since the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that the impact to water supplies was potentially significant because of the possibility that the water infrastructure to accommodate the FPASP may not be developed or coordinated fully with the development of houses and other water using land types, Mitigation Measure 3A.18-1 requires all project applicants to submit proof of surface water supply availability in order to reduce this potential impact to less than significant. The developer of this project is required to comply with Mitigation Measure 3A.18-1. According to the FPASP EIR/EIS, with implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Schools.** With an increase in the number of residents, there is a slight increase in the number of students generated by the project. The plan includes 5 elementary school sites and one combined middle/high school. The amended language retains the five elementary school sites although the exact number will be determined as the project develops. Additionally, the applicants would be required to pay school impact fees, and with SFID #3 bonds and State funding the school facilities are fully funded at no cost to existing residents.

**Traffic**

The updated traffic study for the project concluded that all study intersections located north of U.S. 50 that operate with unacceptable levels of delay under cumulative conditions without the proposed project would continue to operate with similar levels of delay with implementation of the proposed project, and would not experience increases in delay of five or more seconds during a peak hour. Additionally, all intersections south of US 50 within the FPASP would continue to operate at LOS D or better with implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in any new significant or substantially more severe impacts and no further analysis is required.

**Special Conditions**

There is on-going discussion between the City of Folsom and FPASP landowners regarding the future location of a City Corporation Yard. Until this issue is resolved to the satisfaction of the City, it is proposed that a condition be imposed requiring that an acceptable
Corporation Yard site be identified prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPASP area.

A similar situation exists regarding the location of a future high school and middle school in the FPASP area. Discussions are on-going between the Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD) and FPASP landowners regarding the location of a future high school and middle school serving the plan area. Until this issue is resolved to the satisfaction of the City and FCUSD, it is proposed that a condition be imposed requiring that acceptable high school and middle school sites be identified prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPASP area.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

On April 5, 2016, the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting unanimously approved the Hillsborough SPA application with staff recommendations. Staff presented all of the four currently-pending SPA’s in process to the Commission (Hillsborough, Folsom Heights, Broadstone Estates and Carr Trust), which acted on each application individually. The goal of presenting all four pending applications (Hillsborough, Folsom Heights, Broadstone Estates and Carr Trust) was to demonstrate to the Commission that the Quimby Parkland Dedication requirements were fully satisfied. In satisfying the Quimby requirements for the entire Folsom Plan Area, an additional 2.3 acres of parkland was provided in the Hillsborough application areas.

To provide a ¼ mile service radius from each neighborhood park, Staff proposed relocating the 10.0 acre park adjacent to the elementary school site to the former Country Day School site abutting an open space corridor with a Class 1 trail. The park in this location would serve the future residents of former Country Day School and the areas in the western portion of the Hillsborough project area. The additional 2.3 acres of Quimby requirements was satisfied by a 2.3 acre park adjacent to the elementary school site. This park is sufficient in size to serve the residents since the Community Park West is within a ¼ mile radius of the residents in this portion of the Hillsborough project area.

The applicant also agreed to provide a Class 1 trail in the open space area in the former Country Day School site abutting the 10.0 acre park and include a Class 2 on Street “D” west of Oak Avenue. This trail was not provided in the adopted Specific Plan, but staff concluded that a Class 2 trail was warranted.

Final park land dedication requirements and trail improvements will be determined once a Tentative Subdivision Map is submitted to the City.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT MODIFICATIONS

This development is subject to the Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (ARDA) recorded July 15, 2014. As a part of the General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment for the Hillsborough project, Amendment No. 1 to the ARDA is being proposed.
The Amendment to the ARDA proposes to add or amend certain provisions relative to this specific project, which will only apply to the Hillsborough properties. For ease of review, the numbering in the Amendment tracks that of the ARDA.

The summarized specifics of the changes or amendments to the ARDA are listed below:

8. Revision of the recitals to better describe the project history whereby the Hillsborough entities acquired portions of the Aerojet/Easton property and assumed the rights under the Aerojet/Easton ARDA that are now being amended by these Amendments.
9. Sections 1.e and 1.f, clarify compliance with EIR Mitigation Measures and limits the mitigations to the Property affected thereby;
10. Section 1.i, amends in the nomenclature from the “Highway 50 Coalition Fee” to the City’s adopted “Highway 50 Improvement Fee” for the FPA;
11. Section 2.c, acknowledges the City’s intent to treat all ARDA properties consistently; and
12. Sections 2.d and 2.e, clarify City phased processing of plans and phased acceptance of improvements.

All other provisions of the development agreement for Hillsborough properties mirror the ARDA for the Folsom Plan Area.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

The applicant also proposes two minor amendments to the mitigation measures previously adopted for the FPASP for impacts to Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat and oak woodland loss. The amendments would add Amador County as a location in which off-site Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat and oak woodlands could be preserved to fulfill mitigation requirements. The mitigation measures currently only allow for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to be preserved in Sacramento County and for oak woodland preservation in Sacramento and El Dorado Counties. The revisions to existing Mitigation Measures MM 3A.3-10B and MM 3A.3-5 (renumbered as MM 3.3-3) are shown in redline format in Section 4.4.1 of the CEQA Addendum attached hereto as Exhibit 11. The revisions will allow for some greater flexibility in obtaining suitable off-site mitigation land to meet mitigation requirements but do not change the City’s review and oversight obligations for the FPASP applicants’ mitigation plans, nor would they change the mitigation’s effectiveness and enforceability.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared the attached checklist which analyzes the proposed changes to the FPASP. The conclusion drawn from the analysis is that none of the changes or revisions proposed by the project would result in significant new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, 15164, and 15168. Accordingly, an Addendum to the Folsom Plan
Area Environmental Impact Report has been prepared for this project. The complete analysis is included in the attached documentation.

**Water Supply**
The proposed project's water demand can be accommodated by the City’s water supplies within the mandates of Measure W, which requires that the water supply for the Folsom Plan Area south of Highway 50: (1) not cause a reduction in the supply designated to serve existing water users north of Highway 50; and (2) not be paid for by Folsom residents north of Highway 50. Measure W is codified in Section 7.08 of the Folsom City Charter. The following discussion is provided in the interest of addressing issues relating to the City’s water supply planning for the Folsom Plan Area, particularly during multiple years of drought condition.

Under the framework of Measure W, the environmental analysis for the Folsom Plan Area (where this project is located) relating to the availability of water supplies to serve this project, including under a multiple-year drought condition, was disclosed, studied and considered in great detail in an Addendum to the FPASP EIR, which was certified by the City Council on December 11, 2012 (Resolution No. 9096). Following certification of the Addendum, the City Council directed that a civil action be filed under Code of Civil Procedure Section 860 and Government Code Section 53511 to determine the validity of the FPA Water Supply Agreement (WSA) between the City and the landowners in the Folsom Plan Area, which forms the legal basis to secure water supplies for the Folsom Plan Area at no cost to existing City water users north of Highway 50. The validation action specifically sought judicial determination that the WSA is consistent with Measure W, and that the WSA is consistent with the City’s intent to retain control of conserved water under Resolution No. 8457 and California Water Code Section 1011 (which permits the City to retain and use water supplies resulting from its conservation efforts).

On October 16, 2013, Sacramento County Superior Court approved, confirmed, and validated the WSA. The Court specifically adjudged that the WSA is consistent with the Measure W water supply requirements (i.e., that the water supply for the Folsom Plan Area will not cause a reduction in the supply designated to serve existing water users north of Highway 50 and will not be paid for by Folsom residents north of Highway 50), that the WSA is consistent with Resolution No. 8457 protecting water conserved from the City’s pre-1914 water rights and water supplies, and that the WSA is lawful, valid and enforceable. The Court’s determination is valid and forever binding on matters pertaining to water supply to the Folsom Plan Area.

Additionally, the City is a party to the Water Forum Agreement, which represents a regional commitment by stakeholders in the long term health and sustainability of the American River to cooperate and fulfill two co-equal objectives: (1) to provide a reliable and safe water supply for the region’s economic health and planned development to the year 2030; and (2) to preserve the fishery, wildlife, recreational, and aesthetic values of the lower American River.
An EIR was prepared in 1999 that examined the effects of implementing the linked actions agreed to by the stakeholders to fulfill those objectives. As relevant to this project, these linked components include: actions to meet water users’ needs during dry years while reducing diversion impacts, increased water conservation, and improved groundwater management, among other actions.

Consistent with the Water Conservation Act of 2009, the Addendum to the FPASP EIR approved by the City Council in December 2012, and the City’s intent to retain control of conserved water under Resolution No. 8457 and California Water Code Section 1011 (affirmed by the Court in 2013), the City has undertaken several water conservation and management improvements in recent years, including approval of the Water System Optimization Review (SOR) Project that provides for leak and loss detection and repairs to the City’s existing water transmission and distribution facilities. The SOR project is paid for by the landowners in the Folsom Plan Area (not Folsom residents north of Highway 50), and the water savings achievable through these repairs as well as other efforts will make available a sufficient amount (5,600 acre feet per year) to supply the Folsom Plan Area without causing a reduction in the supply designated to serve existing water users north of Highway 50. The implementation of these system improvements and application of the water savings to the Folsom Plan Area were discussed and analyzed in the Addendum to the FPASP EIR.

Notwithstanding the legal framework for securing and providing water supply to the Folsom Plan Area consistent with Measure W, during multiple-dry years the City has the authority to declare a water shortage condition under Chapter 13.26 of the Folsom Municipal Code, and implement increasingly more stringent stages of conservation, which limit many types of outdoor water use and water service in restaurants. A development agreement between the City and a majority of the landowners in the Folsom Plan Area adopted in May 2014, to which the White Rock Springs Ranch project proponent is a party, makes clear that this project area and these landowners are subject to the same water use cut-backs and limitations imposed in the rest of the City during such water shortage conditions. The City’s most recent Urban Water Management Plan (2010) considered the effects of implementing these stages of conservation, as required by law, and still concluded that the City would have sufficient supplies to serve existing residents and planned new growth in multiple dry years.

Accordingly, the proposed project’s water supply is consistent with Measure W, has received judicial validation that is forever binding on matters pertaining to water supply to the Folsom Plan Area, and can be accommodated by the City’s existing water supplies and dry-year plans without imposing additional hardship or otherwise further limiting the supplies available to serve the rest of the City’s residents.

**RECOMMENDED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE ADDENDUM TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN EIR;
AND

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE HILLSBOROUGH PROJECT;

AND

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN FOR THE HILLSBOROUGH PROJECT WITH CONDITIONS 1 THROUGH 5;

AND

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND THE HILLSBOROUGH DEVELOPERS;

AND

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AMENDMENTS FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

GENERAL FINDINGS

A. NOTICE OF HEARING HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER REQUIRED BY LAW

B. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CODE OF THE CITY

CEQA FINDINGS

C. A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT WAS PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA AND NEPA

D. AN ADDENDUM TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA.

E. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED THE ADDENDUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT BEFORE MAKING A DECISION REGARDING THE PROJECT.
F. THE ADDENDUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REFLECTS THE INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM.

G. NONE OF THE CONDITIONS DESCRIBED IN SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES CALLING FOR THE PREPARATION OF A SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT HAVE OCCURRED.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FINDING

H. THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM GENERAL PLAN.

I. THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES.

J. THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65352.3 IN THAT NO TRIBES REQUESTED CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT FINDING

K. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN IS CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN (AS AMENDED), ZONING CODE, AND THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT FINDINGS

L. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE AMENDED AND RESTATE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM GENERAL PLAN AND THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AS AMENDED.

M. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE AMENDED AND RESTATE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT COMPLIES WITH GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65867.5(C).
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

FINDING

N. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN ARE EQUALLY EFFECTIVE AND ENFORCEABLE AND WOULD IMPOSE NO NEW OR ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1) The Owner/Applicant will dedicate the proposed park sites within the Hillsborough SPA including Community Park West, Neighborhood Park 5, Local Park site consistent with the provisions of the Amended Restated Development Agreement for the Folsom Plan Area; however, the Owner/Applicant will receive no parkland dedication credit for the 2.8 acres land within Community Park West designated as CPW2.

2) The Owner/Applicant shall update the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan to include all new or modified tables, maps, text, etc. to reflect any and all modifications that will result from approval of the project. The owner/applicant shall submit an electronic version of the Specific Plan that accounts for all revisions as a result of this project to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

3) Prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or first building permit if development may occur without any subdivision), a site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4 of the ARDA, as may be amended or as otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard, with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City's determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City.

The City intends to impose this condition equitably throughout the Plan Area. If the City fails to impose such a condition with, at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), this condition of approval shall be null and void as to Owner/Applicant’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final small lot map for Owner/Applicant’s Project. If the City approves any other final small lot map for a project within the Plan Area and the Corporation Yard site has not been approved as provided for herein, Owner/Applicant may seek relief from the terms of this condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City.
4) The final locations for a site suitable and feasible for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area have not been approved by the Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

Prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or first building permit if development may occur without any subdivision), the sites for the future high school and middle schools in the Folsom Plan Area will be identified and approved by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

The City intends to impose this condition equitably throughout the Plan Area as and to each and every Participating Landowner who seeks any future specific plan amendment, tentative subdivision map or ARDA amendment in connection with its proposed development. If the City fails to impose such a condition with, at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), this condition of approval shall be null and void as to Owner/Applicant’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final small lot map for Owner/Applicant’s Project. If the City approves any other final small lot map for a project within the Plan Area and the future high school and middle school sites have not been approved as provided for herein, Owner/Applicant may seek relief from the terms of this condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council.

5) Prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the Hillsborough Project Area (or first building permit if development may occur without any subdivision), if Condition #3 to this SPA regarding an acceptable corporation yard site is not met, the City will seek a suitable 32 acre corporation yard site within the boundaries of this Specific Plan Amendment and proceed with the SPA and zoning amendments to provide for the City’s new corporation yard.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

DAVID E. MILLER, AICP
Public Works and Community Development Director
ATTACHMENT NO. 1
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ATTACHMENT NO. 3
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This is a red-line version of selected sections of the adopted Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan showing proposed deletions, substitutions and additions to the adopted text, tables and figures for the proposed Hillsborough Specific Plan Amendment. Throughout this document, one will encounter red text boxes with the caption 

**Note to Reader.** The text boxes are an aid to the reader and further explain proposed Specific Plan changes. The text boxes are for information only and are not a part of the Specific Plan.
FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN SUMMARY

The Folsom Plan Area (Plan Area) is a 3,513.4-acre comprehensively planned community that features new development patterns based on the principles of Smart Growth and Transit Oriented Development. Consistent with these principles, the FPASP includes a mix of residential, commercial, employment and public uses complemented by recreation amenities, including a significant system of parks and open space, all within close proximity to one another and interconnected by a network of “Complete Streets”, trails and bikeways consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Principles and the requirements of SB 375.

A central feature of the Plan Area is the mixed use town and neighborhood centers that form the foundation for walkable neighborhoods, reduced automobile use and higher internal trip capture. The block and street pattern for these neighborhoods will be orthogonal and urban with tree lined streets and wide separated sidewalks to encourage walking. Interconnectivity between land uses will assist in reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and a corresponding reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as required by AB 32.

The FPASP permits the construction of approximately 10,817 units or more residential units developed across a broad range of residential types including single family detached homes, duplexes and patio homes as well as a range of multi-family residential housing types including townhomes, apartments, condominiums and live/work studios. The Plan Area also provides a variety of retail and wholesale commercial, light industrial and office based land uses that will provide local jobs and contribute to the city’s jobs/housing balance. In addition to residential and commercial uses, the Plan Area also provides a substantial number of parks, schools and other important community-serving uses as well as a significant amount of open space.

A vital component of the Plan Area circulation system is the dedicated transit corridor that runs nearly the entire breadth of the Plan Area from Prairie City Road, at the western Plan Area boundary to the intersection of White Rock Road and Old Placerville Road at the southern boundary of the Plan Area. This corridor will “link-up” with the regional transit network envisioned by the Sacramento Regional Transit District to provide future high-speed transit travel between the Plan Area and designations throughout the region.

The FPASP planning principles, objectives and policies set the stage for the orderly and systematic development of the Plan Area. The development standards and regulations contained in the plan provide the framework for the location, type and area of individual land uses; the allowed densities and building setbacks within each land use category; and the location and size of streets, water lines, and other infrastructure improvements.

The Plan Area includes a balanced approach to urban development by protecting its physical beauty while satisfying the ongoing needs of the city and its residents. The FPASP offers a diverse mix of residential, commercial, and public uses as outlined in the following land use summary on the following page.

The Folsom City Council approved the FPASP by adoption of Resolution No. 8863 on 28 June 2011 (Resolution No. 8863). To evaluate potential environmental impacts that may result from implementation of the FPASP, a joint Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared and certified by the Folsom City Council by adoption of Resolution No. 8860 on 14 June 2011 (Resolution No. 8860). The EIR/EIS also contains a Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Program and these three documents, along with the Transit Master Plan, the Appendix to the City of Folsom Bikeway Master Plan, the Operational Air Quality Mitigation Plan, the Public Facilities Finance Plan, the Water, Wastewater and Storm Drainage Master Plans are available for review at the City of Folsom Community Development Department or online at www.folsom.ca.us/home_nav/sphere/current_documents.asp.

On 25 August 2014, the Folsom City Council approved an amendment to the FPASP (Resolution No. 9420) relative to the alignment and design guidelines for the future Capital Southeast Connector (White Rock Road).

On 12 May 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Russell Ranch Specific Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9566), the Final Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 9564) and a General Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9565) for the Russell Ranch Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE SUMMARY (Existing Project + SPA)</th>
<th>Ac.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>466.0</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density</td>
<td>772.3</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (^2)</td>
<td>297.0</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (^3)</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (^3)</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Office Uses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (^5)</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (Public) (^6)</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (Public-Non Quimby Credit)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (Private-Non Quimby Credit)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (Public)</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Storage Tank Sites</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Sewer Pump Station</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Tower Site</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (Measure W)</td>
<td>1,057.0</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (Non-Measure W)</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Circulation</td>
<td>176.5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,513.4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Existing project includes the adopted FPASP dated 28 June 2011, the approved TNHC Russell Ranch and Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendments and the approved White Rock Springs Ranch Tentative Subdivision Map.
2 Includes 26.5 acres of RC-MLD and GC-MLD land use.
3 Includes 15.9 acres of RC-MMD and GC-MMD land use.
4 Includes 15.9 acres of RC-MHD and GC-MHD land use.
5 Includes 24.4 acres of RC-IND/OP and GC-IND/OP land use.
6 Includes 9.2 acres of RC-P and GC-P land use.

On 22 September 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment, an amendment to the Folsom General Plan (Resolution No. 9655) and an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environment Impact Statement (Resolution No. 9654) for the Westland/Eagle project.
SECTION ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.3 PROJECT HISTORY

FPASP APPROVALS

On 28 June 2011, the Folsom City Council approved the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Resolution No. 8863) for the development of 10,210 residential homes in a range of housing types, styles and densities along with commercial, industrial/office park, and mixed-use land uses, open space, public schools, parks and infrastructure projected to develop on the 3,513.4 acre Plan Area property. At build out, projected to occur over a 20 to 30 year time frame, the Plan Area was projected to have a population of approximately 24,362 persons. Along with the 1,455.6 acres of residential development, the adopted FPASP called for 511.3 acres of commercial, office/industrial and mixed-use development, 309.5 acres of public and quasi-public uses (public and private schools, parks and infrastructure); 173.6 acres of major roads and 1,065 acres of open space (refer to 28 June 2011 FPASP Figure 4.1 and Table 4.1).

On August 2014, the Folsom City Council approved an amendment to the FPASP (Resolution No. 9420), relative to the alignment and design guidelines for the future Capital Southeast Connector (White Rock Road).

On 12 May 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Russell Ranch Specific Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9566), the Final Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 9564) and a General Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9566) for the Russell Ranch Project. The approved SPA reduced the Plan Area residential area by approximately 17.8 acres and 264 dwelling units and reduced the commercial, office park/industrial and mixed-use area by approximately 59.5 acres and .65 million square feet of potential building area.

On 22 September 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment, an Amendment to the Folsom General Plan (Resolution No. 9655) and an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environment Impact Statement (Resolution No. 9654) for the Westland/Eagle project. The approved SPA increased the residential dwelling unit count by 889 units and decreased the amount of commercial, office park/industrial and mixed-use area by approximately 82.5 acres and 1.4 million square feet of potential building area.

SECTION TWO - SETTING

2.5 EXISTING OWNERSHIP

The Hillsborough Specific Plan Amendment Area (SPA) comprises approximately 714 acres and at the time of adoption of the FPASP, the properties were owned by Aerojet General Corp. and the Sacramento Country Day School (refer to Figure 1). Currently, the Hillsborough SPA Area is owned by Westland Capital Partners, L.P. and Aerojet Rocketdyne (refer to Figure 2).

2.6 ANNEXATION AREA

The area to be annexed to the City of Folsom includes the 3,513.4 acre Plan Area as well as the existing and proposed highway 50 interchanges, one half the right-of-way of Prairie City and white Rock Roads and the entire right-of-way of Scott Road, Placerville Road and the Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor. The total area of influence annexation area (SOIA) is approximately 3,528 acres. The precise total area to be annexed to the City of Folsom will be determined at the time an annexation application is
Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

Figure 1: Ownership - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)
Ownership Legend

- **Aerjet Rocketdyne**: Light yellow
- **Westland Capital Partners**: Yellow
- **Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) Boundary**: Red

*Westland Capital Partners has an option to purchase the majority of the Aerjet Rocketdyne property.

Figure 2: Ownership - Hillsborough SPA Area
submitted to LAFCo:

The annexation of the Plan Area to the City of Folsom was approved by the Sacramento County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) on 18 January 2012 (Resolution No. 201201-0118-04-11).

SECTION THREE - VISION

No changes are proposed for this section of the FPASP.

SECTION FOUR - LAND USE

4.2 LAND USE OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

The FPASP incorporates a number of objectives and related policies to guide the development of the Plan Area. Objectives and policies related to Land Use are as follows:

Policy 4.6: As established by the FPASP, the total number of dwelling units for the Plan Area shall not exceed 10,817 and the total commercial square footage is 3,336,612. The number of units within individual residential land use parcels may vary, so long as the number of dwelling units falls within the allowable density range for that land use designation. For purposes of CEQA compliance for discretionary projects, the combination of the total maximum number of residential units and commercial square footage analyzed in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (SCH#2008092051) shall not be exceeded without requiring further CEQA compliance.

Policy 4.7: Transfer of dwelling units is permitted between residential parcels, or the residential component of RC and GC parcels, as long as 1) the maximum density within each land use category is not exceeded unless rezoned, and 2) the overall total number of FPASP Plan Area dwelling units maximum of 10,817 does not exceed 11,211, is not exceeded.

Note to Reader: The maximum number of Plan Area residential units shown in this document may vary up or down as subsequent Specific Plan Amendment applications are reviewed and approved by the City of Folsom.

Policy 4.24: All Public/Quasi-Public sites shown on Figures 4.1 and 4.2 may be relocated or abandoned as a minor administrative modification of the FPASP. The land use and zoning of the vacated site or sites will revert to the lowest density adjacent residential land use. In no event shall the maximum number of Plan Area residential dwelling units exceed 10,817 and the total commercial building area does not exceed 3,336,612 square feet. For purposes of CEQA compliance for discretionary projects, the combination of the total maximum number of residential units and commercial square footage analyzed in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (SCH#2008092051) shall not be exceeded without requiring further CEQA compliance.

4.3 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Refer to Figures 3 and 4 for general plan land use designations for the adopted FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area) and the Hillsborough SPA area. Refer to Table 4.1 for a summary of the land uses for the existing project plus the Hillsborough SPA and to Table 4.1A for a comparison of the land uses in the adopted FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area) and the Hillsborough SPA area.

4.4 SPECIFIC PLAN ZONING

Consistent with the requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code, the entire Plan Area has been zoned SP-Specific Plan District and assigned a number as required in FMC Section 17.37.040. On the City’s zoning map, the entire Plan Area is delineated as SP and bears the number that distinguishes the Plan Area from all other specific plan areas in the City.

Additionally, as provided for in FMC Chapter 17.38, a Planned District (P.D.) shall be established overall SP-SF, SP-SFH, SP-MLD, SP-MMD, SP-MHD, SP-MU, SP-GC, SP-CC and SP-RC parcels in the SPA area (refer to Figure 5 for specific plan land use zoning designations for the adopted FPASP SPA area and Figure 6 for specific plan land use zoning designations for the Hillsborough SPA Area. The FPASP creates specific plan land use designations zoning categories that are unique and only apply to the Plan Area. Refer to Appendix Subsection A.2 for a complete description.
of residential and non-residential specific plan land use designations zoning categories.

4.5 RESIDENTIAL LAND USE DESCRIPTIONS

4.5.1 Single Family (SF)
The SF density range is from 1 to 4 dwelling units per gross acre and approximately 504.0 466.0 acres are devoted to SF land use with a target count of 1,175 1,477 units. The SP-SF-PD specific plan land use designation zoning category is consistent with the Single Family general plan residential land use designation.

4.5.2 Single Family High Density (SFHD)
The SFHD density range is from 4 to 7 dwelling units per gross acre and approximately 674.8 722.3 acres of the Plan Area are devoted to SFHD land use with a target count of 3,760 4,193 units (refer to Table 4.1). The SP-SFHD-PD specific plan land use designation zoning category is consistent with the Single Family High Density general plan residential land use designation.

4.5.3 Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)
The MLD density range is from 7 to 12 dwelling units per gross acre and approximately 265.4 270.41 acres of the Plan Area are devoted to MLD land use with a target count of 2,406 2,4601 units (refer to Table 4.1). The SP-MLD-PD specific plan land use designation zoning category is consistent with the Multi-Family Low Density (MLD) general plan residential land use designation.

4.5.4 Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD)
The MMD density range is 12 to 20 units per gross acre and approximately 33.51 acres of the Plan Area are devoted to MMD land use with a target count of 564 5782 units (refer to Table 4.1). The SP-MMD-PD specific plan land use designation zoning category is consistent with the Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD) general plan land use designation.

4.5.5 Multi-Family High Density (MHD)
No changes are proposed for this section of the FPASP.

4.7 TRANSFER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS
The FPASP permits adjustments to the residential land use mix to reflect sensitive natural site features as well as changing market demand for a particular housing type. Transfer of units is permitted between residential parcels, and the residential component of RC and GC parcels provided the Plan Area maximum entitlement of 10,017 11,211 dwelling units is not exceeded except by amendment of the FPASP.

4.8 NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND USES

4.8.3 COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL
The Community Commercial land use designation provides community-based convenience oriented retail and service uses intended to serve residential neighborhoods within the Plan Area. Community commercial parcels average 5 to 10 acres in size and are located in close proximity to residential neighborhoods. The FPASP land use plan provides approximately 25.9 21.7 acres of community commercial parcels strategically located throughout the Plan Area, within walking distance of residential neighborhoods and accessible by public transit. Potential uses in this designation include: grocery stores, retail shops, restaurants, banks, offices, and other similar types of uses supporting the daily needs of nearby residents. Refer to Subsection A.2.2.3 and Table A.13 for a complete list of permitted uses and development standards. The SP-CC-PD specific plan land use designation zoning district is consistent with the Community Commercial general plan land use designation.

4.10 Transfer of Commercial Intensity
The FPASP allows flexibility in the development of commercial, office park and mixed-use parcels in order to respond to changing market conditions. A target floor area ratio (FAR) is used to determine the potential building area for individual commercial, office park and mixed-use parcels (see Table 4.3). If a particular parcel is developed at less than its allocated building area, the remaining un-built area may be transferred to another parcel or parcels. Transfer

---

1 An additional 26.5 acres and 240 dwelling units may be added if the RC-MLD and GC-MLD multi-family residential allocations are developed.

2 An additional 15.9 acres and 320 dwelling units may be added if the RC-MMD and GC-MMD multi-family residential allocations are developed.

3 3,642,997 3,800,526 square feet if the RC-MLD, RC-MMD, GC-MLD and GC-MMD parcels are developed as commercial rather than multi-family residential.
General Plan Land Use Legend

- **SF**: Single Family
- **SFHD**: Single Family High Density
- **MLD**: Multi-Family Low Density
- **MMD**: Multi-Family Medium Density
- **MHD**: Multi-Family High Density
- **IND/OP**: Industrial/Office Park
- **CC**: Community Commercial
- **P**: Parks (Community & Neighborhood)
- **P-QP**: Public/Quasi-Public
- **OS**: Open Space
- **Fire Station (Conceptual Location)**
- **Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) Boundary**

Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

Figure 3: General Plan Land Use - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)
Hillsborough Specific Plan Amendment

Figure 4: General Plan Land Use - Hillsborough SPA Area
Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

Figure 5: Specific Plan Land Use - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)
Hillsborough Specific Plan Amendment

Figure 6: Specific Plan Land Use - Hillsborough SPA Area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (dwellers)</th>
<th>Target DU (x)</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR [x]</th>
<th>Potential Build Area (BF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>466.0</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>1.0 - 4.9</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>14,425</td>
<td>12,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>772.3</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>4.0 - 7.0</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>12,624</td>
<td>12,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MILD)</td>
<td>202.4</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.0 - 12.0</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMMD)</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>12.0 - 26.0</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use District (MU) [x]</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>20.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (dwellers)</th>
<th>Target DU (x)</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR [x]</th>
<th>Potential Build Area (BF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use District (MU) [x]</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>20.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Occupancy (IND/OC)</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC) [x]</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/OC</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSD</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial [x]</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/OC</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial [x]</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/OC</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.0 - 30.0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Total**

- 3,513.4 acres
- 100.0%
- 11,211
- 100%
- 27,305
- 3,336,615

---

1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use falls within the specified density range and the total number of residential units does not exceed 11,211.
2. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 3,516,612 SF (3,000,526 SF if the RC-MLD, RC-MMMD, and GC-MMD and GC-MMMD parcels are not developed as residential) is not exceeded.
3. For planning purposes, the mixed-use land use designation is split 65% residential and 35% commercial area. The target FAR may be higher or lower as long as the maximum Commercial, Industrial/Occupancy and Mixed-Use building area of 3,126,612 SF (2,305,498 SF if the RC-MLD, RC-MMM, GC-MLD and GC-MMMD parcels are not developed as residential) is not exceeded.
4. For planning purposes, the three GC land use parcels (adjacent to the intersection of Scott Road and Easton Valley Parkway) are split approximately 25% residential commercial, 24% general commercial, 14% industrial office park, 15% multifamily low density, 9% multifamily medium density, 9% multifamily high density, and 5% park. No fewer than 272 MLD residential units on a minimum of 15 acres shall be provided in the RC parcel and the three GC parcels described in note 4.
5. Private parks do not receive Quimby park land dedication credit.
6. Existing project includes the approved 1,145 acre Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendments and the approved White Rock Springs Ranch Tentative Subdivision Map.
### Table 4.1A: Hillsborough SPA Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Adopted FFASD (SPA Area)</th>
<th>SPA Plan (8 April 2016)</th>
<th>Difference (FFASD vs. SPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area (Ac.)</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Bldg (SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>126.3</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SHHD)</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Residential</strong></td>
<td>257.3</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (Ind/OP)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>547,549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>189,486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Mixed Use/Commercial</strong></td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>737,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks (P)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks (P)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks (P)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Parks</strong></td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools (PQP-ES)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Day/School (PQP)</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>238.2</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Roads</strong></td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>714.3</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>737,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> 2.8 acres of Community Park West are not credited as Quimby parkland dedication area.
of building area is permitted between Regional Commercial, General Commercial, Community Commercial, Industrial/Office Park and the commercial component of Mixed Use land uses so long as the total commercial building area of 3,379,083 square feet shown in Table 4.1 is not exceeded, except by amendment of the FPASP. Refer to Section 13.3.2 for additional information on the transfer of development rights and commercial, office park and mixed-use building area tracking.

**SECTION FIVE - HOUSING STRATEGIES**

**5.3 HOUSING CONCEPT**

The lower density multi-family residential sites provide a transition in mass and scale from the mixed-use and higher density residential uses to the smaller scale traditional single family neighborhoods. Approximately forty-nine percent of the total Plan Area housing units are included in the mixed use and multi-family residential land use categories. Multi-family and mixed use housing will offer a wide range of rental options as well as the opportunity for fee simple and condominium ownership.

**5.7 RESIDENTIAL SITES INVENTORY**

**5.7.1 MULTI-FAMILY HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MHD)**

No changes are proposed for this section of the FPASP.

**5.7.2 MULTI-FAMILY MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MMD)**

Five sites totaling 33.5 acres are delineated Multi-Family Medium Density Residential use on the FPASP Land Use Diagram (refer to Figure 4.1). The density range for this land use classification is 12 to 20 DU/Ac and the allocated densities are shown in Table 5.2. The MMD sites are also located within walking distance of transit corridors, commercial and employment centers, schools and parks in order to increase transit use, promote walking and decrease automobile trips. The Multi-Family Medium Density sites can potentially yield 564 units of rental and/or for sale housing (5.2% of the total target dwelling units shown in Table 4.1). The four MMD sites are described in more detail below, summarized in Table 5.2 and shown on Figure 5.1.

**5.7.3 MULTI-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MLD)**

Twenty sites totaling 263.2 acres are designated for Multi-Family Low Density Residential development on the FPASP Land Use Diagram (refer to Figure 4.1). The density range for this land use classification is 7 to 12 DU/Ac and the allocated densities are shown in Table 5.3. The MLD sites are envisioned as transition densities that smooth the visual shift from single family detached housing to higher density multi-family residential uses. If developed at the allocated densities, these sites can provide 2,406 housing units (21.9% of the total Plan Area housing units) of moderately priced rental and/or for-sale housing. A summary of the twenty-two sites is included in Table 5.3 and the sites are shown on Figure 5.1.

**5.7.4 MIXED USE (MU)**

No changes are proposed for this section of the FPASP.

**5.7.5 SINGLE FAMILY HIGH DENSITY (SFHD) AND SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (SF)**

The Single Family High Density land use designation comprises approximately 34.2 percent of the total housing units in the Plan Area. The density range for this residential land use is 4 to 7 Du/Ac and the allocated density is 5.4 Du/Ac, which yields 3,760 housing units as shown in Table 4.1. Single family high density neighborhoods provide a range of reasonably priced small-lot detached and semi-attached housing choices.

Single Family neighborhoods consist primarily of single family lots. Single Family neighborhoods provide the largest lot detached housing choices in the Plan Area and allow for executive-type housing as well as conventional sized single family lots. Single Family neighborhoods are located primarily on steeper topography adjacent to open space areas. All Single Family and Single Family High Density housing sites are shown on Figure 4.1.

---

4 An additional 13.9 acres and 320 dwelling units may be added if the RC-MMD and GC-MMD multi-family residential allocations are developed.

5 An additional 26.5 acres and 240 dwelling units may be added if the RC-MLD and GC-MLD multi-family residential allocations are developed.
SECTION SIX - TOWN CENTER

No changes are proposed for this section of the FPASP.

SECTION SEVEN - CIRCULATION

7.4 SIGNATURE CORRIDORS

7.4.2 STREET 'A' CORRIDOR

7.4.4 PRAIRIE CITY ROAD CORRIDOR

Landscape corridors substituted for natural parkways on Street 'A' and Prairie City Road (Community Park West, Community Commercial, MHD and MMD frontages only). Refer to Figures 9 and 10 for a comparison between the adopted FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area) Circulation Plan and the Hillsborough SPA Circulation Plan.

7.7 RESIDENTIAL STREETS

7.7.1 ENTRY/COLLECTOR STREETS

A Natural parkway is substituted for a landscape corridor on the south side of the unnamed collector street linking Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue (Section U). Refer to Figures 9 and 10 for a comparison between the adopted FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area) Circulation Plan and the Hillsborough SPA Circulation Plan.

7.9 SIDEWALK, TRAIL AND BIKEWAY NETWORK

7.9.2 SIDEWALKS AND TRAILS

7.9.3 BIKEWAYS

Land use changes proposed by the SPA require adjustments to the locations and alignments of Class I Bike Paths and paved trails. Refer to Figures 11 and 12 for a comparison between the adopted FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area) Bikeway Plan and the Hillsborough SPA Bikeway Plan.
RHNA Legend

- **MHD**: Multi-Family High Density Residential - Qualifies as a Residential Site Affordable to Low and Very Low Income Households
- **SPA Boundary**: Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) Boundary

Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

**Figure 7:** RHNA Multi-Family High Density Residential Sites - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)
Figure 8: RHNA Multi-Family High Density Residential Sites - Hillsborough SPA Area
Circulation Legend

- **4 Lane Arterial** (Open Space Section With Tree-lined Corridor Median)
- **2 Lane Major Collector** (With Median & Natural Parkway)
- **4 & 6 Lane Expressway** (With Median & Natural Parkway)
- **6 Lane Major Arterial (With Median)**
- **4 Lane Major Arterial (With Median)**
- **4 Lane Major Arterial (With Median)**
- **2 Lane Minor Collector (With Median)**
- Traffic Signal
- Major (Community) Entry Gateway
- Minor (Neighborhood) Entry Gateway

Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

Figure 9: Circulation - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)
Figure 10: Circulation - Hillsborough SPA Area
Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

Figure 11: Bikeway Plan - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)
Figure 12: Bikeway Plan - Hillsborough SPA Area
SECTION EIGHT - OPEN SPACE

8.1 INTRODUCTION
The FPASP exemplifies the philosophy that an interconnected framework of open space is essential to the development of a vibrant, livable community. The Plan Area includes over 1,063,1,057 acres of open space....

8.2 MEASURE W AND FOLSOM CITY CHARTER ARTICLE 7.08C
The Plan Area consists of approximately 3,513 acres and is defined as the area bounded by U.S. Highway 50 to the north, Prairie City Road to the west, White Rock Road to the south and the Sacramento/El Dorado County line to the east. The FPASP provides approximately 1,063,1,057 acres of open space which equates to approximately 30.1% of the Plan Area.

Note to Reader:
The amount of Plan Area open space will be revised as subsequent Specific Plan Amendment applications are reviewed and approved by the City of Folsom. As required by Measure W and City Charter Article 7.08C, the Plan Area open space will equal a minimum of 30% of the Specific Plan area.
SECTION NINE - PARKS

9.3.1 COMMUNITY PARKS

Community Park West (Parcel 10):
The vision for Community Park West is for more intensive active uses, including, but not limited to youth baseball and softball, adult baseball and softball, soccer fields, basketball and tennis courts and picnic areas. Restrooms and lighted sports facilities will be provided for night time use. Community Park West is located adjacent to Prairie City Road due to the active nature of the facilities. If land designated as Community Park West, or any portion thereof, is not available for use as park and open space as identified in the FPASP concurrently with surrounding development that creates demand for park and open space use, the City may rezone equivalent acreage of suitable park and open space land within the Plan Area for development as interim or permanent park and open space to meet the need generated by surrounding development. Approximately 2.8 acres of Community Park West may be used for park activities; however, this area does not qualify for Quimby parkland dedication credit (refer to Figures 15 & 16 and Tables 9.3 and 9.4).

9.3.2 NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

Neighborhood Park 5: At the request of the Parks and Recreation District, the location of Neighborhood Park 5 has shifted from its previous location adjacent to Elementary School 5, to a new location adjacent to a single family high density residential neighborhood that occupies the former Country Day School site (refer to Figures 15 & 16 for the former and proposed location of Neighborhood Park 5).

9.3.3 LOCAL PARKS

Local Park 5: At the request of the Parks and Recreation District, a new 2.3 acre local park is proposed adjacent to Elementary School 5, the previous location of Neighborhood Park 5 (refer to Figure 16 for the location of Local Park 5).
Open Space Legend

- Parks*
- Preserve Open Space
- Passive Open Space
- Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) Boundary

* Parks shown to indicate the links between Open Space and Parks. Dedicated Park land is not a part of Open Space.

Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

Figure 13: Open Space - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)
Open Space Legend

- Parks
- Preserve Open Space
- Passive Open Space
- Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) Boundary

* Parks shown to indicate the limit between Open Space and Parks. Dedicated Park land is not a part of Open Space.

Hillsborough Specific Plan Amendment

Figure 14: Open Space - Hillsborough SPA Area
Figure 16: Parks - Hillsborough SPA Area
### TABLE 9.3
**REQUIRED PARK LAND DEDICATION (Existing Project* + SPA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling</th>
<th>No of Units</th>
<th>City Standard Ac. Per DU</th>
<th>Required Quimby Park Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>0.0146</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>5,541</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,211</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>136.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Existing project includes the adopted FPASP dated 28 June 2011, the approved TNHC Russell Ranch and Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendments and the White Rock Springs Ranch Tentative Subdivision Map.

### TABLE 9.4
**FPASP PARK LAND DEDICATION ACRES (Existing Project¹ + SPA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Park West²</th>
<th>48.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Park East</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Community Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park 1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park 2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park 3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park 4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park 5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park 1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park 2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park 3 (GC area)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park 4 (RC area)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park 5 (Hillsborough area)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Local Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FPASP Net Park Land Dedication Provided²</strong></td>
<td><strong>137.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Existing project includes the adopted FPASP dated 28 June 2011, the approved TNHC Russell Ranch and Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendments and the approved White Rock Springs Ranch Tentative Subdivision Map.

² Consistent with General Plan Policies 35.8 and 35.9, net park land dedications exclude easements, wetlands, public right-of-ways, and steep slopes or structures. Therefore, total FPASP net parkland dedication excludes 2.8 acres of Community Park West.
Note to Reader:

The adopted FPASP establishes a park plan that provides 125.1 acres of dedicated park land for the future development of two community parks, five neighborhood parks and two local parks that will provide a full range of active and passive recreational opportunities. The park plan was based on a projected Plan Area population of 24,362 person housed in 10,210 residential dwelling units. The park plan was reviewed and approved by the City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Department and was also endorsed by the City’s Parks and Recreation Commission.

Specific Plan Amendments approved in 2015 (TNHC Russell Ranch and Westland/Eagle) increased the projected Plan Area population to 26,199 persons housed in 10,817 dwelling units (including multi-family dwelling units located in the Regional Commercial and General Commercial land use areas adjacent to the intersection of Scott Road and Easton Valley Parkway). These approved Specific Plan Amendments retained the Plan Area park plan while increasing the amount of required parkland dedication requirements, i.e. Quimby Act obligations, from 125.1 acres to 134.7 acres (including 9.2 acres located in the Regional Commercial and General Commercial land use area). The actual parkland dedication will be based on the approved number of residential units constructed in the Regional Commercial and General Commercial land use areas and may be satisfied with land and/or in-lieu fees to be determined at the time development projects are approved.

The proposed Hillsborough SPA increases the projected Plan Area population to 27,305 persons housed in 11,211 dwelling units. As shown in Table 9.3, the cumulative impact of the increased population is a corresponding increase in the amount of required parkland dedication (136.5 acres versus the 124.1 in the adopted FPASP). As shown in Table 9.4, the total provided Plan Area park area is 137.2 acres (0.7 acres more than is required). As a stand-alone project, the proposed Hillsborough SPA provides 60.4 acres of dedicated park land (33.6 acres more than its requirement of 26.8 acres).
SECTION TEN - RESOURCE MANAGEMENT & SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

No changes are proposed for this section of the FPASP.

SECTION ELEVEN - PUBLIC SERVICES & FACILITIES

11.3 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

No change in the number of schools provided (refer to Tables 11.2 and 11.3 and Figures 15 & 16).

Table 11.2: Projected Plan Area Students\(^1\) (Existing Project\(^2\) + SPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Land Use</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>K-5 Elem. Yield Factor</th>
<th>K-5 Student Population</th>
<th>6-8 Middle School Yield Factor</th>
<th>6-8 Student Population</th>
<th>9-12 HS Yield Factor</th>
<th>9-12 Student Population</th>
<th>SDC Student Yield Factor</th>
<th>Special Ed. Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD)</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use (MU)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,211</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,451</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,348</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,427</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Students 5,479


Table 11.3: Required Schools\(^1\) (Existing Project\(^2\) + SPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Projected Students</th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Schools Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed.(^3)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 5,479

[3] Special Ed. students are weighted by grade group and included in the corresponding grade group for the calculation of the number of schools required.

**Note to Reader:**
The total number of students will vary up or down as subsequent Specific Plan Amendment applications are reviewed and approved by the City of Folsom. Currently, the Plan Area provides five elementary school sites and one combined middle school/high school site which should be sufficient to accommodate anticipated demand.
Public Services & Facilities Legend

- **ESS**: Proposed Public Elementary School
- **IND/OP**: Proposed Private School
- **SF**: Proposed Fire Station

Adopted FPASP Dated 11 June 2011 (Hillsborough SPA Area)

*Figure 17: Public Services & Facilities - FPASP (Hillsborough SPA Area)*
Figure 18: Public Services & Facilities - Hillsborough SPA Area
SECTION TWELVE - UTILITIES

No changes are proposed for this section of the FPASP.

SECTION 13 - IMPLEMENTATION

13.2.4 SUBSEQUENT CITY OF FOLSOM APPROVALS & ENTITLEMENTS

DISCRETIONARY PROJECT APPROVALS

• Planned Development

To allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of Specific Plan development standards all SP-SF, SP-SFHD, SP-MLD, SP-MMD, SP-MHD, SP-IND/OP, SP-CC, SP-GC and SP-RC land use zoned parcels included within the boundaries of the Specific Plan Amendment Area shall also be included in a Planned Development District (P.D.) per the criteria outlined in FMC Chapter 17.38.

APPENDIX A - DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

A.2.5 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

To allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of Specific Plan development standards all SP-SF, SP-SFHD, SP-MLD, SP-MMD, SP-MHD, SP-IND/OP, SP-CC, SP-GC and SP-RC land use parcels included within the boundaries of the Specific Plan Amendment area shall also be included in a Planned Development District (P.D.) per the criteria outlined in FMC Chapter 17.38.
ATTACHMENT NO. 4

Water Demand Comparison Chart
### Hillsborough Potable Water Demands - Approved Specific Plan Land Uses

#### Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Number of Allocated Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Normal Indoor Demand Factor (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Normal Outdoor Demand Factor (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Total Normal Demand (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Total Dry-Year Demand (ac-ft/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>128.3</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMMD)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Total</td>
<td>257.4</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>677</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (IND/OP)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Total</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park (P)</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park (P)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Quasi-Public-Elementary School (PQP-ES)</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>238.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Road Right-of-Way (ROW)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Total</td>
<td>390.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>707.2</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hillsborough Potable Water Demands - Specific Plan Amendment Land Uses

#### Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Number of Allocated Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Normal Indoor Demand Factor (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Normal Outdoor Demand Factor (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Total Normal Demand (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Total Dry-Year Demand (ac-ft/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>292.2</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMMD)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Total</td>
<td>323.2</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>799</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (IND/OP)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Total</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park (P)</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park (P)</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Quasi-Public-Elementary School (PQP-ES)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Road Right-of-Way (ROW)</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Total</td>
<td>337.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>714.3</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Corridor (LC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space - Landscape Corridor (OS-LC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Non-Residential Total</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>714.3</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Total water demands have been increased 11.11% pursuant to footnote 56 on page 30 of the Folsom Plan Area Water Supply Assessment.
2. Outdoor water demands have been increased by 5% in dry years pursuant to the Water Supply Assessment prepared by Tully and Young.
ATTACHMENT NO. 5

Sewer Demand Comparison Chart
### Hillsborough Sewer Demands - Per FPA November 2015 Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Number of Allocated Dwelling Units/Assigned ESD's</th>
<th>Average Daily Sewer Demand (gal/day) or (gall/ac.)</th>
<th>Average Daily Sewer Flow (Million gal/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHD</td>
<td>211.8</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHD</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/OP</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Community)</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQP (School)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>200.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-LC</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>714.3</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hillsborough Sewer Demands - Density Study #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Number of Allocated Dwelling Units/Assigned ESD's</th>
<th>Average Daily Sewer Demand (gal/day) or (gall/ac.)</th>
<th>Average Daily Sewer Flow (Million gal/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHD</td>
<td>211.8</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHD</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/OP</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Community)</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQP (School)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>200.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-LC</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>714.3</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Neighborhood Park Site is allocated 1 ESD to account for 1 comfort station.
- Community Park Site is allocated 20 ESD’s.
- Elementary School is allocated 40 ESD’s per the City of Folsom Standards.
ATTACHMENT NO. 6

Ordinance No.____ An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and West Hillsborough Investors, LLC Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan
ORDINANCE NO.

AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND WEST HILLSBOROUGH INVESTORS, LLC RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR/EIS) for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) was certified by the City Council on June 14, 2011, and the FPASP was adopted by the City Council on June 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority in Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code, the City Council, following a duly notified public hearing on June 28, 2011, approved the Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan (Tier 1 DA) for the development of the Folsom Plan Area by adopting Ordinance No. 1149 on July 12, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, following a duly noticed public hearing on May 27, 2014, approved a request to amend the Tier 1 DA pertaining to the development of the Folsom Plan Area, including the Hillsborough Project, by approving a First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (ARDA) between the City and the predecessors-in-interest of the developer of the Hillsborough Project, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. and Easton Development Company, LLC, by adopting Ordinance No. 1207 on June 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Hillsborough Project consists of a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, and further amendment to the ARDA for future development within the Folsom Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the City and the owners of the Hillsborough Project desire to amend the ARDA in order to provide greater certainty and clarity to matters that are common, necessary and essential for the development of the Hillsborough Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, at its regular meeting on May ____, 2016, considered Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement by and Between the City of Folsom and West Hillsborough Investors, LLC (Amendment No. 1) at a duly noticed public hearing as prescribed by law, and recommended that the City Council approve said Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, all notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Folsom hereby does ordain as follows:
SECTION 1. FINDINGS

A. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

B. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (Amendment No. 1) is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the City’s General Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

C. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement is in conformity with public convenience, general welfare, and good land use practices.

D. The Amendment No. 1 will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of persons residing in the immediate area, nor be detrimental or injurious to property or persons in the general neighborhood or to the general welfare of the residents of the City as a whole.

E. The Amendment No. 1 will not adversely affect the orderly development of property or the preservation of property values.

F. The Amendment No. 1 has been prepared in accordance with, and is consistent with, Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5, and City Council Resolution No. 2370.

G. All notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

H. A Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement was previously certified for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. An Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared for the proposed Hillsborough Project, which includes the proposed Amendment No. 1, and concludes that the proposed Project will not result in substantial changes to the FPASP.

SECTION 2. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

The Mayor is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and West Hillsborough Investors, LLC on behalf of the City after the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY

If any section, subsection, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this
Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days from and after its passage and adoption, provided it is published in full or in summary within twenty (20) days after its adoption in a newspaper of general circulation in the City.

This ordinance was introduced and the title thereof read at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016 and the second reading occurred at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016.

On a motion by Council Member ______, seconded by Council Member ______, the foregoing ordinance was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Folsom, State of California, this ____ day of _____ 2016 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Member(s):
NOES: Council Member(s):
ABSENT: Council Member(s):
ABSTAIN: Council Member(s):

____________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
Christa Saunders, CITY CLERK

Effective:

Ordinance No.
Page 3 of 3
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATTED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND
WEST HILLSBOROUGH INVESTORS, LLC
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
(West Hillsborough Investors, LLC)

This Amendment No. 1 to First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement ("Amendment No. 1") is entered into this _____ day of ___________, 2016, by and between the City of Folsom ("City") and West Hillsborough Investors, LLC ("Landowner") pursuant to the authority of Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code of California. All capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined herein shall mean and refer to those terms as defined in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement described below between the parties hereto.

RECITALS

A. Restated Development Agreement. The City and Landowner’s predecessors-in-interest, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. ("Aerojet") and Easton Development Company, LLC ("Easton"), previously entered into that certain First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement By and Between the City of Folsom and Landowner Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan, recorded on July 15, 2014, in the Official Records of the County Recorder of Sacramento County in Book 20140715, Page 0552 (the "Restated Development Agreement"). Section 1.5 of the Restated Development Agreement allows the Restated Development Agreement to be amended from time to time by mutual written consent of the parties.

B. After the Effective Date of the Restated Development Agreement, Aerojet and Easton conveyed portions of the property described in the Restated Development Agreement to various entities, with the City approving an Assignment and Assumption Agreement Relative to the Restated Development Agreement between Aerojet and Easton and (1) Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC, (2) Hillsborough North, LLC, (3) Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC and (4) Landowner (collectively the "Assignment and Assumption Agreements" and with the entities identified in this paragraph, collectively the "Subsequent Purchasers"). Pursuant to the Assignment and Assumption Agreements, and under the terms set forth therein, Aerojet and Easton were released from further rights and obligations relative to the properties covered by those Assignment and Assumption Agreements.

C. Property. As provided above, Landowner acquired and owns the portion of real property described in Exhibit A-1 and shown in Exhibit A-2 attached hereto (the "Property") and, in connection therewith, acquired the rights and obligations as "Landowner" under the Restated Development Agreement with respect to the Property. The subject of the Restated Development Agreement, as amended hereby and as applied to Landowner, is the Development of the Property. Landowner owns the Property and represents that all persons holding legal or equitable interests in the
Property shall be bound by the Restated Development Agreement, as amended by this Amendment No. 1 and applied to the Property.

D. **Purpose of Amendment.** The Subsequent Purchasers and Aerojet are jointly processing a Specific Plan Amendment, commonly referred to as the Folsom Area Specific Plan for the Hillsborough Properties (the “SPA”) for development of the real property originally covered by the Restated Development Agreement, which includes the Property, the property acquired by the other Subsequent Purchasers, and the property retained by Aerojet (the “SPA Planning Area”). In connection with the approval of the SPA, the City and Landowner desire to amend the timing of certain requirements related to the approval of tentative subdivision maps otherwise required by Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, as more particularly provided in this Amendment No. 1. Additionally, Landowner desires that the SPA for the Property, including the conditions of approval related thereto, as approved by the City, be included within the definition of Entitlements as that term is used throughout the Restated Development Agreement, pursuant to Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement. City and Landowner further intend to clarify certain provisions related to identification of sites for a corporation yard and high school/middle school, as provided for in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.5.3B of the Restated Development Agreement.

E. **Hearings.** On __________, 2016, the City Planning Commission, designated as the planning agency for purposes of development agreement review pursuant to Government Code Section 65567, in a duly noticed and conducted public hearing, considered this Amendment No. 1 and recommended that the City Council approve this Amendment No. 1 to the Restated Development Agreement.

F. **Environmental Review.** On __________, 2016, the City Council considered the Addendum to the Specific Plan EIR (the “Addendum”) for development of the SPA Planning Area consistent with the SPA (the “Project”). An Initial Study prepared in support of the Addendum identified mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts which have been incorporated into the Project and in the terms and conditions of the approved SPA, as reflected by the findings adopted by the City Council concurrently with this Amendment No. 1.

G. **No New Impacts Associated with Approval of Amendment.** The City Council has determined that the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 involves no new impacts not considered in the Specific Plan EIR and Addendum; therefore, no further environmental documents relating to the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 are required.

H. **Consistency with General Plan and Specific Plan.** Having duly examined and considered this Amendment No. 1, City finds and declares that this Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the General Plan and the Specific Plan, as amended.
NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged and agreed, the parties hereto do hereby agree to amend the Restated Development Agreement as applied to the Property as follows:

1. **Amendments to Existing Sections of Restated Development Agreement.** The definition of “Entitlements” in Recital H, the definition of “Property” in Section 1.3, the provisions regarding the Corporation Yard in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, and Sections 2.5.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7.1, 4.2.2.1 and 4.8 are hereby amended as follows:

   a. **Recital H – Entitlements.** The term “Entitlements” set forth in Recital H of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to include:

      i. the Specific Plan, as amended by the SPA approved by the City Council by Resolution [___________]; and

      ii. this Amendment of Restated Development Agreement.

   In consideration thereof, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, Landowner hereby reaffirms its agreement to abide by the provisions of this Restated Development Agreement, as modified hereby, and the conditions of approval imposed in connection therewith as applicable to the Property with the approved SPA and rezoning of the Property.

   b. **Section 1.3 – Property.** The term “Property” set forth in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised as follows:

      “Property” means that certain parcel of land described in Exhibit A-1 and shown on Exhibit A-2 attached hereto and made a part hereof within the Plan Area.

   c. **Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 – Corporation Yard.** The provisions of Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and the amendment to Section 2.5.3(B)(9), as set forth below, is not intended to alter, amend or enlarge the obligations and rights of Landowner as set forth in Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, except as specifically identified in Section 2.5.3(B)(9).

   d. **Section 2.5.3 – Requirements for Subsequent Plans.** The provisions of Subsections (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and are not affected by this Amendment No. 1. Subsections (A) and (B) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement are hereby revised to read as follows:
"A. Prior to Approval of First Tentative Small Lot Map:

(1) Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan; and

(2) Design Guidelines.

"B. Prior to Approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or First Building Permit if Development May Occur Without Any Subdivision) or as otherwise specified below:

(1) Open Space Management and Financing Plan;

(2) Drainage Facilities Maintenance and Financing Plan;

(3) Formation of the Sewer and Off-Site Water CFD as provided in the PFFP to fund a portion of the Plan Area sewer and water infrastructure, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the sewer and water infrastructure, on a building permit by building permit basis (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to by Landowner and the City) that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(4) Formation of the Aquatic Center CFD related to the recreational facilities that may include an aquatic center, sports complex and/or community center, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the recreational facilities, on a building permit by building permit basis, (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to between Landowner and the City), that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(5) Formation of the Parks, Trails, Landscape Corridors, Medians and Open Space Maintenance CFD (the "Services CFD"), the Storm Drainage Maintenance CFD (unless such drainage maintenance is included in the Services CFD), and the Street Maintenance District/Lighting Maintenance District CFD (unless such street maintenance is included in the Services CFD), as provided in the PFFP;
(6) Adoption of the New Plan Area Fees, including the New Plan Area Fees for City Facilities, the SPIF, and the SPRF, as provided in the PFFP and listed on Exhibit 2.2.4 attached hereto;

(7) Dedication or grant of the rights of way and easements for all Backbone Lands for roadways and utilities within the portion of the Property affected by the Small-Lot Map or anywhere within the Property within thirty (30) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for the dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(8) For each final Small Lot Map, offers of dedication of the Public Parcel(s) described in Section 3.8.5 below located within the portion of the Property affected by the final Small Lot Map, or within sixty (60) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(9) A site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4, as may be amended or otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City’s determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site, consistent with the foregoing, as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion; and

(10) A site or sites identified as suitable by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District, for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area shall be identified and approved by the City in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. If a supplemental fee is required to support the development of such site(s), Landowner agrees to support the establishment of such fee in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act and to pay such fee, so long as such fee
is equitably shared by all similar development within the Plan Area. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion.”

e. Section 3.5 – EIR Mitigation Measures. Section 3.5 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

“3.5 EIR Mitigation Measures. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, to the contrary, as and when Landowner elects to Develop the Property, or any portion or phase thereof, Landowner shall be bound by, and shall perform, or cause to be performed, all mitigation measures contained in the Specific Plan EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND, and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and any additional environmental mitigation measures referenced therein, and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) related to Development of the Property which are adopted by City and are identified in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program as being a responsibility of Landowner for Development of the Property.”

f. Section 3.6 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Section 3.6 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

“3.6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Separate from and in addition to the requirements in Section 3.5 of this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, Landowner shall be responsible for all of the costs and expenses associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program under CEQA as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) that are identified as applicable to this Project in the Project EIR related to the Development. In furtherance of this provision, Landowner shall pay all costs required by the City associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as set forth in the conditions of approval on the Entitlements and the Subsequent Entitlements.”

g. Section 3.7.1 – White Rock Road Improvements. Section 3.7.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to add the following additional paragraph at the end of Section 3.7.1:

"Landowner understands and acknowledges that the alignment for the entire mainline portion of the Capital Southeast Connector has not been finally determined, however the Connector JPA has approved an alignment for what is known as the Capital Southeast Connector Segment
D3/E1, which was presented to the City Council on July 14, 2015 prior to approval by the Connector JPA Board and was endorsed by the City Council by Resolution No. 9609. This alignment, and the footprint for this alignment, was approved by the Connector JPA by Resolution No. 2016-05 on January 22, 2016 in the approval of the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Capital Southeast Connector Segment D3/E1 Project ("IS/MND"), and is depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1, attached hereto and incorporated by reference. The alignment depicted in Exhibit 3.7.1 is referenced herein as the "Current Connector Alignment."

The Current Connector Alignment is not contiguous with White Rock Road and will result in an encroachment on the Property. Landowner will dedicate land necessary to facilitate the Current Connector Alignment, and the landscape buffer associated with the Current Connector Alignment as required in the August 2014 Specific Plan Amendment, at no cost or compensation, both as depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1 as "Future IOD" (Irrevocable Offer of Dedication). Any additional required dedication (whether due to changes in alignment along White Rock Road, additions to the Connector Project, or as may be required for other subsequent phases of the Connector project and identified on Exhibit 3.7.1 as an "Interchange Reservation") shall be subject to the terms set forth in this Section 3.7.1 for limited compensation from other public agencies. Landowner agrees that the Current Connector Alignment as depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1 constitutes a "minor adjustment" to the White Rock Road alignment previously approved in the Specific Plan as that term is used in Section 3.8.3 of the Restated Agreement. Any future compensation shall be valued with the entitlements in place prior to the approval of any maps on Landowner’s property and with the zoning in place immediately prior to the approval of this Amendment No. 1 to the ARDA. Landowner will cooperate with the alignment of the Connector to minimize expense provided that there is no loss of developable acreage, increased cost to improve or develop the Property, or effect on approved entitlements for the Property. If the final Connector alignment results in excess property located between the Connector and south of Landowner’s property line, Landowner will cooperate and support the City with any potential annexation of such excess property into the City, but Landowner shall have no rights or obligations associated with that excess property.”

h. **Section 4.2.2.1 – SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication.**

Section 4.2.2.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

"4.2.2.1 – **SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication Limited to Community Park West Dedication; Payment of SPIF Park Land Equalization Fee Component Upon Approval of a Final Map for Each Subdivision After Exhaustion of Landowner’s Park Land Credits.** In no case shall SPIF reimbursement apply for required dedications of parkland pursuant to the City’s Quimby ordinance. In other words, SPIF
reimbursement for over-dedication of park land is applicable only for the landowner dedicating the Community Park West ("CPW") site, the only Landowner dedicating over and above the dedication requirements provided in City ordinances. In place of the City’s Quimby ordinance and specifically any requirement stated therein for payment of an “in-lieu fee,” the SPIF will include a separate component for park land equalization to be paid by all other Landowners (the “Under-dedicating Owners”) to compensate the over-dedicating owner of the CPW site. As more particularly provided by the SPIF Ordinance (now existing or to be established by the City Council, as amended from time to time), each Under-Dedicating Owner will have a different Park Land Equalization Fee for its property (based, in part, on the amount of park land being dedicated by such Under-Dedicating Owner and credited against its fair share park land obligation) and will begin paying its share of this fee after exhausting the park land credits associated with its own park land dedications. As provided by the SPIF Ordinance, once such fee becomes payable, the Park Land Equalization Fee will be due for an entire Small-Lot Map as each map exceeds the park land dedication credit. For example in an 800 unit project with four subdivision maps and a 357 unit parkland dedication credit, the Parkland Equalization fee shall be due for each map that exceeds the 357th unit and calculated by the units in that subdivision times the existing fee. Landowner acknowledges that the obligation to pay this fee may be included as a condition of each tentative subdivision map for which the payment will become due (after application of applicable park land dedication credits). Prior to approval of each Final Small-Lot Map within the Property, in accordance with the SPIF Ordinance, Landowner shall confirm in writing with the City either that (i) the park land equalization component of the SPIF is not then payable due to its offsetting park land dedication credits or (ii) the amount of the SPIF fee component for park land equalization then due and payable with respect to such Small-Lot Map. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to Landowner if the Property that is the subject of this Agreement includes the CPW site. The references herein to “CPW site” includes both the site identified in Figure 9.1 in the Specific Plan and the Alternate Park site specified in Section 2.2.3 and as depicted in Exhibit 2.2.3.2 until such time as the location of the Community Park West is determined as set forth in Section 2.2.3.”

i. Section 4.8 – City/County SCDTF Agreement/Highway 50 Coalition Fee. Landowner acknowledge that, since the execution of the Restated Agreement, City and the California Department of Transportation entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which provides, among other things, that the fair share contribution by development in the FPA for impacts to Highway 50 and certain related roads and interchanges will be incorporated into a Folsom South development impact fee, and not into a “Highway 50 Coalition Fee” as was previously described in Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement. Such fair share fee, the “Highway 50 Improvement Fee” was subsequently adopted by the City on September 8, 2015, as part of the
Folsom Plan Area Stand Alone Fees. In consideration thereof, all references to the “Highway 50 Coalition Fee” shall mean and refer to the adopted Highway 50 Improvement Fee. With the exception of this change in terminology used to describe the fee, all other provisions of Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply.

2. **Additions of New Sections to Restated Development Agreement.** The following new Sections 1.5.1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7 and 2.8 are added to the Restated Development Agreement as follows:

   a. **"Section 1.5.1.1 Consent to Amend PFFP for Additional Reclaimed/Recycled Water System in Backbone Infrastructure."** Pursuant to Section 1.5.1, Developer expressly consents to the City amending the PFFP in connection with an update to the Recycled Water Analysis Appendix to the Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan in order to provide funding for additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements to serve Zones 4, 5 and 6 of the FPASP east of Placerville Road, including but not limited to conveyance system and related backbone pipeline. An exhibit depicting said additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements prepared as part of the Water System Master Plan update and PFFP amendment will be incorporated into the Restated Development Agreement as Exhibit 1.5.1.1. All provisions in the Restated Agreement relating to PFFP shall include the amendment provided herein and the provisions of Section 2.2.4(4) of the Restated Agreement regarding the potential responsibility for Landowner's Development to provide funding for additional off-site transmission, on-site storage and other necessary infrastructure shall apply with respect thereto.

   b. **"Section 1.6 Anticipated Changes to City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance."** The City has amended the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (i.e., Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104) by Ordinance No. 1243, to eliminate Second Dwelling Units (also referred to as "granny flats") as an alternative means of meeting the City's inclusionary housing requirements. Landowner acknowledges there is no vested right to use this alternative means for meeting the City's inclusionary housing requirements and that this alternative shall not be available to Landowner from and after the date of Ordinance No. 1243. Other than the elimination of the "granny flat" option, the Parties agree that all other alternatives for meeting the City's inclusionary housing requirements remain vested to the full extent provided for in the Restated Agreement.

   c. **"Section 1.7 Consistency with Other Amendments to Restated Agreements for the Plan Area."** By entering into Tier 1 Development Agreements and Restated Development Agreements on like terms with other owners of property within the Plan Area, the City intended, and now reaffirms its intention, to apply comparable rules to all property within the Plan Area for vesting of entitlements and exceptions thereto, term of agreement, requirements imposed on development of the property, obligations of landowners and obligations imposed by City upon itself. In light of the intention to maintain equality in terms and provisions among landowners, City agrees to consider, upon request of the Landowner, and approve or deny in its sole and absolute discretion, a subsequent amendment to this Amendment of Restated Agreement to provide like terms.
that may be included in an Amendment of Restated Agreement for another owner within the Plan Area. Furthermore, with respect to the provisions of Section 2.5.3B(9) and 2.5.3B(10) added herein, City intends to impose these conditions equitably throughout the Plan Area as and to each and every Participating Landowner who seeks any future specific plan amendment, tentative subdivision map or ARDA amendment in connection with its proposed development. If City fails to impose either condition, when required, with at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), the corresponding condition of approval hereunder shall be null and void as to Landowner’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final Small-Lot Map for the Project. If the City approves any other final Small-Lot Map for a project within the Plan Area and the Corporation Yard or high school/middle school site(s), as applicable, has not been approved as provided for in said Section 2.5.3B(9) or 2.5.3B(10), Landowner may seek relief from the terms of the applicable condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council.”

d. “Section 2.7 Requirements for Submittal of Plans and Processing of Maps.

“2.7.1 Phased Maps. Landowner may develop the Project in Development Phases, and consistent with Government Code section 66456.1, Landowner may file multiple final Small-Lot Maps based upon an approved phased Large-Lot or Small-Lot vested tentative subdivision map. Filing of a final Small-Lot Map on a portion of a vested tentative subdivision map shall not invalidate any portion of the vested tentative subdivision map.

“2.7.2 Compliance with Submittal Requirements. Specific projects proposed under the tentative Small-Lot Map shall comply with all submittal and review requirements in effect at the time of submittal, including but not limited to the requirements set forth in Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement.”

e. “Section 2.8 Dedication and Acceptance of Public Improvements. City acknowledges that the FPA and the Project will be constructed in phases, and that certain portions of the Backbone Infrastructure and Project specific improvements, referenced collectively as the Public Improvements, will be constructed in phases, as different portions of the FPA and the Project develop at different times.

Conditions of approval on the Project identify Landowner’s obligation for and timing for construction of portions of the Public Improvements, and subject to any conditions placed by the City on the phasing of Public Improvements, City shall accept for irrevocable dedication those portions of improvements contained within the final Small-Lot Map that are complete. By way of example, if City requires construction of only a portion of a road or drainage facility as part of the Conditions of Approval on the Project, the City shall accept that portion of the Public Improvement once a determination of completeness is made to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.”
3. **Effect of Amendment.** This Amendment No. 1 amends, but does not replace or supersede, the Restated Development Agreement. In the event of any conflict, the language of this Amendment No. 1 shall be controlling in all events or circumstances. Except as modified hereby, all other terms and provisions of the Restated Development Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

4. **Form of Amendment; Execution in Counterparts.** This Amendment No. 1 is executed in duplicate originals, each of which is deemed to be an original, and may be executed in counterparts.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Folsom has authorized the execution of this Restated Agreement in duplicate by its Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk under the authority of Ordinance No. ______ adopted by the City Council on the _____ day of ____________, 2016.

**CITY:**

CITY OF FOLSOM,  
a municipal corporation

__________________________  
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

**APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:**

__________________________  
Evert W. Palmer, City Manager

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

__________________________  
Steven Wang, City Attorney

**ATTEST:**

__________________________  
Christa Saunders, City Clerk

**LANDOWNER:**

WEST HILLSBOROUGH INVESTORS, LLC  
a Delaware Limited Liability Company

By: HBT Hillsborough, LLC  
a Delaware Limited Liability Company  
Its Managing Member

By: ________________________  
William B. Bunce  
Its: Manager
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of ______________________
County of ____________________

On ______________________, 2016, before me, ____________________________ (Here insert Name and Title of Officer) personally appeared ____________________________ (Name(s) of Signer(s)), who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

______________________________  ______________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC SIGNATURE  NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL
EXHIBIT “A-1”
WEST HILLSBOROUGH INVESTORS, LLC

All that real property situated in the City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, State of California and being further described as follows:

Parcel 2 of that certain Parcel Map entitled “PN 14-329 Parcel Map” filed for record on May 28, 2015 in Book 223 of Parcel Maps at Page 5, Sacramento County Records.

Containing 47.68 acres of land, more or less.

APN: 072-0060-091

See Exhibit “A-2”, plat to accompany description, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This legal description was prepared by me or under my supervision pursuant to Section 8729 (2) of the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Craig E. Spiess, PLS 7944
License Expiration Date: 12-31-17

Date: __/20/16

Description prepared by:
MACKAY & SOMPS CIVIL ENGINEERS, INC.
1552 Eureka Road, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95661
P:\27026\survey-MS\mapping\desc\TIER 1 DA AMENDMENT\WEST HILLSBOROUGH INVESTORS, INC.docx
ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Ordinance No.____ An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan
ORDINANCE NO.

AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, INC. RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR/EIS) for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) was certified by the City Council on June 14, 2011, and the FPASP was adopted by the City Council on June 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority in Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code, the City Council, following a duly noticed public hearing on June 28, 2011, approved the Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan (Tier 1 DA) for the development of the Folsom Plan Area by adopting Ordinance No. 1149 on July 12, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, following a duly noticed public hearing on May 27, 2014, approved a request to amend the Tier 1 DA pertaining to the development of the Folsom Plan Area, including the Hillsborough Project, by approving a First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (ARDA) between the City, one of the developers of the Hillsborough Project, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc., and Easton Development Company, LLC, by adopting Ordinance No. 1207 on June 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Hillsborough Project consists of a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, and further amendment to the ARDA for future development within the Folsom Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the City and the owners of the Hillsborough Project desire to amend the ARDA in order to provide greater certainty and clarity to matters that are common, necessary and essential for the development of the Hillsborough Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, at its regular meeting on May ____, 2016, considered Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement by and Between the City of Folsom and Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. (Amendment No. 1) at a duly noticed public hearing as prescribed by law, and recommended that the City Council approve said Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, all notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Folsom hereby does ordain as follows:
SECTION 1. FINDINGS

A. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

B. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (Amendment No. 1) is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the City’s General Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

C. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement is in conformity with public convenience, general welfare, and good land use practices.

D. The Amendment No. 1 will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of persons residing in the immediate area, nor be detrimental or injurious to property or persons in the general neighborhood or to the general welfare of the residents of the City as a whole.

E. The Amendment No. 1 will not adversely affect the orderly development of property or the preservation of property values.

F. The Amendment No. 1 has been prepared in accordance with, and is consistent with, Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5, and City Council Resolution No. 2370.

G. All notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

H. A Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement was previously certified for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. An Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared for the proposed Hillsborough Project, which includes the proposed Amendment No. 1, and concludes that the proposed Project will not result in substantial changes to the FPASP.

SECTION 2. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

The Mayor is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. on behalf of the City after the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY

If any section, subsection, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this
Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days from and after its passage and adoption, provided it is published in full or in summary within twenty (20) days after its adoption in a newspaper of general circulation in the City.

This ordinance was introduced and the title thereof read at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016 and the second reading occurred at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016.

On a motion by Council Member ______, seconded by Council Member ______, the foregoing ordinance was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Folsom, State of California, this ____ day of _____ 2016 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Member(s):

NOES: Council Member(s):

ABSENT: Council Member(s):

ABSTAIN: Council Member(s):

______________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Christa Saunders, CITY CLERK

Effective:
FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM
PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE §6103
RECORDING REQUESTED BY CITY CLERK
WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

City Clerk
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

(SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE RESERVED FOR RECORDER'S USE)

AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND
AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, INC.
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
(Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc.)

This Amendment No. 1 to First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement ("Amendment No. 1") is entered into this ___ day of __________, 2016, by and between the City of Folsom ("City") and Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc., an Ohio corporation ("Landowner") pursuant to the authority of Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code of California. All capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined herein shall mean and refer to those terms as defined in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement described below between the parties hereto.

RECATALS

A. Restated Development Agreement. The City and Landowner, together with Easton Development Company, LLC ("Easton"), previously entered into that certain First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement By and Between the City of Folsom and Landowner Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan, recorded on July 15, 2014, in the Official Records of the County Recorder of Sacramento County in Book 20140715, Page 0552 (the "Restated Development Agreement"). Section 1.5 of the Restated Development Agreement allows the Restated Development Agreement to be amended from time to time by mutual written consent of the parties.

B. After the Effective Date of the Restated Development Agreement, Landowner and Easton conveyed portions of the property described in the Restated Development Agreement to various entities, with the City approving an Assignment and Assumption Agreement Relative to the Restated Development Agreement between Landowner and Easton and (1) Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC, (2) Hillsborough North, LLC, (3) Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC and (4) West Hillsborough Investors, LLC (collectively the "Assignment and Assumption Agreements" and with the entities identified in this paragraph collectively the "Subsequent Purchasers"). Pursuant to the Assignment and Assumption Agreements, and under the terms set forth therein, Landowner and Easton were released from further rights and obligations relative to the properties covered by those Assignment and Assumption Agreements.

C. Property. Landowner retained and still owns the portion of real property described in Exhibit A-1 and shown in Exhibit A-2 attached hereto (the "Property") and, in connection therewith, retains the rights and obligations as Landowner under the Restated Development Agreement with respect to the Property. The subject of the Restated Development Agreement, as amended hereby and as applied to Landowner, is the Development of the Property. Landowner owns the Property and represents that all persons holding legal or equitable interests in the Property shall be bound by the Restated Development Agreement, as amended by this Amendment No. 1 and applied to the Property.
D. **Purpose of Amendment.** The Subsequent Purchasers and Landowner are jointly processing a Specific Plan Amendment, commonly referred to as the Folsom Area Specific Plan for the Hillsborough Properties (the “SPA”) for development of the real property originally covered by the Restated Development Agreement, which includes both the Property and the property acquired by the Subsequent Purchasers (the “SPA Planning Area”). In connection with the approval of the SPA, the City and Landowner desire to amend the timing of certain requirements related to the approval of tentative subdivision maps otherwise required by Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, as more particularly provided in this Amendment No. 1. Additionally, Landowner desires that the SPA for the Property, including the conditions of approval related thereto, as approved by the City, be included within the definition of Entitlements as that term is used throughout the Restated Development Agreement, pursuant to Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement. City and Landowner further intend to clarify certain provisions related to identification of sites for a corporation yard and high school/middle school, as provided for in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.5.3B of the Restated Development Agreement.

E. **Hearings.** On ___________, 2016, the City Planning Commission, designated as the planning agency for purposes of development agreement review pursuant to Government Code Section 65867, in a duly noticed and conducted public hearing, considered this Amendment No. 1 and recommended that the City Council approve this Amendment No. 1 to the Restated Development Agreement.

F. **Environmental Review.** On ___________, 2016, the City Council considered the Addendum to the Specific Plan EIR (the “Addendum”) for development of the SPA Planning Area consistent with the SPA (the “Project”). An Initial Study prepared in support of the Addendum identified mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts which have been incorporated into the Project and in the terms and conditions of the approved SPA, as reflected by the findings adopted by the City Council concurrently with this Amendment No. 1.

G. **No New Impacts Associated with Approval of Amendment.** The City Council has determined that the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 involves no new impacts not considered in the Specific Plan EIR and Addendum; therefore, no further environmental documents relating to the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 are required.

H. **Consistency with General Plan and Specific Plan.** Having duly examined and considered this Amendment No. 1, City finds and declares that this Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the General Plan and the Specific Plan, as amended.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged and
agreed, the parties hereto do hereby agree to amend the Restated Development Agreement as applied to the Property as follows:

1. **Amendments to Existing Sections of Restated Development Agreement**. The definition of “Entitlements” in Recital H, the definition of “Property” in Section 1.3, the provisions regarding the Corporation Yard in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, and Sections 2.5.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7.1, 4.2.2.1 and 4.8 are hereby amended as follows:

   a. **Recital H – Entitlements.** The term “Entitlements” set forth in Recital H of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to include:

      i. the Specific Plan, as amended by the SPA approved by the City Council by Resolution [______]; and

      ii. this Amendment of Restated Development Agreement.

   In consideration thereof, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, Landowner hereby reaffirms its agreement to abide by the provisions of this Restated Development Agreement, as modified hereby, and the conditions of approval imposed in connection therewith as applicable to the Property with the approved SPA and rezoning of the Property.

   b. **Section 1.3 – Property.** The term “Property” set forth in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised as follows:

   “Property” means that certain parcel of land described in Exhibit A-1 and shown on Exhibit A-2 attached hereto and made a part hereof within the Plan Area.

   c. **Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 – Corporation Yard.** The provisions of Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and the amendment to Section 2.5.3(B)(9), as set forth below, is not intended to alter, amend or enlarge the obligations and rights of Landowner as set forth in Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, except as specifically identified in Section 2.5.3(B)(9).

   d. **Section 2.5.3 – Requirements for Subsequent Plans.** The provisions of Subsections (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and are not affected by this Amendment No. 1. Subsections (A) and (B) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement are hereby revised to read as follows:

   "A. Prior to Approval of First Tentative Small Lot Map:

   (1) Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan; and

   (2) Design Guidelines."
"B. Prior to Approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or First Building Permit if Development May Occur Without Any Subdivision) or as otherwise specified below:

(1) Open Space Management and Financing Plan;

(2) Drainage Facilities Maintenance and Financing Plan;

(3) Formation of the Sewer and Off-Site Water CFD as provided in the PFFP to fund a portion of the Plan Area sewer and water infrastructure, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the sewer and water infrastructure, on a building permit by building permit basis (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to by Landowner and the City) that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(4) Formation of the Aquatic Center CFD related to the recreational facilities that may include an aquatic center, sports complex and/or community center, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the recreational facilities, on a building permit by building permit basis, (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to between Landowner and the City), that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(5) Formation of the Parks, Trails, Landscape Corridors, Medians and Open Space Maintenance CFD (the "Services CFD"), the Storm Drainage Maintenance CFD (unless such drainage maintenance is included in the Services CFD), and the Street Maintenance District/Lighting Maintenance District CFD (unless such street maintenance is included in the Services CFD), as provided in the PFFP;

(6) Adoption of the New Plan Area Fees, including the New Plan Area Fees for City Facilities, the SPIF, and the SPRF, as provided in the PFFP and listed on Exhibit 2.2.4 attached hereto;
(7) Dedication or grant of the rights of way and easements for all Backbone Lands for roadways and utilities within the portion of the Property affected by the Small-Lot Map or anywhere within the Property within thirty (30) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for the dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(8) For each final Small Lot Map, offers of dedication of the Public Parcel(s) described in Section 3.8.5 below located within the portion of the Property affected by the final Small Lot Map, or within sixty (60) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(9) A site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4, as may be amended or otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City’s determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site, consistent with the foregoing, as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion; and

(10) A site or sites identified as suitable by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District, for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area shall be identified and approved by the City in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. If a supplemental fee is required to support the development of such site(s), Landowner agrees to support the establishment of such fee in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act and to pay such fee, so long as such fee is equitably shared by all similar development within the Plan Area. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial
progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager's determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion."

e. Section 3.5 – EIR Mitigation Measures. Section 3.5 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

"3.5 EIR Mitigation Measures. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, to the contrary, as and when Landowner elects to Develop the Property, or any portion or phase thereof, Landowner shall be bound by, and shall perform, or cause to be performed, all mitigation measures contained in the Specific Plan EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND, and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and any additional environmental mitigation measures referenced therein, and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) related to Development of the Property which are adopted by City and are identified in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program as being a responsibility of Landowner for Development of the Property."

f. Section 3.6 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Section 3.6 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

"3.6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Separate from and in addition to the requirements in Section 3.5 of this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, Landowner shall be responsible for all of the costs and expenses associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program under CEQA as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) that are identified as applicable to this Project in the Project EIR related to the Development. In furtherance of this provision, Landowner shall pay all costs required by the City associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as set forth in the conditions of approval on the Entitlements and the Subsequent Entitlements."

g. Section 3.7.1 – White Rock Road Improvements. Section 3.7.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to add the following additional paragraph at the end of Section 3.7.1:

"Landowner understands and acknowledges that the alignment for the entire mainline portion of the Capital Southeast Connector has not been finally determined, however the Connector JPA has approved an alignment for what is known as the Capital Southeast Connector Segment D3/E1, which was presented to the City Council on July 14, 2015 prior to approval by the Connector JPA Board and was endorsed by the City Council by Resolution No. 9609. This alignment, and the footprint for this alignment, was approved by the Connector JPA by Resolution No. 2016-
05 on January 22, 2016 in the approval of the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Capital Southeast Connector Segment D3/E1 Project ("IS/MND"), and is depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1, attached hereto and incorporated by reference. The alignment depicted in Exhibit 3.7.1 is referenced herein as the "Current Connector Alignment." The Current Connector Alignment is not contiguous with White Rock Road and will result in an encroachment on the Property. Landowner will dedicate land necessary to facilitate the Current Connector Alignment, and the landscape buffer associated with the Current Connector Alignment as required in the August 2014 Specific Plan Amendment, at no cost or compensation, both as depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1 as "Future IOD" (Irrevocable Offer of Dedication). Any additional required dedication (whether due to changes in alignment along White Rock Road, additions to the Connector Project, or as may be required for other subsequent phases of the Connector project and identified on Exhibit 3.7.1 as an "Interchange Reservation") shall be subject to the terms set forth in this Section 3.7.1 for limited compensation from other public agencies. Landowner agrees that the Current Connector Alignment as depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1 constitutes a “minor adjustment” to the White Rock Road alignment previously approved in the Specific Plan as that term is used in Section 3.8.3 of the Restated Agreement. Any future compensation shall be valued with the entitlements in place prior to the approval of any maps on Landowner’s property and with the zoning in place immediately prior to the approval of this Amendment No. 1 to the ARDA. Landowner will cooperate with the alignment of the Connector to minimize expense provided that there is no loss of developable acreage, increased cost to improve or develop the Property, or effect on approved entitlements for the Property. If the final Connector alignment results in excess property located between the Connector and south of Landowner’s property line, Landowner will cooperate and support the City with any potential annexation of such excess property into the City, but Landowner shall have no rights or obligations associated with that excess property.”

h. **Section 4.2.2.1 – SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication.** Section 4.2.2.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

> "4.2.2.1 – SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication Limited to Community Park West Dedication: Payment of SPIF Park Land Equalization Fee Component Upon Approval of a Final Map for Each Subdivision After Exhaustion of Landowner’s Park Land Credits. In no case shall SPIF reimbursement apply for required dedications of parkland pursuant to the City’s Quimby ordinance. In other words, SPIF reimbursement for over-dedication of park land is applicable only for the landowner dedicating the Community Park West ("CPW") site, the only landowner dedicating over and above the dedication requirements provided in City ordinances. In place of the City's Quimby ordinance and amendment no. 1 to Restated DA – Aerojet Rocketdyne
specifically any requirement stated therein for payment of an “in-lieu fee,” the SPIF will include a separate component for park land equalization to be paid by all other Landowners (the “Under-dedicating Owners”) to compensate the over-dedicating owner of the CPW site. As more particularly provided by the SPIF Ordinance (now existing or to be established by the City Council, as amended from time to time), each Under-Dedicating Owner will have a different Park Land Equalization Fee for its property (based, in part, on the amount of park land being dedicated by such Under-Dedicating Owner and credited against its fair share park land obligation) and will begin paying its share of this fee after exhausting the park land credits associated with its own park land dedications. As provided by the SPIF Ordinance, once such fee becomes payable, the Park Land Equalization Fee will be due for an entire Small-Lot Map as each map exceeds the park land dedication credit. For example in an 800 unit project with four subdivision maps and a 357 unit parkland dedication credit, the Parkland Equalization fee shall be due for each map that exceeds the 357th unit and calculated by the units in that subdivision times the existing fee. Landowner acknowledges that the obligation to pay this fee may be included as a condition of each tentative subdivision map for which the payment will become due (after application of applicable park land dedication credits). Prior to approval of each Final Small-Lot Map within the Property, in accordance with the SPIF Ordinance, Landowner shall confirm in writing with the City either that (i) the park land equalization component of the SPIF is not then payable due to its offsetting park land dedication credits or (ii) the amount of the SPIF fee component for park land equalization then due and payable with respect to such Small-Lot Map. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to Landowner if the Property that is the subject of this Agreement includes the CPW site. The references herein to “CPW site” includes both the site identified in Figure 9.1 in the Specific Plan and the Alternate Park site specified in Section 2.2.3 and as depicted in Exhibit 2.2.3.2 until such time as the location of the Community Park West is determined as set forth in Section 2.2.3.”

i. Section 4.8 – City/County SCDTF Agreement/Highway 50 Coalition Fee. Landowner acknowledge that, since the execution of the Restated Agreement, City and the California Department of Transportation entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which provides, among other things, that the fair share contribution by development in the FPA for impacts to Highway 50 and certain related roads and interchanges will be incorporated into a Folsom South development impact fee, and not into a “Highway 50 Coalition Fee” as was previously described in Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement. Such fair share fee, the “Highway 50 Improvement Fee” was subsequently adopted by the City on September 8, 2015, as part of the Folsom Plan Area Stand Alone Fees. In consideration thereof, all references to the “Highway 50 Coalition Fee” shall mean and refer to the adopted Highway 50 Improvement Fee. With the exception of this change in terminology used to describe the fee, all other provisions of Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply.
2. **Additions of New Sections to Restated Development Agreement.** The following new Sections 1.5.1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7 and 2.8 are added to the Restated Development Agreement as follows:

a. **"Section 1.5.1.1 Consent to Amend PFFP for Additional Reclaimed/Recycled Water System in Backbone Infrastructure."** Pursuant to Section 1.5.1, Developer expressly consents to the City amending the PFFP in connection with an update to the Recycled Water Analysis Appendix to the Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan in order to provide funding for additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements to serve Zones 4, 5 and 6 of the FPASP east of Placerville Road, including but not limited to conveyance system and related backbone pipeline. An exhibit depicting said additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements prepared as part of the Water System Master Plan update and PFFP amendment will be incorporated into the Restated Development Agreement as **Exhibit 1.5.1.1.** All provisions in the Restated Agreement relating to PFFP shall include the amendment provided herein and the provisions of Section 2.2.4(4) of the Restated Agreement regarding the potential responsibility for Landowner’s Development to provide funding for additional off-site transmission, on-site storage and other necessary infrastructure shall apply with respect thereto."

b. **"Section 1.6 Anticipated Changes to City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.** The City has amended the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (i.e., Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104) by Ordinance No. 1243, to eliminate Second Dwelling Units (also referred to as “granny flats”) as an alternative means of meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements. Landowner acknowledges there is no vested right to use this alternative means for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements and that this alternative shall not be available to Landowner from and after the date of Ordinance No. 1243. Other than the elimination of the “granny flat” option, the Parties agree that all other alternatives for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements remain vested to the full extent provided for in the Restated Agreement."

c. **"Section 1.7 Consistency with Other Amendments to Restated Agreements for the Plan Area.** By entering into Tier 1 Development Agreements and Restated Development Agreements on like terms with other owners of property within the Plan Area, the City intended, and now reaffirms its intention, to apply comparable rules to all property within the Plan Area for vesting of entitlements and exceptions thereto, term of agreement, requirements imposed on development of the property, obligations of landowners and obligations imposed by City upon itself. In light of the intention to maintain equality in terms and provisions among landowners, City agrees to consider, upon request of the Landowner, and approve or deny in its sole and absolute discretion, a subsequent amendment to this Amendment of Restated Agreement to provide like terms that may be included in an Amendment of Restated Agreement for another owner within the Plan Area. Furthermore, with respect to the provisions of Section 2.5.3B(9) and 2.5.3B(10) added herein, City intends to impose these conditions equitably throughout the Plan Area as and to each and every Participating Landowner who seeks any future specific plan amendment, tentative subdivision map or ARDA amendment in connection
with its proposed development. If City fails to impose either condition, when required, with at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), the corresponding condition of approval hereunder shall be null and void as to Landowner’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final Small-Lot Map for the Project. If the City approves any other final Small-Lot Map for a project within the Plan Area and the Corporation Yard or high school/middle school site(s), as applicable, has not been approved as provided for in said Section 2.5.3B(9) or 2.5.3B(10), Landowner may seek relief from the terms of the applicable condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council.”

d. “Section 2.7 Requirements for Submittal of Plans and Processing of Maps.

“2.7.1 Phased Maps. Landowner may develop the Project in Development Phases, and consistent with Government Code section 66456.1, Landowner may file multiple final Small-Lot Maps based upon an approved phased Large-Lot or Small-Lot vested tentative subdivision map. Filing of a final Small-Lot Map on a portion of a vested tentative subdivision map shall not invalidate any portion of the vested tentative subdivision map.

“2.7.2 Compliance with Submittal Requirements. Specific projects proposed under the tentative Small-Lot Map shall comply with all submittal and review requirements in effect at the time of submittal, including but not limited to the requirements set forth in Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement.”

e. “Section 2.8 Dedication and Acceptance of Public Improvements. City acknowledges that the FPA and the Project will be constructed in phases, and that certain portions of the Backbone Infrastructure and Project specific improvements, referenced collectively as the Public Improvements, will be constructed in phases, as different portions of the FPA and the Project develop at different times. Conditions of approval on the Project identify Landowner’s obligation for and timing for construction of portions of the Public Improvements, and subject to any conditions placed by the City on the phasing of Public Improvements, City shall accept for irrevocable dedication those portions of improvements contained within the final Small-Lot Map that are complete. By way of example, if City requires construction of only a portion of a road or drainage facility as part of the Conditions of Approval on the Project, the City shall accept that portion of the Public Improvement once a determination of completeness is made to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.”

3. Effect of Amendment. This Amendment No. 1 amends, but does not replace or supersede, the Restated Development Agreement. In the event of any conflict, the language of this Amendment No. 1 shall be controlling in all events or circumstances. Except as modified hereby, all other terms and provisions of the Restated Development Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.
4. Form of Amendment; Execution in Counterparts. This Amendment No. 1 is executed in duplicate originals, each of which is deemed to be an original, and may be executed in counterparts.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Folsom has authorized the execution of this Restated Agreement in duplicate by its Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk under the authority of Ordinance No. ______ adopted by the City Council on the ____ day of ________, 2016.

CITY:

CITY OF FOLSOM,
a municipal corporation

________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:

________________________
Evert W. Palmer, City Manager

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________
Steven Wang, City Attorney

ATTEST:

________________________
Christa Saunders, City Clerk

LANDOWNER:

AEROJET ROCKETFYNE, INC.,
an Ohio Corporation

By: Easton Development Company, LLC,
a California Limited Liability Company
Its Manager

By: _________________________
David C. Hatch
Vice President and
Chief Operating Officer
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of _______________
County of _______________

On ________________, 2016, before me, __________________________ (Here insert Name and Title of Officer)
personally appeared __________________________ (Name(s) of Signer(s))
who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

______________________________ NOTARY PUBLIC SIGNATURE

______________________________ NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL
EXHIBIT “A-1”  
AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, LLC

All that real property situated in the City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, State of California and being further described as follows:

Parcel 1 of that certain Parcel Map entitled “PN 14-329 Parcel Map” filed for record on May 28, 2015 in Book 223 of Parcel Maps, at Page 5, Sacramento County Records.

Containing 148.40 acres of land, more or less.

APN: 072-0060-090

See Exhibit “A-2”, plat to accompany description, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This legal description was prepared by me or under my supervision pursuant to Section 8729 (2) of the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Craig E. Spiess, PLS 7944  
License Expiration Date: 12-31-17

Date: 4/20/16

Description prepared by:  
MACKAY & SOMPS CIVIL ENGINEERS, INC.  
1552 Eureka Road, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95661
EXHIBIT A-2
AEROJET ROCKETFYNE, INC.
PARCEL 1, 223 P.M. 5
TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
AMENDMENT NO. 1
CITY OF FOLSOM
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO  STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MACKAY & SOMPS
ENGINEERS  PLANNERS  SURVEYORS
1052 Eureka Road, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95661 (916) 773-1189

RMAP  1" = 600'  04/20/2016  27026WCP
DRAWN BY  SCALE  DATE  JOB NO.

IF A DISCREPANCY EXISTS BETWEEN THIS EXHIBIT AND THE ASSOCIATED DESCRIPTION, THE DESCRIPTION HOLDS. THIS EXHIBIT IS FOR GRAPHIC PURPOSES ONLY.
AEROJET ROCKETDYNE
APN 072-0060-090

PARCEL BOUNDARY LINE

FUTURE PRAIRIE CITY ROAD IOD INTERSECTION WITH CONNECTOR MAINLINE

WEST HILLSBOROUGH INVESTORS, LLC
APN 072-0060-091

EXHIBIT 3.7.1

City of Fontana,

MACKay & SOMPS

California
April, 2016
2926, WCP
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ATTACHMENT NO. 8

Ordinance No.____ An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Hillsborough North, LLC Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan
ORDINANCE NO.

AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND HILLSBOROUGH NORTH, LLC RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR/EIS) for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) was certified by the City Council on June 14, 2011, and the FPASP was adopted by the City Council on June 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority in Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code, the City Council, following a duly notified public hearing on June 28, 2011, approved the Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan (Tier 1 DA) for the development of the Folsom Plan Area by adopting Ordinance No. 1149 on July 12, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, following a duly noticed public hearing on May 27, 2014, approved a request to amend the Tier 1 DA pertaining to the development of the Folsom Plan Area, including the Hillsborough Project, by approving a First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (ARDA) between the City and the predecessors-in-interest of the developer of the Hillsborough Project, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. and Easton Development Company, LLC, by adopting Ordinance No. 1207 on June 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Hillsborough Project consists of a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, and further amendment to the ARDA for future development within the Folsom Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the City and the owners of the Hillsborough Project desire to amend the ARDA in order to provide greater certainty and clarity to matters that are common, necessary and essential for the development of the Hillsborough Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, at its regular meeting on May ____, 2016, considered Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement by and Between the City of Folsom and Hillsborough North, LLC (Amendment No. 1) at a duly noticed public hearing as prescribed by law, and recommended that the City Council approve said Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, all notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Folsom hereby does ordain as follows:
SECTION 1. FINDINGS

A. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

B. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (Amendment No. 1) is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the City's General Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

C. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement is in conformity with public convenience, general welfare, and good land use practices.

D. The Amendment No. 1 will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of persons residing in the immediate area, nor be detrimental or injurious to property or persons in the general neighborhood or to the general welfare of the residents of the City as a whole.

E. The Amendment No. 1 will not adversely affect the orderly development of property or the preservation of property values.

F. The Amendment No. 1 has been prepared in accordance with, and is consistent with, Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5, and City Council Resolution No. 2370.

G. All notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

H. A Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement was previously certified for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. An Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared for the proposed Hillsborough Project, which includes the proposed Amendment No. 1, and concludes that the proposed Project will not result in substantial changes to the FPASP.

SECTION 2. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

The Mayor is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Hillsborough North, LLC on behalf of the City after the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY

If any section, subsection, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.
Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days from and after its passage and adoption, provided it is published in full or in summary within twenty (20) days after its adoption in a newspaper of general circulation in the City.

This ordinance was introduced and the title thereof read at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016 and the second reading occurred at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016.

On a motion by Council Member ______, seconded by Council Member ______, the foregoing ordinance was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Folsom, State of California, this ____ day of ____ 2016 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Member(s):

NOES: Council Member(s):

ABSENT: Council Member(s):

ABSTAIN: Council Member(s):

_____________________________________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____________________________________________________
Christa Saunders, CITY CLERK

Effective:

Ordinance No.
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AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND
HILLSBOROUGH NORTH, LLC
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
(Hillsborough North, LLC)

This Amendment No. 1 to First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement ("Amendment No. 1") is entered into this ___ day of ____________, 2016, by and between the City of Folsom ("City") and Hillsborough North, LLC ("Landowner") pursuant to the authority of Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code of California. All capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined herein shall mean and refer to those terms as defined in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement described below between the parties hereto.

RECATALS

A. Restated Development Agreement. The City and Landowner's predecessors-in-interest, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. ("Aerojet") and Easton Development Company, LLC ("Easton"), previously entered into that certain First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement By and Between the City of Folsom and Landowner Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan, recorded on July 15, 2014, in the Official Records of the County Recorder of Sacramento County in Book 20140715, Page 0552 (the "Restated Development Agreement"). Section 1.5 of the Restated Development Agreement allows the Restated Development Agreement to be amended from time to time by mutual written consent of the parties.

B. After the Effective Date of the Restated Development Agreement, Aerojet and Easton conveyed portions of the property described in the Restated Development Agreement to various entities, with the City approving an Assignment and Assumption Agreement Relative to the Restated Development Agreement between Aerojet and Easton and (1) Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC, (2) Landowner, (3) Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC and (4) West Hillsborough Investors, LLC (collectively the "Assignment and Assumption Agreements" and with the entities identified in this paragraph, collectively the "Subsequent Purchasers"). Pursuant to the Assignment and Assumption Agreements, and under the terms set forth therein, Aerojet and Easton were released from further rights and obligations relative to the properties covered by those Assignment and Assumption Agreements.

C. Property. As provided above, Landowner acquired and owns the portion of real property described in Exhibit A-1 and shown in Exhibit A-2 attached hereto (the "Property") and, in connection therewith, acquired the rights and obligations as "Landowner" under the Restated Development Agreement with respect to the Property. The subject of the Restated Development Agreement, as amended hereby and as applied to Landowner, is the Development of the Property. Landowner owns the Property and represents that all persons holding legal or equitable interests in the
Property shall be bound by the Restated Development Agreement, as amended by this Amendment No. 1 and applied to the Property.

D. **Purpose of Amendment.** The Subsequent Purchasers and Aerojet are jointly processing a Specific Plan Amendment, commonly referred to as the Folsom Area Specific Plan for the Hillsborough Properties (the “SPA”) for development of the real property originally covered by the Restated Development Agreement, which includes the Property, the property acquired by the other Subsequent Purchasers, and the property retained by Aerojet (the “SPA Planning Area”). In connection with the approval of the SPA, the City and Landowner desire to amend the timing of certain requirements related to the approval of tentative subdivision maps otherwise required by Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, as more particularly provided in this Amendment No. 1. Additionally, Landowner desires that the SPA for the Property, including the conditions of approval related thereto, as approved by the City, be included within the definition of Entitlements as that term is used throughout the Restated Development Agreement, pursuant to Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement. City and Landowner further intend to clarify certain provisions related to identification of sites for a corporation yard and high school/middle school, as provided for in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.5.3B of the Restated Development Agreement.

E. **Hearings.** On ______________, 2016, the City Planning Commission, designated as the planning agency for purposes of development agreement review pursuant to Government Code Section 65867, in a duly noticed and conducted public hearing, considered this Amendment No. 1 and recommended that the City Council approve this Amendment No. 1 to the Restated Development Agreement.

F. **Environmental Review.** On ______________, 2016, the City Council considered the Addendum to the Specific Plan EIR (the “Addendum”) for development of the SPA Planning Area consistent with the SPA (the “Project”). An Initial Study prepared in support of the Addendum identified mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts which have been incorporated into the Project and in the terms and conditions of the approved SPA, as reflected by the findings adopted by the City Council concurrently with this Amendment No. 1.

G. **No New Impacts Associated with Approval of Amendment.** The City Council has determined that the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 involves no new impacts not considered in the Specific Plan EIR and Addendum; therefore, no further environmental documents relating to the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 are required.

H. **Consistency with General Plan and Specific Plan.** Having duly examined and considered this Amendment No. 1, City finds and declares that this Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the General Plan and the Specific Plan, as amended.
NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged and agreed, the parties hereto do hereby agree to amend the Restated Development Agreement as applied to the Property as follows:

1. **Amendments to Existing Sections of Restated Development Agreement.** The definition of "Entitlements" in Recital H, the definition of "Property" in Section 1.3, the provisions regarding the Corporation Yard in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, and Sections 2.5.3, 3.5, 3.6, 4.2.2.1 and 4.8 are hereby amended as follows:

   a. **Recital H – Entitlements.** The term "Entitlements" set forth in Recital H of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to include:

      i. the Specific Plan, as amended by the SPA approved by the City Council by Resolution [__________]; and

      ii. this Amendment of Restated Development Agreement.

   In consideration thereof, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, Landowner hereby reaffirms its agreement to abide by the provisions of this Restated Development Agreement, as modified hereby, and the conditions of approval imposed in connection therewith as applicable to the Property with the approved SPA and rezoning of the Property.

   b. **Section 1.3 – Property.** The term "Property" set forth in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised as follows:

      "Property" means that certain parcel of land described in Exhibit A-1 and shown on Exhibit A-2 attached hereto and made a part hereof within the Plan Area.

   c. **Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 – Corporation Yard.** The provisions of Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and the amendment to Section 2.5.3(B)(9), as set forth below, is not intended to alter, amend or enlarge the obligations and rights of Landowner as set forth in Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, except as specifically identified in Section 2.5.3(B)(9).

   d. **Section 2.5.3 – Requirements for Subsequent Plans.** The provisions of Subsections (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and are not affected by this Amendment No. 1. Subsections (A) and (B) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement are hereby revised to read as follows:

   "A. **Prior to Approval of First Tentative Small Lot Map:**

   (1) Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan; and
(2) Design Guidelines.

"B. Prior to Approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or First Building Permit if Development May Occur Without Any Subdivision) or as otherwise specified below:

(1) Open Space Management and Financing Plan;

(2) Drainage Facilities Maintenance and Financing Plan;

(3) Formation of the Sewer and Off-Site Water CFD as provided in the PFFP to fund a portion of the Plan Area sewer and water infrastructure, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the sewer and water infrastructure, on a building permit by building permit basis (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to by Landowner and the City) that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(4) Formation of the Aquatic Center CFD related to the recreational facilities that may include an aquatic center, sports complex and/or community center, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the recreational facilities, on a building permit by building permit basis, (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to between Landowner and the City), that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(5) Formation of the Parks, Trails, Landscape Corridors, Medians and Open Space Maintenance CFD (the "Services CFD"), the Storm Drainage Maintenance CFD (unless such drainage maintenance is included in the Services CFD), and the Street Maintenance District/Lighting Maintenance District CFD (unless such street maintenance is included in the Services CFD), as provided in the PFFP;

(6) Adoption of the New Plan Area Fees, including the New Plan Area Fees for City Facilities, the SPIF, and the SPRF, as provided in the PFFP and listed on Exhibit 2.2.4 attached hereto;
(7) Dedication or grant of the rights of way and easements for all Backbone Lands for roadways and utilities within the portion of the Property affected by the Small-Lot Map or anywhere within the Property within thirty (30) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for the dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(8) For each final Small Lot Map, offers of dedication of the Public Parcel(s) described in Section 3.8.5 below located within the portion of the Property affected by the final Small Lot Map, or within sixty (60) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(9) A site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4, as may be amended or otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City’s determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site, consistent with the foregoing, as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion; and

(10) A site or sites identified as suitable by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District, for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area shall be identified and approved by the City in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. If a supplemental fee is required to support the development of such site(s), Landowner agrees to support the establishment of such fee in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act and to pay such fee, so long as such fee is equitably shared by all similar development within the Plan Area. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial
progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion.”

e. Section 3.5 – **EIR Mitigation Measures.** Section 3.5 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

“3.5 **EIR Mitigation Measures.** Notwithstanding any other provision in this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, to the contrary, as and when Landowner elects to Develop the Property, or any portion or phase thereof, Landowner shall be bound by, and shall perform, or cause to be performed, all mitigation measures contained in the Specific Plan EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND, and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and any additional environmental mitigation measures referenced therein, and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) related to Development of the Property which are adopted by City and are identified in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program as being a responsibility of Landowner for Development of the Property.”

f. Section 3.6 – **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** Section 3.6 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

“3.6 **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** Separate from and in addition to the requirements in Section 3.5 of this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, Landowner shall be responsible for all of the costs and expenses associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program under CEQA as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) that are identified as applicable to this Project in the Project EIR related to the Development. In furtherance of this provision, Landowner shall pay all costs required by the City associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as set forth in the conditions of approval on the Entitlements and the Subsequent Entitlements.”

g. Section 4.2.2.1 – **SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication.** Section 4.2.2.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

“4.2.2.1 **SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication Limited to Community Park West Dedication; Payment of SPIF Park Land Equalization Fee Component Upon Approval of a Final Map for Each Subdivision After Exhaustion of Landowner’s Park Land Credits.** In no case shall SPIF reimbursement apply for required dedications of parkland pursuant to the City’s Quimby ordinance. In other words, SPIF reimbursement for over-dedication of park land is applicable only for the landowner dedicating the Community Park West ("CPW") site, the only...
Landowner dedicating over and above the dedication requirements provided in City ordinances. In place of the City’s Quimby ordinance and specifically any requirement stated therein for payment of an “in-lieu fee,” the SPIF will include a separate component for park land equalization to be paid by all other Landowners (the “Under-dedicating Owners”) to compensate the over-dedicating owner of the CPW site. As more particularly provided by the SPIF Ordinance (now existing or to be established by the City Council, as amended from time to time), each Under-Dedicating Owner will have a different Park Land Equalization Fee for its property (based, in part, on the amount of park land being dedicated by such Under-Dedicating Owner and credited against its fair share park land obligation) and will begin paying its share of this fee after exhausting the park land credits associated with its own park land dedications. As provided by the SPIF Ordinance, once such fee becomes payable, the Park Land Equalization Fee will be due for an entire Small-Lot Map as each map exceeds the park land dedication credit. For example in an 800 unit project with four subdivision maps and a 357 unit parkland dedication credit, the Parkland Equalization fee shall be due for each map that exceeds the 357th unit and calculated by the units in that subdivision times the existing fee. Landowner acknowledges that the obligation to pay this fee may be included as a condition of each tentative subdivision map for which the payment will become due (after application of applicable park land dedication credits). Prior to approval of each Final Small-Lot Map within the Property, in accordance with the SPIF Ordinance, Landowner shall confirm in writing with the City either that (i) the park land equalization component of the SPIF is not then payable due to its offsetting park land dedication credits or (ii) the amount of the SPIF fee component for park land equalization then due and payable with respect to such Small-Lot Map. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to Landowner if the Property that is the subject of this Agreement includes the CPW site. The references herein to “CPW site” includes both the site identified in Figure 9.1 in the Specific Plan and the Alternate Park site specified in Section 2.2.3 and as depicted in Exhibit 2.2.3.2 until such time as the location of the Community Park West is determined as set forth in Section 2.2.3.”

h. Section 4.8 – City/County SCDTF Agreement/Highway 50
Coalition Fee. Landowner acknowledge that, since the execution of the Restated Agreement, City and the California Department of Transportation entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which provides, among other things, that the fair share contribution by development in the FPA for impacts to Highway 50 and certain related roads and interchanges will be incorporated into a Folsom South development impact fee, and not into a "Highway 50 Coalition Fee" as was previously described in Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement. Such fair share fee, the "Highway 50 Improvement Fee" was subsequently adopted by the City on September 8, 2015, as part of the Folsom Plan Area Stand Alone Fees. In consideration thereof, all references to the “Highway 50 Coalition Fee” shall mean and refer to the adopted Highway 50
Improvement Fee. With the exception of this change in terminology used to describe the fee, all other provisions of Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply.

2. **Additions of New Sections to Restated Development Agreement.** The following new Sections 1.5.1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7 and 2.8 are added to the Restated Development Agreement as follows:

   a. **“Section 1.5.1.1 Consent to Amend PFFP for Additional Reclaimed/Recycled Water System in Backbone Infrastructure.”** Pursuant to Section 1.5.1, Developer expressly consents to the City amending the PFFP in connection with an update to the Recycled Water Analysis Appendix to the Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan in order to provide funding for additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements to serve Zones 4, 5 and 6 of the FPASP east of Placerville Road, including but not limited to conveyance system and related backbone pipeline. An exhibit depicting said additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements prepared as part of the Water System Master Plan update and PFFP amendment will be incorporated into the Restated Development Agreement as **Exhibit 1.5.1.1.** All provisions in the Restated Agreement relating to PFFP shall include the amendment provided herein and the provisions of Section 2.2.4(4) of the Restated Agreement regarding the potential responsibility for Landowner’s Development to provide funding for additional off-site transmission, on-site storage and other necessary infrastructure shall apply with respect thereto."

   b. **“Section 1.6 Anticipated Changes to City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.”** The City has amended the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (i.e., Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104) by Ordinance No. 1243, to eliminate Second Dwelling Units (also referred to as “granny flats”) as an alternative means of meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements. Landowner acknowledges there is no vested right to use this alternative means for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements and that this alternative shall not be available to Landowner from and after the date of Ordinance No. 1243. Other than the elimination of the “granny flat” option, the Parties agree that all other alternatives for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements remain vested to the full extent provided for in the Restated Agreement."

   c. **“Section 1.7 Consistency with Other Amendments to Restated Agreements for the Plan Area.”** By entering into Tier 1 Development Agreements and Restated Development Agreements on like terms with other owners of property within the Plan Area, the City intended, and now reaffirms its intention, to apply comparable rules to all property within the Plan Area for vesting of entitlements and exceptions thereto, term of agreement, requirements imposed on development of the property, obligations of landowners and obligations imposed by City upon itself. In light of the intention to maintain equality in terms and provisions among landowners, City agrees to consider, upon request of the Landowner, and approve or deny in its sole and absolute discretion, a subsequent amendment to this Amendment of Restated Agreement to provide like terms that may be included in an Amendment of Restated Agreement for another owner within the Plan Area. Furthermore, with respect to the provisions of Section 2.5.3B(9) and
2.5.3B(10) added herein, City intends to impose these conditions equitably throughout the Plan Area as and to each and every Participating Landowner who seeks any future specific plan amendment, tentative subdivision map or ARDA amendment in connection with its proposed development. If City fails to impose either condition, when required, with at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), the corresponding condition of approval hereunder shall be null and void as to Landowner’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final Small-Lot Map for the Project. If the City approves any other final Small-Lot Map for a project within the Plan Area and the Corporation Yard or high school/middle school site(s), as applicable, has not been approved as provided for in said Section 2.5.3B(9) or 2.5.3B(10), Landowner may seek relief from the terms of the applicable condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council."

d. “Section 2.7 Requirements for Submittal of Plans and Processing of Maps.

“2.7.1 Phased Maps. Landowner may develop the Project in Development Phases, and consistent with Government Code section 66456.1, Landowner may file multiple final Small-Lot Maps based upon an approved phased Large-Lot or Small-Lot vested tentative subdivision map. Filing of a final Small-Lot Map on a portion of a vested tentative subdivision map shall not invalidate any portion of the vested tentative subdivision map.

“2.7.2 Compliance with Submittal Requirements. Specific projects proposed under the tentative Small-Lot Map shall comply with all submittal and review requirements in effect at the time of submittal, including but not limited to the requirements set forth in Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement.”

e. “Section 2.8 Dedication and Acceptance of Public Improvements. City acknowledges that the FPA and the Project will be constructed in phases, and that certain portions of the Backbone Infrastructure and Project specific improvements, referenced collectively as the Public Improvements, will be constructed in phases, as different portions of the FPA and the Project develop at different times. Conditions of approval on the Project identify Landowner’s obligation for and timing for construction of portions of the Public Improvements, and subject to any conditions placed by the City on the phasing of Public Improvements, City shall accept for irrevocable dedication those portions of improvements contained within the final Small-Lot Map that are complete. By way of example, if City requires construction of only a portion of a road or drainage facility as part of the Conditions of Approval on the Project, the City shall accept that portion of the Public Improvement once a determination of completeness is made to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.”

3. Effect of Amendment. This Amendment No. 1 amends, but does not replace or supersede, the Restated Development Agreement. In the event of any
conflict, the language of this Amendment No. 1 shall be controlling in all events or circumstances. Except as modified hereby, all other terms and provisions of the Restated Development Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

4. **Form of Amendment; Execution in Counterparts.** This Amendment No. 1 is executed in duplicate originals, each of which is deemed to be an original, and may be executed in counterparts.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Folsom has authorized the execution of this Restated Agreement in duplicate by its Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk under the authority of Ordinance No. _______ adopted by the City Council on the ___ day of __________, 2016.

**CITY:**

**CITY OF FOLSOM,**
a municipal corporation

________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

**APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:**

________________________
Evert W. Palmer, City Manager

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

________________________
Steven Wang, City Attorney

**ATTEST:**

________________________
Christa Saunders, City Clerk

**LANDOWNER:**

**HILLSBOROUGH NORTH, LLC**
a Delaware Limited Liability Company

By: HBT Hillsborough, LLC
a Delaware Limited Liability Company
Its Managing Member

By: ______________________
William B. Bunce
Its: Manager
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of ________________
County of ________________

On __________________, 2016, before me, ____________________________ (Here insert Name and Title of Officer)

personally appeared ____________________________ (Name(s) of Signer(s))

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

_________________________________________ NOTARY PUBLIC SIGNATURE

_________________________________________ NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL
EXHIBIT “A-1”
HILLSBOROUGH NORTH, LLC

All that real property situated in the City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, State of California and being further described as follows:

Parcel 4 of that certain Parcel Map entitled “PN 14-329 Parcel Map” filed for record on May 28, 2015 in Book 223 of Parcel Maps, at Page 5, Sacramento County Records.

Containing 99.22 acres of land, more or less.

APN: 072-0060-093

See Exhibit “A-2”, plat to accompany description, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This legal description was prepared by me or under my supervision pursuant to Section 8729 (2) of the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Craig E. Spiess, PLS 7944
License Expiration Date: 12-31-17

Date: 4/20/16

Description prepared by:
MACKAY & SOMPS CIVIL ENGINEERS, INC.
1552 Eureka Road, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95661
P:\27026\survey-MS\mapping\desc\TIER 1 DA ADMENDMENTS\HILLSBOROUGH NORTH, LLC.docx
ATTACHMENT NO. 9

Ordinance No.____ An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan
ORDINANCE NO.

AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND OAK AVENUE HOLDINGS, LLC RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR/EIS) for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) was certified by the City Council on June 14, 2011, and the FPASP was adopted by the City Council on June 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority in Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code, the City Council, following a duly notified public hearing on June 28, 2011, approved the Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan (Tier 1 DA) for the development of the Folsom Plan Area by adopting Ordinance No. 1149 on July 12, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, following a duly noticed public hearing on May 27, 2014, approved a request to amend the Tier 1 DA pertaining to the development of the Folsom Plan Area, including the Hillsborough Project, by approving a First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (ARDA) between the City and the predecessors-in-interest of the developer of the Hillsborough Project, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. and Easton Development Company, LLC, by adopting Ordinance No. 1207 on June 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Hillsborough Project consists of a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, and further amendment to the ARDA for future development within the Folsom Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the City and the owners of the Hillsborough Project desire to amend the ARDA in order to provide greater certainty and clarity to matters that are common, necessary and essential for the development of the Hillsborough Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, at its regular meeting on May ___, 2016, considered Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement by and Between the City of Folsom and Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC (Amendment No. 1) at a duly noticed public hearing as prescribed by law, and recommended that the City Council approve said Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, all notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Folsom hereby does ordain as follows:
SECTION 1. FINDINGS

A. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

B. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (Amendment No. 1) is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the City’s General Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

C. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement is in conformity with public convenience, general welfare, and good land use practices.

D. The Amendment No. 1 will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of persons residing in the immediate area, nor be detrimental or injurious to property or persons in the general neighborhood or to the general welfare of the residents of the City as a whole.

E. The Amendment No. 1 will not adversely affect the orderly development of property or the preservation of property values.

F. The Amendment No. 1 has been prepared in accordance with, and is consistent with, Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5, and City Council Resolution No. 2370.

G. All notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

H. A Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement was previously certified for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. An Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared for the proposed Hillsborough Project, which includes the proposed Amendment No. 1, and concludes that the proposed Project will not result in substantial changes to the FPASP.

SECTION 2. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

The Mayor is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC on behalf of the City after the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY

If any section, subsection, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.
Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days from and after its passage and adoption, provided it is published in full or in summary within twenty (20) days after its adoption in a newspaper of general circulation in the City.

This ordinance was introduced and the title thereof read at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016 and the second reading occurred at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016.

On a motion by Council Member ______, seconded by Council Member ______, the foregoing ordinance was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Folsom, State of California, this ____ day of ____ 2016 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Member(s):

NOES: Council Member(s):

ABSENT: Council Member(s):

ABSTAIN: Council Member(s):

________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
Christa Saunders, CITY CLERK

Effective:

Ordinance No.
Page 3 of 3
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND
OAK AVENUE HOLDINGS, LLC
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
(Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC)

This Amendment No. 1 to First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement ("Amendment No. 1") is entered into this ___ day of __________, 2016, by and between the City of Folsom ("City") and Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC ("Landowner") pursuant to the authority of Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code of California. All capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined herein shall mean and refer to those terms as defined in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement described below between the parties hereto.

RECITALS

A. Restated Development Agreement. The City and Landowner’s predecessors-in-interest, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. ("Aerojet") and Easton Development Company, LLC ("Easton"), previously entered into that certain First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement By and Between the City of Folsom and Landowner Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan, recorded on July 15, 2014, in the Official Records of the County Recorder of Sacramento County in Book 20140715, Page 0552 (the “Restated Development Agreement”). Section 1.5 of the Restated Development Agreement allows the Restated Development Agreement to be amended from time to time by mutual written consent of the parties.

B. After the Effective Date of the Restated Development Agreement, Aerojet and Easton conveyed portions of the property described in the Restated Development Agreement to various entities, with the City approving an Assignment and Assumption Agreement Relative to the Restated Development Agreement between Aerojet and Easton and (1) Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC, (2) Hillsborough North, LLC, (3) Landowner and (4) West Hillsborough Investors, LLC (collectively the “Assignment and Assumption Agreements" and with the entities identified in this paragraph, collectively the “Subsequent Purchasers”). Pursuant to the Assignment and Assumption Agreements, and under the terms set forth therein, Aerojet and Easton were released from further rights and obligations relative to the properties covered by those Assignment and Assumption Agreements.

C. Property. As provided above, Landowner acquired and owns the portion of real property described in Exhibit A-1 and shown in Exhibit A-2 attached hereto (the “Property”) and, in connection therewith, acquired the rights and obligations as "Landowner" under the Restated Development Agreement with respect to the Property. The subject of the Restated Development Agreement, as amended hereby and as applied to Landowner, is the Development of the Property. Landowner owns the Property and represents that all persons holding legal or equitable interests in the
Property shall be bound by the Restated Development Agreement, as amended by this Amendment No. 1 and applied to the Property.

D. **Purpose of Amendment.** The Subsequent Purchasers and Aerojet are jointly processing a Specific Plan Amendment, commonly referred to as the Folsom Area Specific Plan for the Hillsborough Properties (the “SPA”) for development of the real property originally covered by the Restated Development Agreement, which includes the Property, the property acquired by the other Subsequent Purchasers, and the property retained by Aerojet (the “SPA Planning Area”). In connection with the approval of the SPA, the City and Landowner desire to amend the timing of certain requirements related to the approval of tentative subdivision maps otherwise required by Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, as more particularly provided in this Amendment No. 1. Additionally, Landowner desires that the SPA for the Property, including the conditions of approval related thereto, as approved by the City, be included within the definition of Entitlements as that term is used throughout the Restated Development Agreement, pursuant to Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement. City and Landowner further intend to clarify certain provisions related to identification of sites for a corporation yard and high school/middle school, as provided for in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.5.3B of the Restated Development Agreement.

E. **Hearings.** On ____________, 2016, the City Planning Commission, designated as the planning agency for purposes of development agreement review pursuant to Government Code Section 65867, in a duly noticed and conducted public hearing, considered this Amendment No. 1 and recommended that the City Council approve this Amendment No. 1 to the Restated Development Agreement.

F. **Environmental Review.** On ____________, 2016, the City Council considered the Addendum to the Specific Plan EIR (the “Addendum”) for development of the SPA Planning Area consistent with the SPA (the “Project”). An Initial Study prepared in support of the Addendum identified mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts which have been incorporated into the Project and in the terms and conditions of the approved SPA, as reflected by the findings adopted by the City Council concurrently with this Amendment No. 1.

G. **No New Impacts Associated with Approval of Amendment.** The City Council has determined that the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 involves no new impacts not considered in the Specific Plan EIR and Addendum; therefore, no further environmental documents relating to the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 are required.

H. **Consistency with General Plan and Specific Plan.** Having duly examined and considered this Amendment No. 1, City finds and declares that this Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the General Plan and the Specific Plan, as amended.
NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged and agreed, the parties hereto do hereby agree to amend the Restated Development Agreement as applied to the Property as follows:

1. **Amendments to Existing Sections of Restated Development Agreement.** The definition of “Entitlements” in Recital H, the definition of “Property” in Section 1.3, the provisions regarding the Corporation Yard in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, and Sections 2.5.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7.1, 4.2.2.1 and 4.8 are hereby amended as follows:

   a. **Recital H – Entitlements.** The term “Entitlements” set forth in Recital H of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to include:

      i. the Specific Plan, as amended by the SPA approved by the City Council by Resolution [___________]; and

      ii. this Amendment of Restated Development Agreement.

   In consideration thereof, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, Landowner hereby reaffirms its agreement to abide by the provisions of this Restated Development Agreement, as modified hereby, and the conditions of approval imposed in connection therewith as applicable to the Property with the approved SPA and rezoning of the Property.

   b. **Section 1.3 – Property.** The term “Property” set forth in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised as follows:

   “Property” means that certain parcel of land described in Exhibit A-1 and shown on Exhibit A-2 attached hereto and made a part hereof within the Plan Area.

   c. **Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 – Corporation Yard.** The provisions of Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and the amendment to Section 2.5.3(B)(9), as set forth below, is not intended to alter, amend or enlarge the obligations and rights of Landowner as set forth in Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, except as specifically identified in Section 2.5.3(B)(9).

   d. **Section 2.5.3 – Requirements for Subsequent Plans.** The provisions of Subsections (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and are not affected by this Amendment No. 1. Subsections (A) and (B) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement are hereby revised to read as follows:
"A. Prior to Approval of First Tentative Small Lot Map:

(1) Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan; and

(2) Design Guidelines.

"B. Prior to Approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or First Building Permit if Development May Occur Without Any Subdivision) or as otherwise specified below:

(1) Open Space Management and Financing Plan;

(2) Drainage Facilities Maintenance and Financing Plan;

(3) Formation of the Sewer and Off-Site Water CFD as provided in the PFFP to fund a portion of the Plan Area sewer and water infrastructure, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the sewer and water infrastructure, on a building permit by building permit basis (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to by Landowner and the City) that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(4) Formation of the Aquatic Center CFD related to the recreational facilities that may include an aquatic center, sports complex and/or community center, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the recreational facilities, on a building permit by building permit basis, (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to between Landowner and the City), that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(5) Formation of the Parks, Trails, Landscape Corridors, Medians and Open Space Maintenance CFD (the "Services CFD"), the Storm Drainage Maintenance CFD (unless such drainage maintenance is included in the Services CFD), and the Street Maintenance District/Lighting Maintenance District CFD (unless such street maintenance is included in the Services CFD), as provided in the PFFP;
(6) Adoption of the New Plan Area Fees, including the New Plan Area Fees for City Facilities, the SPIF, and the SPRF, as provided in the PFFP and listed on Exhibit 2.2.4 attached hereto;

(7) Dedication or grant of the rights of way and easements for all Backbone Lands for roadways and utilities within the portion of the Property affected by the Small-Lot Map or anywhere within the Property within thirty (30) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for the dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(8) For each final Small Lot Map, offers of dedication of the Public Parcel(s) described in Section 3.8.5 below located within the portion of the Property affected by the final Small Lot Map, or within sixty (60) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(9) A site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4, as may be amended or otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City’s determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site, consistent with the foregoing, as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion; and

(10) A site or sites identified as suitable by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District, for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area shall be identified and approved by the City in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. If a supplemental fee is required to support the development of such site(s), Landowner agrees to support the establishment of such fee in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act and to pay such fee, so long as such fee
is equitably shared by all similar development within the Plan Area. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager's determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion."

e. **Section 3.5 – EIR Mitigation Measures.** Section 3.5 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

> "3.5 EIR Mitigation Measures. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, to the contrary, as and when Landowner elects to Develop the Property, or any portion or phase thereof, Landowner shall be bound by, and shall perform, or cause to be performed, all mitigation measures contained in the Specific Plan EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND, and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and any additional environmental mitigation measures referenced therein, and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) related to Development of the Property which are adopted by City and are identified in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program as being a responsibility of Landowner for Development of the Property."

f. **Section 3.6 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** Section 3.6 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

> "3.6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Separate from and in addition to the requirements in Section 3.5 of this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, Landowner shall be responsible for all of the costs and expenses associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program under CEQA as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) that are identified as applicable to this Project in the Project EIR related to the Development. In furtherance of this provision, Landowner shall pay all costs required by the City associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as set forth in the conditions of approval on the Entitlements and the Subsequent Entitlements."

g. **Section 3.7.1 – White Rock Road Improvements.** Section 3.7.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to add the following additional paragraph at the end of Section 3.7.1:

> "Landowner understands and acknowledges that the alignment for the entire mainline portion of the Capital Southeast Connector has not been finally determined, however the Connector JPA has approved an alignment for what is known as the Capital Southeast Connector Segment
D3/E1, which was presented to the City Council on July 14, 2015 prior to approval by the Connector JPA Board and was endorsed by the City Council by Resolution No. 9609. This alignment, and the footprint for this alignment, was approved by the Connector JPA by Resolution No. 2016-05 on January 22, 2016 in the approval of the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Capital Southeast Connector Segment D3/E1 Project ("IS/MND"), and is depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1, attached hereto and incorporated by reference. The alignment depicted in Exhibit 3.7.1 is referenced herein as the “Current Connector Alignment.” The Current Connector Alignment is not contiguous with White Rock Road and will result in an encroachment on the Property. Landowner will dedicate land necessary to facilitate the Current Connector Alignment, and the landscape buffer associated with the Current Connector Alignment as required in the August 2014 Specific Plan Amendment, at no cost or compensation, both as depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1 as “Future IOD” (Irrevocable Offer of Dedication). Any additional required dedication (whether due to changes in alignment along White Rock Road, additions to the Connector Project, or as may be required for other subsequent phases of the Connector project and identified on Exhibit 3.7.1 as an “Interchange Reservation”) shall be subject to the terms set forth in this Section 3.7.1 for limited compensation from other public agencies. Landowner agrees that the Current Connector Alignment as depicted on Exhibit 3.7.1 constitutes a “minor adjustment” to the White Rock Road alignment previously approved in the Specific Plan as that term is used in Section 3.8.3 of the Restated Agreement. Any future compensation shall be valued with the entitlements in place prior to the approval of any maps on Landowner’s property and with the zoning in place immediately prior to the approval of this Amendment No. 1 to the ARDA. Landowner will cooperate with the alignment of the Connector to minimize expense provided that there is no loss of developable acreage, increased cost to improve or develop the Property, or effect on approved entitlements for the Property. If the final Connector alignment results in excess property located between the Connector and south of Landowner’s property line, Landowner will cooperate and support the City with any potential annexation of such excess property into the City, but Landowner shall have no rights or obligations associated with that excess property.”

h. Section 4.2.2.1 – SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication. Section 4.2.2.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

“4.2.2.1 – SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication Limited to Community Park West Dedication; Payment of SPIF Park Land Equalization Fee Component Upon Approval of a Final Map for Each Subdivision After Exhaustion of Landowner’s Park Land Credits. In no case shall SPIF reimbursement apply for required dedications of parkland pursuant to the City’s Quimby ordinance. In other words, SPIF
reimbursement for over-dedication of park land is applicable only for the landowner dedicating the Community Park West ("CPW") site, the only Landowner dedicating over and above the dedication requirements provided in City ordinances. In place of the City’s Quimby ordinance and specifically any requirement stated therein for payment of an “in-lieu fee,” the SPIF will include a separate component for park land equalization to be paid by all other Landowners (the “Under-dedicating Owners”) to compensate the over-dedicating owner of the CPW site. As more particularly provided by the SPIF Ordinance (now existing or to be established by the City Council, as amended from time to time), each Under-Dedicating Owner will have a different Park Land Equalization Fee for its property (based, in part, on the amount of park land being dedicated by such Under-Dedicating Owner and credited against its fair share park land obligation) and will begin paying its share of this fee after exhausting the park land credits associated with its own park land dedications. As provided by the SPIF Ordinance, once such fee becomes payable, the Park Land Equalization Fee will be due for an entire Small-Lot Map as each map exceeds the park land dedication credit. For example in an 800 unit project with four subdivision maps and a 357 unit parkland dedication credit, the Parkland Equalization fee shall be due for each map that exceeds the 357th unit and calculated by the units in that subdivision times the existing fee. Landowner acknowledges that the obligation to pay this fee may be included as a condition of each tentative subdivision map for which the payment will become due (after application of applicable park land dedication credits). Prior to approval of each Final Small-Lot Map within the Property, in accordance with the SPIF Ordinance, Landowner shall confirm in writing with the City either that (i) the park land equalization component of the SPIF is not then payable due to its offsetting park land dedication credits or (ii) the amount of the SPIF fee component for park land equalization then due and payable with respect to such Small-Lot Map. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to Landowner if the Property that is the subject of this Agreement includes the CPW site. The references herein to "CPW site" includes both the site identified in Figure 9.1 in the Specific Plan and the Alternate Park site specified in Section 2.2.3 and as depicted in Exhibit 2.2.3.2 until such time as the location of the Community Park West is determined as set forth in Section 2.2.3."

i. **Section 4.8 – City/County SCDTF Agreement/Highway 50 Coalition Fee.** Landowner acknowledge that, since the execution of the Restated Agreement, City and the California Department of Transportation entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which provides, among other things, that the fair share contribution by development in the FPA for impacts to Highway 50 and certain related roads and interchanges will be incorporated into a Folsom South development impact fee, and not into a "Highway 50 Coalition Fee" as was previously described in Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement. Such fair share fee, the "Highway 50 Improvement Fee" was subsequently adopted by the City on September 8, 2015, as part of the
Folsom Plan Area Stand Alone Fees. In consideration thereof, all references to the “Highway 50 Coalition Fee” shall mean and refer to the adopted Highway 50 Improvement Fee. With the exception of this change in terminology used to describe the fee, all other provisions of Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply.

2. **Additions of New Sections to Restated Development Agreement.** The following new Sections 1.5.1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7 and 2.8 are added to the Restated Development Agreement as follows:

   a. **“Section 1.5.1.1 Consent to Amend PFFP for Additional Reclaimed/Recycled Water System in Backbone Infrastructure.** Pursuant to Section 1.5.1, Developer expressly consents to the City amending the PFFP in connection with an update to the Recycled Water Analysis Appendix to the Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan in order to provide funding for additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements to serve Zones 4, 5 and 6 of the FPASP east of Placerville Road, including but not limited to conveyance system and related backbone pipeline. An exhibit depicting said additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements prepared as part of the Water System Master Plan update and PFFP amendment will be incorporated into the Restated Development Agreement as **Exhibit 1.5.1.1.** All provisions in the Restated Agreement relating to PFFP shall include the amendment provided herein and the provisions of Section 2.2.4(4) of the Restated Agreement regarding the potential responsibility for Landowner’s Development to provide funding for additional off-site transmission, on-site storage and other necessary infrastructure shall apply with respect thereto.”

   b. **“Section 1.6 Anticipated Changes to City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.** The City has amended the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (i.e., Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104) by Ordinance No. 1243, to eliminate Second Dwelling Units (also referred to as “granny flats”) as an alternative means of meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements. Landowner acknowledges there is no vested right to use this alternative means for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements and that this alternative shall not be available to Landowner from and after the date of Ordinance No. 1243. Other than the elimination of the “granny flat” option, the Parties agree that all other alternatives for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements remain vested to the full extent provided for in the Restated Agreement.”

   c. **“Section 1.7 Consistency with Other Amendments to Restated Agreements for the Plan Area.** By entering into Tier 1 Development Agreements and Restated Development Agreements on like terms with other owners of property within the Plan Area, the City intended, and now reaffirms its intention, to apply comparable rules to all property within the Plan Area for vesting of entitlements and exceptions thereto, term of agreement, requirements imposed on development of the property, obligations of landowners and obligations imposed by City upon itself. In light of the intention to maintain equality in terms and provisions among landowners, City agrees to consider, upon request of the Landowner, and approve or deny in its sole and absolute discretion, a subsequent amendment to this Amendment of Restated Agreement to provide like terms...
that may be included in an Amendment of Restated Agreement for another owner within the Plan Area. Furthermore, with respect to the provisions of Section 2.5.3B(9) and 2.5.3B(10) added herein, City intends to impose these conditions equitably throughout the Plan Area as and to each and every Participating Landowner who seeks any future specific plan amendment, tentative subdivision map or ARDA amendment in connection with its proposed development. If City fails to impose either condition, when required, with at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), the corresponding condition of approval hereunder shall be null and void as to Landowner's Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final Small-Lot Map for the Project. If the City approves any other final Small-Lot Map for a project within the Plan Area and the Corporation Yard or high school/middle school site(s), as applicable, has not been approved as provided for in said Section 2.5.3B(9) or 2.5.3B(10), Landowner may seek relief from the terms of the applicable condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council."

d. "Section 2.7 Requirements for Submittal of Plans and Processing of Maps.

"2.7.1 Phased Maps. Landowner may develop the Project in Development Phases, and consistent with Government Code section 66456.1, Landowner may file multiple final Small-Lot Maps based upon an approved phased Large-Lot or Small-Lot vested tentative subdivision map. Filing of a final Small-Lot Map on a portion of a vested tentative subdivision map shall not invalidate any portion of the vested tentative subdivision map.

"2.7.2 Compliance with Submittal Requirements. Specific projects proposed under the tentative Small-Lot Map shall comply with all submittal and review requirements in effect at the time of submittal, including but not limited to the requirements set forth in Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement."

e. "Section 2.8 Dedication and Acceptance of Public Improvements. City acknowledges that the FPA and the Project will be constructed in phases, and that certain portions of the Backbone Infrastructure and Project specific improvements, referenced collectively as the Public Improvements, will be constructed in phases, as different portions of the FPA and the Project develop at different times. Conditions of approval on the Project identify Landowner's obligation for and timing for construction of portions of the Public Improvements, and subject to any conditions placed by the City on the phasing of Public Improvements, City shall accept for irrevocable dedication those portions of improvements contained within the final Small-Lot Map that are complete. By way of example, if City requires construction of only a portion of a road or drainage facility as part of the Conditions of Approval on the Project, the City shall accept that portion of the Public Improvement once a determination of completeness is made to the satisfaction of the City Engineer."
3. **Effect of Amendment.** This Amendment No. 1 amends, but does not replace or supersede, the Restated Development Agreement. In the event of any conflict, the language of this Amendment No. 1 shall be controlling in all events or circumstances. Except as modified hereby, all other terms and provisions of the Restated Development Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

4. **Form of Amendment; Execution in Counterparts.** This Amendment No. 1 is executed in duplicate originals, each of which is deemed to be an original, and may be executed in counterparts.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Folsom has authorized the execution of this Restated Agreement in duplicate by its Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk under the authority of Ordinance No. _______ adopted by the City Council on the _____ day of __________, 2016.

**CITY:**

CITY OF FOLSOM,
a municipal corporation

________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

**APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:**

________________________
Evert W. Palmer, City Manager

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

________________________
Steven Wang, City Attorney

**ATTEST:**

________________________
Christa Saunders, City Clerk

**LANDOWNER:**

OAK AVENUE HOLDINGS, LLC
a Delaware Limited Liability Company

By: HBT Hillsborough, LLC
a Delaware Limited Liability Company
Its Managing Member

By: _______________________
William B. Bunce
Its: Manager
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of _______________
County of _______________

On _________________, 2016, before me, ____________________________________________ (Here insert Name and Title of Officer)

personally appeared ________________________________________________________________

Name(s) of Signer(s)

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal,

______________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC SIGNATURE

______________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL
EXHIBIT “A-1”
OAK AVENUE HOLDINGS, LLC

All that real property situated in the City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, State of California and being further described as follows:

Parcels 3 and 5 of that certain Parcel Map entitled “PN 14-329 Parcel Map” filed for recorded on May 28, 2015 in Book 223 of Parcel Maps at Page 5, Sacramento County Records.

Containing 345.24 acres of land, more or less.

APN: 072-0060-092 and 072-0060-094

See Exhibit “A-2”, plat to accompany description, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This legal description was prepared by me or under my supervision pursuant to Section 8729 (2) of the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Craig E. Spiess, PLS 7944
License Expiration Date: 12-31-17
Date: 4/20/16

Description prepared by:
MACKAY & SOMPS CIVIL ENGINEERS, INC.
1552 Eureka Road, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95661
P:\27026\survey-MS\mapping\desc\TIER 1 DA ADENDMENTS\OAK AVENUE HOLDINGS, INC.docx
OAK AVENUE HOLDINGS, LLC
APN 072-0060-094

FOLSOM REAL ESTATE SOUTH, LLC
APN 072-0060-090

ICD FOR MAINLINE ROW
PARCEL BOUNDARY LINE AND EXISTING C/L

100'
200'
MAINLINE ROW

EXISTING C/L

43' LANDSCAPE BUFFER

MATCH LINE
SEE SHEET 2

PROPOSED C/L

-7' ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE BUFFER

PARCEL LINE

OAK AVENUE HOLDINGS, LLC
APN 072-0060-092 & APN 072-0060-094
SouthEast Capital Connector

Exhibit 3.7.1

City of Folsom,

MACKay & SomPS

California
April, 2016
27025 WCP

Preliminary - Subject to Revision
ATTACHMENT NO. 10

Ordinance No.____ An Uncodified Ordinance of the City of Folsom Approving Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended And Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan
ORDINANCE NO.

AN UNCODIFIED ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND PRAIRIE CITY COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES, LLC RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR/EIS) for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) was certified by the City Council on June 14, 2011, and the FPASP was adopted by the City Council on June 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority in Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code, the City Council, following a duly notified public hearing on June 28, 2011, approved the Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan (Tier 1 DA) for the development of the Folsom Plan Area by adopting Ordinance No. 1149 on July 12, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, following a duly noticed public hearing on May 27, 2014, approved a request to amend the Tier 1 DA pertaining to the development of the Folsom Plan Area, including the Hillsborough Project, by approving a First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (ARDA) between the City and the predecessors-in-interest of the developer of the Hillsborough Project, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. and Easton Development Company, LLC, by adopting Ordinance No. 1207 on June 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Hillsborough Project consists of a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, and further amendment to the ARDA for future development within the Folsom Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the City and the owners of the Hillsborough Project desire to amend the ARDA in order to provide greater certainty and clarity to matters that are common, necessary and essential for the development of the Hillsborough Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, at its regular meeting on May ___, 2016, considered Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement by and Between the City of Folsom and Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC (Amendment No. 1) at a duly noticed public hearing as prescribed by law, and recommended that the City Council approve said Amendment No. 1; and

WHEREAS, all notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Folsom hereby does ordain as follows:

Ordinance No.
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SECTION 1. FINDINGS

A. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

B. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (Amendment No. 1) is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the City’s General Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

C. The Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement is in conformity with public convenience, general welfare, and good land use practices.

D. The Amendment No. 1 will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of persons residing in the immediate area, nor be detrimental or injurious to property or persons in the general neighborhood or to the general welfare of the residents of the City as a whole.

E. The Amendment No. 1 will not adversely affect the orderly development of property or the preservation of property values.

F. The Amendment No. 1 has been prepared in accordance with, and is consistent with, Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5, and City Council Resolution No. 2370.

G. All notices have been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and the Folsom Municipal Code.

H. A Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement was previously certified for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. An Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared for the proposed Hillsborough Project, which includes the proposed Amendment No. 1, and concludes that the proposed Project will not result in substantial changes to the FPASP.

SECTION 2. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

The Mayor is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Between the City of Folsom and Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC on behalf of the City after the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY

If any section, subsection, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this
Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, clauses, phrases or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days from and after its passage and adoption, provided it is published in full or in summary within twenty (20) days after its adoption in a newspaper of general circulation in the City.

This ordinance was introduced and the title thereof read at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016 and the second reading occurred at the regular meeting of the City Council on __________, 2016.

On a motion by Council Member _______, seconded by Council Member _______, the foregoing ordinance was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Folsom, State of California, this ____ day of ____ 2016 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Member(s):

NOES: Council Member(s):

ABSENT: Council Member(s):

ABSTAIN: Council Member(s):

________________________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Christa Saunders, CITY CLERK

Effective:
FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM
PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE §6103

RECORDING REQUESTED BY CITY CLERK

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

City Clerk
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

(SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE RESERVED FOR RECORDER'S USE)

AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF FOLSOM AND
PRAIRIE CITY COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES, LLC
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
RELATIVE TO THE FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
(Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC)

This Amendment No. 1 to First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement ("Amendment No. 1") is entered into this ___ day of __________, 2016, by and between the City of Folsom ("City") and Prairie City Commercial Properties, LLC ("Landowner") pursuant to the authority of Sections 65864 through 65869.5 of the Government Code of California. All capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined herein shall mean and refer to those terms as defined in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement described below between the parties hereto.

RECITALS

A. Restated Development Agreement. The City and Landowner’s predecessors-in-interest, Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. ("Aerojet") and Easton Development Company, LLC ("Easton"), previously entered into that certain First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement By and Between the City of Folsom and Landowner Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan, recorded on July 15, 2014, in the Official Records of the County Recorder of Sacramento County in Book 20140715, Page 0552 (the "Restated Development Agreement"). Section 1.5 of the Restated Development Agreement allows the Restated Development Agreement to be amended from time to time by mutual written consent of the parties.

B. After the Effective Date of the Restated Development Agreement, Aerojet and Easton conveyed portions of the property described in the Restated Development Agreement to various entities, with the City approving an Assignment and Assumption Agreement Relative to the Restated Development Agreement between Aerojet and Easton and (1) Landowner, (2) Hillsborough North, LLC, (3) Oak Avenue Holdings, LLC and (4) West Hillsborough Investors, LLC (collectively the "Assignment and Assumption Agreements" and with the entities identified in this paragraph, collectively the "Subsequent Purchasers"). Pursuant to the Assignment and Assumption Agreements, and under the terms set forth therein, Aerojet and Easton were released from further rights and obligations relative to the properties covered by those Assignment and Assumption Agreements.

C. Property. As provided above, Landowner acquired and owns the portion of real property described in Exhibit A-1 and shown in Exhibit A-2 attached hereto (the "Property") and, in connection therewith, acquired the rights and obligations as "Landowner" under the Restated Development Agreement with respect to the Property. The subject of the Restated Development Agreement, as amended hereby and as applied to Landowner, is the Development of the Property. Landowner owns the Property and represents that all persons holding legal or equitable interests in the
Property shall be bound by the Restated Development Agreement, as amended by this Amendment No. 1 and applied to the Property.

D. **Purpose of Amendment.** The Subsequent Purchasers and Aerojet are jointly processing a Specific Plan Amendment, commonly referred to as the Folsom Area Specific Plan for the Hillsborough Properties (the "SPA") for development of the real property originally covered by the Restated Development Agreement, which includes the Property, the property acquired by the other Subsequent Purchasers, and the property retained by Aerojet (the "SPA Planning Area"). In connection with the approval of the SPA, the City and Landowner desire to amend the timing of certain requirements related to the approval of tentative subdivision maps otherwise required by Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, as more particularly provided in this Amendment No. 1. Additionally, Landowner desires that the SPA for the Property, including the conditions of approval related thereto, as approved by the City, be included within the definition of Entitlements as that term is used throughout the Restated Development Agreement, pursuant to Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement. City and Landowner further intend to clarify certain provisions related to identification of sites for a corporation yard and high school/middle school, as provided for in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.5.3B of the Restated Development Agreement.

E. **Hearings.** On _____________, 2016, the City Planning Commission, designated as the planning agency for purposes of development agreement review pursuant to Government Code Section 65867, in a duly noticed and conducted public hearing, considered this Amendment No. 1 and recommended that the City Council approve this Amendment No. 1 to the Restated Development Agreement.

F. **Environmental Review.** On _____________, 2016, the City Council considered the Addendum to the Specific Plan EIR (the "Addendum") for development of the SPA Planning Area consistent with the SPA (the "Project"). An Initial Study prepared in support of the Addendum identified mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts which have been incorporated into the Project and in the terms and conditions of the approved SPA, as reflected by the findings adopted by the City Council concurrently with this Amendment No. 1.

G. **No New Impacts Associated with Approval of Amendment.** The City Council has determined that the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 involves no new impacts not considered in the Specific Plan EIR and Addendum; therefore, no further environmental documents relating to the adoption of this Amendment No. 1 are required.

H. **Consistency with General Plan and Specific Plan.** Having duly examined and considered this Amendment No. 1, City finds and declares that this Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the General Plan and the Specific Plan, as amended.
NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged and agreed, the parties hereto do hereby agree to amend the Restated Development Agreement as applied to the Property as follows:

1. **Amendments to Existing Sections of Restated Development Agreement.** The definition of "Entitlements" in Recital H, the definition of "Property" in Section 1.3, the provisions regarding the Corporation Yard in Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, and Sections 2.5.3, 3.5, 3.6, 4.2.2.1 and 4.8 are hereby amended as follows:

   a. **Recital H – Entitlements.** The term "Entitlements" set forth in Recital H of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to include:

      i. the Specific Plan, as amended by the SPA approved by the City Council by Resolution [___________]; and

      ii. this Amendment of Restated Development Agreement.

   In consideration thereof, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, Landowner hereby reaffirms its agreement to abide by the provisions of this Restated Development Agreement, as modified hereby, and the conditions of approval imposed in connection therewith as applicable to the Property with the approved SPA and rezoning of the Property.

   b. **Section 1.3 – Property.** The term "Property" set forth in Section 1.3 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised as follows:

      "Property" means that certain parcel of land described in Exhibit A-1 and shown on Exhibit A-2 attached hereto and made a part hereof within the Plan Area.

   c. **Sections 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 – Corporation Yard.** The provisions of Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and the amendment to Section 2.5.3(B)(9), as set forth below, is not intended to alter, amend or enlarge the obligations and rights of Landowner as set forth in Section 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.4.1, except as specifically identified in Section 2.5.3(B)(9).

   d. **Section 2.5.3 – Requirements for Subsequent Plans.** The provisions of Subsections (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and are not affected by this Amendment No. 1. Subsections (A) and (B) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement are hereby revised to read as follows:

      "A. Prior to Approval of First Tentative Small Lot Map:

      (1) Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan; and
(2) Design Guidelines.

"B. Prior to Approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or First Building Permit if Development May Occur Without Any Subdivision) or as otherwise specified below:

(1) Open Space Management and Financing Plan;

(2) Drainage Facilities Maintenance and Financing Plan;

(3) Formation of the Sewer and Off-Site Water CFD as provided in the PFFP to fund a portion of the Plan Area sewer and water infrastructure, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the sewer and water infrastructure, on a building permit by building permit basis (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to by Landowner and the City) that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(4) Formation of the Aquatic Center CFD related to the recreational facilities that may include an aquatic center, sports complex and/or community center, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the recreational facilities, on a building permit by building permit basis, (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to between Landowner and the City), that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(5) Formation of the Parks, Trails, Landscape Corridors, Medians and Open Space Maintenance CFD (the "Services CFD"), the Storm Drainage Maintenance CFD (unless such drainage maintenance is included in the Services CFD), and the Street Maintenance District/Lighting Maintenance District CFD (unless such street maintenance is included in the Services CFD), as provided in the PFFP;

(6) Adoption of the New Plan Area Fees, including the New Plan Area Fees for City Facilities, the SPIF, and the SPRF, as provided in the PFFP and listed on Exhibit 2.2.4 attached hereto;
(7) Dedication or grant of the rights of way and easements for all Backbone Lands for roadways and utilities within the portion of the Property affected by the Small-Lot Map or anywhere within the Property within thirty (30) days of Landowner's receipt of a written request for the dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(8) For each final Small Lot Map, offers of dedication of the Public Parcel(s) described in Section 3.8.5 below located within the portion of the Property affected by the final Small Lot Map, or within sixty (60) days of Landowner's receipt of a written request for dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(9) A site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4, as may be amended or otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City's determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site, consistent with the foregoing, as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager's determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion; and

(10) A site or sites identified as suitable by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District, for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area shall be identified and approved by the City in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. If a supplemental fee is required to support the development of such site(s), Landowner agrees to support the establishment of such fee in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act and to pay such fee, so long as such fee is equitably shared by all similar development within the Plan Area. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial
progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager's determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion."

e. Section 3.5 – **EIR Mitigation Measures.** Section 3.5 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

"3.5 **EIR Mitigation Measures.** Notwithstanding any other provision in this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, to the contrary, as and when Landowner elects to Develop the Property, or any portion or phase thereof, Landowner shall be bound by, and shall perform, or cause to be performed, all mitigation measures contained in the Specific Plan EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND, and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and any additional environmental mitigation measures referenced therein, and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) related to Development of the Property which are adopted by City and are identified in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program as being a responsibility of Landowner for Development of the Property."

f. Section 3.6 – **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** Section 3.6 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

"3.6 **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** Separate from and in addition to the requirements in Section 3.5 of this Restated Agreement, as amended hereby, Landowner shall be responsible for all of the costs and expenses associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program under CEQA as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND and the Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS and any Supplemental Environmental Review(s) that are identified as applicable to this Project in the Project EIR related to the Development. In furtherance of this provision, Landowner shall pay all costs required by the City associated with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as set forth in the conditions of approval on the Entitlements and the Subsequent Entitlements."

g. Section 4.2.2.1 – **SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication.** Section 4.2.2.1 of the Restated Development Agreement is hereby revised to read as follows:

"4.2.2.1 **SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication Limited to Community Park West Dedication: Payment of SPIF Park Land Equalization Fee Component Upon Approval of a Final Map for Each Subdivision After Exhaustion of Landowner’s Park Land Credits.** In no case shall SPIF reimbursement apply for required dedications of parkland pursuant to the City’s Quimby ordinance. In other words, SPIF reimbursement for over-dedication of park land is applicable only for the landowner dedicating the Community Park West ("CPW") site, the only..."
Landowner dedicating over and above the dedication requirements provided in City ordinances. In place of the City’s Quimby ordinance and specifically any requirement stated therein for payment of an "in-lieu fee," the SPIF will include a separate component for park land equalization to be paid by all other Landowners (the "Under-dedicating Owners") to compensate the over-dedicating owner of the CPW site. As more particularly provided by the SPIF Ordinance (now existing or to be established by the City Council, as amended from time to time), each Under-Dedicating Owner will have a different Park Land Equalization Fee for its property (based, in part, on the amount of park land being dedicated by such Under-Dedicating Owner and credited against its fair share park land obligation) and will begin paying its share of this fee after exhausting the park land credits associated with its own park land dedications. As provided by the SPIF Ordinance, once such fee becomes payable, the Park Land Equalization Fee will be due for an entire Small-Lot Map as each map exceeds the park land dedication credit. For example in an 800 unit project with four subdivision maps and a 357 unit parkland dedication credit, the Parkland Equalization fee shall be due for each map that exceeds the 357th unit and calculated by the units in that subdivision times the existing fee. Landowner acknowledges that the obligation to pay this fee may be included as a condition of each tentative subdivision map for which the payment will become due (after application of applicable park land dedication credits). Prior to approval of each Final Small-Lot Map within the Property, in accordance with the SPIF Ordinance, Landowner shall confirm in writing with the City either that (i) the park land equalization component of the SPIF is not then payable due to its offsetting park land dedication credits or (ii) the amount of the SPIF fee component for park land equalization then due and payable with respect to such Small-Lot Map. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to Landowner if the Property that is the subject of this Agreement includes the CPW site. The references herein to "CPW site" includes both the site identified in Figure 9.1 in the Specific Plan and the Alternate Park site specified in Section 2.2.3 and as depicted in Exhibit 2.2.3.2 until such time as the location of the Community Park West is determined as set forth in Section 2.2.3."

h. **Section 4.8 – City/County SCDTF Agreement/Highway 50 Coalition Fee**  Landowner acknowledge that, since the execution of the Restated Agreement, City and the California Department of Transportation entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which provides, among other things, that the fair share contribution by development in the FPA for impacts to Highway 50 and certain related roads and interchanges will be incorporated into a Folsom South development impact fee, and not into a "Highway 50 Coalition Fee" as was previously described in Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement. Such fair share fee, the "Highway 50 Improvement Fee" was subsequently adopted by the City on September 8, 2015, as part of the Folsom Plan Area Stand Alone Fees. In consideration thereof, all references to the "Highway 50 Coalition Fee" shall mean and refer to the adopted Highway 50
Improvement Fee. With the exception of this change in terminology used to describe the fee, all other provisions of Section 4.8 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply.

2. Additions of New Sections to Restated Development Agreement. The following new Sections 1.5.1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7 and 2.8 are added to the Restated Development Agreement as follows:

a. "Section 1.5.1.1 Consent to Amend PFFP for Additional Reclaimed/Recycled Water System in Backbone Infrastructure. Pursuant to Section 1.5.1, Developer expressly consents to the City amending the PFFP in connection with an update to the Recycled Water Analysis Appendix to the Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan in order to provide funding for additional reclaimed/ recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements to serve Zones 4, 5 and 6 of the FPASP east of Placerville Road, including but not limited to conveyance system and related backbone pipeline. An exhibit depicting said additional reclaimed/ recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements prepared as part of the Water System Master Plan update and PFFP amendment will be incorporated into the Restated Development Agreement as Exhibit 1.5.1.1. All provisions in the Restated Agreement relating to PFFP shall include the amendment provided herein and the provisions of Section 2.2.4(4) of the Restated Agreement regarding the potential responsibility for Landowner’s Development to provide funding for additional off-site transmission, on-site storage and other necessary infrastructure shall apply with respect thereto."

b. "Section 1.6 Anticipated Changes to City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. The City has amended the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (i.e., Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104) by Ordinance No. 1243, to eliminate Second Dwelling Units (also referred to as “granny flats”) as an alternative means of meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements. Landowner acknowledges there is no vested right to use this alternative means for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements and that this alternative shall not be available to Landowner from and after the date of Ordinance No. 1243. Other than the elimination of the “granny flat” option, the Parties agree that all other alternatives for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements remain vested to the full extent provided for in the Restated Agreement."

c. "Section 1.7 Consistency with Other Amendments to Restated Agreements for the Plan Area. By entering into Tier 1 Development Agreements and Restated Development Agreements on like terms with other owners of property within the Plan Area, the City intended, and now reaffirms its intention, to apply comparable rules to all property within the Plan Area for vesting of entitlements and exceptions thereto, term of agreement, requirements imposed on development of the property, obligations of landowners and obligations imposed by City upon itself. In light of the intention to maintain equality in terms and provisions among landowners, City agrees to consider, upon request of the Landowner, and approve or deny in its sole and absolute discretion, a subsequent amendment to this Amendment of Restated Agreement to provide like terms that may be included in an Amendment of Restated Agreement for another owner within the Plan Area. Furthermore, with respect to the provisions of Section 2.5.3B(9) and
2.5.3B(10) added herein, City intends to impose these conditions equitably throughout the Plan Area as and to each and every Participating Landowner who seeks any future specific plan amendment, tentative subdivision map or ARDA amendment in connection with its proposed development. If City fails to impose either condition, when required, with at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), the corresponding condition of approval hereunder shall be null and void as to Landowner’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final Small-Lot Map for the Project. If the City approves any other final Small-Lot Map for a project within the Plan Area and the Corporation Yard or high school/middle school site(s), as applicable, has not been approved as provided for in said Section 2.5.3B(9) or 2.5.3B(10), Landowner may seek relief from the terms of the applicable condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council.”

d. “Section 2.7 Requirements for Submittal of Plans and Processing of Maps.

“2.7.1 Phased Maps. Landowner may develop the Project in Development Phases, and consistent with Government Code section 66456.1, Landowner may file multiple final Small-Lot Maps based upon an approved phased Large-Lot or Small-Lot vested tentative subdivision map. Filing of a final Small-Lot Map on a portion of a vested tentative subdivision map shall not invalidate any portion of the vested tentative subdivision map.

“2.7.2 Compliance with Submittal Requirements. Specific projects proposed under the tentative Small-Lot Map shall comply with all submittal and review requirements in effect at the time of submittal, including but not limited to the requirements set forth in Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement.”

e. “Section 2.8 Dedication and Acceptance of Public Improvements. City acknowledges that the FPA and the Project will be constructed in phases, and that certain portions of the Backbone Infrastructure and Project specific improvements, referenced collectively as the Public Improvements, will be constructed in phases, as different portions of the FPA and the Project develop at different times. Conditions of approval on the Project identify Landowner’s obligation for and timing for construction of portions of the Public Improvements, and subject to any conditions placed by the City on the phasing of Public Improvements, City shall accept for irrevocable dedication those portions of improvements contained within the final Small-Lot Map that are complete. By way of example, if City requires construction of only a portion of a road or drainage facility as part of the Conditions of Approval on the Project, the City shall accept that portion of the Public Improvement once a determination of completeness is made to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.”

3. Effect of Amendment. This Amendment No. 1 amends, but does not replace or supersede, the Restated Development Agreement. In the event of any
conflict, the language of this Amendment No. 1 shall be controlling in all events or circumstances. Except as modified hereby, all other terms and provisions of the Restated Development Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

4. **Form of Amendment; Execution in Counterparts.** This Amendment No. 1 is executed in duplicate originals, each of which is deemed to be an original, and may be executed in counterparts.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Folsom has authorized the execution of this Restated Agreement in duplicate by its Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk under the authority of Ordinance No. ______ adopted by the City Council on the ____ day of __________, 2016.

CITY:

CITY OF FOLSOM, a municipal corporation

______________________________
Stephen E. Miklos, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:

______________________________
Evert W. Palmer, City Manager

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Steven Wang, City Attorney

ATTEST:

______________________________
Christa Saunders, City Clerk

LANDOWNER:

PRAIRIE CITY COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company

By: HBT Hillsborough, LLC
   a Delaware Limited Liability Company
   Its Managing Member

   By: _______________________
      William B. Bunce
      Its:  Manager
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of ________________
County of ________________

On ________________, 2016, before me, ________________________, (Here insert Name and Title of Officer) personally appeared ________________ (Name(s) of Signer(s)), who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal,

__________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC SIGNATURE

__________________________
NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL
EXHIBIT “A-1”

PRAIRIE CITY COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES, LLC

All that real property situated in the City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, State of California and being further described as follows:

Resultant Parcel 1B as described in that certain City of Folsom (Conditional) Certificate of Compliance-Lot Line Adjustment recorded on May 22, 2015 in Book 20150522 at Page 0277, Official Records of Sacramento County.

Containing 73.78 acres of land, more or less.

APN: 072-0231-140

See Exhibit “A-2”, plat to accompany description, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This legal description was prepared by me or under my supervision pursuant to Section 8729 (2) of the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Craig E. Spiess, PLS 7944
License Expiration Date: 12-31-17
Date: 4/20/11

Description prepared by:

MACKAY & SOMPS CIVIL ENGINEERS, INC.
1552 Eureka Road, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95661

P:\27026\survey-MS\mapping\desc\TIER 1 DA ADJUSTMENTS\PRAIRIE CITY COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES, LLC.docx
ATTACHMENT NO. 11

Environmental Checklist and Addendum for Hillsborough Specific Plan Amendment
Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendment
for the Hillsborough at Easton Area
Environmental Checklist and Addendum

PREPARED FOR:

City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

CONTACT:
Scott Johnson, Planning Manager
(916) 355-7222

PREPARED BY:

Ascent Environmental, Inc.
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814

CONTACT:
Amanda Olekszulin
916.444.7301

April 2016
Addendum to the
Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report
for the Hillsborough at Easton Area

April 20, 2016
State Clearinghouse No. 2008092051

BACKGROUND AND ACTION TRIGGERING THE ADDENDUM

This addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EiS) for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project evaluates an amendment to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP). Specifically, this addendum analyzes the effects of an increase in residentially-designated land, a decrease in commercially-designated land, decrease in open space, and a decrease in public/quasi-public land. The project changes reflect that a private school would no longer be sited in this area. There is potential for 394 additional dwelling units and a reduction of approximately 47,000 square feet of commercial areas.

As the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Folsom has determined that, in accordance with Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed reductions in nonresidential space, increases in residential units, and other changes differ sufficiently from the development scenario described in the Final EIR/EIS for the adopted FPASP to warrant preparation of an addendum.

PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES

The environmental process for the FPASP involved the preparation of the following documents that are relevant to the consideration of the proposed amendment to the FPASP for the Hillsborough at Easton area.

- Draft EIR/EIS for the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan Project, Volumes I-III and Appendices, June 2010;
- FEIR for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, May 2011;
- CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, May 2011; and

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT GUIDELINES REGARDING AN ADDENDUM TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Altered conditions, changes, or additions to the description of a project that occur after certification of an EIR may require additional analysis under CEQA. The legal principles that guide decisions regarding whether additional environmental documentation is required are provided in the State CEQA Guidelines, which establish three mechanisms to address these changes: a subsequent environmental impact report (SEIR), a Supplement to an EIR, and an Addendum to an EIR.
Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines describes the conditions under which a SEIR would be prepared. In summary, when an EIR has been certified for a project, no Subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Section 15163 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that a lead agency may choose to prepare a supplement to an EIR rather than a Subsequent EIR if:

(1) any of the conditions described above for Section 15162 would require the preparation of a SEIR; and

(2) only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.

An addendum is appropriate where a previously certified EIR has been prepared and some changes or revisions to the project are proposed, or the circumstances surrounding the project have changed, but none of the changes or revisions would result in significant new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, consistent with CEQA Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, 15164, and 15168.

This addendum is intended to evaluate and confirm CEQA compliance for proposed amendment to the FPASP, which would be a change relative to what is described and evaluated in the FPASP Final EIR/EIS. This addendum is organized as an environmental checklist, and is intended to evaluate all environmental topic areas for any changes in circumstances or the project description, as compared to the approved Final EIR/EIS, and determine whether such changes were or were not adequately covered in the certified EIR/EIS. This checklist is not the traditional CEQA Environmental Checklist, per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. As explained below, the purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the checklist categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a different environmental impact significance conclusion from the FPASP EIR/EIS. The column titles of the checklist have been modified from the Appendix G presentation to help answer the questions to be addressed pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, 15163, 15164 and 15168.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>peak particle velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td>Hillsborough at Easton project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDMD</td>
<td>Rhoades' Diggings Mining District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>reactive organic gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCWA</td>
<td>Sacramento County Water Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENL</td>
<td>single-event noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF\textsubscript{6}</td>
<td>sulfur hexafluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
<td>Sacramento Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD</td>
<td>Sacramento Municipal Utility District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVAB</td>
<td>Sacramento Valley Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>toxic air contaminant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>trichloroethene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>transport refrigeration units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VdB</td>
<td>vibration decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>vehicle miles travelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>volatile organic compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP</td>
<td>wastewater treatment plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT HISTORY

The City of Folsom (City) has received an entitlement application from Westland Capital Partners, L.P. and Aerojet Rocketdyne (Aerojet) for the development of the Hillsborough at Easton project (project). The project is located within the approved boundaries of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP). The FPASP is a development plan for approximately 3,500 acres of undeveloped land located south of Highway 50, north of White Rock Road, east of Prairie City Road, and adjacent to the Sacramento County/EI Dorado County line in the southwestern portion of the City.

With approval of the FPASP (June 28, 2011), the City approved General Plan land use and zoning designations for the entire plan area including the lands within the proposed Hillsborough at Easton site. The City and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) prepared a joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the FPASP that evaluated the environmental impacts associated with development of the entire plan area based on the land use and zoning designations identified in the specific plan. The City was the Lead Agency with respect to preparation of the EIR and USACE was the Lead Agency with respect to preparation of the EIS.

On December 7, 2012, the City approved an Addendum to the EIR for the FPASP for purposes of analyzing an alternative water supply for the project. The revisions to the “Water” component of the FPASP project included: (1) leak fixes, (2) implementation of metered rates, (3) exchange of water supplies, and (4) new water conveyance facilities. The City concluded that, with implementation of certain mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR’s “Water” sections, the water supply and infrastructure changes would not result in any new significant impacts, substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed impacts or involve any of the other conditions related to changed circumstances or new information that can require a subsequent or supplemental EIR. The analysis in portions of the FPASP EIR’s “Water” sections that have not been superseded by the Addendum are still applicable.

In August 2014, the Folsom City Council approved an amendment to the FPASP (Resolution No. 9420) relative to the alignment and design guidelines for the future Capital Southeast Connector (White Rock Road).

On May 12, 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Russell Ranch Specific Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9566), the Final Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 9564) and a General Plan Amendment (Resolution No. 9566) for the Russell Ranch Project. The approved SPA reduced the Plan Area residential area by approximately 17.8 acres and 264 dwelling units and reduced the commercial, office park/industrial and mixed-use area by approximately 59.5 acres and .65 million square feet of potential building area.

On September 22, 2015, the Folsom City Council approved the Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment, an Amendment to the Folsom General Plan (Resolution No. 9655) and an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environment Impact Statement (Resolution No. 9654) for the Westland/Eagle project. The approved SPA increased the residential dwelling unit count by 889 units and decreased the amount of commercial, office park/industrial and mixed-use area by approximately 82.5 acres and 1.4 million square feet of potential building area.

At the time of processing and approval of the FPASP in 2011, Aerojet Rocketdyne had previously donated an approximate 80-acre parcel to a private school entity. Since then, however, the private school has opted not to construct on the parcel, therefore, the site reverted back to its original owner and is now incorporated into the project. The project site now encompasses approximately 715 acres in the western portion of the FPASP adjacent to Prairie City Road; with approximately 635 acres of the site under the ownership of Westland Capital Partners, L.P. and approximately 80 acres under the ownership of Aerojet.
In response to the change in ownership for the private school property, the applicants have proceeded to the next phase of entitlements for the site, a proposed entitlement package requesting a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Planned Development Permit, and Development Agreement Amendment. The requested entitlements would result in changes to the layout of land uses and zoning designations throughout the project site. In general, these changes include roadway realignments, relocation and resizing of commercial land uses within the site, relocation of multifamily land uses, and construction of single-family, high-density land uses in the area designated as public/quasi-public for the approved private school site.

The EIR/EIS was prepared at the program, “first-tier” level of environmental review consistent with the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Sections 15152 and 15168. The program-level analysis considered the broad environmental impacts of the overall specific plan. In addition, the EIR/EIS also included a detailed analysis of specific topic areas beyond the program level, including: Aesthetics; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; and Land Use Planning and Agricultural Resources. The EIR/EIS acknowledged that development of the specific plan area would occur in multiple phases in an undetermined order. As those phases are proposed, such as the Hillsborough at Easton Development permit application, they would be evaluated to determine whether the entitlements/actions proposed fall within the scope of the approved EIR/EIS and incorporate all applicable performance standards and mitigation measures identified therein. Should the subsequent development phases not be consistent with the approved FPASP, additional environmental review through the streamlining provisions of CEQA may be warranted (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 through 15164).

Consistent with the process described, the City is evaluating the project to determine whether this project is consistent with the FPASP and whether additional environmental review would be required. This environmental checklist has been prepared to determine whether any additional environmental review would be required for the City to consider adoption of the proposed changes in the FPASP. This analysis considers whether the environmental conditions that exist today have changed such that new or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur compared to that evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

In 2011, the City Council approved the FPASP in which the Hillsborough at Easton area was a part. The approved version of the Hillsborough at Easton area included 1,624 residential units ranging from single family units to high-density, multifamily units, approximately 17 acres of community commercial, 42 acres of industrial/office park, 58 acres of public/quasi-public land uses, 58 acres of parks, and 238 acres of open space. About 80 acres of the public/quasi-public and open space land were allocated for a private school.

Since the plan was adopted, the private school found a different location outside of the FPASP and the housing market has changed. As part of the next step in the development process, as well as to respond to shifting conditions, the applicants have brought forward an amended site plan for the project. In the amended plan, the public/quasi-public land uses at the site formerly meant for the private school are now proposed for single-family, high-density land uses. Open space areas and individual resources have been further evaluated throughout the site to better protect and preserve water and biological resources on-site. Some uses, including the community commercial and multi-family residential uses have been shifted in location and the circulation design has been refined. The plan now includes 394 additional housing units with about 65 additional acres of residential uses, approximately 49 fewer acres of public/quasi-public uses, approximately 16 acres less open space, approximately five additional acres of park space, and approximately four fewer acres of community commercial land uses compared to that approved as part of the FPASP.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The FPASP area is located within the City of Folsom, south of U.S. Highway 50 and north of White Rock Road, between Prairie City Road and El Dorado County line (Exhibit 2-1). The project is located to the western edge of the FPASP, with the majority of the project located at the corner of Prairie City Road and White Rock Road (Exhibit 2-2).

2.3 EXISTING SETTING

The existing project area is undeveloped grassland, currently used for cattle grazing. Developed land north and east of the project area consists of large residential and commercial developments. The topography of the area consists of gently rolling hills. The project site is bisected by a 400-foot electric transmission corridor right-of-way with a north-south alignment in the western portion of the project site. The corridor contains multiple transmission lines operated by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) and the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). Aerojet has owned and operated a facility for aerospace testing activities in Rancho Cordova since the early 1960s. The facility consists of approximately 8,500 acres, approximately 5,900 of which were designated as a Superfund site in 1983 by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Aerojet Superfund site is located immediately west of the FPASP. One portion, the Island Operable Unit, of the Aerojet Superfund site is located in Hillsborough at Easton (Exhibit 2-3). An approximately 54-acre area at the northwest corner of the FPASP was formerly included in the Aerojet Superfund site, but is part of a “carve-out” area that was removed from the site by regulatory agencies as it needed special treatment before it could be developed.
2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The FPASP’s objectives, as described in the Draft EIR/EIS for the FPASP (City of Folsom, May 2011: p. 1-7) are the following:

1. Be consistent with the City of Folsom’s General Plan and implement Sacramento Area Council of Governments Smart Growth Principles.

2. Expand the City’s boundaries based on the ultimate boundaries of development that the City can reasonably control and service, and do so in a manner that would foster orderly urban development and discourage leapfrog development and urban sprawl.

3. Annex those parcels of land adjacent to the City limit and within the City’s Sphere of Influence whose development could have significant visual, traffic, public service, and environmental impacts on the City so that the City may influence the ultimate development of those parcels.

4. Provide a large-scale mixed-use and mixed-density residential housing development within the City of Folsom, south of U.S. 50.

5. Develop several distinct neighborhoods within the project site, connected by a substantial open space area and recreational trail network.

6. Provide neighborhood- and regional-serving retail areas within the project site.

7. Provide a mix of housing types within the project site to diversify the City’s housing stock.

8. Provide a combined high school/middle school and the appropriate elementary schools on-site sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

9. Provide the appropriate number and size of on-site community and neighborhood parks sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

10. Generate positive fiscal impacts for the City through development within the project site.

11. Secure a sufficient and reliable water supply consistent with the requirements of Measure W and objectives of the Water Forum Agreement to support planned development within the SPA, which the City estimates to be 5,600 acre-feet per year.

12. Construct the necessary water supply delivery and treatment infrastructure to ensure the safe and reliable delivery of up to 5,600 acre-feet per year to the FPASP.

In addition to the FPASP objectives which the project would incorporate, the project includes the following additional objectives:

1. Be consistent with the intent of the FPASP.

2. Provide a refined site plan for the project to respond to more detailed information gained regarding infrastructure efficiency and biological resource mitigation since the FPASP was approved.

3. Provide a development that reflects the type of housing needed by the expected Folsom housing market.

4. Relocate the commercial site within the project, across from the planned Community Park West to take advantage of possible synergy with the park and provide proper site access.
2.5 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE SPECIFIC PLAN

The project includes approximately 715 acres of land area. At the time of processing and approval of the FPASP, Aerojet Rocketdyne had donated an approximate 80-acre parcel to a private school entity. Since then however, the private school has opted not to construct on the parcel, therefore, the site reverted back to its original owner and is now incorporated into the project. Table 2-1 shows the Hillsborough at Easton portion of the approved FPASP.

The proposed redesigned land use plan for the Hillsborough at Easton site includes the same land uses as the approved FPASP (minus the private school site) but locations and housing land use types have been revised and adjusted by the applicant to respond to needs of the current, and expected future, Folsom housing market (Exhibit 2-4). The proposed redesign includes slight re-alignments in both Oak Avenue and Street A to better conform to the existing land contours and to emphasize the major vehicular routes through the community.

The redesigned plan includes re-locating the community commercial site from the corner of White Rock Road and Prairie City Road (where site access is restricted) to the corner of Street A and Prairie City Road.

The revised design would result in the co-location of a 2.3-acre neighborhood park and elementary school site in the center of the plan area in generally the same location as shown in the approved FPASP land use map, however slightly reconfigured to increase the sites’ visibility and accessibility within the project. In addition, 10 acres of neighborhood park land was moved to the old private school site in the southeast project area.

The storm drainage, water, and wastewater facilities were redesigned to accommodate the changes to the land uses. These changes would be enacted if the proposed changes to the specific plan for the Hillsborough at Easton area are adopted. Since FPASP was adopted, the project proponent has done more detailed designs to show how culvert crossings would be built within the Plan Area. This action is directly related to complying with Mitigation Measure 3.3-1B: Secure Clean Water Act Section 404 Section 401 Permits. The detailed designs are included in Appendix C of this document.

2.5.1 Changes to Section 4: Land Use & Zoning

The project includes several changes to the FPASP that require amendments to the land use and zoning designations. Table 2-2 shows the proposed land use summary for the project and Table 2-3 shows the changes in land use designation acreage and dwelling units that would result from the project. The largest change in land use is because the private school originally planned for within the FPASP would no longer be part of the project. The adopted FPASP had included re-aligning Prairie City Road which traverses the west edge of the planning area. This SPA would remove that part of the project, keeping Prairie City Road in its current location.
Land Use Legend

- SF: Single Family
- SFHD: Single Family High Density
- MLD: Multi-Family Low Density
- MMD: Multi-Family Medium Density
- MHD: Multi-Family High Density
- IND/OP: Industrial/Office Park
- CC: Community Commercial
- P: Parks (Community & Neighborhood)
- P-QP: Public/Quasi-Public
- OS: Open Space
- 🌡️: Fire Station (Conceptual Location)
- 🔥: Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) Boundary

P: 2.8 Acres of Community Park/Next May Be Used for Park Activities but not to Satisfy Quimby Park Dedication Requirements.

Exhibit 2-4
Proposed Hillsborough at Easton Plan
### Table 2-1
Adopted Specific Plan Land Use Summary (Adopted Specific Plan Table 4.1, excerpted to show Hillsborough at Easton only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/ac)</th>
<th>Target DU¹</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population²</th>
<th>Target FAR³</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>126.30</td>
<td>17.68%</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family, High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>103.64</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family, Medium Density (MMD)</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>12 to 20</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family, High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>257.34</td>
<td>36.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use District (MU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 to 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (IND/OP)</td>
<td>41.85</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>547,549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>189,486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial (RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>737,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community West (P)</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community East (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Neighborhood (P)</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Local (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/Middle School / MS/HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (PQP) ES</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Day School (PQP)</td>
<td>48.69</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Reservoir Site (PQP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Pump Station (PQP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Parks and Schools</td>
<td>116.60</td>
<td>16.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (GS)</td>
<td>238.25</td>
<td>33.35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Major Circulation</td>
<td>42.94</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hillsborough at Easton</td>
<td>714.30</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>737,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use fails within the specified density range and the range and the total residential unit count does not exceed the FAPSP area maximum of 11,230 dwelling units.
2. Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multifamily unit.
3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 3,338,378 SF is not exceeded.
### Table 2-2: Proposed Project Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/ac)</th>
<th>Target DU</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>202.2</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>12 to 20</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>322.3</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use District (MU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 to 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (IND/OP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial (RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community West (P)</td>
<td>50.9²</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community East (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Neighborhood (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Local (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School-Middle School (PQP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (PQP) ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Day School (PQP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Reservoir Site (PQP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Pump Station (PQP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Parks and Schools</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Major Circulation</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Hillsborough at Easton</strong></td>
<td>714.30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td></td>
<td>690,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Numbers may not sum exactly because of small rounding errors.
- Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use falls within the specified density range and the total residential unit count does not exceed the 5,128 dwelling units.
- Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multifamily unit.
- Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 3,338,378 SF is not exceeded.
- 2.8 acres of Community Park West are not credited towards Quincy's parkland requirements.
Table 2-3 Summary of Changes (2011 FPASP to 2014 Hillsborough at Easton Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Potential Bidg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>-40.8</td>
<td>-135</td>
<td>-394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Medium Density (MMD)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Density (MHD)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Office Park (IND/OP)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-46,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Community West (P)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks - Neighborhood (P)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (PQP) ES</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Day School (PQP)</td>
<td>-48.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Major Circulation</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hillsborough at Easton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>-46,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may not sum exactly because of small rounding errors.
Source: Adapted by Ascent Environmental 2014

2.5.2 Changes to Section 7: Circulation

Refine alignment of Street “A” to match the updated plan as shown on Exhibit 2-5.

2.5.3 Changes to Section 8: Open Space

Folsom voters approved Measure W which amended the City Charter to require the FPASP to preserve 30 percent of the FPASP as open space. City Charter Article 7.08C requires the City Council to adopt a plan “requiring 30 percent of the [FPASP] Area to be maintained as natural open space to preserve oak woodlands and sensitive habitat areas.” Section 7.08C also restricts the definition of open space: ”Natural open space shall not include active parks sites, residential yard areas, golf courses, parking lots, and their associated landscaping.”

With this project, the amount of zoned open space would be reduced from 238.25 acres to 222.3 acres. This comprises 31.1 percent of the total land area in Hillsborough which maintains compliance with Measure W. The FPASP area as a whole continues to have more than 30 percent of the land preserved in open space as well.

Additionally, one 2.8-acre area commonly referred to as the “peanut” (because of its shape) was zoned OS in the approved FPASP, however it is now intended to become a part of the larger Community Park development and; therefore, is proposed to be re-zoned as P in the proposed 2016 plan. However, the re-zoned “peanut” area would not be part of the area calculated for credit towards parkland required by the City.
2.5.4 Changes to Section 9: Parks

The City of Folsom requires developers to provide five acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. Table 2-4 shows how this parkland could be measured. With the changes in land designations, the project must provide at least 26.8 acres of parkland. The project would provide 60.4 acres of parkland, more than enough to fulfill the City's parkland requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-4</th>
<th>Parkland Dedication Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Dwelling</td>
<td>Average Population/DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal Code Section 16.32.040, FPASP Table 9.2

2.6 REQUIRED DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

2.6.1 Lead Agency

Table 2-5, shows the entitlements, approvals and permits that would be required to develop the proposed project. The items in bold are under consideration as part of this Addendum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-5</th>
<th>Entitlements, Approvals and Permits</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement/Approval or Permit Needed</td>
<td>Planned Development Permit</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan (Land Use) Amendment</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Plan (Rezone) Amendment</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vesting Tentative Parcel Map</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Agreement Amendment</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Permit</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold - Entitlements under consideration in this Addendum

2.6.2 Responsible Agencies

In addition to the list of entitlements, approvals and/or permits identified in Table 2-5 above that must be obtained from the City of Folsom, the following approvals, consultations, and/or permits may be required from other agencies prior to physical development of the site. However, none of the entitlements listed below would be required prior to consideration of this Addendum.
FEDERAL ACTIONS/PERMITS

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Department of the Army permit under Section 404 of the CWA for discharges of dredge or fill material into waters of the U.S. consultation and for impacts on cultural resources pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Consultation for impacts on federally listed species pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA (Endangered Species Act).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: concurrence with Section 404 CWA permit.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: ESA consultation and issuance of incidental-take authorization for the take of federally listed endangered and threatened species.

National Marine Fisheries Service: ESA consultation and issuance of incidental-take authorization for the take of federally listed endangered and threatened species.

STATE ACTIONS/PERMITS

California Department of Education: approval of new school sites for which state funding is sought.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento Valley–Central Sierra Region: California Endangered Species Act (CESA) consultation and issuance of take authorization (if needed) (California Fish and Game Code Section 2081), streambed alteration agreement (California Fish and Game Code Section 1602), and protection of raptors (California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5).

California Department of Transportation: encroachment permits; approval of landscaping plans and specifications for landscape corridor adjacent to U.S. 50.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 5): National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater permit (Notice of Intent to proceed under General Construction Permit) for disturbance of more than 1 acre; discharge permit for stormwater; general order for dewatering; and Section 401 CWA certification or waste discharge requirements; Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification; NPDES permit coverage for hydrostatic testing of pipeline (coverage expected under General Order for Low Threat Discharges to Surface Water)

State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO): approval of a Programmatic Agreement and/or Historic Property Treatment Plan for Section 106 compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

California Department of Public Health: approval of an amendment to the City’s Public Water System Permit.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL ACTIONS/PERMITS

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District: authority to construct (for devices that emit air pollutants), health risk assessment, and Air Quality Management Plan consistency determination.

Sacramento County: approval of roadway encroachment permit for pipeline construction, tree removal permit (if needed), rezoning, use permit, and parcel map application for new wastewater treatment plant (WTP), approval of grading permit.

City of Rancho Cordova: roadway encroachment permit for pipeline construction, tree removal permit (if needed), rezoning, use permit, and parcel map application for new Folsom Boulevard WTP.
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3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

3.1 EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in environmental impact significance conclusions different from those found in the 2011 EIR. The row titles of the checklist include the full range of environmental topics, as presented in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. The column titles of the checklist have been modified from the Appendix G presentation to help answer the questions to be addressed pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but rather that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact because it was previously analyzed and adequately addressed with mitigation measures in the EIR/EIS. For instance, the environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist because the impacts associated with the proposed project were adequately addressed in the EIR/EIS, and the environmental impact significance conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain applicable. The purpose of each column of the checklist is described below.

3.1.1 Where Impact was Analyzed

This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the EIR/EIS where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic. Unless otherwise specified, all references point to the Draft EIR/EIS document.

3.1.2 Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts?

The significance of the changes proposed to the approved FPASP, as it is described in the certified FPASP EIR/EIS is indicated in the columns to the right of the environmental issues.

3.1.3 Any new Circumstances Involving New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there have been changes to the project site or the vicinity (circumstances under which the project is undertaken) that have occurred subsequent to the prior environmental documents, which would result in the current project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or having substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

3.1.4 Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete is available, requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigation measures remain valid. If the new information shows that: (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental
documents; or (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; or (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects or the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the Mitigation Measure or alternative; or (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the Mitigation Measure or alternative, the question would be answered ‘Yes’ requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplement to the EIR. However, if the additional analysis completed as part of this Environmental Checklist Review finds that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified significant environmental impacts are not found to be substantially more severe, the question would be answered ‘No’ and no additional EIR documentation (supplement to the EIR or subsequent EIR) would be required.

Notably, where the only basis for preparing a subsequent EIR or a supplement to an EIR is a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact, the need for the new EIR can be avoided if the project applicant agrees to one or more mitigation measures that can reduce the significant effect(s) at issue to less than significant levels. (See River Valley Preservation Project v. Metropolitan Transit Development Board (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 154, 168.)

3.1.5 Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?

This column indicates whether the prior environmental documents and adopted CEQA Findings provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigation measures have already been implemented. A “yes” response will be provided in either instance. If “NA” is indicated, this Environmental Checklist Review concludes that there was no impact, or the impact was less-than-significant and, therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

3.2 DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION SECTIONS

3.2.1 Discussion

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category to clarify the answers. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the project relates to the issue, and the status of any mitigation that may be required or that has already been implemented.

3.2.2 Mitigation Measures

Applicable mitigation measures from the prior environmental review that would apply to the proposed amendment are listed under each environmental category. New mitigation measures are included, if needed.

3.2.3 Conclusions

A discussion of the conclusion relating to the need for additional environmental documentation is contained in each section.
3.2.4 Acronyms Used in Checklist Tables

Acronyms used in the Environmental Checklist tables and discussions include:

- **EIR**: Environmental Impact Report
- **FEIR**: Final Environmental Impact Report
- **MM**: Mitigation Measure
- **NA**: not applicable
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4 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

4.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.1-2 to 3A.1-22 impacts 3A.1-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.1-26 Impact 3A.1-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, issue addressed but mitigation is still not feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.1-1 to 3A.1-20 impacts 3A.1-3 and 3A.1-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.1-22 Impacts 3A.1-5, 3A.1-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to aesthetics, described in the EIR/EIS Section 3A.1 Aesthetics - Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

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

As described in the Aesthetics setting (see page 3A.1-2), the project site and surrounding area is part of a large stretch of undeveloped land along U.S. 50 in eastern Sacramento County that contains oak woodlands and rock outcroppings; it is considered to be a scenic vista. Because the FPASP contains high levels of vividness, intactness, and unity, and because of its location along U.S. 50 where it is seen by thousands of motorists, viewer sensitivity is considered to be high. Project implementation would substantially degrade this scenic vista. In Impact 3A.1-1, the EIR/EIS concluded that viewsheds that include the FPASP are part of thousands of acres of open space that would no longer exist. Instead, this area would contain development that would substantially degrade the existing scenic view of the landscape. This area would become of similar visual quality to nearby developed land, and would no longer be considered a unique or scenic vista. The impact to a scenic vista was determined to be significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.1-1 was concluded to reduce the impact of substantial alteration of a scenic vista, but not to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation would require the applicant to construct and maintain a landscape corridor adjacent to U.S. 50. No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with the alteration of scenic vistas from project development to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable. The visual characteristics of the site have not changed.

The project would affect the same area already analyzed and proposed changes to the plan would not substantially alter the development type or density at the site such that different or more severe aesthetic
impacts would result. Further, the project would comply with all appropriate mitigation identified in the EIR/EIS. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur; therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

At the time of the certification of the EIR/EIS there were no officially designated State Scenic Highways or National Scenic Byways with views of the site. However, Scott Road south of White Rock Road was identified as a designated scenic corridor in Sacramento County because it is considered to be located within an especially scenic rural portion of Sacramento County. As described in the FPASP EIR/EIS, project implementation would substantially damage views from the portion of Scott Road designated as a scenic corridor. No mitigation measures were found feasible, therefore, the impact was concluded to remain significant and unavoidable. No new scenic corridor designations have occurred since approval of the FPASP; therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

Impact 3A.1-3 of the EIR/EIS describes permanent changes to the visual character of the FPASP area, while Impact 3A.1-4 describes temporary, short-term construction-related changes to visual character. At full buildout, the visual character of the FPASP (including Hillsborough) would consist of developed urban land uses with intermittent areas of open space and parks. The development is required to preserve at least 30 percent as natural open space. However, motorists on surrounding roadways and other sensitive viewers would no longer have views of expansive grasslands within the project site.

Implementation of the FPASP would result in conversion of grassy hillsides to urban areas, generally consisting of housing units and commercial developments. Views would be permanently altered to urban development, substantially degrading views located on Scott Road, Placerville Road, White Rock Road, U.S. 50, and for people located within the community of El Dorado Hills, the City of Folsom, and nearby rural residences. In addition, the presence and movement of heavy construction equipment and staging areas could temporarily degrade the existing visual character and/or quality of the FPASP and surrounding area for existing developed land uses. Given the large scale of this urban development and the rural nature of its setting, the EIR/EIS concluded that the degradation of visual character at the FPASP would be significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1 and 3A.7-4 in the FPASP EIR/EIS would reduce significant impacts associated with substantial adverse effects on changes to visual character by reducing the extent of grading within the FPASP and providing a 50-foot-wide landscaped corridor between U.S. 50 and the FPASP. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.1-4 would reduce significant impacts associated with temporary visual-quality degradation for developed land uses from concurrent construction staging areas by providing visual screening. However, the EIR/EIS concluded that implementation of screening may not always be feasible. Overall, it was determined that even with implementation of mitigation, the FPASP would substantially alter a scenic vista and the impact was concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

The project would affect the same area analyzed for development in the FPASP EIR/EIS and proposed changes would not substantially alter the development type or density at the site. No changes to the visual character of the site or surrounding areas have occurred since approval of the EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur, and the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

The proposed amendment to the FPASP would not result in substantial changes in land use within the specific plan area. Two impacts in the EIR/EIS described how the FPASP would contribute to the creation of
a new source of substantial light or glare and new skyglow (Impacts 3A.1-5 and 3A.1-6). The site previously designated for the private school would be replaced with residential development that would include similar exterior lighting as the approved school. Because of the scale of proposed FPASP development and because FPASP implementation would introduce a substantial quantity of light into a rural landscape, overall light and glare effects were determined to be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5 would reduce significant impacts associated with new sources of light and glare to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation would be applicable to the project. No changes in nighttime lighting conditions have occurred since approval of the FPASP. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if project was approved.

- **Mitigation Measure 3A.1-1: Construct and Maintain a Landscape Corridor Adjacent to U.S. 50.**
- **Mitigation Measure 3A.1-4: Screen Construction Staging Areas.**
- **Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5: Establish and Require Conformance to Lighting Standards and Prepare and Implement a Lighting Plan.**

The EIR/EIS concluded that alteration of views of the project site from surrounding roadways, as well as views from within the project site, as a result of urbanization would result in significant and unavoidable impacts and that no additional mitigation measures are available to reduce or eliminate the impacts. This conclusion would not change with implementation of the project.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to aesthetics.
### 4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.10-2, 3A.10-5, 3A.10-6 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.10-2 to 3A.10-4, 3A.10-6, 3A.10-7 Impacts 3A.10-3 and 3A.10-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>Not addressed, criterion was not part of Appendix G when EIR/EIS was certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land?</td>
<td>Not addressed, criterion was not part of Appendix G when EIR/EIS was certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>Not addressed, criterion was not part of Appendix G when EIR/EIS was certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to Agriculture and Forest Resources, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.10 Land Use and Agricultural Resources, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

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?**

As described in the EIR/EIS, the FPASP does not include any agricultural land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as defined in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. There is no impact. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designations for the site have not changed since approval of the FPASP. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid. No further analysis is required.
b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?**
As described in Table 3A.10-1 of the EIR/EIS, the Williamson Act contracts for parcels pertaining to the Hillsborough at Easton site (73-AP-019 and 84-AP-001) were in nonrenewal starting in 2004, which means they expired in 2014. Although Impact 3A.10-3 assumes that project implementation would require the cancellation of one or more of these Williamson Act contracts before their expiration date, this is no longer required as the nonrenewable period has been exhausted. The FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that impacts associated with conflicts with zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts would be less than significant (Impact 3A.10-3). Impacts would continue to be less than significant with implementation of the project. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**
The FPASP EIR/EIS did not address forestry issues. Nonetheless, there is no forest land or timberland on or near the project site. Therefore, there would be no conflicts with lands designated for forestry uses and no impact would occur.

d) **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**
The FPASP EIR/EIS did not address forestry issues. Nonetheless, there is no forest land or timberland on or near the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land and no impact would occur.

e) **Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**
The project site was rezoned as part of the FPASP approval from agricultural land use designations to urban designations. While the project includes some changes to the land use designations on-site, proposed designations would continue to be urban, similar to approved land uses. The project would not involve the conversion of farmland that was not previously evaluated in the EIR/EIS and no new impacts would occur. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Mitigation Measures**
There were no mitigation measures included in the EIR/EIS for this topic.

**CONCLUSION**
Since the EIR/EIS was certified, no new circumstances have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and implementation of the project would not result in any new significant impacts associated with agriculture and forest resources.
4.3 AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2.10 to 3A.2.10; Impact 3A.2-1 and Impact 3A.2-2</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2.2 to 3A.2-6; Impact 3A.2-1, Impact 3A.2-2, and Impact 3A.2-3</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>and Cumulative analysis on p. 4-22 to 4-23</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2-7 to 3A.2-10 and 3A.2-20 to 3A.2-23; Impact 3A.2-4; and Cumulative analysis on p. 4-23 to 4-26</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2-9; Impact 3A.2-6</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to Air Quality, described in EIR/EIS Sections 3A.2 and 3B.2 under Air Quality, has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011. The Sacramento Valley Air Basin is nonattainment with respect to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for ozone and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM$_{2.5}$); and also nonattainment of the CAAQS for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM$_{10}$) (SMAQMD 2013). There has also been no substantial change to how the Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) recommends evaluating the air quality impacts of proposed development projects (SMAQMD 2009).

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

**Construction-Generated Emissions of NOx**

As stated under Impact 3A.2-1 in the FPASP EIR/EIS, the mass emissions threshold for oxides of nitrogen (NOx) established by SMAQMD was used to determine whether construction-generated emission of NOx, an ozone precursor, would conflict with implementation of SMAQMD’s federal and State ozone attainment plans and/or contribute substantially or result in an exceedance of the NAAQS and CAAQS for ozone. The analysis determined that maximum daily emissions of NOx generated by construction of the FPASP would exceed SMAQMD’s recommended threshold of 85 pounds per day (lb/day). It also acknowledged that some portions of the FPASP, such as the Hillsborough at Easton site, would be undergoing construction while other portions...
of the FPASP would not. Thus, the level of maximum daily emissions of NOx generated by construction of the project would also exceed SMAQMD’s mass emission threshold of 85 lb/day. The types of emissions-generating construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the adopted plan for Hillsborough at Easton, as well as the quantity of land that would be developed and the intensity and pace of construction. Therefore, the maximum daily level of NOx generated by construction of the project would be approximately the same as determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

Implementation of SMAQMD’s Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, and payment of an off-site mitigation fee to offset construction-generated NOx emissions, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1b of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce emissions of NOx associated with construction of the project to levels that do not exceed SMAQMD’s threshold of significance of 85 lb/day. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a and 3A.2-1b adopted as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts related to NOx emissions.

Construction-Generated Emissions of PM_{10}

The FPASP EIR/EIS provides a program-level analysis of construction-generated PM_{10} emissions under Impact 3A.2.1. SMAQMD recommends that project-level analysis be conducted to determine the maximum concentration of PM_{10} by performing air dispersion modeling with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) AERMOD model if the maximum daily acreage of ground disturbance would exceed 15 acres. However, dispersion modeling was not performed for this program-level analysis because detailed information about grading activities and the locations and occupancy timing of future planned on-site receptors was not known at the time of writing the FPASP EIR/EIS. The FPASP EIR/EIS determined it would be likely that more than 15 acres of ground disturbance activity would occur in one day and, thus, concluded that that ground-disturbing activities associated with site construction (i.e., grading, earth movement) would result in concentrations of PM_{10} that exceed or substantially contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS. These exceedances would conflict with SMAQMD’s air quality planning efforts.

Implementation of SMAQMD’s Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices for Soil Disturbance Areas, and Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices for Unpaved Roads, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce PM_{10} concentrations generated during construction. Nonetheless, resultant PM_{10} concentrations could potentially exceed or substantially contribute to the CAAQS and NAAQS because the intensity of construction activity and the acreage of ground disturbance that could occur at any one point in time could be substantially high and/or take place in close proximity to existing or future planned sensitive receptors (e.g., residents, schools). Therefore, PM_{10} emissions associated with construction would be significant and unavoidable unless the results of a detailed project-level analysis, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c, support another impact conclusion. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c requires a detailed project-level analysis after project phasing has been determined and tentative maps and improvement plans have been prepared.

Construction of land uses in the amended Hillsborough at Easton plan would also likely involve more than 15 acres of grading in a single day. Thus, construction-generated concentrations of PM_{10} could also exceed or substantially contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS and conflict with SMAQMD planning efforts. However, because the intensity of grading activity, the types of ground disturbance equipment used, and the types of soils disturbed would be similar, PM_{10} concentrations resulting from construction of the project are not anticipated to be substantially greater than was analyzed in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Nonetheless, project-level analysis will be needed, based on dispersion modeling, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c adopted as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to PM_{10} emissions.

Long-Term, Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursor Emissions

In the 2010 FPASP EIR/EIS, operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors were evaluated for the entire FPASP using the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS) 2007 version 9.2.4, which was the widely-accepted emissions modeling tool at that time. URBEMIS has been superseded by the contemporary air quality modeling tool for use in CEQA analysis in California: the California Emissions Estimator Model.
(CalEEMod). SMAQMD started recommending use of CalEEMod to estimate emissions of land use development projects in April 2013. The new model does not constitute “new information” as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 because a similar model estimating criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions was available at the time of the EIR/EIS. However, revised emissions modeling was conducted to ascertain what changes might have arisen in the recommended methodologies and emission factors since 2010. More specifically, CalEEMod was used to model both the adopted land use plan for the Hillsborough at Easton project area and the currently proposed project to determine whether the levels of operational emissions from these two planning scenarios would be substantially different. This modeling is based on the daily trip generation rates and estimates for vehicle miles travelled (VMT) that were calculated for both scenarios (i.e., adopted and amended) as part of the Hillsborough Draft Transportation Impact Study (Fehr & Peers 2015).

The following land use types and quantities were used for modeling purposes based on the traffic analysis prepared for the amended Hillsborough at Easton plan:

- Single-Family Residential: 1,394 dwelling units
- Multi-Family Residential: 624 dwelling units
- Community Commercial: 13.27 acres
- Industrial/Office Park: 43.9 acres
- Elementary School: 10 acres
- Parks: 63.5 acres

Subsequent to the completion of the final air quality modeling, the proposed land use quantities for the project were amended as follows:

- Single-Family Residential: +87 dwelling units
- Multi-Family Residential: -87 dwelling units
- Community Commercial: -0.15 acres
- Industrial/Office Park: -2 acres
- Elementary School: No change
- Parks: -2.6 acres

According to the updated traffic analysis, the above land use modifications resulted in estimated trip generation being reduced by approximately 125 trips on a daily basis. Therefore, the analysis contained in the remainder of this section accounts for a slightly higher trip generating project than is currently proposed and is; therefore, considered somewhat conservative.

Mobile-source emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors would result from employee commute trips, visitor trips, and other associated vehicle trips (e.g., deliveries of supplies, maintenance vehicles). Table 4.3-1 summarizes the modeled operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors of both the adopted specific plan and the amended specific plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source</th>
<th>ROG (lb/day)</th>
<th>NOx (lb/day)</th>
<th>PM10 (lb/day)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (lb/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Hillsborough Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources²</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Combustion</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>243.2</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions Source</td>
<td>ROG (lb/day)</td>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x} (lb/day)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10} (lb/day)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5} (lb/day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended Hillsborough at Easton Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>153.4</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Combustion</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270.2</td>
<td>123.8</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD CEQA Thresholds</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Appendix A for detail on model inputs, assumptions, and modeling parameters.

\textsuperscript{1} Emission estimates shown in this table do not account for the emission reductions that would be achieved by implementation of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Air Quality Mitigation Plan, which is required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS.

\textsuperscript{2} Area sources of emissions include landscaping equipment, architectural coatings, and consumer products (e.g., kitchen aerosols, cleaning supplies, cosmetics, and toiletries).

\textsuperscript{3} SMAQMD does not recommend mass emission thresholds for evaluating PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5}.

Also shown in Table 4.3-1, maximum daily emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and NO\textsubscript{x} for the Hillsborough at Easton plan area under the adopted FPASP and the project would exceed SMAQMD’s mass emission thresholds. Therefore, the operational emissions associated with the project would still be expected to violate or contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation or conflict with air quality planning efforts to bring the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) into attainment of the CAAQS and NAAQS for ozone.

Also shown in Table 4.3-1, operational emissions of ROG and NO\textsubscript{x} under the amended specific plan would be approximately 27 and 10 lb/day greater than estimated for the adopted specific plan, respectively. These increases are not considered to be substantial, in part, because they do not exceed SMAQMD’s mass emissions thresholds for ROG and NO\textsubscript{x} of 65 lbs/day.

Like the adopted specific plan, and subsequent to this project-specific environmental review, the amended specific plan would be subject to the emission reduction measures outlined in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Air Quality Mitigation Plan, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 requires the FPASP to achieve a 35 percent reduction in operational NO\textsubscript{x} emissions from baseline levels; however, similar to the explanation provided in the FPASP EIR/EIS, the baseline levels are not represented by the CalIEEMod modeling output in Table 4.3-1 (or the URBEMIS modeling output summarized in Table 3A.2-7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS). For the purposes of developing an air quality mitigation plan pursuant to SMAQMD’s Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions Version 3.2 (SMAQMD 2015) a baseline emissions level is presumed that is based on standard default trip generation rates established by the Institution of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The traffic modeling output used in the CalIEEMod model runs here did not use standard ITE trip generation rates. Instead, the traffic modeling prepared for this analysis was based on a modified version of the SACMET regional travel demand forecasting model (Fehr and Peers 2015:21). The SACMET traffic demand forecasting model is a tool that assigns trips generated by the various land uses to the surrounding roadway network based on the locations of trip attractions and productions. SACMET incorporates several types of data, including detailed land use; trip generation characteristics of specific land use types; mode choice propensity based upon user and trip
characteristics; roadway, pedestrian, and transit networks; and census information. By incorporating more parameters that are unique to the region and the FPASP, SACMET estimates more precise (and lower) estimates of VMT than using standard default ITE trip generation rates, which in turn results in more precise (and lower) estimates of operational air pollutant emissions. In other words, the traffic modeling already accounts for some of the unique attributes of both the adopted plan and the project (such as the proximity of residential and commercial land uses to activity centers), for which an emissions reduction is also included in the Air Quality Mitigation Plan. Therefore, one would overestimate the reduction achieved by the AQMP by reducing the levels of operational NOx emissions reported in Table 4.3-1 (or in Table 3A.2-7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS) by 35 percent. Nonetheless, even if operational emissions of ROG and NOx were 35 percent lower than the levels reported in Table 4.3-1, they would still exceed SMAQMD’s significance threshold of 65 lbs/day.

This impact would be significant and unavoidable, which is the same conclusion reached for Impact 3A.2-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. This impact is within the scope of the impact evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS and Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 includes feasible best practices for reduction of operational emissions from land use-related sources, and no additional measures are recommended. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. While emissions were modeled to be slightly higher than presented in the FPASP EIR/EIS, this increase would not be substantial because they would not exceed SMAQMD’s significance threshold of 65 lb/day. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from criteria air pollutants or precursors as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

Construction-Generated Emissions of NOx and PM10

As discussed in (a) above, the types of emission-generating construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the adopted Hillsborough at Easton plan, as well as the quantity of land that would be developed, the amount of ground disturbance that exceeds 1.5 acres per day, and the intensity and pace of construction. Therefore, the maximum daily level of NOx, an ozone precursor, and PM10 generated by construction of the amended Hillsborough Specific Plan would be approximately the same as determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Implementation of SMAQMD’s Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2.1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, and payment of an off-site mitigation fee to off-set construction-generated NOx emissions, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2.1b of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce emissions of NOx associated with construction of the project to levels that do not exceed SMAQMD’s threshold of significance of 85 lb/day. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.2.1a and 3A.2.1b adopted as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts related to NOx emissions.

Implementation of the dust control measures required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2.1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce PM10 concentrations generated during construction but resultant PM10 concentrations could potentially exceed or substantially contribute to the CAAQS and NAAQS because the intensity of construction activity and the acreage of ground disturbance that could occur at any one point in time could be substantially high and/or take place in close proximity to existing or future planned sensitive receptors. PM10 concentrations resulting from construction of the project are not anticipated to be substantially greater than was analyzed in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Long-Term, Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursor Emissions

Also shown in Table 4.3-1 in (a), above, maximum daily emissions of ozone precursors, ROG and NOx from operation of the project would exceed SMAQMD’s mass emission thresholds but would not be substantially greater than the adopted Hillsborough at Easton plan. All applicable mitigation measures were recommended in Mitigation Measure 3A.2.2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, and would minimize operation-related emissions, but not to less-than-significant levels. For these reasons, operation of the project could result in
or substantially contribute to a violation of air quality standards related to ozone, which is the same conclusion reached in the FPASP EIR/EIS Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mobile-Source CO Concentrations
The potential for FPASP-induced traffic congestion at area intersections to result in relatively high concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) near sensitive receptors is discussed under Impact 3A.2-3 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. Applying the “Second Tier” screening methodology recommended in SMAQMD’s Guide to Air Quality Assessment (SMAQMD 2009) this analysis determined that FPASP-induced congestion would not result in or contribute to exceedances of the CAAQS or NAAQS for CO at affected intersections because none of these intersections would experience a traffic volume that exceeds 31,600 vehicles per hour. Thus, Impact 3A.2-3 was determined to be less than significant.

While the project would generate more vehicle trips and a higher level of daily vehicle miles traveled (i.e., 31,130 trips/day) than this area under the adopted FPASP (i.e., 29,118 trips/day) it would not result in any intersection experiencing a traffic volume more than 31,600 vehicles per hour. This impact would be within the scope of the impact already evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS, and would be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Pages 4-22 through 4-29 of the FPASP EIR/EIS evaluated cumulative air quality impacts of the FPASP, which includes those attributable to the development in the area of the Hillsborough at Easton plan under the adopted FPASP. Cumulative impacts on air quality associated with the project would be similar and are within the scope of the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

As discussed in (a), above, the adopted Specific Plan would result in exceedances of SMAQMD’s significance criteria for NOx and PM_{10} during project construction and operation. The amount of emissions generated during project construction and operation would be substantial compared with other projects in the region, and would be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, significant. In addition, all applicable mitigation measures were recommended in and adopted as Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a, 3A.2-1b, and 3A.2-2, which would minimize construction- and operation-related emissions, respectively, but not to less-than-significant levels. For these reasons, project construction and operation could result in or substantially contribute to a violation of air quality standards related to ozone and PM_{10} on a cumulative basis.

Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a, 3A.2-1b, and 3A.2-2 were required to minimize the project’s construction- and operation-related emissions. These mitigation measures include feasible best practices for reducing construction and operation-related emissions. No additional mitigation is recommended. The adopted FPASP would involve substantial development, and would generate emissions that would be considered substantial in the region. This cumulative impact on air quality would remain significant and unavoidable for the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

The FPASP EIR/EIS also evaluated cumulative air quality impacts associated with localized CO concentrations from traffic congestion at buildout of the FPASP. This cumulative impact was found to be less than significant. The project is within the scope of this impact analysis, and cumulative air quality impacts for localized CO would also be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Toxic Air Contaminant Concentrations**

**Temporary, Short-Term Emissions from Construction Equipment**
Emissions of particulate exhaust from diesel-powered engines (diesel PM) including diesel-powered construction equipment were identified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC) by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) in 1998. Impact 3A.2-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that diesel PM emissions generated during construction of the land uses on the FPASP site, including the Hillsborough at Easton area, could expose nearby residents and schools to levels that exceed applicable standards as some phases of the development plan are built out while construction of other phases continues in both the Hillsborough at Easton area and other portions of the FPASP area. This would particularly be the case when some new residents occupy dwelling units while other land uses are still under construction and some residents may be exposed to diesel PM generated by construction activity in all directions at varying stages of construction. Because construction activities could expose sensitive receptors to levels of health risk that exceed applicable standards, the FPASP EIR/EIS determined this impact to be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a in the FPASP EIR/EIS requires project applicants of all phases to develop a plan that reduces the exposure of sensitive receptors, including residents and school children, to construction-generated TACs. Each plan shall be developed by the project applicant(s) in consultation with SMAQMD and each plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval before the approval of any grading plans. While implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a would lessen health-related risks associated with the use of off-road diesel powered equipment during construction activity, exposure to construction-generated TAC emissions would not necessarily be reduced to less-than-significant levels and; therefore, the potential exposure of receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions would be considered significant and unavoidable. This would also be true for the project because it would be built out over multiple years, and some residential dwelling units, and possibly the proposed elementary school, could be occupied and operational while nearby land uses are still under construction. Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Stationary-Source Emissions**
Impact 3A.2-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that any stationary sources of TACs developed under the FPASP or in close proximity to the FPASP planning area (e.g., dry cleaning operations, gasoline-dispensing facilities, and diesel-fueled backup generators, and restaurants using charbroilers) would be subject to the permitting requirements of SMAQMD and, therefore, operation of any stationary sources would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs at levels exceeding SMAQMD’s significance threshold. Therefore, this direct impact is considered less than significant. This would also be true for the project and, thus, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Emissions from On-Site Operational Mobile Sources**
Impact 3A.2-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that buildout of the FPASP could potentially involve substantial volumes of TAC-emitting activity occurring in close proximity to nearby sensitive receptors and, therefore, that this impact would be potentially significant. The FPASP EIR/EIS made this determination because the types of commercial and industrial land uses developed under the FPASP and their location relative to residential land uses were unknown at the time of the analysis. The FPASP EIR/EIS included implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.2-4b, which includes the following measures to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs from on-site mobile sources:

- Proposed commercial and industrial land uses that have the potential to emit TACs or host TAC-generating activity (e.g., loading docks) shall be located away from existing and proposed on-site sensitive receptors such that they do not expose sensitive receptors to TAC emissions that exceed an incremental increase of 10 in 1 million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0.
Where necessary to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to an incremental increase of 10 in 1 million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0, proposed commercial and industrial land uses that would host diesel trucks shall incorporate idle reduction strategies that reduce the main propulsion engine idling time through alternative technologies such as IdleAire, electrification of truck parking, and alternative energy sources for transport refrigeration units (TRUs), to allow diesel engines to be completely turned off.

Signs shall be posted at all loading docks and truck loading areas which indicate that diesel-powered delivery trucks must be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises to reduce idling emissions. This measure is consistent with the air toxic control measures (ATCMs) to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling, which was approved by the California Office of Administrative Law in January 2005.

The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that implementation of the above measures that are part of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b would lessen health-related risks associated with on-site mobile-source TACs, including truck activity at land uses proposed in the FPASP.

The project would not include any industrial land uses and the only commercial land uses—a retail shopping center and business park—are not anticipated to include more than a few loading docks or support a high level truck activity. Therefore, as a result of the project, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from TAC exposure from on-site truck activity. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**TAC Exposure from Remediation Activity**

Impact 3A.2-4 in the FPASP EIR/EIS also discussed whether remediation activity on the Aerojet General Corporation parcel along the western property boundary of the FPAP, which has been classified as a Superfund site, would result in TAC exposure of land uses developed under the FPASP. A report prepared by ARCADIS (2007) entitled *Draft Ambient Air Evaluation of Aerojet Area 40* examined potential health risks to future adult and child recreationists on the adjacent portion of the FPASP that would remain open space from volatile organic compounds (VOCs) potentially migrating from groundwater into the ambient air. The report analyzed groundwater analytical data for the VOC plume located in the northern portion of Area 40. The primary chemicals of potential concern in the VOC plume include trichloroethene (TCE) and tetrachloroethene (PCE). Exposure and risk to adult and child recreationists were estimated using standard EPA and California risk assessment practices. The analysis determined that the hazard indices (a.k.a., hazard quotients) used for determining levels of non-cancer risk would be 0.010 and 0.0000025 from TCE and PCE exposure, respectively. It also determined that cancer risk levels would be 0.8 in one million from TCE exposure and 0.01 in one million from PCE exposure. Because all of the estimated risk levels would be below the SMAQMD's recommended thresholds of significance for health risk (i.e., a hazard index less than 1.0 at the maximally exposed individual and a cancer risk level less than 10 in one million), airborne exposure of recreationists on the SPA to off-gassing VOC emissions from the contaminated groundwater plume was determined to be a less-than-significant impact. The project would experience even lower levels of risk because it is located further from the remediation site. Therefore, as a result of the project, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from TAC exposure because of remediation activities on the Aerojet site. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Land Use Compatibility with TACs Generated at Off-Site Corporation Yard**

As part of the discussion under Impact 3A.2-4, the FPASP EIR/EIS addressed the possibility that residential land uses developed near White Rock Road could be exposed to potentially high concentrations of diesel PM generated by trucks and other equipment that are staged at a corporation yard the City plans to locate near the south side of White Rock Road and east of Prairie City Road. Because the types and number of equipment and activities at the future corporation yard were not known at the time the analysis was conducted for the FPASP EIR/EIS, and because it was not known whether activities at the corporation yard could potentially expose future residents to substantial levels of diesel PM exhaust, the analysis conservatively determined this impact to be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b of the FPASP
EIR/EIS requires that the multi-family residences proposed across White Rock Road in the FPASP (and part of the adopted Hillsborough at Easton plan) be set back as far as possible from the boundary of the future corporation yard and/or relocated to another area.

Since that analysis was written for the FPASP EIR/EIS, more detail is now known about the types and level of TAC-generating activities that would take place at the corporation yard and its proximity to proposed sensitive land uses. Thus, this new information is used to conduct a more detailed impact analysis in this environmental document. The project would locate more multi-family residential units, as well as some single-family residences, near the portion of White Rock Road that is across from the future corporation yard site. However, it is now known that the corporation yard would be located more than 242 feet south of White Rock Road rather than right along the road as was assumed when the FPASP EIR/EIS was written. Recent design drawings of the corporation yard now show that its northern boundary would be approximately 470 feet from the nearest location in the Hillsborough at Easton plan area; the center of the corporation yard would be approximately 1,100 feet from the nearest residence; and an 8-foot-tall berm would likely be built between the corporation yard and White Rock Road (MacKay & Soms 2015).

TAC-generating equipment stored at the corporation yard would include approximately 12 transit buses and vans, three vacuum trucks; five street sweepers; three fork lifts; three boom trucks; two tractor trailers; two asphalt machines; one dump truck; two water trucks, and two fleet response service vehicles (Nugen, pers. comm., 2015). The City may also decide to locate its solid waste collection fleet at the new corporation yard, consisting of 36 diesel-powered solid waste collection trucks (Kent, pers. comm. 2015). Four to six fuel pumps—gasoline, diesel, and potentially compressed natural gas (CNG)—would be located at the corporation yard, as well as 16 bay repair stations for vehicle repair and maintenance. The City estimates that approximately 50 to 60 trucks would enter or leave the corporation yard each day, assuming it is used by the City's solid waste collection fleet (Nugen, pers. comm., 2015).

ARB’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective provides guidance on land use compatibility with various sources of TACs (ARB 2005). The handbook is not a law or adopted policy but offers advisory recommendations for the siting of sensitive receptors near uses associated with TACs, such as freeways and high-traffic roads, commercial distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, dry cleaners, gasoline stations, and industrial facilities, to help keep sensitive receptors from being exposed to substantial doses of TACs. The handbook’s discussion of truck distribution facilities is applicable to this analysis because the corporation yard would serve as central point of activity for multiple diesel-powered vehicles. In its handbook ARB recommends that lead agencies avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week (ARB 2005:4). ARB also recommends that lead agencies take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid locating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points because, in addition to on-site emissions, truck travel in and out of distribution centers contributes to the local pollution impact (ARB 2005:4.11).

Overall, the amount of diesel PM generated at the future corporation yard and the resultant level of health risk exposure at nearby receptors (i.e., residential land uses in the project area) would be less than the type of truck distribution centers discussed in ARB’s handbook. The total number of diesel-powered vehicles at the future corporation yard would be less than 100, even if the City’s solid waste collection fleet is moved to the site, and no TRUs would be operated. Unlike a typical truck distribution center there would be no “yard truck” used to move containers around the corporation yard that is typical of truck distribution centers. Because the entry and exit points to the corporation yard would be from Prairie City Road, not all trucks would pass by the proposed residential locations along White Rock Road when arriving or departing. Furthermore, truck idling is restricted by ARB regulations, particularly the Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling rule which prohibits the driver to idle its primary diesel engine for more than 5 minutes (CCR Title 13, Section 2485). ARB also continues to implement its Diesel Risk Reduction Plan to substantially reduce emissions of diesel PM from existing and new trucks (ARB 2000).
In summary, because the center of the corporation yard would be more than 1,000 feet from the proposed residential area, the number of diesel engines at the corporation yard would not be more than 100 and there would be no TRUs, and the reductions in diesel PM resulting from ARB’s regulatory efforts, it is not anticipated that residential land uses developed under the project would be exposed to substantial levels of health risk from TACs emitted at the future corporation yard. This impact would be less than significant.

Note that when the corporation yard is proposed it would be required to undergo its own environmental review pursuant to CEQA and additional analysis will be necessary, particularly if the type of TAC-generating sources operating at the corporation yard will be different than described in this analysis.

**Land Use Compatibility with U.S. 50**
Impact 3A.2-4 in the FPASP EIR/EIS also examined whether the northern portion of the FPASP would be exposed to high concentrations of mobile-source TACs from the high volumes of traffic that travel on U.S. 50. The analysis concluded that impact of exposure to TAC emission from U.S. 50 would be less than significant because no schools, residences, or other sensitive receptors would be developed within the 500-foot setback distance recommended in ARB’s guidance document entitled *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (ARB 2005). The potential for the land uses developed under the project to be exposed to high concentrations of TAC’s generated on U.S. 50 would also be less than significant because they would be even more distant from the freeway. Therefore, this impact would be within the scope of the impact already evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS, and would also be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Land Use Compatibility with High-Volume Arterial Roadways**
As part of the cumulative impact analysis in section 4.1.7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the previous analysis examined health risk exposure levels from traffic on nearby high-volume arterial roadways to new residential land uses proposed under the FPASP. The FPASP EIR/EIS analyzed this impact because relatively high volumes of diesel-powered trucks associated with nearby sand and gravel quarries would travel on arterial roadways that pass by the proposed residential land uses and diesel PM emitted by this traffic could expose nearby residents to relatively high levels of health risk. Quarry trucks are expected to use segments of Prairie City Road, White Rock Road, Scott Road, and possibly Oak Avenue. The analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS employed guidance from SMAQMD’s *Recommended Protocol for Evaluating the Location of Sensitive Land Uses Adjacent to Major Roadways, Version 2.3* (SMAQMD 2010). SMAQMD suggests using its protocol to determine whether it recommends that site-specific dispersion modeling and health risk calculations be conducted to further evaluate levels of health risk exposure associated with an individual project. The protocol consists of look-up tables that account for the volume of traffic on the roadway being examined, the roadway orientation (e.g., east-west or north-south), the distance between the receptor and roadway, and the orientation of the receptor relative to the roadway (e.g., a receptor located 50 feet north of a roadway segment that runs east-west). The analysis found that risk exposure levels could potentially be high enough to warrant a site-specific HRA for some of the roadway segments that pass by the project site, including the segments of Prairie City Road north of White Rock Road, White Rock Road between Prairie City Road and Scott Road South, White Rock Road east of Scott Road South, and Oak Avenue north of White Rock Road, as shown in Table 4-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS.

The analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS was conservative; however, because of uncertainty about when residential land uses on the FPASP site would be developed and occupied, the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS assumed that exposure to residents could begin as early as 2010 and; thus, used screening factors based on 2010 emission rates. This assumption was conservative because emissions of diesel PM from trucks are expected to decrease in the future as stricter, emission-reducing regulations come into effect, and as new trucks replace older trucks.

Thus, a new screening analysis was conducted at the time of writing this environmental review document because it is now known that the project’s residential land uses would not be occupied any earlier than 2018. Adjustments were made to reflect that diesel PM emissions from trucks would be lower than were used in the analysis presented in the FPASP EIR/EIS. This updated analysis also uses the newer screening tables provided in the most recent version of SMAQMDs protocol (Version 2.4) (SMAQMD 2011). Detailed
parameters and calculations are provided in Appendix A. Therefore, the level of health risk exposure to residential land uses on the project site would be less than significant.

Moreover, this impact determination is consistent with the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS, which determined that levels of health risk exposure would decrease over time. As shown in Table 4-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the exposure levels would decrease along all studied roadway segments from 2010 to 2030. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction-Generated Emissions of Naturally Occurring Asbestos**

Impact 3A.2-5 in the FPASP EIR/EIS examined whether construction-related ground disturbance activities (i.e., grading, rock blasting) could generate fugitive PM_{10} dust that contains naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). Based on a report by the California Geologic Survey, portions of the FPASP area, including portions of the project area, include areas that are moderately likely to contain NOA (California Geologic Survey 2006). The analysis explains that the serpentine soils may be disturbed during site grading and rock blasting activities, potentially exposing residents of the nearby residential neighborhoods in El Dorado County or neighborhoods that have already been developed in the FPASP to asbestos during project construction. Without appropriate controls, sensitive receptors near construction sites could be exposed to localized high levels of re-entrained fugitive PM_{10} dust, potentially including NOA. As a result, this direct impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-5 would reduce impacts associated with generation of fugitive dust that potentially contains NOA by requiring site-specific investigations and, where the presence of NOA is determined, implementation of a dust control plan that is approved by SMAQMD that would reduce impacts related to construction in serpentine soils.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the potentially significant impact associated with exposure to NOA during construction to a less-than-significant level. The potential for sensitive receptors to be exposed to NOA under the project is not substantially greater than determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from NOA exposure as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

**Short-Term Use of Construction Equipment**

Impact 3A.2-6 of the FPASP EIR/EIS explains that construction activities associated with the development of on-site land uses could result in objectionable emissions from diesel exhaust generated by construction equipment. Because the level of grading along the eastern, hilly side of the FPASP area construction would be particularly intense and require multiple pieces of heavy-duty, diesel-powered equipment (e.g., graders, dozers). Therefore, it was determined that a substantial number of people in the residential areas to the east in El Dorado Hills area could be exposed to objectionable odorous diesel exhaust emissions, and the FPASP EIR/EIS required implementation of exhaust reduction measures listed in Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a to reduce the level of exposure it was nonetheless determined that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Odorous emissions generated during the construction of the project (as well as the adopted approved Hillsborough at Easton plan) would be less likely to expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. First the Hillsborough at Easton portion of the FPASP area would not require as much grading activity because it is not as hilly as the east side of the FPASP area and would not occur for an extended period of time. Also, there are no residents or other sensitive receptors located nearby or immediately downwind from (i.e., to the north) the Hillsborough at Easton plan area. For these reasons, odorous emissions generated during construction under the project would be less than significant and would be less than reported in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

**Long-Term Operation of On-Site Land Uses**

Impact 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that receptors could be exposed to objectionable odors from delivery trucks visiting commercial land uses, from sewer lift stations, and from the development of convenience uses such as fast food restaurants that may emit odors. Because these sources could expose a
substantial number of proposed on-site receptors to objectionable odors the analysis determined this impact to be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS requires the following measures to address these operational sources of odorous emissions:

▲ The odor-producing potential of land uses shall be considered when the exact type of facility that would occupy areas zoned for commercial, industrial, or mixed-use land uses is determined. Facilities that have the potential to emit objectionable odors shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors.

▲ Before the approval of building permits, odor control devices shall be identified to mitigate the exposure of receptors to objectionable odors if a potential odor-producing source is to occupy an area zoned for commercial, industrial, or mixed-use land uses. The identified odor control devices shall be installed before the issuance of certificates of occupancy for the potentially odor-producing use. The odor-producing potential of a source and control devices shall be determined in coordination with SMAQMD and based on the number of complaints associated with existing sources of the same nature.

▲ Truck loading docks and delivery areas shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors.

▲ Signs shall be posted at all loading docks and truck loading areas which indicate that diesel-powered delivery trucks must be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises to reduce idling emissions. This measure is consistent with the ATCM to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling, which was approved by California’s Office of Administrative Law in January 2005. (This measure is also required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b to limit TAG emissions.)

▲ Proposed commercial and industrial land uses that have the potential to host diesel trucks shall incorporate idle reduction strategies that reduce the main propulsion engine idling time through alternative technologies such as, IdleAire, electrification of truck parking, and alternative energy sources for TRUs, to allow diesel engines to be completely turned off. (This measure is also required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b to limit TAG emissions.)

The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that implementation of these measures to address on-site operational sources of odorous emissions would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

The potential for on-site emission sources in the project to expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors is the same as for the FPASP, including the adopted Hillsborough at Easton plan. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe odor impacts from on-site sources would occur as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Land Use Compatibility with Off-Site Corporation Yard

In the discussion of odor impacts, Impact 3A.2-6 of the FPASP EIR/EIS also determined that the corporation yard could be a source of odorous exhaust emissions that would expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Similar to the TAC impact analysis, this analysis was conservative because it was known at the time what types of odor-generating activity could take place at the future site of the corporation yard and it was assumed that the corporation yard would be right across White Rock Road from the residential land use locations identified in the adopted Hillsborough at Easton plan. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6 of the FPASP EIR/EIS requires the residences to be set back "as far as possible" and this impact was determined to be to be significant and unavoidable.

Since the analysis was written for the FPASP EIR/EIS, more detail is now known about the types of odor sources that may be located at the future corporation yard and its proximity to proposed sensitive land uses. Thus, this new information is used to conduct a more detailed impact analysis in this environmental document. The project would locate more multi-family residential units, as well as some single family residences, near the portion of White Rock Road that is across from the future corporation yard site. However, it is now known that the corporation yard boundary would be located more than 242 feet south of
White Rock Road rather than right along the road as was assumed when the FPASP EIR/EIS was written. Recent design drawings of the corporation yard now show that its northern boundary would be approximately 470 feet from the nearest residence location in the project; the center of the corporation yard would be approximately 1,100 feet from the nearest residence; and an 8-foot-tall berm would likely be built between the corporation yard and White Rock Road (MacKay & Soms 2015).

Equipment stored at the corporation yard would include approximately 12 transit busses and vans, three vacuum trucks; five street sweepers; three fork lifts; three boom trucks; two tractor trailers; two asphalt machines; one dump truck; two water trucks, and two fleet response service vehicles (Nugen, pers. comm. 2015). The City may also decide to locate its solid waste collection fleet at the new corporation yard, consisting of 36 solid waste collection trucks (Kent, pers. comm. 2015). Most of these vehicles would be diesel-powered and emit odorous diesel exhaust.

Locating some solid waste collection activities at the future corporation yard is also being considered by the City. The collection trucks that pick up recyclables and yard waste may haul these materials to the corporation yard so they can be consolidated and picked up by larger haul trucks. The Purchase and Sale Agreement between the City and the seller explicitly states that the property cannot be used as a solid waste transfer station for municipal garbage other than temporary storage of debris from tree removal, e-waste, and household hazardous waste (Aerojet Rocketdyne Inc. and City of Folsom 2014:6). No putrescible waste such as landfill-bound solid waste, food scraps, or finished compost would be stored or processed at the corporation yard (Gary, pers. comm. 2015). Therefore, diesel exhaust would be the only odorous emission generated at the site and SMAQMD does not recommend a setback distance for land uses that harbor a large number of diesel powered vehicles or equipment (SMAQMD 2014a:7-4). For these reasons, as well as the dispersive properties of diesel exhaust (Zhu et al., 2012:1), it is not anticipated that diesel exhaust generated at the corporation yard would expose a substantial number of people to unwanted odors. This impact would be less than significant.

Note that when the corporation yard is proposed it will be required to undergo its own environmental review pursuant to CEQA and additional analysis will be necessary, particularly if the types of odor sources located at the corporation yard will be different than described in this analysis.

**Land Use Compatibility with Off-Site Agricultural Land Uses**

Impact 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS explained that land uses developed on the southern side of the FPASP area could be exposed to odors generated by neighboring agricultural land uses, including livestock grazing that takes place just south of White Rock Road. Adversely affected portions of the FPASP include the southernmost areas of the project area. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS requires the following measures to address exposure to odorous emissions from agricultural operations:

- The deeds to all properties located within the [FPASP area] that are within one mile of an on- or off-site area zoned or used for agricultural use (including livestock grazing) shall be accompanied by a written disclosure from the transferor, in a form approved by the City of Folsom, advising any transferee of the potential adverse odor impacts from surrounding agricultural operations, which disclosure shall direct the transferee to contact the County of Sacramento concerning any such property within the County zoned for agricultural uses within one mile of the subject property being transferred.

Because increasing the setback distance between on-site residents and the existing off-site agricultural lands would not necessarily reduce the intensity or frequency of these residents' exposure to odorous exhaust emissions, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

The potential for on-site residential land uses to be exposed to objectionable odors associated with off-site livestock grazing would be the same under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe odor impacts to on-site residences would occur as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

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

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1b: Pay Off-site Mitigation Fee to SMAQMD to Off-Set NOX Emissions Generated by Construction of On-Site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c: Analyze and Disclose Projected PM10 Emission Concentrations at Nearby Sensitive Receptors Resulting from Construction of On-Site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1e: Implement EDCAQMD-Recommended Measures for Controlling Fugitive PM10 dust During Construction of the Two Roadway Connections in El Dorado County.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1f: Implement SMAQMD’s Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices during Construction of all Off-site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1g: Pay Off-site Mitigation Fee to SMAQMD to Off-Set NOX Emissions Generated by Construction of Off-site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1h: Analyze and Disclose Projected PM10 Emission Concentrations at Nearby Sensitive Receptors Resulting from Construction of Off-site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2: Implement All Measures Prescribed by the Air Quality Mitigation Plan to Reduce Operational Air Pollutant Emissions.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a: Develop and Implement a Plan to Reduce Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction-Generated Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b: Implement Measures to Reduce Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Operational Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-5: Implement a Site Investigation to Determine the Presence of NOX and, if necessary, Prepare and Implement an Asbestos Dust Control Plan.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6: Implement Measures to Control Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Operational Odorous Emissions.

CONCLUSION

As required by many of the air quality mitigation measures adopted as part of the FPASP, this report provides additional project-level air quality analysis. While the project-specific analyses provide additional detail for the project site, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air quality. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis is required.
### 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Biological Resources. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-7 to 3A.3-21, Impacts 3A.3-2 and 3A.3-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-21 to 3A.3-26, Impact 3A.3-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-5 to 3A.3-7, 3A.3-18 to 3A.3-21, Impact 3A.3-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.3-7, Impact 3A.3-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-23 to 3A.3-26, Impact 3A.3-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.3-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Have the potential to cause a commercial and/or recreational fishery to drop below self-sustaining levels?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.3-17, No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1 Discussion

New information pertaining to biological resources on the project site has become available since the EIR/EIS was certified in 2011. After the EIR/EIS was certified, additional detailed biological studies were completed on behalf of the project applicant for the FPASP. From July to November 2014, ECORP produced updated studies for biological resources for the Hillsborough at Easton area. In January 2015, ECORP published a report which included the information derived from these detailed biological studies (ECORP 2015a). In addition, USFWS has published a biological opinion relating to the FPASP (Formal Consultation on the Proposed Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Project [Corps# SPK-2007-02159]) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has entered into a streambed alteration agreement with the FPASP applicants (Master Streambed Alteration Agreement [Notification No. 1600-2012-0198-R2] for Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan-Backbone Infrastructure Project). These documents contain guidance on how to treat special-status species, and provide conditions for the FPASP and associated projects. In addition, the project proponent has done more detailed designs to show how culvert crossings would be built within the Plan Area. This action is directly related to complying with Mitigation Measure 3.3-1B: Secure Clean Water Act Section 404 Section 401 Permits. The detailed designs are included in Appendix C of this document. The following discussion summarizes the new information and compares this information to the analysis presented in the EIR/EIS in Section 3A.3.a).

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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The EIR/EIS evaluated the impact of the FPASP on 13 special-status plant and 28 special-status animal species which had the potential to occur within the FPASP area (Impacts 3A.3-2 and 3A.3-3). The certified EIR/EIS concluded that the following special-status species could be substantially affected by implementation of the FPASP: vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, conservancy fairy shrimp, and valley elderberry longhorn beetle, Swainson’s hawk, special-status raptors, western spadefoot, tricolored blackbird, and special-status bats. Impacts to all other special-status wildlife species were considered less than significant.

The Draft EIR/EIS determined that implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.3-2a, 3A.3-2b, 3A.3-2c, 3A.3-2d, 3A.3-2e, 3A.3-2f, 3A.3-2g, and 3A.3-2h would lessen the impacts on special-status wildlife resulting from implementation of the FPASP; however, the EIR/EIS concluded that, even with the mitigation, the impact on Swainson’s hawk would remain significant and unavoidable. All other special-status species impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

ECORP conducted project-level biological surveys for the Hillsborough at Easton area from July through November of 2014. Based on the results of those surveys and review of the approved mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR/EIS, ECORP has recommended revised mitigation (3.3-1A, 3.3-1B, 3.3-1C, 3.3-2, 3.3-3, 3.3-4, 3.3-5, 3.3-10A, 3.3-10B, 3.3-11, 3.3-12, 3.3-13, and 3.3-15) to address the impacts related to implementation of the project. However, no new impacts from those identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS were identified. Rather, the site-specific surveys allowed ECORP to amend the mitigation to address the impacts to special-status species on a project level at the Hillsborough site. With the implementation of mitigation measures included below, the project’s impact on special-status species would continue to be less-than-significant. Further, the project-specific mitigation provided below would also ensure that the project would have a less-than-significant impact on Swainson’s hawk. The mitigation measures presented below would replace the measures adopted in the FPASP EIR/EIS. While revised mitigation is provided, the project would still contribute to the cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact on Swainson’s hawk habitat because the project would continue to be part of a larger set of projects (i.e., FPASP) which would permanently remove and convert Swainson’s hawk habitat to urban uses. The FPASP EIR/EIS identified that no additional feasible mitigation is available to mitigate the cumulative impact on
Swainson's hawk. This condition has not changed. Therefore, while the project-specific mitigation requirements for impacts to biological resources have been refined, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe biological impacts would occur with implementation of the project. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

In Impact 3A.3-4, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact on riparian habitat and valley needle grassland. Mitigation was recommended to reduce impacts to these habitats (Mitigation Measures 3.3-1C and 3.3-2). However, these habitats occur in areas where some off-site improvements are proposed (i.e., U.S. 50 roadway intersections). The off-site improvements would be implemented by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and would not be subject to the City’s direct control. Therefore, the EIR/EIS determined that this impact would be potentially significant and unavoidable because the City could not guarantee that Caltrans would comply with the recommended mitigation. This condition would not change with the project. However, based upon review of the project and the specific site characteristics, ECORP has identified appropriate project-level mitigation measures for impacts to these species. These measures are presented below as Mitigation Measures 3.3-1C and 3.3-2. Measure 3.3-1C would require the applicant to amend and implement the Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement to address potential impacts on riparian habitat. Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 requires the applicant to avoid and minimize impacts on valley needlegrass grassland. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1C and 3.3-2 (which replace EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.3-4a and 3A.3-4b for this project), the project would have a less-than-significant impact on riparian habitat and valley needle grassland. Further, based on ECORP’s survey of the site, no new impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities were identified (ECORP 2015a). Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?

The EIR/EIS (Impact 3A.3-1) evaluated the impact of the FPASP on federally protected wetlands. The EIR/EIS concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact on federally protected wetlands because the FPASP would cause some wetland areas to be filled. In the EIR/EIS, the impact was considered significant and unavoidable even with Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a and 3A.3-1b. Specific project-level mitigation measures (3.3-1A, 3.3-1B, and 3.3-1C) are included below that require stormwater, erosion, and sediment control plans; Section 404 and Section 401 permits; and implementation of the Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement. Mitigation Measures 3.3-1A, 3.3-1B, and 3.3-1C would replace EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a and 3A.3-1b for this project. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the project would have a less-than-significant impact to wetland resources and no residual significant and unavoidable impacts would remain. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts were identified. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

In Impact 3A.3-6, the EIR/EIS evaluated the impact of the FPASP on wildlife movement and concluded that the impact would be less than significant. The project would generally develop the site with the same pattern and density of urban and open space uses. No changes in habitat or migration patterns has occurred since the FPASP was approved. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

In Impact 3A.3-5, the EIR/EIS evaluated whether the FPASP would conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The EIR/EIS concluded that the removal of blue oak woodland and individual oak trees and other trees would conflict with local ordinances protecting these resources and result in a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.3-5 would lessen the impacts on blue oak woodland and other trees because it would require the applicant to implement an oak woodland mitigation plan, and other measures to avoid and minimize impacts on oak woodlands. However, the EIR/EIS concluded that, even with the mitigation, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable because the loss of individual oak trees and blue oak woodland acreage and function would be extensive and would contribute substantially to the regional loss of this resource.

According to the ECORP January 2015 biological resources technical memorandum, implementation Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 (provided below) would reduce the project’s impacts to blue oak woodland and other protected trees to a less-than-significant level. Measure 3.3-3 is a revised version of Mitigation Measure 3A.3-5 in the FPASP EIR/EIS and provides updated information on the acreage of woodland within the FPASP. While Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 would reduce the project’s impact on blue oak woodland, the project would still result in the removal of some blue oak woodland, contributing to the continuing significant and unavoidable impact on blue oak woodland and other trees Therefore, a significant and unavoidable cumulative oak woodland impact would remain. This conclusion would be the same as the FPASP EIR/EIS. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

As discussed in Impact 3A.3-7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, there is no adopted conservation plan for this area. Therefore, no impact was identified. No new conservation plans have been adopted. Therefore, there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts that would occur pertaining to conflicts with adopted conservation plans. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

g) Have the potential to cause a commercial and/or recreational fishery to drop below self-sustaining levels?

No special-status fish species are known or have potential to occur within the Alder Creek watershed, which is the watershed that occurs within the project area. No changes to this environmental condition have occurred. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts to fishery resources would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS but were updated consistent with the requirement outlined in the adopted mitigation measures to be specific to the project. The mitigation measures are numbered as found in the Biological Resources Technical Memorandum for the Hillsborough at Easton Project provided by ECORP in January 2015. These mitigation measures replace all biological resources mitigation as found in the certified EIR/EIS.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-1A: Mitigation for erosion impacts.

To minimize indirect effects on water quality and wetland hydrology, the project applicant shall include a storm water drainage plan and an erosion and sediment control plan in the improvement plans and shall submit these plans to the City Public Works Department for review and approval. Before approval of these improvement plans, the project applicant shall obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System MS4 Municipal Stormwater Permit and Grading Permit, comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance and County drainage and storm water quality standards, and commit to implementing all measures in their drainage plans.
and erosion and sediment control plans to avoid and minimize erosion and runoff into Alder Creek and all wetlands and other waters that would remain within the Specific Plan Area (SPA).

The project applicant shall implement storm water quality treatment controls consistent with the Storm Water Quality Design Manual for Sacramento and South Placer Regions (Sacramento Stormwater Quality Control Partnership 2007). Appropriate runoff controls such as berms, storm gates, off-stream detention basins, overflow collection areas, filtration systems, and sediment traps shall be implemented to control siltation and the potential discharge of pollutants. Development plans shall incorporate low impact development (LID) features, such as pervious strips, permeable pavements, bioretention ponds, vegetated swales, disconnected rain gutter downspouts, and rain gardens, where appropriate. Use of LID features is recommended by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and stream geomorphology. In addition, free-spanning bridge systems shall be used for all roadway crossings over wetlands and other waters that are retained in the on-site open space. These bridge systems would maintain the natural and restored channels of creeks, including the associated wetlands, and would be designed with sufficient span width and depth to provide for wildlife movement along the creek corridors even during high-flow or flood events.

In addition to complying with City ordinances, the project applicant shall obtain a General Construction Storm Water Permit from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and implement best management practices (BMPs) to reduce water quality effects during construction.

Each project phase shall result in no net change to peak flows into Alder Creek and associated tributaries, or to tributaries to Buffalo Creek, and Coyote Creek. The project applicant shall establish a baseline of conditions for drainage on-site. The baseline-flow conditions shall be established for 2-, 5-, 10-, and 20-year storm events. These baseline conditions shall be used to develop monitoring standards for the storm water system within the project area. The baseline conditions, monitoring standards, and a monitoring program shall be submitted to USACE and the City for their approval. Water quality and detention basins shall be designed and constructed to ensure that the performance standards are met and shall be designed as off-stream detention basins. Discharge sites into Alder Creek and associated tributaries, as well as tributaries to Coyote Creek, and Buffalo Creek, shall be monitored to ensure that pre-Project conditions are being met. Corrective measures shall be implemented as necessary. The mitigation measures will be satisfied when the monitoring standards are met for five consecutive years without undertaking corrective measures to meet the performance standard.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-1B: Secure Clean Water Act Section 404 Section 401 Permits.

Before the approval of grading and improvement plans and before any groundbreaking activity associated with each distinct project phase, the owner/applicant shall secure all USACE necessary permits obtained under Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act or the State’s Porter-Cologne Act and implement all permit conditions for the proposed Central Valley project. All permits, regulatory approvals, and permit conditions for effects on wetland habitats shall be secured and conditions implemented before implementation of any grading activities within 250 feet (or lesser distance as approved by the applicable agencies) of Waters of the U.S. or wetland habitats, including Waters of the State, that potentially support federally-listed species, or within 100 feet (or lesser distance as approved by the applicable agencies) of any other Waters of the U.S. or wetland habitats, including Waters of the State. The owner/applicant shall adhere to all conditions outlined in the permits. The owner/applicant shall commit to replace, restore, or enhance on a “no net loss” basis (in accordance with USACE and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board) the acreage of all wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. that would be removed, lost, and/or degraded with implementation of the project. Wetland habitat shall be restored, enhanced, and/or replaced at an acreage and location and by methods agreeable to USACE, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the City, as appropriate, depending on agency jurisdiction, and as determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes. The boundaries of the 404 permit, including required buffer shall be shown on the grading plans.
All mitigation requirements to satisfy the requirements of the City and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, for impacts on the non-jurisdictional wetlands beyond the jurisdiction of USACE, shall be determined and implemented before grading plans are approved.

All wetland mitigation compliance reports submitted to USACE shall also be copied concurrently to the City.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-1C: Implement Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement.**

The owner/applicant shall amend, if necessary, and implement the original Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement received from CDFW for all construction activities that would occur in the bed and bank of CDFW jurisdictional features within the project and Wildlife site. As outlined in the Master Streambed Alteration Agreement, the owner/applicant shall submit a Sub-Notification Form (SNF) to CDFW 60 days prior to grading and/or the commencement of construction to notify California Department of Fish and Wildlife of the project.

Any conditions of issuance of the Master Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be implemented as part of those project construction activities that would adversely affect the bed and bank within on-site drainage channels subject to CDFW jurisdiction. The agreement shall be executed by the owner/applicant and CDFW before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any construction activities in any project phase that could potentially affect the bed and bank of on-site drainage channels under CDFW jurisdiction.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: Valley needlegrass grassland avoidance and minimization measures.**

Prior to ground-breaking activities including grading or construction, high visibility construction fencing should be placed around all Valley needlegrass grassland to be preserved. The construction fencing shall not be removed until completion of construction activities.

- All Valley needlegrass grassland areas slated for removal shall be replaced at a 1:1 acreage on-site within the preserve areas.

- Needlegrass plants in areas slated for removal shall be salvaged, to the extent feasible, and replanted within the preserve areas. If this is infeasible, then seedlings/saplings from a local nursery shall be obtained.

- A mitigation plan outlining methods to be used, success criteria to be met, and adaptive management strategies shall be completed prior to project construction.

At a minimum, unless agreed upon otherwise with regulatory agencies, the Valley needlegrass grassland creation areas shall be monitored twice annually for the first year and once annually for the four subsequent years for a total of five years; success criteria shall be established to ensure an 80 percent success rate is met by the fifth year, and adaptive management techniques shall be implemented to ensure that the 80 percent success rate is met by the fifth year or as otherwise agreed upon in consultation with CDFW. This plan may be combined with the Operations and Management Plan for the open space preserves.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Oak woodlands mitigation.**

Starting on page 10-13 of the approved FPASP, the following mitigation provides an update to Mitigation Measure 3A.3-5 as published in the MMRP (May 2011).

To fully mitigate for impacts to oak woodlands, the project applicant shall implement one or more of the mitigation measures listed below. Together, the mitigation measures will permanently protect approximately of 396.52-acres of existing Plan Area oak woodlands and create approximately of 245.63-acres of new oak woodland habitat either on-site or with a combination of on-site and off-site location(s). The combined total of existing preserved oak woodlands and newly created oak woodlands will equal approximately 642-acres. The final area (acres) of preserved and newly created oak woodlands may be adjusted on a project-by-project basis
at the time of tentative parcel or subdivision map approval to compensate for minor changes in oak woodland and isolated oak tree canopy impacts.

Option 1: Preserve Existing Plan Area Oak Woodlands
The FPASP will permanently preserve and protect approximately 396.52-acres of existing oak woodlands. This figure represents 62 percent of the existing woodland habitat and 65 percent of the existing oak canopy in the Plan Area.

Option 2: Create Oak Woodlands within the Plan Area
Plant a combination of oak acorns, seedlings and oak trees (refer to Oak Woodlands Mitigation Planting Criteria below) within the boundaries of the Plan Area to create approximately 245.63-acres of new oak woodland habitat in the following Plan Area locations (refer to Open Space Management Plan for allowable planting locations):

▲ Non-wooded areas that are adjacent to or within the existing oak woodland habitat.
▲ Preserve and passive open space zones throughout the Plan Area.
▲ Open space areas that are adjacent to existing oak woodlands that will be impacted by project grading (i.e. catch slopes).
▲ Other practical locations within the Plan Area adjacent to open space.

Option 3: Preserve and Protect Existing Off-site Oak Woodlands
Existing, unprotected oak woodland habitat within Amador, Sacramento, and El Dorado Counties may be secured and placed under conservation easement in lieu of on-site mitigation measures if necessary. The off-site locations would be managed as oak woodland habitat in perpetuity.

Option 4: Create Oak Woodlands Off-site
Plant a combination of oak acorns, seedlings and oak trees at off-site location(s), if needed, following the same guidelines as outlined in the Oak Woodland Mitigation Planting Criteria below. Planted areas would be placed under conservation easements and managed as oak woodlands in perpetuity.

Oak Woodlands Mitigation Planting Criteria
A minimum of 55 planting sites per acre (with a total of 70 units) will be required with additional minimum requirements of #1, #5 and #15 container plantings. Mitigation acreage that is planted solely with larger oak trees (no acorns) will have minimum of 35 planting sites per acre. Plantings will have unit values as outlined below:

▲ One established acorn equals one unit (acorns will be over planted to maximize potential germination).
▲ One oak seedling in a #1 container equals two units (minimum of 10 percent required).
▲ One #5 container oak tree equals three units (minimum of 10 percent required).
▲ One #15 container oak tree equals four units ((minimum of 10 percent required).
▲ One 24-inch boxed oak tree equals six units.
▲ One transplanted oak tree equals four units per trunk diameter inch (diameter at breast height [DBH]).
▲ The planting of non-oak species will be required as a component of oak woodland mitigation to augment the overall habitat value of these areas. Appropriate non-oak species will be determined by the city at the
time of mitigation planting. Each non-oak planting will represent unit values as described above for oak trees, but no more than 10 percent of planting may be non-oak species to count as mitigation.

Ratios of planting types will vary based upon site specific conditions which will require an evaluation of several factors including irrigation needs, access, soil types, and evidence of natural oak recruitment. Some areas may be determined (in consultation with the city arborist) to be best suited for acorn planting only. These areas will not be subject to the minimum planting requirement of #1, #5 and #15 container stock.

Mitigation acreage will be monitored for eight years to ensure that a minimum of 80 percent of planted unit values are successfully established. Trees surviving after eight years, with a minimum of three years without maintenance or irrigation will be considered successfully established.

**Isolated Oak Tree Mitigation**

Isolated oak trees in commercial and residential development parcels may be removed according to the following criteria:

- Trees rated 0 or 1 may be removed with no mitigation
- Trees rated 2 may be removed with 50 percent of required mitigation
- Trees rated 3, 4 or 5 may be removed at full required mitigation

**Isolated Oak Tree Mitigation Planting Criteria**

For every one (1) diameter inch of removed oak tree, the mitigation shall be either:

- One half of a 24-inch boxed oak tree or,
- One oak tree in a #15 container or,
- Two oak trees in #5 containers or,
- $150 or a fee set by Folsom City Council resolution.
- Replacement trees may be located within the boundaries of any development parcel, natural parkway, landscape corridor or passive or preserve open space zone.
- Native oak trees transplanted within the Plan Area will be granted double mitigation credit.

**Exceptions**

- Isolated oak trees 24-inch (DBH) in diameter or larger, or a multi-trunked oak trees with an aggregate diameter of 40-inches or more (DBH) with a rating of 3 to 5 shall be retained unless retaining walls greater than 4-feet in height are required to save the tree.

- Isolated oak trees 12-inch (DBH) to 24-inch (DBH) in diameter with a rating of 4 or 5 shall be retained unless retaining walls greater than 4-feet in height are required to save the tree. Trees with a rating of 2 or 3 may be removed if the cost to preserve the tree is greater than the cost to mitigate its loss based on the Isolated Oak Tree Mitigation Planting criteria above.

- Isolated oak trees 5-inch (DBH) to 12-inch (DBH) in diameter with a rating of 4 or 5 shall be retained unless the cost to preserve the tree is greater than the cost to mitigate its loss based on the Isolated Oak Tree Mitigation Planting criteria above.

- Isolated oak trees 1-inch (DBH) to 5-inch (DBH) in diameter that are preserved may be credited against oak tree mitigation requirements as follows:
Table 4.4-1  Small Oak Tree Preservation Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trunk Diameter of Tree to be Preserved</th>
<th>Mitigation Tree Size Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; or greater, but less than 2&quot;</td>
<td>1 - #15 container tree or 2 - #5 container trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; or greater, but less than 3&quot;</td>
<td>2 - #15 container trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot; or greater, but less than 4&quot;</td>
<td>3 - #15 container trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot; or greater, but less than 5&quot;</td>
<td>4 - #15 container trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oak Woodlands & Isolated Oak Tree Planting & Maintenance Agreement
A planting and maintenance agreement shall include a planting plan, planting and irrigation design details and a monitoring schedule for the 5-year establishment period. Trees surviving after 8 years, with a minimum of 3 years without maintenance or irrigation will be considered successfully established. An annual monitoring report shall be completed by 1 December of each year, including a summary of needed corrections, a proposed work plan and notice of compliance. All needed corrections shall be completed within 100 calendar days of receipt of the annual monitoring report.

▲ Performance Security
Security or other financing mechanisms acceptable to the city shall be required to fulfill the planting and maintenance agreement.

▲ No Additional Mitigation
No additional oak woodlands and isolated oak tree canopy mitigation is required for subsequent tentative and final parcel maps, subdivision maps and infrastructure improvement projects that are in compliance with the mitigation requirements of this section, the FPASP Open Space Management Plan and the FPASP EIR/EIS.

▲ Variances
Requests for variances to the isolated oak tree mitigation described above shall follow the process outlined in Folsom Municipal Code chapter 17.62. Any variance request shall be given increased consideration by the city when the purpose of the variance is to preserve additional oak trees.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-4: Valley elderberry longhorn beetle avoidance and minimization measures.
The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Biological Opinion issued by USFWS for the FPASP (USFWS 2014) before construction can commence within 100 feet of elderberry shrubs.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-5: Vernal pool crustacean avoidance and minimization measures.
The project applicant shall purchase vernal pool crustacean preservation credits for direct and indirect impacts and creation credits only for direct impacts at a USFWS-approved conservation bank(s) as outlined in the Biological Opinion for the FPASP (USFWS 2014).

Mitigation Measure 3.3-8A: Conduct environmental awareness training for construction employees.
Before beginning construction activities, the project applicant shall employ a qualified biologist to develop and conduct environmental awareness training for construction employees. The training shall describe the importance of on-site biological resources, including special-status wildlife habitats; potential nests of special-status birds; and roosting habitat for special-status bats. The biologist shall explain the importance of other responsibilities related to the protection of wildlife during construction such as inspecting open trenches and looking under vehicles and machinery before moving them to ensure there are no lizards, snakes, small
mammals, or other wildlife that could become trapped, injured, or killed in construction areas or under equipment.

The environmental awareness program shall be provided to all construction personnel to brief them on the life history of special-status species in or adjacent to the project area, the need to avoid impacts on sensitive biological resources, any terms and conditions required by state and federal Agencies, and the penalties for not complying with biological mitigation requirements. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the contractor's superintendent shall ensure that the personnel receive the mandatory training before starting work. An environmental awareness handout that describes and illustrates sensitive resources to be avoided during project construction and identifies all relevant permit conditions shall be provided to each person.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-8B: Conduct preconstruction western spadefoot survey.**

Before ground breaking activities, the applicant shall comply with all conditions stipulated in the Lake and Streambed Alteration issued by the CDFW for the project as required under Mitigation Measure 3.3-1C. The following shall occur:

- A preconstruction survey shall be conducted for Western spadefoot within 48 hours of the initiation of construction activity within suitable tadpole habitat (e.g., vernal pools, seasonal wetlands and drainages with standing water). Any Western spadefoot observed in the survey limits shall be reported to the CNDDB. If no Western spadefoot individuals are found during the preconstruction survey, the biologist shall document the findings in a letter report to CDFW and the City, and no further mitigation shall be required. If Western spadefoot individuals are found, the qualified biologist shall consult with CDFW to determine appropriate avoidance measures.

A qualified biological monitor(s) shall be present during construction to relocate any Western spadefoot in to suitable habitat up or downstream of the area of disturbance. Prior to construction, CDFW shall be notified of the intent to conduct Western spadefoot monitoring and potential relocation. Any Western spadefoot observed during biological monitoring activities shall be reported to the CNDDB.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-9: Conduct preconstruction western pond turtle survey.**

Before ground breaking activities, the applicant shall comply with all conditions stipulated in the Lake and Streambed Alteration issued by the CDFW for the project as required under Mitigation Measure 3.3-1C. The following shall occur:

- A preconstruction survey shall be conducted for nesting pond turtle by a CDFW approved biologist. If nesting areas for pond turtles are identified within the survey limits, a buffer area determined in coordination with CDFW shall be established between the construction area and the nesting site. Any western pond turtles observed in the survey limits shall be reported to the CNDDB.

- A qualified biological monitor(s) shall be present during construction to relocate any western pond turtles in to suitable habitat up or downstream of the area of disturbance. Before construction, CDFW shall be notified of the intent to conduct western pond turtle monitoring and potential relocation. Any western pond turtles observed during biological monitoring activities shall be reported to the CNDDB.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-10A: Conduct preconstruction Swainson’s hawk and other raptor surveys.**

To mitigate impacts on Swainson’s hawk and other raptors, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct preconstruction surveys and to identify active nests on and within 0.5 mile of the project area if construction begins during March through August. The surveys shall be conducted less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction activities/staging. Guidelines provided in *Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson’s Hawk Nesting Surveys in the Central Valley* (Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000) shall be followed for surveys for Swainson’s hawk. If no active/occupied nests are found, no further mitigation is required.
If active nests are found, impacts on nesting Swainson’s hawks and other raptors shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers around the nests. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until the young have fledged, the nest is no longer active, or until a qualified biologist has determined in coordination with CDFW that reducing the buffer would not result in nest abandonment. CDFW guidelines recommend implementation of 0.25- or 0.5-mile-wide buffers, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and the City, in consultation with CDFW, determine that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-10B: Prepare and implement Swainson’s hawk mitigation plan.

To mitigate for the loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, the project applicant shall identify permanent impacts to foraging habitat and prepare and implement a Swainson’s hawk mitigation plan including, but not limited to, the requirements described below.

Before the approval of grading and improvement plans or before any ground-disturbing activities, whichever occurs first for each phase, the project applicant, to the satisfaction of the City, shall secure suitable Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to ensure 1:1 mitigation (or other agreed upon ratio) of habitat value for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat that is permanently lost as a result of the project phase, as determined by the City after consultation with CDFW and a qualified biologist. This foraging habitat would also provide complimentary foraging habitat benefits for other foraging species, such as tri-colored blackbird, because these species forage in similar habitat types (e.g., grasslands, agricultural fields, oak savannas, oak woodland, and irrigated pastures).

The 1:1 ratio (or other agreed-upon ratio) shall be based on Swainson’s hawk nesting distribution and an assessment of habitat quality, availability, and use within the project area. The mitigation ratio shall be consistent with the 1994 Department of Fish and Game’s Swainson’s Hawk Guidelines included in the Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks (Buteo swainsoni) in the Central Valley of California (Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000). These call for the following mitigation ratios for loss of foraging habitat in these categories: 1:1 if within one mile of an active nest site, 0.75:1 if over one mile but less than five miles, and 0.5:1 if over five miles and less than 10 miles from an active nest. Such mitigation shall be accomplished through purchase of credits at an approved mitigation bank, or the transfer of fee title or perpetual conservation easement. If non-bank mitigation is proposed, the mitigation land shall be located within the known foraging area and within Sacramento or Amador counties. The City, after consultation with CDFW, shall determine the appropriateness of the mitigation land.

The project applicant shall transfer said Swainson’s hawk mitigation land, through either conservation easement or fee title, to a third-party, nonprofit conservation organization (Conservation Operator), with the City and CDFW named as third-party beneficiaries. The Conservation Operator shall be a qualified conservation easement land manager that manages land as its primary function. Additionally, the Conservation Operator shall be a tax-exempt nonprofit conservation organization that meets the criteria of Civil Code Section 815.3(a) and shall be selected or approved by the City, after consultation with CDFW. After consultation with CDFW and the Conservation Operator, the City shall approve the content and form of the conservation easement. The City, CDFW, and the Conservation Operator shall each have the power to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. The Conservation Operator shall monitor the easement in perpetuity to assure compliance with the terms of the easement.

After consultation with the City, the project applicant, CDFW, and the Conservation Operator, shall establish an endowment or some other financial mechanism that is sufficient to fund in perpetuity the operation, maintenance, management, and enforcement of the conservation easement. If an endowment is used, either the endowment funds shall be submitted to the City for impacts on lands within the City’s jurisdiction to an appropriate third-party nonprofit conservation agency, or they shall be submitted directly to the third-party nonprofit conservation agency in exchange for an agreement to manage and maintain the lands in perpetuity. The Conservation Operator shall not sell, lease, or transfer any interest of any conservation easement or mitigation land it acquires without prior written approval of the City and CDFW.
If the Conservation Operator ceases to exist, the duty to hold, administer, manage, maintain, and enforce the interest shall be transferred to another entity acceptable to the City and CDFW. The City shall ensure that mitigation habitat established for impacts on habitat within the City’s planning area is properly established and is functioning as habitat by conducting regular monitoring of the mitigation site(s) for the first ten years after establishment of the easement.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-11: Conduct preconstruction burrowing owl survey.

To mitigate impacts on burrowing owl, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct preconstruction surveys to identify active burrows within the project area. The surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction. The preconstruction survey shall follow the protocols outlined in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012). Burrowing owls may be present on-site during any season.

If active burrows are found, a mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval before any ground-disturbing activities. The City shall consult with CDFW. The mitigation plan may consist of installation of one-way doors (during the non-breeding season) on all burrows to allow owls to exit, but not reenter, and construction of artificial burrows within the Project vicinity, as needed; however, burrow owl exclusions during the breeding season (February 1-August 31) may only be used if a qualified biologist verifies that the burrow does not contain eggs or dependent young. If active burrows contain eggs and/or young, no construction shall occur within a minimum of 50 meters (164 feet) of the burrow until young have fledged. During the non-breeding season, once it is confirmed that there are no owls inside burrows, the burrows may be collapsed.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-12: Conduct preconstruction tricolored blackbird nesting survey.

To avoid and minimize impacts to tricolored blackbird colonies, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for any project activity that would occur during the tricolored blackbird’s nesting season (1 March – 31 August). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 500 feet of potential on-site suitable nesting habitat, including freshwater marsh and areas of riparian scrub vegetation, within the ponds and Alder Creek. The survey shall be conducted within 14 days before project activity begins.

If no tricolored blackbird nesting activity is documented on-site, no further mitigation is required. If nesting activity is found, the qualified biologist shall consult CDFW to establish a buffer around the nesting colony. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the colony is no longer active. The size of the buffer shall be determined in consultation with CDFW. Buffer size is anticipated to range from 100 to 500 feet, depending on the nature of the project activity, the extent of existing disturbance in the area, and other relevant circumstances.

If required by CDFW, the project applicant shall initiate incidental take permit process according to Section 2081 (b) and (c) of the California Fish and Game Code and shall prepare a mitigation plan as an attachment to the 2081 permit.

Avoidance and minimization measures may include protective fencing around sensitive habitat within construction sites, preconstruction notification to CDFW, scientific reporting procedures when an animal is killed, injured, or trapped, compliance inspections and reports, directions for the acquisition and transfer of habitat management lands, and/or associated funding.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-13: Preconstruction nesting bird survey.

The project applicant shall conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey of all areas associated with construction activities on the project site within 14 days before commencement of construction during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31).

If active nests are found, a no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. The buffer shall be maintained until the fledglings are capable of flight and become independent of the nest, to be determined by a qualified biologist.
Once the young are independent of the nest, no further measures are necessary. Pre-construction nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside of the nesting season.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-15: Preconstruction bat roosting survey.**

Before construction in any given phase, a pre-construction bat roost survey shall be conducted. A qualified biologist shall conduct a dusk emergence survey (start one hour before sunset and last three hours), followed by a pre-dawn re-entry survey (start one hour before sunrise and last for two hours), as well as a daytime visual inspection of all potential bat roosting habitat within the limits of construction. If no active bat roosts or sign are observed, construction may proceed. If no active special-species bat roosts are found, no further measures pertaining to special-species bats are necessary. If roosting special-species bats are found on-site during the surveys, construction activities shall avoid direct and indirect impacts to roosting sites through the establishment of a no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet around roost sites in consultation with CDFW. Clearing and grubbing adjacent to the roost site and lighting use near the roost site where it would shine on the roost or interfere with bats entering or leaving the roost shall be prohibited. Operation of internal combustion equipment, such as generators, pumps, and vehicles within 100 feet of the roost site shall be prohibited.

**CONCLUSION**

While additional biological surveys of the site have been conducted and refined mitigation program for the project has been recommended, this information is consistent with the activities recommended in the mitigation adopted for the FPASP. No new significant or substantially more severe biological impacts would occur with the project. In some cases, based on the refined mitigation program, the biological impacts associated with the project would be reduced compared to the impacts described in the EIR/EIS. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3B.5-1 to 3B.5-3 Impact 3A.5-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3B.5-1 to 3B.5-3 Impacts 3A.5-1 and 3A.5-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-13 to 3A.7-17 Impact 3A.7-10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside the formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.5-13 to 3A.5-15 Impact 3A.5-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Discussion

Since the adoption of the FPASP and certification of the EIR/EIS, and consistent with the mitigation adopted in the FPASP, the FPASP applicants entered into a programmatic agreement (PA) with USACE to fulfill the requirements in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The PA was amended in 2013 and the project is subject to the requirements of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement (FAPA) to meet obligations under all applicable state and federal requirements that were in place at the time of its execution. The execution of the PA (and subsequent amendments) was a requirement of the programmatic EIR/EIS to comply with both federal and state laws, including CEQA, and allowed for a phased approach for the identification and determination of impacts to cultural resources.

The FAPA provides the framework for compliance and requires that each individual development, including the project, must comply with specific terms that include, but are not limited to, development of a project-specific Area of Potential Effects (APE), a geoarchaeological investigation, an updated records search, good-faith identification efforts including pedestrian surveys, evaluation of significance of resources, a finding of effect, and the resolution of adverse effects to significant cultural resources. Furthermore, the FAPA requires that all work done in compliance with the FAPA be carried out in accordance with the overall research design and Preliminary Historic Properties Synthesis (PHPS) that has been prepared for the FPASP. The PHPS was renamed the Historic Property Management Plan (HPMP) in conjunction with the execution of the FAPA in 2013.

ECORP prepared a report and subsequent updates summarizing the project-specific information for the Hillsborough at Easton project on historic and cultural resources and, in that report, provided refined mitigation measures specific to the project (ECORP 2015b). A summary of that information is presented below.

SENATE BILL 18

Senate Bill (SB) 18 was signed into law in September 2004 and became effective in March 2005. SB 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) requires city and county governments to consult with California Native American tribes early in the planning process with the intent of protecting traditional tribal cultural places. The purpose of involving tribes at the early stage of planning efforts is to allow consideration of tribal
cultural places in the context of broad local land use policy before project-level land use decisions are made by a local government. As such, SB 18 applies to the adoption or substantial amendment of general or specific plans. The process by which consultation must occur in these cases was published by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research through its Tribal Consultation Guidelines: Supplement to General Plan Guidelines (November 14, 2005).

Because the Project is seeking a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) to the FPASP, the City was required to initiate consultation under SB 18. On December 16, 2014, the City requested an SB 18 contact list from the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). On January 30, 2015, in a letter dated January 22, the NAHC responded with a list of four California Native American tribes and individuals who had notified the NAHC of their desire to consult under SB 18 in the vicinity of the Project. On February 3, 2015, the City mailed SB 18 notification letters to the four individuals, Nicolas Fonseca (Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians [SSBMI]), Grayson Coney (T’si-Akim Maidu), Don Ryberg (T’si-Akim Maidu), and Gene Whitehouse (United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria), offering them an opportunity to consult within the 90-day comment period, scheduled to end on May 4, 2015.

On February 13, 2015, the City received a letter from the SSBMI (dated February 6), accepting the invitation to consult on the SPA. The City’s consultant contacted SSBMI by email on February 18, 2015 to invite them to a meeting at the City on one of two potential dates in March. Because no responses were received from SSBMI on a potential meeting, or from the other three tribes contacted, the City sent additional letters to all four tribes on March 16, 2015. The letters (dated March 13) alerted the tribes to the passage of the halfway mark in the 90-day consultation window and offered them an opportunity to consult on the SPA. The letter to SSBMI further acknowledged receipt of the February 6 response and asked for a response.

No responses were received, and on May 5, 2015, after the close of the 90-day consultation window, the City mailed consultation termination letters to the four tribes. The letters notified them that they will be contacted again at 45 days and 10 days prior to the City Council hearing on the SPA. On June 22, 2015, 48 days after the close of the 90-day consultation window, a letter from the United Auburn Indian Tribe that responded to the May 5 termination letter. The response requested copies of cultural resources technical studies; however, on August 15, 2014 and November 21, 2014, the USACE had already sent them copies of the documents.

On April 8, 2016, the City sent the tribes a 45-day notice of the City Council hearing, and on May 13, 2016, anticipates sending a 10-day notice. These notices provide the tribes with information about the City Council hearing, but in accordance with the statute, do not open up a new consultation window.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 52**

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) established a formal consultation process for California Native American tribes as part of CEQA and equates significant impacts on tribal cultural resources with significant environmental impacts (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21084.2). AB 52 consultation requirements went into effect on July 1, 2015 for all projects that had not already published a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, or published a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report prior to that date (Section 11 [c]). Specifically, AB 52 requires that “prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, the lead agency shall begin consultation” (21808.3.1 [a]), and that “the lead agency may certify an environmental impact report or adopt a mitigated negative declaration for a project with a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource only if” consultation is formally concluded (21082.3[d]).

However, in the case of the current project, the lead agency has prepared this addendum to a previously certified EIR, in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. An addendum was determined to be the most appropriate document because none of the conditions described in Section 15162, calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR, have occurred. The addendum addresses minor technical changes or
additions, and confirms that the project is consistent with what was previously analyzed under the certified EIR. As such, the addendum will not result in an additional certification; therefore, the AB 52 procedures specified in PRC Sections 21080.3.1(d) and 21080.3.2 do not apply and no tribal consultation under AB 52 is required.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

Impacts under the approved FPASP to historical resources within the FPASP area are described in Impact 3A.5-1. Impacts were determined to be potentially significant because the FPASP would develop in areas containing known historic resources. Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b were recommended and required the applicants to enter into a programmatic agreement (PA) with USACE for the comprehensive evaluation of resources within the FPASP as well as an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources and methods to avoid or minimize damage to resources. As described in the mitigation, the PA would establish an APE and provide a framework for data gathering so that the applicant, City, and USACE would have a more thorough understanding of the resources present in the area and how best to address these resources, once projects were proposed within the FPASP. Although implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b in the EIR/EIS would reduce the impact to known prehistoric and historic-era cultural resources, the EIR/EIS concluded that the impact would remain potentially significant and unavoidable because some of the affected resources would not be within the City's jurisdiction.

As described above, the applicant has already entered into a PA with USACE and has conducted a subsequent review of historic resources pertaining to the Hillsborough at Easton project area. That review determined the specific locations and qualities of historic resources present on the site. Based on the information in this review, the project applicants made modifications to the project design to facilitate complete avoidance of on-site resources through re-routing infrastructure or extending conservation easements over sites, and to enhance public interpretation opportunities using interpretive panels along proposed bike trails. Direct and indirect adverse effects to historic resources were reduced through the preparation of the HPMP, extensive archival research, and through detailed LIDAR and aerial mapping. While these are not sufficient to reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level, the information gathered through the extensive surveys, Native American consultation, and reviews of records were used to refine the mitigation measures adopted in the EIR/EIS.

Because of the extensive work on historic resources since the EIR/EIS was certified, the mitigation measures from the EIR/EIS addressing historic resources were refined to more specifically address the Hillsborough at Easton area. With the implementation of these modified mitigation measures (3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b), implementation of the project would result in less-than-significant impacts to historic resources. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

The EIR/EIS analyzed potential destruction or damage to known (Impact 3A.5-1) or unknown (Impact 3A.5-2) archeological resources and concluded that there would be potentially significant impacts because of the potential destruction and removal of these resources. The EIR/EIS recommended Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a, 3A.5-1b, and 3A.5-2, which would reduce the impact to archaeological resources by requiring a programmatic agreement, an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources and methods to avoid or minimize damage to resources, construction personnel education, and, if determined necessary, on-site monitoring during construction activities. However, the EIR/EIS concluded that this impact would remain potentially significant and unavoidable because some of the affected resources would not be within the City's jurisdiction and the City would not have control over their protection and preservation, because there always exists a potential for unknown archaeological sites to become uncovered during construction, and because not all resources would be avoided under the approved FPASP.
As described previously, the applicant entered into a programmatic agreement and subsequent review of cultural resources. As described under "a," the applicant made some changes to the project to avoid impacts to known resources. While these are not sufficient to reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level without mitigation, the information gathered through the extensive surveys, Native American consultation, and reviews of records were used to refine the mitigation measures from the EIR/EIS. With the implementation of these modified mitigation measures shown below (3A.5-1a, 3A.5-1b, and 3A.5-2), the impact would be reduced to less than significant. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
Impact 3A.7-10 of the EIR/EIS analyzed the potential for damage to unique paleontological resources during earthmoving activities in the FPASP area. The EIR/EIS concluded that the impact of the FPASP on this resource would be potentially significant because the western part of the FPASP area, coinciding with the project area, is underlain by formations which have been known to contain vertebrate mammal, plant, and invertebrate fossils. Mitigation Measure 3A.7-10 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level through construction personnel training, stop work processes, and recovery plans.

Because the development of the project under the proposed project would result in a similar footprint for ground disturbance as the approved FPASP, the impact conclusions pertaining to paleontological resources remain unchanged. As described in Impact 3A.7-10 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the potential for damage to previously unknown unique paleontological resources during earthmoving activities in the project area is considered a potentially significant impact. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.7-10, the impact to paleontological resources would be reduced to less-than-significant. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
The EIR/EIS analyzed potential destruction or damage to human remains in Impact 3A.5-3 and concluded that although there are no known or documented human burials or remains in the project area, the impact was potentially significant because ground-disturbing activities may inadvertently disinter or destroy previously unidentified interred human remains. The EIR/EIS recommended Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3, which would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level because it would require the applicant to halt ground-disturbing activities if remains are uncovered and follow the requirements of the California Health and Safety Code.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3 has been updated to include a statement requiring the applicant to submit to the City proof of compliance and this updated version is presented below and replaces Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3 in the EIR/EIS. No new information regarding human remains has been identified requiring new analysis or verification. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measure was referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-10: Conduct Construction Personnel Education, Stop Work if Archeological or Paleontological Resources Are Discovered, Assess the Significance of the Find, and Prepare and Implement a Recovery Plan as Required.

In addition to the mitigation measures in the EIR/EIS (listed above), the following mitigation measures replace what was in the EIR/EIS for this project and were revised to include the more specific requirements found in the Historic Property Treatment Plan (HPTP) and FAPA.
Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1a: Comply with the Programmatic Agreement.

The PA for the proposed project is incorporated by reference. The Programmatic Agreement (PA) provides a management framework for identifying historic properties, determining adverse effects, and resolving those adverse effects as required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The PA is available for public inspection and review at the California Office of Historic Preservation, 1725 23rd Street, Sacramento, CA 95816.

The project and all of its earlier components, including Backbone and non-Backbone portions of the property, have been subjected to cultural resources studies prepared under the PA and subsequent FAPA. Historical resources have been identified, and for the Prairie City Road Business Park and Backbone portions of the project, significant impacts have been determined, and mitigation of significant impacts has been proposed through HPTPs (ECORP 2015b), with concurrence by SHPO. Historical resources have been identified for the non-Backbone Hillsborough at Easton portion of the project, and consultation with the USACE, SHPO, and the City on the determination of impacts and appropriate mitigation is in progress. The applicable mitigation measures from the HPTPs are provided below, relative to Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b, 3A.5-2, and 3A.5-3.

As of March 2016, two of the three applicable HPTPs for the project have been approved by the USACE with SHPO concurrence (Prairie City Road Business Park and the Backbone Infrastructure), and one (non-Backbone Hillsborough) is pending approval. Therefore, full compliance with this Mitigation Measure will be satisfied upon: 1) approval of the Hillsborough HPTP and submission of written approval from the USACE and/or SHPO to the City; and 2) written approval from the USACE and/or SHPO of the documentation resulting from implementation of the applicable portions of the HPTPs for PCRB, Hillsborough, and the Backbone Infrastructure. Steps needed to meet the latter are discussed under the subsequent mitigation measures, below.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b: Cultural resource inventory, treatment, and evaluation mitigation.

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 California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) listing criteria and significance thresholds that apply under CEQA. Before ground disturbing work for each individual development phase or off-site element, the applicable oversight agency (City of Folsom or USACE), or the project applicant(s) of all project phases, with applicable agency oversight, shall perform the following actions that are required by the FAPA, or provide proof of compliance for the following:

- The project applicant shall retain the services of a qualified archaeologist to perform an inventory of cultural resources within each individual development phase or off-site element 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 any sensitive locations subject to monitoring during construction of each individual development phase, as determined by the qualified archaeologist, shall be performed in concert with monitoring activities performed under the FAPA 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 (under the agency’s direction) shall obtain the services of a qualified archaeologist who shall determine if implementation of the individual project development 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) of all project phases (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) of all project phases 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 FAPA 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 shall 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).

As stated and cited above, the project and all of its earlier components, including Backbone and non-backbone portions of the property, has been subjected to cultural resources studies prepared under the PA and subsequent FAPA. Historical Resources have been identified through SHPO consultation, preservation in place has been considered and maximized, mitigation of significant impacts has been or will be proposed through HPTPs, and the HPMP has been revised and updated to incorporate the historic context (Westwood et al. 2013).

The applicable treatment measures specified in the HPTPs have either been completed (Backbone) or will be carried out upon approval and implementation of the HPTPs for PCRBP and Hillsborough. Following is a detailed list of only the applicable treatment measures for the project and the status of each. Unanticipated discovery and contractor awareness training measures are provided separately, in Mitigation Measures 3A.5-2 and 3A.5-3, below.

**Treatment 1: Landscape Mapping of Districts.** Section 4.1 of the PCRBP HPTP, Section 4.4 of the Backbone HPTP, and Section 4.3 of the draft Hillsborough HPTP require low-level aerial photography and topographic mapping of the portions of the Rhoades’ Digings Mining District (RDMD) and Alder Creek Corridor Mining District (ACCMD) that fall within the FPASP. Because both districts partly overlap the project area, compliance with this Mitigation Measure is required. The treatment measure in its entirety, as presented in the HPTPs, is as follows:

Low level aerial photography and topographic mapping of the districts within the entire APE will be completed, which includes both contributing and non-contributing elements. Color multiband digital photography will be collected at or better than 0.5-foot pixel resolution, equating to 1” =100’ scale in traditional imagery. Topographic data was already acquired for most of the districts by aircraft-mounted LIDAR equipment with an approximate ground point spacing of better than one meter, allowing for the creation of 1-foot contours at 1” =100’ scale, which fulfills the National Mapping Accuracy Standards. Documentation for the balance of the districts shall be carried out in a similar manner during the “leaf-off” period between November and February. The digital aerial photographs and topographic data shall be incorporated into a Geographic Information System database with the ACCMD boundaries delineated, as established below. Preservation and archiving of digital imagery and topographic data shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of Attachment G of the HPMP (Westwood et al. 2011). The district boundaries shall be permanently established and mapped to establish permanent boundaries for the district within the APE with sub-meter accuracy. The verification will define the boundaries of the district within the APE using an updated California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523A (Primary Record) form, color photography, and a district-level plan map. The feature records for each element of the district will be updated to reflect the new mapping data.
It should be noted that low-level aerial photography and LIDAR data collection was carried out in February 2012 for the majority of the project, and supplemental data meeting these standards was acquired August 2014 (collected spring 2008). All data were incorporated into the project’s cultural GIS database maintained by ECORP Consulting, Inc. and updated boundaries for the districts and their contributing elements (DPR records) have been prepared and submitted to the USACE and North Central Information Center (NCIC). This treatment measure has been satisfied in full. Proof of compliance of the submission of the data to the USACE and NCIC (as applicable) shall be provided to the City.

**Treatment 2: Archival Research and Cultural Context.** Section 4.1 of the PCRBH HPTP, Section 4.4 of the Backbone HPTP, and Section 4.3 of the draft Hillsborough HPTP require focused archival research and incorporation of information generated by implementation of the HPTP into the cultural context statement in the HPMP. The treatment measure in its entirety, as presented in the HPTPs, is as follows:

Data generated through the implementation of this HPTP and focused archival research conducted or synthesized from previous efforts will be incorporated into the revised cultural context statement for the SPA via the HPMP.

It should be noted that focused archival research was carried out as part of the preparation of the HPMP for the FPASP and applicable technical studies for the project. This research was synthesized into the PHPS and later the HPMP, which were approved by the USACE with SHPO concurrence in June 2012. Upon completion of the implementation of the HPTPs for Hillsborough at Easton, the cultural context in the HPMP shall be revised. Because the HPMP is a living document that undergoes continual revision, proof of compliance with this treatment measure will be submission of draft interim revised text to the City of Folsom.

**Treatment 3: Public Interpretation.** Section 4.1 of the PCRBH HPTP, Section 4.4 of the Backbone HPTP, and Section 4.3 of the draft Hillsborough HPTP require development of interpretive panels along public trails or at trailheads. The treatment measure states:

The [district] will be interpreted for the benefit of the general public through the development and installation of... interpretive panel[s] along trails or at a trailhead, which must be focused on interpreting the [district]... The specific location and content of the panel[s] will be developed in consultation with local historical societies and agencies. Interpretive panels will measure approximately 24 inches by 36 inches and will be displayed along a newly constructed trail within the permit area.

Conceptual layouts of the interpretive panels, based on the photographic, artistic, and historical information from the subject materials gathered from historical archival research and consultation activities, shall first be developed. Layout and content for the interpretive panels will be reviewed multiple times to ensure the design is appropriate and fitting for all audiences and conveys the historical information pertinent to the permit area. The text shall be reviewed by a professional technical editor for grammar, spelling, and general flow, and will be reviewed by professional cultural resources staff for accuracy of content. All text shall be authored at the fifth-grade reading level.

Upon completion of the preliminary interpretive panel design, the USACE will circulate the conceptualized content and layout to the appropriate consulting parties for review and ask for comments within 30 days. The USACE will review any comments received within 30 days and revise the content and layout of the interpretive panels as determined appropriate.

The panels will be printed, manufactured, and installed by appropriate and experienced professionals. The location for installation will be selected in consultation between the USACE and project applicant and shall not disclose the locations of confidential archaeological sites. Immediately following manufacturing, photographs of the completed panels will be submitted to the USACE as proof of compliance, as installation of the panels may be delayed until trails or public facilities are constructed in future phases of the project. Otherwise, installation of the panels before the development of the property would result in deterioration, as there is no mechanism to maintain the panels until development occurs. Immediately following installation, photographs and GPS coordinates of the installed panels will be provided to the USACE as final proof of compliance with this requirement.
The requirements for number and subject matter of interpretive panels under these requirements is as follows:

- **PCRBP HPTP**: one panel for ACCMD plus one panel for RDMD
- **Hillsborough Draft HPTP**: one panel for RDMD (subject to concurrence from USACE and SHPO)
- **Backbone HPTP**: one panel for ACCMD plus two panels for RDMD plus one panel for Native American culture

The requirement for interpretive panels in the Backbone HPTP has been satisfied by the overall specific plan ownership. However, the project shall be required to develop and install the panels specified in the PCRBP and Hillsborough HPTPs, which collectively include one panel for the ACCMD and two panels for the RDMD.

**Treatment 4: Photo-Documentation of White Rock Road.** Section 4.3 of the Backbone HPTP pertains to the documentation requirements for cumulative impacts to the historic White Rock Road and Lincoln Highway. The HPTP states:

- Resolution of adverse effect to the White Rock Road and Lincoln Highway shall occur through a combination of focused archival research and field documentation. An expanded cultural context statement shall be developed and incorporated into the Historic Property Synthesis report. The cultural context statement will include historic maps, or recreated historic maps, that show the routes of White Rock Road and the Lincoln Highway adjacent to the SPA during its period of significance.

- Field documentation will include photo-documentation of the existing road alignments using black-and-white and color photography, and videography. The photo-documentation will be extensive enough to capture the setting, alignment, and association with adjacent features.

It should be noted that this documentation has already been completed under the Backbone HPTP by the overall specific plan ownership. A copy of the completed and USACE-approved documentation shall be submitted to the City as proof of compliance.

**Treatment 4: Photo-Documentation of Contributing Elements.** Section 4.1 of the PCRBP HPTP, Section 4.4 of the Backbone HPTP, and Section 4.3 of the Hillsborough HPTP require photo-documentation and updated site records for contributing elements to districts that will be significantly impacted by the project. The treatment measure states:

- There are several types of elements that contribute to the significance of the district. The actions required to resolve adverse effect to each of the classifications on a landscape level are generally the same and are described below. Non-contributing elements, including hardrock mining features, prospect pits, ranching or farming features, or other features not otherwise identified or affiliated with the district will be indirectly documented via the aerial photography and district-wide mapping discussed above.

- Before the initiation of ground disturbance, the affected contributing elements will be documented with high resolution digital photography, videography, and (if applicable) detailed scale drawings. At a minimum, each contributing element must be documented as follows:
  - from above using a recent high-resolution aerial photograph that overlays site boundaries;
  - an updated DPR record;
  - photo-documentation using black-and-white and color photography (35mm or high resolution digital), and videography (the photo-documentation will be extensive enough to capture the setting, alignment, and association with adjacent features); and
all elements that contain extant architecture or culturally-modified natural features shall be further documented using at least two scaled elevation drawings from different angles.

It should be noted that many of the contributing elements that require photo documentation have already been documented and submitted to the USACE for review and approval. The project shall be required to provide proof of USACE-approved documentation for each of the elements to the City as proof of compliance.

**Treatment 5: HAER Documentation.** Impacts to the Rhoades' Branch Ditch will require mitigation through preparation of focused documentation, in accordance with Section 4.1 of the Backbone HTP and Section 4.1 of the Hillsborough draft HTP as follows:

- Resolution of adverse effect to the Rhoades' Branch Ditch shall take the form of Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation. To determine the appropriate level of documentation necessary, the USACE shall first consult with the National Park Service (NPS), which administers the HAER program. Consultation with the NPS will be initiated through the submission of the DPR site record and copies of applicable technical reports with a request for review and issuance of a stipulation letter. Unless an objection to the requirements of the stipulation letter is expressed and resolved through the process outlined in the FAPA, the level of documentation stipulated by the NPS shall be implemented and all documentation approved by the USACE and NPS before ground-disturbing activities affecting the resource, or governed by the permit conditions. In addition, focused archival research will be conducted or synthesized from previous efforts to incorporate into the revised cultural context statement for the SPA via the HPMP.

HAER documentation for the Rhoades' Branch Ditch has already been completed by other permittees in the SPA. The HAER documentation includes the portions that fall within the current APE. The project proponent shall be required to submit proof of acceptance of the HAER documentation from the USACE to the City as proof of compliance.

**Treatment 6: Data Recovery Excavation.** Significant impacts to one site (P-34-1066) will require mitigation in the form of data recovery excavations, as specified in Section 4.2 of the draft Hillsborough HTP, subject to concurrence from USACE and SHPO. The Mitigation Measure states:

- Resolution of adverse effect to this site shall take the form of data recovery excavations and detailed documentation, as described in detail in Attachment G of the HPMP (Westwood et al. 2013). All data recovery efforts shall follow a consistent set of standard tasks summarized briefly below. Efforts that are specific to each of these resources, such as the number and placement of data recovery units or other documentation, are described in Table 4.2-2. The methods used for data recovery shall be specified in the HTP.

The project applicants shall be required to implement the data recovery program specified in the HTP and submit proof of acceptance from the USACE (via approval on the data recovery report or issuance of a notice to proceed with authorized fill under Stipulation 8 of the FAPA) to the City as proof of compliance.

**Mitigation Measure 3A.5-2: Cultural resource construction training and stop work mitigation.**

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 upon 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).

The project applicant, in coordination with USACE, shall ensure that an archaeological sensitivity training program is developed and implemented during a pre-construction meeting for construction supervisors. The sensitivity training program shall provide information about notification procedures when potential archaeological material is discovered, procedures for coordination between construction personnel and monitoring personnel, and information about other treatment or issues that may arise if cultural resources (including human remains) are discovered during project construction. This protocol shall be communicated to all new construction personnel during orientation and on a poster that is placed in a visible location inside the construction job trailer. The phone number of the USACE cultural resources staff member shall also be included.

The on-site sensitivity training shall be carried out each time a new contractor will begin work in the APE and at the beginning of each construction season by each contractor.

In the event that unanticipated discoveries of additional Historic Properties, defined in 36 CFR 800.16 (I), are made during the construction of the project, the USACE shall ensure that they will be protected by implementing the following measures:

The Construction Manager, or archaeological monitor, if given the authority to halt construction activities, shall ensure that work in that area is immediately halted within a 100-foot radius of the unanticipated discovery until the find is examined by a person meeting the professional qualifications standards specified in Section 2.2 of Attachment G of the HPMP (Westwood et al. 2013). The Construction Manager, or archaeological monitor, if present, shall notify the USACE within 24 hours of the discovery.

The USACE shall notify the SHPO within one working day of an unanticipated discovery, and may initiate interim treatment measures in accordance with this HPTP. Once the USACE makes a formal determination of eligibility for the resource, the USACE will notify the SHPO within 48 hours of the determination and afford the SHPO an opportunity to comment on appropriate treatment. The SHPO shall respond within 72 hours of the request to consult. Failure of the SHPO to respond within 72 hours shall not prohibit the USACE from implementing the treatment measures.

The project shall be required to submit to the City proof of compliance in the form of a completed training roster and copy of training materials.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3: Human remains mitigation.

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 Sacramento 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 California Native American Heritage Commission (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 Most Likely Descendant (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 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 reinterment document with the county.

- 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).

- The project applicants shall be required to submit to the City proof of compliance in the form of a completed training roster and copy of training materials.

CONCLUSION

While consultation with regulatory agencies regarding cultural resources mitigation has been on-going and resulted in the development of refined mitigation program for the project, this mitigation program is consistent with the activities recommended in the mitigation adopted for the FPASP. No new significant or substantially more severe cultural resources impacts would occur with the project. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
### 4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils: Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-3 to 3A.7-5, 3A.7-18, 3A.7-19 impacts 3A.7-1, 3A.7-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-5 to 3A.7-6 Impact 3A.7-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.7-6 Impacts 3A.7-4, 3A.7-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.7-11 Impact 3A.7-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.7-11 Impact 3A.7-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.6.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to geology and soils, described in the EIR/EIS Section 3A.7 Geology, Soils, Mineral, and Paleontological Resources - Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS. The regional and local settings remain the same as stated Section 3A.7.
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 California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)

The project would not change the land development pattern or types of built structures in the Hillsborough at Easton area and would result in substantially the same footprint of ground disturbance as was evaluated under the adopted FPASP. As described on page 3A.7-3 of the EIR/EIS, the project is located approximately 50 miles from the northern segment of the Cleveland Hills Fault, located near Lake Oroville, the nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The project site is not underlain by or adjacent to any known faults. Because the damage from surface fault rupture is generally limited to a linear zone a few yards wide, the potential for surface fault rupture to cause damage to proposed structures is negligible. The certified EIR/EIS found that there was no need to discuss this issue any further. No new information regarding earthquake faults been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The EIR/EIS provides analysis of the potential for ground shaking to occur that could damage structures during strong earthquakes generated along faults in the region (Impact 3A.7-1). As described in the EIR/EIS, the potential for damage from strong seismic ground shaking is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a and 3A.7-1b would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level. No new information regarding seismic ground shaking been identified requiring new analysis or verification. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

The EIR/EIS analyzed the potential for seismic-related ground failure (Impact 3A.7-2), and found that it is unlikely that on- or off-site soils would be subject to liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. Therefore, direct impacts related to potential damage to structures from seismically-induced liquefaction are considered less than significant. No new information regarding seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

iv) Landslides?

The area in which the project is located is made of rolling hills with low to no potential for landslides. As described on page 3A.7-6 of the EIR/EIS, no landslides have been recorded in the vicinity of the project. As discussed on page 3B.7-5, the landslide potential for native and engineered slopes depends on the gradient, localized geology and soils, amount of rainfall, amount of excavation, and seismic activity. Only a narrow strip along the County's eastern boundary, from the Placer County line to the Cosumnes River, is considered to have landslide potential at specific locations. Because the project area is not within the area for landslide potential, this topic was not addressed in an impact discussion. Even so, implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a and 3A.7-1b would reduce any potential impact related to landslides and other soil instability by requiring site-specific geotechnical reports and earthwork monitoring. All project facilities would be designed in accordance with the latest California Building Codes that include soil stability requirements and protections from landslides. No new information regarding landslides has been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Because the project would not substantially change the type of development that would occur at the site, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
The EIR/EIS analyzed the potential for construction activities to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil (Impact 3A.7-3). As described in the EIR/EIS, project implementation would involve intensive grading and construction activities. The impacts from these activities would be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.7-3 along with Mitigation Measure 3A.9-1 would reduce potentially significant construction-related erosion to a less-than-significant level. The project would result in the same types and intensity of construction activities as those evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS. No new information regarding on- or off-site erosion has been identified requiring new analysis or verification. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described in Impacts 3A.7-4 and 3A.7-5 of the EIR/EIS, implementation of the FPASP would result in potentially significant impacts regarding potential geologic hazards from construction in bedrock/rock outcroppings and seasonal subsurface water flows from surface infiltration. By implementing Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a, 3A.7-4, and 3A.7-5, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. No changes in soils at the site have occurred since the EIR/EIS was certified, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?
As described in Impact 3A.7-6 of the EIR/EIS, the project site does contain soils with moderate to high shrink-swell potential, indicating the soils are expansive. The EIR/EIS found that this impact would be potentially significant. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a and 3A.7-1b, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. No changes in soils at the site have occurred since the EIR/EIS was certified. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
As described in the EIR/EIS, the FPASP, as well as the project, would use piped sewer service from Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and/or El Dorado Irrigation District. Septic systems would not be required and there would be no impact. This condition has not changed. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-1a: Prepare Site-Specific Geotechnical Report per CBC Requirements and Implement Appropriate Recommendations.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-1b: Monitor Earthwork during Earthmoving Activities.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-3: Prepare and Implement the Appropriate Grading and Erosion Control Plan.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-4: Prepare a Seismic Refraction Survey and Obtain Appropriate Permits for all On-Site and Off-Site Elements East of Old Placerville Road.
Mitigation Measure 3A.7-5: Divert Seasonal Water Flows Away from Building Foundations.

The EIR/EIS concluded that mitigation measures were adequate to reduce the risk regarding geology and soils to a less-than-significant level.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to geology and soils.
4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>Environmental Setting p. 3A.4-1 to 3A.4-4 and updated below; Regulatory Setting p. 3A.4-4 to 3A.4-9 and updated below; Impact 3A.4.1 and Impact 3A.4.2.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 Discussion

Since the Draft FPASP EIR/EIS was certified in 2011, new information about the science of climate change has become available and the relationship between greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and land use planning has become better understood. For these reasons, updated and comprehensive environmental and regulatory settings are provided in this document.

Environmental Setting

The Physical Scientific Basis

Certain gases in the earth’s atmosphere, classified as GHG emissions, play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters the earth’s atmosphere from space. A portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth’s surface and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected back toward space. This absorbed radiation is then emitted from the earth as low-frequency infrared radiation. The frequencies at which bodies emit radiation are proportional to temperature. The earth has a much lower temperature than the sun; therefore, the earth emits lower frequency radiation. Most solar radiation passes through GHGs; however, infrared radiation is absorbed by these gases. As a result, radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead “trapped,” resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the greenhouse effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on Earth. Without the greenhouse effect, Earth would not be able to support life as we know it.

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are believed 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. It is “extremely likely” that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in GHG concentrations and other anthropogenic forces together (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] 2014:3, 5).
Climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Whereas pollutants with localized air quality effects have relatively short atmospheric lifetimes (about one day), GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes (one to several thousand years). GHGs persist in the atmosphere for long enough time periods to be dispersed around the globe. Although the exact lifetime of any particular GHG molecule is dependent on multiple variables and cannot be pinpointed, it is understood that more CO₂ is emitted into the atmosphere than is sequestered by ocean uptake, vegetation, and other forms of sequestration. CO₂ sinks, or reservoirs, include vegetation and the ocean, which absorb CO₂ through sequestration and dissolution, respectively, two of the most common processes of CO₂ sequestration. Of the total annual human-caused CO₂ emissions, approximately 55 percent is sequestered through ocean and land uptakes every year, averaged over the last 50 years, whereas the remaining 45 percent of human-caused CO₂ emissions remains stored in the atmosphere (IPCC 2013:467).

The quantity of GHGs that it takes to ultimately result in climate change is not precisely known; suffice it to say, the quantity is enormous, and no single project alone would measurably contribute to a noticeable incremental change in the global average temperature, or to global, local, or micro climates. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

**Greenhouse Gas Emission Sources**
Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the transportation, industrial/manufacturing, utility, residential, commercial, and agricultural emissions sectors (ARB 2014a). In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation (ARB 2014a). Emissions of CO₂ are, largely, byproducts of fossil fuel combustion. CH₄, a highly potent GHG, primarily results from off-gassing (the release of chemicals from nonmetallic substances under ambient or greater pressure conditions) and is largely associated with agricultural practices and landfills. N₂O is also largely attributable to agricultural practices and soil management. Additionally, high-GWP gases have atmospheric insulative properties that are hundred to tens of thousands of times greater than that of CO₂. HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆ are some of the most common types of high-global warming potential (GWP) gases and result from a variety of industrial processes. HFCs and PFCs are used as refrigerants and can be emitted through evaporation and leakage. SF₆ is a powerful electrical insulator used in power transmission and semiconductor manufacturing and is emitted through evaporation and leakage into the atmosphere.

**Effects of Climate Change on the Environment**
IPCC was established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme to provide the world with a scientific view on climate change and its potential effects. According to the IPCC global average temperature is expected to increase relative to the 1986-2005 period by 0.3–4.8°C (0.5–8.6°F) by the end of the 21st century (2081-2100), depending on future GHG emission scenarios (IPCC 2014:SPM-8). This temperature range represents the lower and higher bounds of five mitigation scenarios analyzed by the IPCC – two stringent scenarios, two intermediate scenarios, and a worst-case scenario. Temperatures in California are projected to increase 2.7°F above 2000 averages by 2050 and, depending on global emission levels, 4.1–8.6°F by 2100 (California Energy Commission [CEC] 2012:2).

Physical conditions beyond average temperatures could be indirectly affected by the accumulation of GHG emissions. For example, changes in weather patterns resulting from increases in global average temperature are expected to result in a decreased volume of precipitation falling as snow in California and an overall reduction in snowpack in the Sierra Nevada. Based upon historical data and modeling, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) projects that the Sierra snowpack will experience a 25 to 40 percent reduction from its historic average by 2050 (DWR 2008:4). An increase in precipitation falling as rain rather than snow also could lead to increased potential for floods because water that would normally be held in the Sierra Nevada until spring could flow into the Central Valley concurrently with winter storm events (CEC 2012:5). This scenario would place more pressure on California’s levee/flood control system.

Another outcome of global climate change is sea level rise. Sea level rose approximately seven inches during the last century. The National Research Council (NRC), in their 2012 report on Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts
of California, Oregon, and Washington projects that the sea level along the California coastline will change between -1 inch (fall) to 24 inches (rise) between 2000 and 2050 and 4 to 66 inches (rise) between 2000 and the end of this century. This projection is based on projected future ice loss at the poles, steric and ocean dynamics, seismic trends affecting land subsidence, and other numerical models and extrapolations, accounting for increasing levels of uncertainty in future years (NRC 2012:6).

As the existing climate throughout California changes over time, the ranges of various plant and wildlife species could shift or be reduced, depending on the favored temperature and moisture regimes of each species. In the worst cases, some species would become extinct or be extirpated from the state if suitable conditions are no longer available (CEC 2012:11 and 12).

Changes in precipitation patterns and increased temperatures are expected to alter the distribution and character of natural vegetation and associated moisture content of plants and soils. An increase in frequency of extreme heat events and drought are also expected. These changes are expected to lead to increased frequency and intensity of large wildfires (CEC 2012:11).

Regulatory Setting
Greenhouse gas emissions and responses to global climate change are regulated by a variety of federal, state, and local laws and policies. Key regulatory and conservation planning issues applicable to the proposed project are discussed below.

Federal

Supreme Court Ruling of CO₂ as a Pollutant
EPA is the federal agency responsible for implementing the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and its amendments. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled on April 2, 2007 that CO₂ is an air pollutant as defined under the CAA, and that EPA has the authority to regulate emissions of GHGs. The ruling in this case resulted in EPA taking steps to regulate GHG emissions and lent support for state and local agencies’ efforts to reduce GHG emissions.

National Program to Cut Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Improve Fuel Economy for Cars and Trucks
On August 28, 2014, EPA and the Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) finalized a new national program that would reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy for all new cars and trucks sold in the United States (NHTSA 2012). EPA proposed the first-ever national GHG emissions standards under the CAA, and NHTSA proposed Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. This proposed national program allows automobile manufacturers to build a single light-duty national fleet that satisfies all requirements under both Federal programs and the standards of California and other states. While this program will increase fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks by Model Year 2025, additional phases are being developed by NHTSA and EPA that address GHG emission standards for new medium- and heavy-duty trucks (NHTSA 2014).

State

Executive Order B-30-15
On April 20, 2015 Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. signed Executive Order B-30-15 to establish a California GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The Governor’s executive order aligns California’s GHG reduction targets with those of leading international governments such as the 28-nation European Union which adopted the same target in October 2014. California is on track to meet or exceed the current target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32, discussed below). California’s new emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 will make it possible to reach the ultimate goal of reducing emissions 80 percent under 1990 levels by 2050. This is in line with the scientifically established levels needed in the U.S. to limit global warming below 2 degrees Celsius (°C)—the warming threshold at which there will likely be major climate disruptions such as super droughts and rising sea levels according to scientific consensus.
Executive Order S-3-05
Executive Order S-3-05, signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2005, proclaims that California is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. It declares that increased temperatures could reduce the Sierra Nevada snowpack, further exacerbate California's air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To combat those concerns, the Executive Order established total GHG emission targets for the State. Specifically, emissions are to be reduced to the 2000 level by 2010, the 1990 level by 2020, and to 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050.

As described below, legislation was passed in 2006 to limit GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, but no additional reductions were specifically enumerated in the legislation.

Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
In September 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). AB 32 establishes regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and a cap on statewide GHG emissions. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 also requires that these reductions “...shall remain in effect unless otherwise amended or repealed. (b) It is the intent of the Legislature that the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit continue in existence and be used to maintain and continue reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases beyond 2020. (c) The (Air Resources Board) shall make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on how to continue reductions of greenhouse gas emissions beyond 2020.” [California Health and Safety Code, Division 25.5, Part 3, Section 38551]

AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan and Update
In December 2008, ARB adopted its Climate Change Scoping Plan, which contains the main strategies California will implement to achieve reduction of approximately 118 million metric tons (MMT) of CO2e-equivalent (CO2e) emissions, or approximately 21.7 percent from the state’s projected 2020 emission level of 545 MMT of CO2e under a business-as-usual scenario (this is a reduction of 47 MMT CO2e, or almost 10 percent, from 2008 emissions). ARB’s original 2020 projection was 596 MMT CO2e, but this revised 2020 projection takes into account the economic downturn that occurred in 2008 (ARB 2011a). The Scoping Plan reapproved by ARB in August 2011 includes the Final Supplement to the Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document, which further examined various alternatives to Scoping Plan measures. The Scoping Plan also includes ARB-recommended GHG reductions for each emissions sector of the state’s GHG inventory. ARB estimates the largest reductions in GHG emissions to be achieved by 2020 will be by implementing the following measures and standards (ARB 2011a):

- improved emissions standards for light-duty vehicles (estimated reductions of 26.1 MMT CO2e),
- the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (15.0 MMT CO2e),
- energy efficiency measures in buildings and appliances (11.9 MMT CO2e),
- a renewable portfolio and electricity standards for electricity production (23.4 MMT CO2e), and
- the Cap-and-Trade Regulation for certain types of stationary emission sources (e.g., power plants).

In May 2014, ARB released and has since adopted the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan to identify the next steps in reaching AB 32 goals and evaluate the progress that has been made between 2000 and 2012 (ARB 2014b:4 and 5). According to the update, California is on track to meet the near-term 2020 GHG limit and is well positioned to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 (ARB 2014b:ES-2). The update also reports the trends in GHG emissions from various emission sectors.

The update also elaborates on potential GHG reduction goals beyond 2020:

California will develop a mid-term target to frame the next suite of reduction measures and ensure continued progress toward scientifically based targets. This target should be consistent with the level of reduction needed [by 2050] in the developed world to stabilize warming at 2° C (3.6° F) [above pre-industrial levels] and align with targets and commitments elsewhere. The European Union has adopted an emissions reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The United Kingdom has committed to reduce its emissions by 50 percent below 1990 levels within the 2022–2027...
timeframe, and Germany has set its own 2030 emissions target of 55 percent below 1990 levels. The United States, in support of the Copenhagen Accord, pledged emission reductions of 42 percent below 2005 levels in 2030 (which, for California, translates to 35 percent below 1990 levels).

This level of reduction is achievable in California. In fact, if California realizes the expected benefits of existing policy goals (such as 12,000 megawatts [MW] of renewable distributed generation by 2020, net zero energy homes after 2020, existing building retrofits under AB 758, and others) it could reduce emissions by 2030 to levels squarely in line with those needed in the developed world and to stay on track to reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Additional measures, including locally driven measures and those necessary to meet federal air quality standards in 2032, could lead to even greater emission reductions (ARB 2014b:34).

As supported by many of California’s climate scientists and economists, a key next step needed to build on California’s framework for climate action is to establish a mid-term statewide emission reduction target. Cumulative emissions drive climate change, and a continuum of action is needed to reduce emissions not just to stated limits in 2020 or 2050, but also every year in between (ARB 2014b:ES6).

The update summarizes sector-specific actions needed to stay on the path toward the 2050 target. While the update acknowledges certain reduction targets by others (such as in the Copenhagen Accord), it stops short of recommending a specific target for California, instead acknowledging that mid-term targets need to be set “consistent with the level of reduction needed [by 2050] in the developed world to stabilize warming at 2° C (3.6° F) [above pre-industrial levels].”

Actions are recommended for the energy sector, transportation (clean cars, expanded zero-emission vehicle program, fuels policies, etc.), land use (compliance with regional sustainability planning targets), agriculture, water use (more stringent efficiency and conservation standards, runoff capture, etc.), waste (elimination of organic material disposal, expanded recycling, use of Cap and Trade program, etc.), green building (strengthen Green Building Standards), and other sectors. Many of the actions that result in meeting targets will need to be driven by new or modified regulations.

At the time of writing of this document, however, no specific reduction goal beyond 2020 has been recommended or formally adopted by ARB or the California State Legislature other than the 2050 goal included in Executive Order S-3-05 (discussed above). As noted in the discussion of AB 32, above, the ARB is tasked with making a recommendation for targets beyond 2020 as part of the legislation.

**Senate Bill 375**
SB 375, signed by the Governor in September 2008, aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG emission reduction targets for cars and light duty trucks, and land use and housing allocation. SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy, showing prescribed land use allocation in each MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan. ARB, in consultation with the MPOs, is to provide each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in their respective regions for 2020 and 2035.

The applicable MPO in the project region is the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), which includes Placer County except for of the Lake Tahoe Basin. SACOG adopted its SCS in 2012. SACOG was tasked by ARB to achieve a 9 percent per capita reduction by 2020 and a 16 percent per capita reduction by 2035, which ARB confirmed the region would achieve by implementing its Sustainable Communities Strategy (ARB 2013).

**Advanced Clean Cars Program**
In January 2012, ARB approved the Advanced Clean Cars program which combines the control of GHG emissions and criteria air pollutants, as well as requirements for greater numbers of zero-emission vehicles, into a single package of standards for vehicle model years 2017 through 2025. The new rules strengthen the GHG standard for 2017 models and beyond. This will be achieved through existing technologies, the use of
stronger and lighter materials, and more efficient drivetrains and engines. The program’s zero-emission vehicle regulation requires battery, fuel cell, and/or plug-in hybrid electric vehicles to account for up to 15 percent of California’s new vehicle sales by 2025. The program also includes a clean fuels outlet regulation designed to support the commercialization of zero-emission hydrogen fuel cell vehicles planned by vehicle manufacturers by 2015 by requiring increased numbers of hydrogen fueling stations throughout the state. The number of stations will grow as vehicle manufacturers sell more fuel cell vehicles. By 2025, when the rules will be fully implemented, the statewide fleet of new cars and light trucks will emit 34 percent fewer GHG emissions and 75 percent fewer smog-forming emissions than the statewide fleet in 2016 (ARB 2011b).

Senate Bill 97 of 2007
SB 97 directed the California Natural Resources Agency to adopt amendments to the CEQA Guidelines to specifically address GHG emissions. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010. This EIR complies with these Amendments and the CEQA checklist questions added to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines in response to SB 97 are discussed under the Significance Criteria heading below.

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

Construction-Generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Construction-related GHG emissions were analyzed under Impact 3A.4-1 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. Modeling was conducted using the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS 2007) and estimated that approximately 50,456 MT CO2e would be generated by construction activity during the multiple-decade buildout period of the FPASP, including the adopted Hillsborough at Easton plan. Because of the intensity and duration of construction activities associated with all development under the FPASP, including the Hillsborough at Easton plan, and presuming that this level of construction-generated GHG emissions would be substantial compared to other construction projects in the region and in the state, the analysis determined that construction-generated GHG emission levels would have a substantial contribution to GHGs that cause climate change. Therefore, the analysis concluded, GHG emissions associated with construction under the FPASP would result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to this significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

SMAQMD did not have a recommended threshold for evaluating construction-related GHGs at the time of the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. Since that time, however, SMAQMD has developed a mass emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO2e/year for determining whether construction-generated GHG emissions are significant (SMAQMD 2014a:6-12). Based on 50,456 MT CO2-e provided in the FPASP EIR/EIS for construction of the entire FPASP, GHG emissions generated by construction of the FPASP (including Hillsborough) Plan would exceed SMAQMD’s threshold.

The types of emissions-generating construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the adopted Hillsborough at Easton plan, as well as the quantity of land that would be developed and the intensity and pace of construction. The project would result in construction of more residential units and more non-residential land uses but would not include the private school that was part of the adopted specific plan. The increases will be offset by reduction in dwelling units in other parts of the FPASP. For example, the City Council recently approved amendments to Russell Ranch which reduced the dwelling units by 265 units. Overall, development within the Hillsborough site under the amended plan would be similar in area, size, and intensity to what was approved under the FPASP. For these reasons it is not anticipated that the project would result in any new circumstances involving new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts pertaining to construction-generated GHG emissions then were identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.4-1, which focuses on reducing construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, would also result in reductions in construction-generated GHGs. Similarly, implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.4-1b, which requires applicants to pay an off-site mitigation fee to SMAQMD to offset construction-generated emissions of oxides of nitrogen would also result in reductions in construction-generated GHGs. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 3A.4-1 requires implementation
of additional measures to minimize construction-generated GHG emissions. These mitigation measures would generally result in the same reductions in GHG emissions under the project as the adopted FPASP. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis would be required.

**Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

GHG emissions and associated climate change impacts of the approved FPASP were evaluated in Section 4.7 of the 2010 Draft FPASP EIR/EIS. The methods of analysis for GHG estimation have evolved since the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. Since that time the Urban Emissions model (URBEMIS) that was used in the FPASP EIR/EIS analysis was replaced with the California Emissions Estimator Model (CaEEMod). CaEEMod is now the widely-recognized modeling tool by air districts in California for estimating GHG emissions for development projects, including SMAQMD (SMAQMD 2014a:6-7). Also, SMAQMD now recommends a specific threshold of significance for evaluating GHG emissions from land use development projects, as discussed above. The replacement of URBEMIS with CaEEMod, as well as the new threshold and guidance recommended by SMAQMD, do not constitute “new information” as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, because information was known about GHGs at the time the FPASP was prepared and modeling methodologies similar to what is now used were available to estimate emissions. In this environmental review, an analysis is conducted to evaluate the project’s impacts in the context of the current regulatory environment, to apply SMAQMD’s threshold and methodology and, more specifically, to evaluate whether the project would have substantially more severe impacts with respect to climate change than the approved Hillsborough at Easton plan. As part of this analysis, mass GHG emissions were estimated for four separate scenarios, listed in Table 4.7-1, and discussed in further detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7-1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Comparison Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MT CO₂e/year)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Specific Plan for Hillsborough Site, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources (vehicle trips)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mass GHG Emissions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GHG Efficiency (MT CO₂e/SP/year)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Appendix A for detail on model inputs, assumptions, and modeling parameters.

1. Emission estimates shown in this table do not account for the emission reductions that would be achieved by implementation of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Air Quality Mitigation Plan, which is required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2.2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS.
2. Area sources of emissions include landscaping equipment and off-road equipment.
3. Emissions associated with electricity consumption, including electricity consumption associated with water consumption, would be greater under the No-Action-Taken Scenario because no reductions would be realized from the implementation of renewable requirements in the electric power generation industry and new efficiency standards for the heating and cooling of buildings, interiors, and water heating.
4. Emissions from vehicle trips would be greater under the No-Action-Taken Scenario because no reductions would result from regulations governing vehicle emission standards for GHGs, including the vehicle emission standards from Advanced Clean Cars and the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard. These regulations provide increasingly stringent emission standards over time.
5. No substantial difference would be expected in emissions associated with wastewater treatment, the generation of solid waste, landscaping.

MT = metric tons  
CO₂e = carbon dioxide-equivalent  
SP = service population (i.e., residents + jobs)

Source: Modeling and calculations conducted by Ascent Environmental 2015
Emission levels for all of the scenarios were estimated using CalEEMod Version 2013.2. Detailed assumptions and input parameters are provided in Appendix A. Estimates of mobile-source emissions for the Hillsborough site as approved in the FPASP and the project are based on estimates of VMT provided by the traffic analysis in the Hillsborough Draft Transportation Impact Study (Fehr & Peers 2015).

As discussed above in the air quality analysis, subsequent to the completion of the final GHG modeling, the proposed land use quantities for the project were amended as follows:

- Single-Family Residential: +76 dwelling units
- Multi-Family Residential: -75 dwelling units
- Community Commercial: -0.2 acres
- Industrial/Office Park: -2 acres
- Elementary School: No change
- Parks: -0.3 acres

According to the updated traffic analysis, the above land use modifications resulted in an estimated trip generation that would be reduced by approximately 125 trips on a daily basis. Therefore, the analysis contained in the remainder of this section accounts for a slightly higher trip generating project than is currently proposed and is, therefore, considered conservative.

As show in Table 4.7-1, the project would generate more GHGs annually than the approved Hillsborough at Easton Plan. This is because the amended specific plan would consist of more residential dwellings, including more single-family homes, more non-residential land uses and; therefore, more GHG-generating activity. The approved specific plan was estimated to support approximately 4,250 residents and 2,132 jobs—or a service population of 6,382 (where service population is the sum of residents and jobs). In comparison, the amended specific plan would support approximately 5,266 residents and 2,181 jobs—or a service population of 7,477—using the same planning area. Service population is an important metric because it allows the comparison of different land use plans that consist of different mix of land use types. On a per-service-population basis the amended specific plan would be more GHG efficient, generating 3.79 annual MT CO₂e per service population (MT CO₂e/SP/year) in 2020, while the approved specific plan would have a GHG efficiency of 4.02 MT CO₂e/SP/year if fully operational during the same calendar year. For this reason, it is determined that the project would not result more severe impacts with respect to its contribution of GHG emissions.

The analysis under Impact 3A.4-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS estimated that GHG efficiency of the entire FPASP would be approximately 7.8 MT CO₂e/SP/year in 2030 if fully built out. This analysis determined that the level of GHG emissions associated with operation of the FPASP would be substantial and because of the uncertainty about whether the future regulations (relative to the time the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared) developed through implementation of AB 32 would cause operational emissions to be 30 percent lower than business-as-usual emission levels or achieve a GHG efficiency of 4.4 CO₂e/SP/year by 2020 or 3.7 CO₂e/SP/year by 2030, which are the necessary efficiency targets estimated at the time of the analysis in the FSPAP EIR/EIS. Thus, the FPASP EIR/EIS included Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2a, which requires each increment of new development under the FPASP that needs discretionary approval (e.g., proposed tentative subdivision map, conditional use permit) to undergo project-specific environmental review and also requires that GHG emissions operation of each phase of development be reduced by 30 percent from 2006 business-as-usual emissions as required by the AB 32.

This analysis provides additional examination of the GHG emissions that would be generated by the Amended Specific Plan by applying the threshold and methodology more recently recommended by SMAQMD (SMAQMD 2016).

As shown in Table 4.7-1, the mass emission level generated by operation of the approved FPASP for the Hillsborough site and project would exceed the threshold of 1,100 MT CO₂e/year. Thus, this analysis focuses on the GHG efficiency of the proposed project and comparison to the approved Specific Plan. As shown in Table 4.7-1, the project would have a service population-based GHG efficiency of 3.79 MT CO₂e/SP/year in
2020 and 3.63 MT CO\textsubscript{2e}/SP/year in 2030, which would improve upon the respective efficiency targets of 4.36 CO\textsubscript{2e}/SP/year and 3.68 CO\textsubscript{2e}/SP/year that are also stated in Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2a.

Therefore, GHG emissions associated with operation of the project would not conflict with ARB's Scoping Plan for 2020 targets and buildout of the Hillsborough at Easton plan would not result in any new circumstances involving new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to GHG emissions than were identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Furthermore, the emissions estimates summarized in Table 4.7-1 in combination with this analysis fulfill the requirement of Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2a to complete a project-specific analysis of the amended Hillsborough at Easton plan.

The analysis under Impact 3A.4-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that the FPASP would result in the loss of blue oak woodland and individual oak trees, which are a form of carbon storage and sequester carbon from the atmosphere. Therefore, the applicant still must fulfill the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2b in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2b requires the applicant to participate in and implement an urban and community forestry program and/or off-site tree program to offset loss in carbon sequestration associated with any removal of onsite trees.

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

Construction-Generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions
As discussed in (a), above, the types and amount of GHG-generating construction activity, as well as the reductions resulting from required mitigation, would generally be the same under the project as the approved FPASP for the Hillsborough at Easton site. Also, construction-generated GHG emissions would exceed SMAQMD's mass emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO\textsubscript{2e}/year under both the approved plan and the project. Therefore, construction-generated emissions under the approved plan and the project would be a substantial contribution to global climate change and would conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. However, because construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the approved plan, the project would not result in any new circumstances involving new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts pertaining to construction-generated GHG emissions than were identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions
As discussed in (a), above, the project would have a service population-based GHG efficiency of 3.79 MT CO\textsubscript{2e}/SP/year in 2020 and 3.63 MT CO\textsubscript{2e}/SP/year in 2030, which would improve upon the respective efficiency targets of 4.36 CO\textsubscript{2e}/SP/year and 3.68 CO\textsubscript{2e}/SP/year that are also stated in Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2a. Therefore, operational GHG emissions under the project would not be considered a cumulative contribution to climate change and, therefore, would not conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts.

Impacts of Climate Change on the Project
Section 3A.4.2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS discusses impacts on the FPASP related to global climate change. This section discusses ways in which global climate change could alter the physical environment in California including increased average temperatures; modifications to the timing, amount, and form (rain versus snow) of precipitation; changes in the timing and amount of runoff; reduced water supply; deterioration of water quality; elevated sea level; and effects on agriculture. The analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that (1) either the climate change effect from these changes would not have the potential to substantially affect the FPASP area, or (2) because of significant uncertainty in projecting future conditions related to the climate change effect, it would be too speculative to reach a meaningful conclusion regarding the significance of any reasonably foreseeable direct impact on physical conditions in the project vicinity and, therefore, impacts are too speculative for meaningful consideration. No substantial changes in the understanding of climate change science have occurred since the FPASP was approved. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis is required.
Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.4-1: Implement Additional Measures to Control Construction-Generated GHG Emissions.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2a: Implement Additional Measures to Reduce Operational GHG Emissions.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2b: Participate in and Implement an Urban and Community Forestry Program and/or Off-Site Tree Program to Off-Set Loss of On-Site Trees.

CONCLUSION
This report updates the environmental setting addressing GHG’s and provides additional project-level GHG analysis. While the updated information and the project-specific analyses provide additional detail for the project site, the proposed amendment to the FPASP would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to greenhouse gases. Therefore, no additional analysis is required.
# 4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong> Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-11, 3A.8-12 Impact 3A.8-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-13 Impact 3A.8-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong> Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-13 Impact 3A.8-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-2 to 3A.8-9 Impact 3A.8-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-18 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f.</strong> For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on the project area?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-18, 3A.8-19 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g.</strong> Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-14 Impact 3A.8-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-18, 3A.8-19 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i.</strong> Create a significant hazard to the public through use of explosive materials in grading or earth-moving activities?</td>
<td>Setting pp.3A.8-13, 3A.8-14 Impact 3A.8-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>k.</strong> Expose project residents to excessive electrical or magnetic fields?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-7, 3A.8-11, 3A.8-12, 3A.8-13, 3A.8-15 Impact 3A.8-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>j.</strong> Create public health hazards from increased exposure to mosquitoes by providing substantial new habitat for mosquitoes or other vectors?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-10, 3A.8-15 Impact 3A.8-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to hazards and hazardous materials, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011. The EIR/EIS included three criteria that are not included in the current Appendix G of the CEQA guidelines.

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The EIR/EIS analysis of the adopted FPASP (Impact 3A.8-1) considered the potential for the public to be exposed to hazardous materials through the increased use, storage, and disposal of household hazardous materials and for commercial and industrial development to result in increased use, storage, and/or disposal of hazardous materials during routine operations. The EIR/EIS analysis concluded that the impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. The project would not change the overall pattern of development of the types of hazardous materials that would be used, handled, or transported to the site. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

As discussed in the EIR/EIS, potential sources of hazards and hazardous materials include structures that may contain asbestos-containing materials and lead paint, polychlorinated biphenyls, abandoned mine shafts, and chemicals from mining activities. While the EIR/EIS found that there was a potentially significant impact, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.8-2 would reduce significant impacts from potential human health hazards from possible exposure to hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level. No changes to the conditions of the site or the presence of hazardous materials has occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

As discussed above, under b), implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.8-2 would reduce significant impacts from potential human health hazards from possible exposure to hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level. No changes to the conditions of the site or the presence of hazardous materials has occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

As discussed in Impact 3A.8-3, a portion of the Aerojet Superfund site (Area 40) is located in the Hillsborough at Easton area, and is undergoing investigation and remediation under the direction of EPA and DTSC. An approximately 54-acre portion of the SPA is part of a larger carve-out area that has been removed from the Superfund site. This carve-out area is no longer a Cortese-listed site. Area 40 and the carve-out area are illustrated on Exhibit 2-4. The EIR/EIS concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact because Area 40 is in the area which is planned for development and it has the potential to create a public health hazard. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.8-3a, 3A.8-3b, and 3A.8-3c, which would require that remediation activities are fully disclosed, coordinated with development to ensure construction doesn’t affect remediation, and the applicants provide notice to the City that they have fulfilled DTSC requirements, the impact would be reduced to less than significant. The type and mix of land uses proposed at the site has.
not changed from that evaluated in the FPASP EIR. Therefore, the same hazards would be present and the project would be required to implement mitigation recommended in the EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur and the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

As described on page 3A.8-18 of the EIR/EIS, the project is not located within two miles of a public, public-use, or private airport, nor is it within and airport land use plan area. The nearest airport, Sacramento Mather Airport, is located approximately seven miles southwest of the SPA. Therefore, impacts related to airport or private airfield safety were not discussed in the EIR/EIS. No new airports have been developed near the project area. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

As described on page 3A.8-19 of the EIR/EIS, the project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Impacts related to private airfield safety were not discussed in the EIR/EIS. No new airports have been developed near the project area. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

As described in Impact 3A.8-4, implementation of the project would require permits from the City of Folsom to ensure that the project provides sufficient hydrant locations, street width, circulation, and project access for fire and emergency response units. Implementation of the project would not conflict with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. The impact was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required. No changes to these circumstances have occurred. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

As described on page 3A.8-18 of the EIR/EIS, the FPASP was not located in an area with significant risk related to wildland fires and no detailed analysis related to this topic was evaluated. No changes to the location of the project have occurred and no changes to the risks from wildfires has occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project was approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.8-2: Complete Investigations Related to the Extent to Which Soil and/or Groundwater May Have Been Contaminated in Areas Not Covered by the Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments and Implement Required Measures.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.8-3a: Require the Project Applicant(s) to Cooperate with Aerojet and Regulatory Agencies to Preserve, Modify, or Close Existing Groundwater Monitoring Wells.
Mitigation Measure 3A.8-3b: Coordinate Development Activities to Avoid Interference with Remediation Activities.

Mitigation Measure 3A.8-3c: Provide Written Notification to the City that DTSC-Required Notification Obligations and/or Easements Have Been Fulfilled to Ensure that Construction Activities Do Not Interfere with Remedial Actions.

Mitigation Measure 3A.8-5: Prepare and Implement a Blasting Safety Plan in Consultation with a Qualified Blaster.

Mitigation Measure 3A.8-6: Prudent Avoidance and Notification of EMF Exposure.

Mitigation Measure 3A.8-7: Prepare and Implement a Vector Control Plan in Consultation with the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes related to hazards and hazardous materials have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts. No additional analysis is required.
## 4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>Setting pp. A.9-10 to 3A.9-23 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (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)</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-5 to 3A.9-6 Impact 3A.9-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-1 to 3A.9-5 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-1 to 3A.9-5 Impacts 3A.9-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-1 to 3A.9-5 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-6 to 3A.9-9 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-5 to 3A.9-1-7 Impact 3A.9-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-5 to 3A.9-1-7 Impact 3A.9-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.9-20 Impact 3A.9-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-5 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to hydrology and water quality, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.9 Hydrology and Water Quality - Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

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

The EIR/EIS addressed water quality impacts related to the approved FPASP in Section 3A.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. As described in Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3, the FPASP could result in significant impacts to water quality because of soil disturbance during construction and alteration of water flows over the site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3 would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level by requiring a project-specific stormwater water quality maintenance plan. No substantial changes to the development plans for the Hillsborough site would occur with the project. The project would continue to comply with mitigation requirements outlined in the adopted mitigation for the FPASP. With implementation of this mitigation, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The EIR/EIS addressed the FPASP’s effect on groundwater recharge in Impact 3A.9-6. As described in this impact, the FPASP would introduce new impervious surfaces and there is poor natural groundwater recharge in the area. Most substantial recharge would occur along active stream channels. Impact 3A.9-6 concluded that the impact on groundwater recharge would be less-than-significant because those areas within the FPASP that are most conducive to groundwater recharge (e.g., the Alder Creek stream and tributary corridors) would generally be maintained in open space and as retention basins. No mitigation was required. The project would not substantially change development patterns and the amount of impermeable surfaces from that approved in the FPASP. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 on- or off-site erosion or siltation?

As discussed in Impact 3A.9-1 and Impact 3A.9-3, construction activities associated with development of the FPASP would create the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation both within and downstream of the FPASP and this was determined to be a significant impact. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3, which require a project-specific storm water pollution prevention plan and water quality maintenance plan, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The storm drainage system for the Hillsborough site, as described in the Storm Drainage Master Plan (MacKay & Somps 2014a), would be designed to direct runoff flows into on-site detention basins (and one off-site basin west of Prairie City Road), and would incorporate water quality treatment. MacKay & Somps conducted a review of the proposed changes to the drainage plans as a result of the project to determine what changes would be necessary at the site (2014b). As described in their technical memo, the drainage plans would be slightly modified to allow for changes to the detention/hyromodification basins within the plan area. No changes to off-site infrastructure would be required. These changes can be accommodated within the plan area. Therefore, there would be no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
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 on- or off-site flooding?

The certified EIR/EIS addresses impacts resulting from alteration of drainage patterns and drainage capacity under the approved FPASP in Impact 3A.9-2. As described in this impact, urbanization of the FPASP area would increase runoff volume and peak flows, which could contribute to downstream flooding and erosion. Increased runoff to existing and proposed culverts within and downstream of the FPASP area could result in overtopping and flooding because of inadequate capacity for urbanized flow-rates, and could lead to bank erosion, elevated flood levels and increased runoff. The EIR/EIS concluded that there was a potentially significant impact related to stormwater runoff and the subsequent risk of flooding. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.9-2 would reduce the potentially significant impact associated with the potential increased risk of flooding from increased stormwater runoff to a less-than-significant level because it requires the applicant to prepare, submit, and implement a final drainage plan. MacKay & Soms completed a drainage analysis to insure compliance with City of Folsom Drainage Standards and consistency with the approved Folsom Plan Area Storm Drainage Master Plan and found that “The analysis demonstrates that compliance and consistency have been achieved, and that the basins designed for the Hillsborough at Easton project adequately attenuate storm water discharges from the project. The post development discharges from the Hillsborough at Easton project as proposed per the SPA are equal to or less than the pre-development discharges (MacKay & Soms 2016a).” The project would not substantially change development or drainage patterns from that approved in the FPASP. Further, the project would continue to comply with mitigation requirements outlined in the adopted mitigation for the FPASP. With implementation of this mitigation, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

As described in Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3, the conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses would have both short- and long-term effects on stormwater runoff. The storm drainage system for the approved FPASP and Storm Drainage Master Plan for the project (MacKay & Soms 2014a), would be designed to direct runoff flows into on-site detention basins (and one off-site basin west of Prairie City Road), and would incorporate water quality treatment. Nonetheless, the impacts on drainage were found to be significant because the conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses would have both short- and long-term effects on stormwater runoff. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3 which requires a project-specific storm water pollution prevention plan and water quality maintenance plan, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. As described in the MacKay & Soms’ technical memo (2014a), the drainage plans would be slightly modified to allow for changes to the detention/hydroromodification basins within the plan area. However, no changes to off-site infrastructure would be required. These changes can be accommodated within the plan area. In addition, MacKay & Soms found that discharges post development would be equal or less than pre-development discharges (MacKay & Soms 2016a). Therefore, there would be no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The potential for the project to substantially degrade water quality is addressed in a) and e). There are no other unaddressed water quality impacts.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

The EIR/EIS addressed impacts related to flood hazards in Impact 3A.9-5. A delineation of the proposed 200-year floodplain was developed for the FPASP. Development under the FPASP including the Hillsborough site would be subject to the requirements of SB 5 which disallow development in a flood hazard zone unless 200-year flood protection is provided. Because of this protection, the impact related to building in a floodplain
would be less-than-significant. Floodplain designations for the site have not changed since approval of the FPASP. Further, the project would continue to be required to comply with the requirements of SB 5. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?
This is addressed under g), above.

i) 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?
As described in Impact 3A.9-4, there is some potentially significant risk of flooding because of the failure of a dam upstream of the FPASP. Mitigation Measure 3A.9-4 would reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level by requiring the applicant to inspect and evaluate existing dams within and upstream of the project site and make improvements if necessary. This mitigation would continue to apply to the project. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
The FPASP including the Hillsborough site is not located in an area prone to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows. No impact would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.9-1: Acquire Appropriate Regulatory Permits and Prepare and Implement SWPPP and BMPs.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.9-3: Develop and Implement a BMP and Water Quality Maintenance Plan.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.9-4: Inspect and Evaluate Existing Dams Within and Upstream of the Project Site and Make Improvements if Necessary.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the proposed amendment to the FPASP would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to hydrology and water quality.
### 4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.10-1 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.10-4 to 3A.10-28 Impacts 3A.10-1 and 3A.10-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.3-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.10.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to land use and planning, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.10 under Land Use and Agricultural Resources and Section 3A.3 under Biological Resources, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

**a) Physically divide an established community?**

As discussed in the certified EIR/EIS on page 3A.10-29, the project is located in an area which consists of livestock grazing lands. There is only one existing single-family residence and associated agricultural outbuildings. Therefore, project implementation would not physically divide an established community and this issue was not evaluated in the EIR/EIS. No changes in development at the site have occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

Impacts 3A.10-1 and 3A.10-2 in the EIR/EIS address consistency of the then-proposed FPASP with Sacramento LAFCo Guidelines and the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint. The LAFCo Guidelines were relevant because the FPASP area was required to be annexed into the City of Folsom. Since the adoption of the FPASP, the area was annexed into the City and this impact discussion is no longer relevant.

As discussed on page 3A.10-39 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the FPASP was found to be consistent with the SACOG Sacramento Region Preferred Blueprint Scenario. As stated in Impact 3A.10-2, the FPASP provides fewer dwelling units than what is identified in the Blueprint. With the addition of the additional 394 units proposed under the project, the project would provide more of the housing density desired in the Blueprint plan further meeting the objectives of SACOG. In addition, the project would continue to be consistent with the smart growth principles within the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint.
This project includes an amendment to the adopted FPASP. This project will remain consistent with the community vision, design framework, and planning principles. The changes to the land uses and backbone infrastructure will be evaluated and, if approved, the FPASP will be amended to include the changes. Because the project includes amending the FPASP, and the project remains consistent with other applicable plans and policies, impacts would be less than significant.

No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?
As stated in Impact 3A.3-7, there is no adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan that covers the area in which project is located and no new plans have been adopted since approval of the FPASP. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures were needed for the certified EIR/EIS regarding land use and planning. No additional mitigation measures are required for project for this topic.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to land use and planning.
4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Mineral Resources. Would the Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-12 and 3A.7-13 Impacts 3A.7-8, 3A.7-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-12 and 3A.7-13 Impacts 3A.7-8, 3A.7-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to mineral resources, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.7, Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011.

a) 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 b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

As described in Impacts 3A.7-8 and 3A.7-9, the project area contains mineral resource zones for construction aggregate and kaolin clay. While the EIR/EIS found that the possible loss of the construction aggregate would be a less-than-significant impact, the possible loss of kaolin clay was determined to be potentially significant because it is unknown whether there could be an economically valuable deposit of kaolin clay that would be lost with development of the FPASP. While Mitigation Measure 3A.7-9 was included to determine if economically valuable mineral resources are present, they would still be lost because of the development. The impact was concluded to remain potentially significant and unavoidable. This condition would not change with implementation of the project because the same area and soils would be developed. Therefore, there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts and the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

This topic is addressed above, under a).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure was referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-9: Conduct Soil Sampling in Areas of the SPA Designated as MRZ-3 for Kaolin Clay and if Found, Delineate its Location and Notify Lead Agency and the California Division of Mines and Geology.
The EIR/EIS concluded that there is a potentially significant and unavoidable impact to kaolin clay as an important mineral resource. There are no additional mitigation measures available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to mineral resources.
### 4.12 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Noise. Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.11-12 to 3A.11-17 Impacts 3A.11-4, 3A.11-5, and 3A.11-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.11-4 Impact 3A.11-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5 to 3A.11-11 Impacts 3A.11-4, 3A.11-5, and 3A.11-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5 to 3A.11-11 Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5, 3A.11-10, 3A.11-11 Impact 3A.11-6 overflight</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5, 3A.11-10, 3A.11-11 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.12.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to noise and vibration, described in FPASP EIR/EIS Sections 3A.11 Noise – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR in. No new noise sources have been introduced near the planning area since the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared.

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?

**Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Traffic Noise Levels from Project Operation**

Long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased stationary-source noise levels from operation of the FPASP were analyzed under Impact 3A.11-5 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. Traffic noise levels with and without buildout of the FPASP, under both existing and future baseline conditions, were modeled using the Federal Highway Administration’s Highway Noise Prediction Model for all the roadway segments in the traffic study area, including roadways in the City of Folsom, unincorporated areas of Sacramento County, the City of Rancho Cordova, El Dorado County, and nearby segments of U.S. 50. The modeling estimates showed that
buildout of the FPASP would result in net increases in community noise equivalent levels (CNELs) along affected roadway segments in comparison to existing no project conditions that range from 6.7 to 10.0 decibels (dB). Traffic noise levels increase along many roadway segments were considered substantial because they exceed 3.0 dB CNEL where existing or projected future traffic noise levels range between 60 and 65 dB CNEL, or 1.5 dB CNEL where existing or projected future traffic noise levels are greater than 65 dB day-night average noise level (L_{da})/CNEL. Because there were numerous roadway segments for which project buildout of the FPASP would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors this analysis determined this impact would be significant. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS required individual project applicants to ensure that specific Sound Transmission Class ratings are achieved by all noise-sensitive buildings built in the FPASP. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 also requires project applicants to conduct a site-specific analysis to determine predicted roadway noise impacts attributable to the project in accordance with adopted City noise standards and implement measures to reduce these impacts. Because the feasibility and effectiveness of mitigation is uncertain at this time the FPASP EIR/EIS determined this impact to be significant and unavoidable.

The project generally consists of the same types of collector roads that connect to area arterials as the approved FPASP. While it no longer includes a private school, it consists of more residential dwelling units and more commercial land uses. Overall, the project would generate approximately 7.4 percent more VMT than the approved FPASP. The VMT estimates are based on the trip generation rates that were calculated for both plans (i.e., approved and proposed) as part of the Hillsborough Draft Transportation Impact Study (Fehr & Peers 2015).

A 7.4 percent increase in VMT represents a 7.4 percent increase in the level of acoustical energy due to the logarithmic nature of adding multiple sound sources, and given that the doubling of the source strength (i.e., 100 percent) results in an increase in the sound pressure level of 3 dB (Caltrans 2013:2-12, 2-15), a 7.4 percent increase in traffic levels would not result in any substantial change in traffic noise levels. Thus, the size of the traffic noise increases resulting from trips generated by the project would not be substantially greater than determined under Impact 3A.11-5 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. As with the approved FPASP, additional detail about the severity and locations of receptors affected by these impacts will be understood when site-specific noise analyses are conducted to fulfill the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4.

**Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Stationary-Source Noise Levels from Project Operation**

Impact 3A.11-5 in the FPASP EIR/EIS discussed the potential impacts of long-term exposure of sensitive receptors, both existing and future, to increased stationary-source noise levels from project operation. The FPASP EIR/EIS addressed this impact area as it relates to a variety of stationary sources, including rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment; mechanical equipment; emergency electrical generators; parking lot activities; and loading dock operations. The respective noise impacts from these and other stationary sources were discussed and had significance determinations individually by source type.

The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that noises from mechanical HVAC could be primary noise sources associated with proposed residential, commercial, and industrial uses with the potential for significant impacts on nearby receptors. The FPASP EIR/EIS also determined that emergency generator, parking lot, and loading dock and delivery activities could have potentially significant impacts on sensitive receptors for long-term exposure due to the potential for the receptors to be located within range of noise levels exceeding applicable noise standards. For noise impacts from emergency facilities and outdoor recreational and educational activities, it was assumed that the normal operation of these facilities would be exempt from the Folsom City Noise Ordinance. Thus, the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that long-term noise impacts from emergency facilities and outdoor recreational and educational activities would be less than significant. Whether or not the project would change the significance determinations made by the FPASP EIR/EIS is discussed in more detail for each of the other stationary noise sources below.

**Mechanical HVAC Equipment**

Although the FPASP EIR/EIS did not anticipate noise from mechanical HVAC systems to exceed stationary-source noise standards at noise-sensitive land uses, the potential for impacts still exists. None of the changes to the layout of land uses in the project would result in substantial changes to this impact or an
increase in its severity. Residential mechanical HVAC equipment could still impact adjacent residences; and, the commercial land uses would still be adjacent to residential land uses under the proposed amended specific plan. Thus, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from mechanical HVAC noise levels as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding this noise impact remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Emergency Generators, Parking Lot, and Loading Dock and Delivery Activities
As discussed in the FPASP EIR/EIS, emergency generators, parking lot activity, and loading dock and delivery activities would most likely occur at industrial/office park and commercial land uses. These noise sources could result in significant impacts on sensitive receptors as far as 1,200 feet. With respect to the placement of the industrial, commercial, residential land uses between the FPASP and the Hillsborough Specific Plan (within the confines of the HSP project boundaries), there would be a marginal reduction in distances between the industrial and commercial land uses and the residential land uses, as shown in Exhibit 2-4. Additionally, the proposed industrial land use to the northwestern end of the specific plan area would still be located more than 2,000 feet from the nearest residence. The proposed commercial land use in the southwestern end of the plan area would share a property line with a medium density residential land use rather than be located across a local roadway, as was planned under the FPASP. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise associated with emergency generators, parking lot activity, and loading dock and delivery activities as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Emergency Facilities and Outdoor Recreational and Educational Activities
Like the approved FPASP, the project would include one fire station, park land uses, and educational land uses. Under the project there would be approximately 49 fewer acres designated for educational land use and an additional six acres designated as parks, as shown in Table 2-3. Regardless, the FPASP EIR/EIS stated that the Folsom City Municipal Code exempts noise associated with the operation of emergency facilities and from unlighted public parks, public playgrounds, and public or private schools from the hours of 7 a.m. to dusk, and from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. for such facilities that are lighted. Thus, regardless of the change in educational or park land uses, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise generated by emergency facilities and outdoor recreational and educational activities as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Compatibility of Proposed On-Site Land Uses with the Ambient Noise Environment
Under Impact 3A.11-7, the FPASP EIR/EIS analyzed whether noise-sensitive land use developed under the FPASP would be exposed to excessive noise levels from off-site noise sources, including activity at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area, activities at the Aerojet General Corporation site located just west of the Hillsborough site, and roadway traffic.

The analysis determined that no portions of the FPASP, including the Hillsborough site, would be exposed to noise levels generated at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area that exceed applicable standards. This is largely because the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area is located approximately 1,600 feet from the Hillsborough site. This would also be the case for the land uses developed under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise generated at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding noise generated at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Land owned by the Aerojet General Corporation is located just west of the Hillsborough site across Prairie City Road. The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that activities at the Aerojet facility, including testing of rocket and aircraft engines, would not exceed the City’s nontransportation noise standards because these noise-generating activities would be located a sufficient distance from any noise-sensitive land uses, would occur during less noise-sensitive daytime hours, and their duration would be relatively short. This would also be the case for the land uses developed under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise generated at the Aerojet General Corporation site as a result of the proposed
amended Hillsborough Specific Plan. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding noise generated at the Aerojet General Corporation site remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Regarding traffic noise, however, the analysis under Impact 3A.11-7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that some of the noise-sensitive land uses developed on the Hillsborough site could be exposed to traffic noise levels under future traffic conditions that exceed the City’s land-use compatibility standard of 60 dBA CNEL. For instance traffic noise levels along the segment of White Rock Road between Prairie City Road and Scott Road, which pass by the southern boundary of the Hillsborough site, would be approximately 73.9 A-weighted decibels (dBA) CNEL at the roadway corridor boundary. Thus, any residential land uses located near this corridor would be exposed to traffic noise levels that exceed the City’s land-use compatibility standard of 60 dBA CNEL. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS requires individual project applicants to ensure that specific Sound Transmission Class ratings are achieved by all noise-sensitive buildings built in the FPASP. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 also requires project applicants to conduct a site-specific analysis to determine predicted roadway noise impacts attributable to the project in accordance with adopted City noise standards and implement measures to reduce these impacts, including but not limited to sound barriers. The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that this mitigation would reduce on-site traffic noise levels at proposed noise-sensitive land uses to levels conditionally acceptable with mitigation (i.e., 65 dBA L_{1/2}/CNEL). This would also be the case for the land uses under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from traffic noise generated on area roadways as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding land use compatibility with traffic corridors remain valid. As with the approved FPASP, additional detail about the severity and locations of receptors affected by these impacts will be understood when site-specific noise analyses are conducted to fulfill the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4.

Overall, no new or substantially severe significant effects would occur with implementation of the project; therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

**Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Potential Groundborne Noise and Vibration from Project Construction**

Impacts from potential construction-related short-term groundborne noise and vibration on sensitive receptors were analyzed under Impact 3A.11-3 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. The FPASP EIR/EIS identified bulldozing and blasting activities as the source of maximum groundborne noise and vibration levels that would result from the construction of the FPASP. According to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), levels associated with the use of a large bulldozer and blasting are 0.089 and 1.13 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) (87 and 109 vibration decibels [VdB]) at 25 feet, respectively, as shown in Table 3A.11-17 in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Caltrans-recommended vibration exposure thresholds of 0.2 in/sec PPV for the protection of normal residential buildings and 0.08 in/sec PPV for the protection of old or historically significant structures (Caltrans 2004:17). In addition, with respect to prevention of human disturbance, bulldozing and blasting could exceed the FTA-recommended level of 78 VdB within 50 and 275 feet, respectively.

The analysis determined that, although bulldozing activities would not exceed the Caltrans-recommended thresholds for residential buildings, any blasting performed within 80 feet of a receptor could exceed the vibration threshold. Existing off-site residences along the eastern border of the FPASP area in El Dorado County, the closest sensitive receptors to the FPASP border, could be located within 80 feet of FPASP blasting activities. Thus, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that short-term construction could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne noise or vibration levels and determined a direct significant impact with no indirect impacts.

The construction project is located on the western side of the FPASP area. As discussed in Section 4.3.1 a), construction activities under the proposed amended Hillsborough Specific plan are expected to be similar to those characterized in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Construction of the land uses in the project would require similar
types of equipment and activities of similar intensity as evaluated under Impact 3A.11-3 in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The closest sensitive receptors to the Hillsborough site are a group of single-family homes located approximately 355 feet from its northwestern border, just northeast of the junction of U.S. 50 and Prairie City Road. At this distance, these receptors would not be exposed to levels of ground vibration above the selected thresholds; and, the sensitive receptors would not be exposed to noise and vibration levels substantially greater than determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from construction-generated groundborne vibration or groundborne noise as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
Refer to a) for discussion about whether the project would result in a more substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels relative to the approved FPASP.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Equipment Noise from Project Construction
The FPASP EIR/EIS provides a program-level analysis of short-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased equipment noise from project construction under Impact 3A.11-1. Based on the modeling conducted for the FPASP EIR/EIS, construction noise levels could exceed 55 dB L_{eq} within 850 feet of an activity center (e.g., acoustical center of areas where construction activities are focused). During nighttime hours, the modeling also estimated construction noise levels could exceed 50 and 45 dB L_{eq} within 1,300, and 2,000 feet of the activity centers, respectively. These noise level limits were based on noise standards and thresholds discussed in Section 3A.11.2 in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Because existing and future sensitive receptors located in both the City of Folsom and El Dorado County are located within these project-generated noise contours, the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that exposure of sensitive receptors to equipment noise levels would exceed applicable noise standards and result in a direct, significant impact.

As discussed in Section 4.3.1 a) regarding air pollutant emissions, construction activities under the proposed amended Hillsborough Specific plan are expected to be similar to those characterized in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Construction activities under the proposed amended specific plan would require similar types and numbers of equipment operating at similar levels of intensity. In addition, as discussed in b) above, the closest existing sensitive receptors to the Hillsborough site are located within 400 feet of the proposed area of construction. Future sensitive receptors may also be present on-site as remaining portions of plan area undergo construction and these receptors could be located within 2,000 feet of activity centers. Thus, construction activity under the project would expose sensitive receptors to equipment noise levels that would exceed applicable noise standards. However, noise-sensitive receptors would not be exposed to construction noise levels that are new or substantially more severe than would occur from under the approved FPASP. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Traffic Noise Levels from Project Construction
Impact 3A.11-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS explained that construction of the FPASP would result in additional vehicle trips on the local roadway network from worker commute and the transport of equipment and materials. This analysis determined that additional construction-related vehicles trips would not result in noise level increases greater than 3 dB CNEL and, therefore, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that the short-term increase traffic noise levels due to construction-generated vehicle trips would be a less-than-significant impact.

The number of additional vehicle trips associated with construction activity under the project is not anticipated to be substantially more severe because the same types of land uses would be developed. Thus, this impact would be within the scope of the impact already evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS and would also be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
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?

As explained in the FPASp EIR/EIS Mather Airport is located approximately 7 miles southwest of the FPASp area, including the Hillsborough site. The runways at this airport are oriented southwest to northeast. The Mather Airport Master Plan has been updated since the time the FPASp EIR/EIS was prepared. The update largely accounts for projected increases in future aircraft operations at Mather Airport. It is anticipated that most, if not all, regional air cargo demand will be handled by Mather Airport instead of Sacramento International Airport and that general aviation use at Mather Airport will also increase. These changes will result in more take offs and landings during both daytime and nighttime hours. The noise analysis in the EIR for the 2013 Mather Airport Master Plan indicates that the future projected 65 dB CNEL contour for Mather Airport extends across a portion of White Rock Road that is approximately 3,000 feet of Nimbus Road (County of Sacramento 2014: 9-64). The eastern end of this 65 dB CNEL contour is approximately three miles west of the southwest corner of the Hillsborough site. The noise contour maps presented in the EIR do not show the extent of the 60 dB CNEL contour but because the extent of the maps do not even include the Hillsborough site and because the future projected 65 dB CNEL contour would be three miles away, it is anticipated that land uses developed in the Hillsborough site would not be subject to aircraft noise levels that exceed the 60 dBA CNEL standard stated in City of Folsom General Plan Policy 30.4 (City of Folsom 1988:26-12). Also, as explained in the FPASp EIR/EIS, the nearest 60 dB CNEL noise contour developed in 2005 is approximately 5,000 feet to the west of the FPASp area. Please note, aviation easements exist on property within the FPASp.

The CNEL is not the only metric for analyzing the potential noise effects of aircraft operations around airports. As stated in Policy 30.4 of the City of Folsom General Plan noise element, noise from single occurrences such as the passage of aircraft should also be evaluated in terms of single event noise levels (SENLs). The maximum noise level created by such an event may have the potential to result in activity interference even though the cumulative noise exposure in terms of CNEL is within acceptable limits. The potential for sleep disturbance is usually of primary concern, and should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis (City of Folsom 1988:26-12).

In this fashion, the EIR for the 2013 Mather Airport Master Plan also provides detailed discussion about aircraft-generated SENLs and their effect on sleep at residential land uses. The analysis uses a methodology developed by the American National Standards Institute and the Acoustical Society of America to predict sleep disturbance, which is measured by the resultant percent of the population potentially awakened at least once during the night.

The analysis mapped eastern Sacramento County, including portions of Folsom north of U.S. 50, and western El Dorado County to show the level of sleep disturbance at existing residential areas under 2012 conditions, 2018 conditions, and 2035 conditions. This mapping shows percent ranges including 0 to 1 percent, 1.1 to 4.0 percent, 4.1 to 7.0 percent, 7.1 to 10.0 percent, and additional, higher ranges. While the analysis did not map the Hillsborough at Easton area, some understanding about the level of sleep disturbance at this location can be interpolated based on the mapped results for nearby areas. This analysis assumes that the level of sleep disturbance in the portions of Folsom south of U.S. 50, including the Hillsborough Specific Plan area, would be comparable to areas of Folsom north of U.S. 50 because these two areas are approximately the same distance from the flight tracks that approach and depart the airport. The mapping for 2012 show the 1.1-to-4.0 and, 4.1-to-7.0 percent ranges in Folsom. Increases in aircraft activity at Mather Airport would expose some portions of Folsom to the 7.1-to-10.0 percent range in 2018, and even more areas of Folsom to the 7.1-to-10.0 percent range in 2035 (County of Sacramento 2014: 9-75, 9-76, 9-78).

One key consideration about this analysis is that the estimates of the percent of population potentially awakened assume that the residential dwelling units have their windows open. Please note that closed windows typically result in a 25-30 dB reduction in interior noise levels.

The awakenings analysis in the EIR for the 2013 Mather Airport Master Plan does not reach an impact conclusion (County of Sacramento 2014: 9-72). It states the following:
This “information only” discussion of single event noise provides data on the potential for awakenings and/or classroom disruption, applying the latest technical guidance for quantifying these issues. This approach allows the decision makers and public evaluating the [2013 Mather Airport Master Plan] to draw their own conclusions regarding the significance of the analysis in the context of the larger project. City of Folsom staff also regard this as an “information only” analysis in this environmental review because even though aircraft SENLs have been the subject of various CEQA court cases no government agency has identified a consistently used threshold for determining what level of sleep disturbance is significant. The existence of Mather Airport and the fact it is expected to host increasing levels of aircraft activity was known at the time the FPASP EIR/EIS was written. The level of expected growth in operations at Mather Airport is not considered a new circumstance involving new or substantially more severe impacts than existed at the time FPASP EIR/EIS was written. Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

In addition, Bolliard Acoustical Consultants (BACs), Inc. prepared an analysis of aircraft single-event noise at the Hillsborough at Easton property (April 2016). The analysis was conducted to evaluate the potential for sleep disturbance associated with single-event aircraft operations at Mather Airport. This study concluded that the probability of awakening associated with nighttime aircraft operations would be very low at the Hillsborough at Easton property and stated that the presence of existing and projected increases in future nighttime aircraft operations at Mather Airport would be fully disclosed to prospective residents of this development. Also, interior noise levels would be well below the City of Folsom 45 dBA interior noise level standard applicable to new residential developments. The study recognized that individual sensitivities to noise can vary, and that aircraft single-event noise exposure would vary with changing aircraft types and atmospheric conditions, it was nonetheless BAC’s professional opinion that adequate mitigation measures are in place and that the Hillsborough at Easton project site would not be adversely impacted by aircraft noise relative to the sleep disturbance issue.

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?

As stated in the FPASP EIR/EIS the FPASP area is not located within two miles of a public, public-use, or private airport. The nearest airport, Sacramento Mather Airport, is located approximately seven miles southwest of the project site. No new private airstrips have been developed within the FPASP area since that time. Therefore, there are no new circumstances or new information requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures were referenced in the FPASP EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.1-1: Construct and Maintain a Landscape Corridor Adjacent to U.S. 50.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.1-4: Screen Construction Staging Areas.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5: Establish and Require Conformance to Lighting Standards and Prepare and Implement a Lighting Plan.

The EIR/EIS concluded that the impacts of roadway noise would remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of recommended mitigation. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce or eliminate the impacts.

CONCLUSION

No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any substantially important new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and approval project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant noise impacts. No further analysis is required.
4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>Population and Housing. Would the Project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.13-1 to 3A.13-6 Impacts 3A.13-1, 3A.13-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.13-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.13-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the regulatory settings related to population and housing, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.13 under Population, Employment and Housing, has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011. As described in the project description, there are an estimated 1,016 additional residents in 394 dwelling units than were accounted for in the approved FPASP for this area.

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)?**
As described in the EIR/EIS under Impacts 3A.13-1 and 3A.13-2, the FPASP would directly induce population growth through construction of new homes and businesses over the buildout period. Because population growth is not considered in and of itself to be a significant environmental impact, this was concluded to be a less-than-significant impact. While there would be a greater population within the Hillsborough at Easton project area than anticipated in the certified EIR/EIS, this additional population would not be in and of itself to be a significant environmental impact. The potentially new significant or substantially more severe impacts related to the development of homes, jobs, and infrastructure to accommodate this additional population growth are evaluated in all topic areas throughout this environmental checklist.

b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**
As described in Impact 3A.13-3, the FPASP would result in the removal of a single housing unit. This was determined to be a less-than-significant impact. No changes to this condition would occur with implementation of the project. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**
This topic is discussed under b).
Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures were needed for the certified EIR/EIS regarding population and housing. No additional mitigation measures are required for the project for this issue.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to population and housing.
## 4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Fire protection?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.14-1 to 3A.14-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts 3A.14-1, 3A.14-2, 3A.14-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Police protection?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.14-2 to 3A.14-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact 3A.14-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Schools?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.14-3 to 3A.14-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts 3A.14-5, 3A.14-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Parks?</td>
<td>See below in Section 4.15, Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4.14.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to public services, described in EIR/EIS Sections 3A.14 under Public Services, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

### Fire protection?

Impacts 3A.14-1, 3A.14-2, and 3A.14-3 address how the construction of the project would affect emergency response services and create increased demand for fire protection and for fire flow. The EIR/EIS found that there would be a significant impact on emergency response. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1, this impact would be reduced to less than significant because the applicant would be required to prepare and implement traffic control plans during construction activities to ensure that emergency access is not impeded. Furthermore, the potentially significant impacts to fire protection and fire flow would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2, which would require...
the applicant to incorporate fire code requirements into all plans and submit these plans for approval to the fire department. The project would not substantially change development densities from that approved in the FPASP. Further, the project would continue to comply with mitigation requirements outlined in the adopted mitigation for the FPASP. With implementation of this mitigation, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Police Protection?**

As described in Impact 3A.14-4, applicants would be required to fund and construct sufficient police facilities and personnel to serve the planned development. Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, “Capital Improvement New Construction Fee,” new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City’s capital improvement new construction fees. The impact was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required. The project would not substantially change development densities from that approved in the FPASP. Further, the project would subject to the same funding requirements for police services. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Schools?**

As discussed in Impacts 3A.14-5 and 3A.14-6, the applicants would be required to pay school impact fees and would fund all costs associated with school facilities. Because of this, the EIR/EIS concluded that the FPASP’s impact to schools would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. The project would not substantially change development densities from that approved in the FPASP. Further, the project would subject to the same school impact fees and funding requirements for school services. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project was approved.

- **Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1:** Prepare and Implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan.

- **Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2:** 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.

- **Mitigation Measure 3A.14-3:** Incorporate Fire Flow Requirements into Project Designs.

**CONCLUSION**

No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to public services.
4.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Recreation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.12-1 to 3A.12-11, Impacts 3A.12-1, 3A.12-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.12-1 to 3A.12-11, Impact 3A.12-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the regulatory settings related to recreation, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.12 under Parks and Recreation, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The EIR/EIS addresses impacts associated with parks and recreation under Impacts 3A.12-1 and 3A.12-2. Under the project, the population of the Hillsborough at Easton site would be 1,109 more persons than what was identified for this area in the approved FPASP. However, the project includes more dedicated parkland/open space than what was approved in the FPASP. Using the City's standard of five acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, the project must provide at least 26.8 acres of parkland on-site. The proposed site plan would provide 60.4 acres of parkland, which substantially exceeds the City's parkland requirements. The EIR/EIS concluded that the impact to existing parks and facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation was required. The proposed project would not change this conclusion and would improve the parkland amenities at the site. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

As described in Impact 3A.12-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the potential for new or expanded recreational facilities to have an adverse physical effect on the environment was analyzed in all topic area throughout the EIR/EIS as part of the project. Those impacts have been described throughout this environmental checklist.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures were identified in for the certified EIR/EIS regarding recreation, nor are any additional mitigation measures required the project.
CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to recreation.
## 4.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.15-8 to 3A.15-24 Impacts 3A.15-1, 3A.15-1a, 3A.15-1b, 3A.15-1c, 3A.15-1d, 3A.15-1e, 3A.15-1f, 3A.15-1g, 3A.15-1h, 3A.15-1i, 3A.15-1j, 3A.15-1k, 3A.15-1l, 3A.15-1m, 3A.15-1n, 3A.15-1o, 3A.15-1p, 3A.15-1q, 3A.15-1r, 3A.15-1s, 3A.15-1t, 3A.15-1u, 3A.15-1v, 3A.15-1w, 3A.15-1x, 3A.15-1y, 3A.15-1z, 3A.15-1aa, 3A.15-1bb, 3A.15-1cc, 3A.15-1dd, 3A.15-1ee, 3A.15-1ff, 3A.15-1gg, 3A.15-1hh, 3A.15-1ii, 3A.15-1jj, 3A.15-1kk, 3A.15-1ll, 3A.15-1mm, 3A.15-1nn, 3A.15-1oo, 3A.15-1pp, 3A.15-1qq, 3A.15-1rr, 3A.15-1ss, 3A.15-1tt, 3A.15-1uu, 3A.15-1vv, 3A.15-1ww, 3A.15-1xx, 3A.15-1yy, 3A.15-1zz</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.15-8 to 3A.15-24 Impacts 3A.15-1, 3A.15-1a, 3A.15-1b, 3A.15-1c, 3A.15-1d, 3A.15-1e, 3A.15-1f, 3A.15-1g, 3A.15-1h, 3A.15-1i, 3A.15-1j, 3A.15-1k, 3A.15-1l, 3A.15-1m, 3A.15-1n, 3A.15-1o, 3A.15-1p, 3A.15-1q, 3A.15-1r, 3A.15-1s, 3A.15-1t, 3A.15-1u, 3A.15-1v, 3A.15-1w, 3A.15-1x, 3A.15-1y, 3A.15-1z, 3A.15-1aa, 3A.15-1bb, 3A.15-1cc, 3A.15-1dd, 3A.15-1ee, 3A.15-1ff, 3A.15-1gg, 3A.15-1hh, 3A.15-1ii, 3A.15-1jj, 3A.15-1kk, 3A.15-1ll, 3A.15-1mm, 3A.15-1nn, 3A.15-1oo, 3A.15-1pp, 3A.15-1qq, 3A.15-1rr, 3A.15-1ss, 3A.15-1tt, 3A.15-1uu, 3A.15-1vv, 3A.15-1ww, 3A.15-1xx, 3A.15-1yy, 3A.15-1zz</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Not addressed, no impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>Not addressed, no impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>Discussed under 4.14, Public Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.15-8 to 3A.15-24 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.16.1 Discussion

The traffic analysis for the certified EIR/EIS was conducted by DKS Associates in 2009. Since the FPASP was approved, no infrastructure or development work has taken place on the site. The FPASP traffic analysis provided a gross assessment of traffic impacts in the FPASP area including the Hillsborough site. The impacts were determined based on the entire plan's effects on the roadway network. While certain development projects like Hillsborough were known at the time the FPASP was prepared and land use data from these projects were used in the assumptions and analysis, the FPASP EIR/EIS analysis did not carve out or assign specific impacts to each of the developments within the FPASP. The analysis recognized that subsequent individual traffic assessments would be prepared as developments were proposed.

Consistent with the assumptions of the FPASP, at the City's direction Fehr and Peers prepared a traffic analysis, *Hillsborough Draft Transportation Impact Study* (Fehr and Peers 2015), to determine project-related traffic impacts. This traffic analysis only evaluated the proposed development of Hillsborough at Easton (as opposed to re-evaluating the entire FPASP). However, to ensure consistency of analysis between the FPASP and the project, the analysis included a cumulative scenario that incorporates development of the FPASP updated for what is known currently. The cumulative scenario in the FPASP EIR/EIS and the project's analysis can be compared to determine whether the changes proposed as part of the project would result in any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts.

Some conditions have changed in the five years since the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. Fehr and Peers has incorporated updated traffic count data and used the updated data and a modified version of the SACMET regional travel demand model (base year Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy [MTP/SCS] version) to forecast travel demand. Further, at the request of the City, some additional intersections and roadways were added to the analysis. While new roadways and intersections were included, these facilities were known at the time the FPASP was prepared and could have been evaluated at that time. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, the inclusion of these facilities would not constitute significant new information. Rather, this information provides further refinement and details of the roadway network.

The project's traffic analysis evaluated study area intersections to determine the impact of the project on the existing (i.e., current) and cumulative (i.e., future) transportation network. A similar analysis was conducted for the FPASP EIR/EIS. However, under the FPASP the existing plus project scenario considered the
development of the entire FPASP area including Hillsborough at Easton. Under both scenarios, the analysis provides an assessment of the traffic conditions at a specific snapshot in time based on the currently available data and modeling methodologies. The FPASP snapshot represents different conditions than the project snapshot. As time progresses, conditions in the environment continually change (i.e., traffic volumes increase over time) and modeling is refined to respond to changing conditions. In the case of the project, five years has passed since the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. While conditions at the site have not changed, local traffic volumes, traffic infrastructure, and commonly accepted traffic models have changed since the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. Therefore, the updated traffic analysis reflects these changed conditions.

While an evaluation of existing plus project conditions is a requirement of CEQA, it should be noted that for longer-term (i.e., 20 years) buildout projects such as the FPASP and Hillsborough at Easton project, the impacts identified under the existing plus project condition would not likely occur. That is because it would be physically impossible for the entire project (i.e., all development proposed under the Hillsborough at Easton site plan) to develop over a short time period such that the total project-related vehicle trips would be applied to the existing roadway network. Rather, the project would be developed over a 20-year time period with different and overlapping stages of construction and development. With each new development phase an increment of the projected trips would be added to the roadway network. Similarly, agencies such as the City, County, and Caltrans would continue to implement their planned transportation improvements over the same time period responding to the changed traffic volumes and patterns, thereby improving the roadway network to better handle additional traffic. Therefore, while this scenario would not be physically realized, the planning exercise of evaluating the impacts of the project on existing conditions is conducted to provide agency decision makers a picture of what traffic conditions would look like if the project were wholly applied to the existing roadway network and what improvements would be needed to meet those demands. However, because of the long-term nature and size of the project (and the FPASP), it is not realistic to expect that the physical condition where the project would be applied to the existing roadway network is feasible.

Transportation agencies such as the City, typically employ a longer-term view of transportation planning because of the substantial investment required to implement traffic infrastructure improvements. Agencies typically plan improvements in logical increments to prevent the installation and subsequent removal and reconstruction of traffic facilities as growth and development occurs in an area. Therefore, agencies typically look to cumulative growth and development projections to understand the long-term traffic infrastructure needs. Where demands for new infrastructure occur, the agencies would plan incremental improvements that would ultimately lead to the long-term buildout condition for the roadway or intersection. Then all projects that would contribute to the demands for that infrastructure would be required to contribute to its implementation.

Planning for facilities in this manner is beneficial because agencies recognize that an assessment of project impacts is a representation of conditions (either existing or projected) at the moment in time the analysis is prepared and does not necessarily account for the full build out condition. Therefore, the cumulative plus project scenario represents a project’s true contribution to impacts on the roadway network especially where that project is a longer-term land use plan. The existing plus project scenario identifies potential impacts that could occur as the project is developed and the cumulative network improvements are being implemented over time. Therefore, the impacts identified under the existing plus project scenario are best used by agencies to determine the timing of when specific cumulative improvements need to be made or how to incrementally implement improvements to the roadway network as it builds out to the cumulative projection.

For longer-term projects, agencies plan for the cumulative traffic network because when large projects such as FPASP and Hillsborough at Easton are proposed, there is very little predictability in the timing and location of where specific development projects would occur. The economic conditions and market demand for certain types of development (e.g., retail vs. commercial vs. residential) ultimately determine which projects are developed and when. Therefore, by taking a longer-term view (i.e., cumulative projection) of infrastructure needs, the agency can make individual adjustments to the roadway network where needed to respond to individual development demands. As it relates to the project, the cumulative plus project scenario provides the City the best, most realistic assessment of how the project would affect the transportation network in comparison to the projections included in the FPASP EIR/EIS. If the project’s cumulative plus project impacts are substantially different from those projected in the FPASP EIR/EIS, then the City would understand that the changes proposed under the project could adversely affect the planned roadway network. However, if the
results of the cumulative plus project scenario show that operation of the cumulative roadway network is the same or better than previous projections under the FPASP EIR/EIS, then no significant changes would occur.

Subsequent to the completion of the travel demand modeling, the proposed land use quantities for the project were amended (Fehr and Peers 2016). Due to the land use modifications, the estimated trip generation of the proposed project would be reduced by approximately 125 trips on a daily basis, 10 trips during the AM peak hour, and 11 trips during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the analysis contained in the remainder of this section accounts for a slightly higher trip generating project than is currently proposed and is, therefore, considered conservative.

**Impacts to Intersection Level of Service**

Fehr & Peers evaluated existing and existing plus project traffic conditions on area intersections for the project (i.e., full development of the FPASP was not included). The project as proposed (based on today’s conditions) would cause the deterioration of these four intersections from existing conditions because it would result in an increase in delay by more than five seconds (Table 4.16-1). All other intersections would operate acceptably. It should be noted that the existing plus project scenario provides a snapshot of projected conditions under the hypothetical scenario in which the entire project was built today and its traffic added to today’s roads. Please refer to the cumulative plus project scenario below for the more realistic assessment of whether the project would result in any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts. Further, as analyzed in Impact 3A.15-1, the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that significant and unavoidable impacts would occur to area intersections under the existing plus project and cumulative plus project condition. A series of mitigation measures including funding mechanisms were recommended to reduce the impacts of the FPASP; however, some intersections would remain significant and unavoidable. The impacts reported in the FPASP EIR/EIS provide a representation of the conditions that would occur based on the information known at that time. The project’s analysis provides a similar representation of conditions that would occur based on information available today. As described above, significant impacts to four intersections would occur under the project based on the recent traffic analysis. The identification of significant intersection impacts is consistent with the analysis provided in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

- Prairie City Road/Iron Point Road
- East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road
- Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road
- Scott Road (East)/White Rock Road

The intersection of Prairie City Road/Iron Point Road was identified as operating acceptably under existing plus project conditions in the FPASP EIR/EIS (Table 3A.15-16). However, under the updated analysis, a significant intersection impact would occur (Table 4.16-1) if the entire project were built today. Mitigation Measure 4.16-1 (identified below), is recommended and would require the applicant to pay a fee to retim the signal optimization at this intersection. No physical changes to the environment would occur. Signal retiming is a common and recurring action that the City periodically reviews and adjusts as traffic patterns change and growth occurs. With implementation of this mitigation, the impact to this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. No significant impact would remain. This impact would not change the conclusion of Impact 3A.15-1 in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

The intersection of East Bidwell/Iron Point Road was identified as operating unacceptably during p.m. peak hours under existing plus project conditions in the FPASP EIR/EIS (Table 3A.15-16). Similarly, a significant impact was identified for this intersection under the updated analysis (Table 4.16-1). This intersection was identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS (Impact 3A.15-4d) as a significant impact under cumulative conditions. Mitigation was recommended in the EIR/EIS that would require the installation of additional lanes. The City determined that the implementation of intersection expansion as proposed (i.e., eight lanes) may not be feasible from a policy standpoint and no other feasible mitigation was available. Based on current traffic conditions, Fehr and Peers has recommended revised mitigation for this intersection as shown in Mitigation Measure 4.16-2 below. This mitigation would require a slight re-design of the intersection to convert one of the westbound turn lanes to a left-turn lane. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts at this
intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur.

The intersection of Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road was identified as operating unacceptably during p.m. peak hours under existing plus project conditions in the FPASP EIR/EIS (Table 3A.15-16). Similarly, a significant impact was identified for this intersection under the updated analysis (Table 4.16-1). Based on current traffic conditions, Fehr and Peers has recommended revised mitigation for this intersection as shown in Mitigation Measure 4.16-3 below. The mitigation requires the project applicant to pay a fee towards constructing a westbound left-turn lane at the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road intersection.

With implementation of this mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur. This impact would not change the conclusion of Impact 3A.15-1 in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

The intersection at Scott Road (East)/White Rock Road was identified as operating acceptably under existing plus project conditions in the FPASP EIR/EIS (Table 3A.15-16). However, under the updated analysis, a significant intersection impact would occur (Table 4.16-1). Mitigation Measure 4.16-4 (identified below), is recommended and would require the applicant to install a signal at this intersection. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. No significant impacts would remain. This impact would not change the conclusion of Impact 3A.15-1 in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

As presented above, the existing plus project scenario presents a view of what mitigation would be required if the project were to be wholly applied to the existing traffic network. The City would coordinate with the applicant to fund appropriate traffic improvements as they are needed based on the rate of development and the changes in local traffic volumes and infrastructure. None of the mitigation presented above is inconsistent with the traffic improvements projected for cumulative development under the FPASP.

Further, as discussed above, certain impacts and traffic improvements are projected to be required based on information currently known. These conditions could change as the project proceeds through the permitting process and develops. Based upon what is known today, the project (when comparing the FPASP analysis to the project analysis) would result in the improvement of some intersection operations (e.g., Oak Avenue Parkway/Iron Point Road, Rowberry Drive/Iron Point Road, Broadstone Parkway/Iron Point Road, Scott Road/U.S. 50 White Rock Road, and Prairie City Road/Street A, and Oak Avenue/Street A) compared to that presented in the FPASP EIR/EIS and other intersections would operate worse. However, overall the cumulative roadway network and operations would not change (see analysis below) with the changes proposed under the project. The differences presented in this analysis reflects a shuffling and redistribution of the impacts within the roadway network based on conditions known today, but the overall roadway network under cumulative conditions would continue to operate as was projected in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Finally, as acknowledged in Impact 3A.15-1, the FPASP (including Hillsborough at Easton) would result in some area intersections operating unacceptably even with implementation of the project. This conclusion has not changed based on this analysis. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS are valid and no further evaluation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.16-1</th>
<th>Intersection Level of Service – Existing Plus Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prairie City Road/Iron Point Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road</td>
<td>Side-Street Stop Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Scott Road (East)/White Rock Road</td>
<td>All-Way Stop Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr and Peers 2015, Table 7
Impacts to Freeway Facilities
As shown in Table 8 of the transportation impact study (Fehr and Peers 2015), the project would not increase the volume-to-capacity ratio at any applicable freeway facilities that currently operate with unacceptable levels of delay. This would be a less-than-significant impact and no mitigation is needed. Impacts 3A.15-1q, 3A.15-1r, 3A.15-1t, 3A.15-1u, 3A.15-1v, 3A.15-1w, 3A.15-1x, 3A.15-1y, 3A.15-1z, 3A.15-1aa, 3A.15-1bb, 3A.15-1cc, 3A.15-1dd, 3A.15-1ee, 3A.15-1ff, 3A.15-1gg, 3A.15-1hh, and 3A.15-1ii in the FPASP EIR/EIS analyzed the potential impacts caused by the adoption of the FPASP. While mitigation measures were included (listed below) to address these impacts, some remained significant and unavoidable. As described in the revised traffic study, the project does not result in any new significant or substantially more severe impacts to freeway facilities. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid.

Impacts to the Transit System
The project would not disrupt existing or planned transit services or facilities, or create inconsistencies with any adopted plans, guidelines, policies or standards related to transit. Therefore, this impact is considered less-than-significant and no mitigation is needed.

Impacts to Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
The project would construct curb, gutter, and sidewalks on all project roadways to facilitate any potential pedestrian demand. The curb, gutter, and sidewalks would be designed and constructed to meet City standards. The project would not disrupt existing or planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities or create inconsistencies with any adopted plans, guidelines, policies or standards related to bicycle or pedestrian systems. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Impacts due to Construction-Related Activities
Similar to that identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS in Impact 3A.14-1, construction of the project may include disruptions to the transportation network near the site, including the possibility of temporary lane closures, street closures, sidewalk closures, and bikeway closures; however, access to all nearby parcels would be maintained. Pedestrian and bicycle access in the vicinity of the project site may be disrupted. Heavy vehicles would access the site and may need to be staged for construction. These activities could result in degraded roadway operating conditions and degraded emergency access. Therefore, the impacts are considered significant for the FPASP and project. Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1 would require the applicant to implement a construction management plan that would ensure that adequate emergency response access would be maintained throughout development of the project. The project would be subject to this mitigation. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Impacts to Intersections in Cumulative Conditions
As shown in Table 4.16-2, all study intersections located north of U.S. 50 that operate with unacceptable levels of delay under cumulative conditions without the proposed project would continue to operate with similar levels of delay with implementation of the proposed project, and would not experience increases in delay of five or more seconds during a peak hour. Additionally, all intersections south of US 50 within the FPASP would continue to operate at LOS D or better with implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in any new significant or substantially more severe impacts and no further analysis is required.
### Table 4.16-2  Intersection Level of Service – Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Minimum Acceptable LOS</th>
<th>Cumulative No Project AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Cumulative No Project PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Cumulative Plus Project AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Cumulative Plus Project PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Prairie City Road/ Iron Point Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>37  D  42  D</td>
<td>39  D  43  D</td>
<td>39  D  42  D</td>
<td>39  D  43  D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oak Avenue Parkway/Iron Point Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>34  C  50  D</td>
<td>34  C  51  D</td>
<td>34  C  50  D</td>
<td>34  C  51  D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rowberry Drive/ Iron Point Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>33  C  39  D</td>
<td>33  C  41  D</td>
<td>33  C  39  D</td>
<td>33  C  41  D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East Bidwell Street/ Iron Point Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>52  D  176  F</td>
<td>52  D  176  F</td>
<td>52  D  176  F</td>
<td>52  D  176  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prairie City Road/ U.S. 50 Westbound Ramp</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14  B  7  A</td>
<td>15  B  7  A</td>
<td>15  B  7  A</td>
<td>15  B  7  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. East Bidwell Street, Ponceville Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21*  C*  43*  D*</td>
<td>22*  C*  44*  D*</td>
<td>22*  C*  43*  D*</td>
<td>22*  C*  44*  D*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Prairie City Road/ White Rock Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>11  B  12  B</td>
<td>14  B  16  B</td>
<td>14  B  16  B</td>
<td>14  B  16  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Scott Road (West)/ White Rock Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5  A  4  A</td>
<td>5  A  4  A</td>
<td>5  A  4  A</td>
<td>5  A  4  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Scott Road (East)/ White Rock Road</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16  B  17  B</td>
<td>18  B  18  B</td>
<td>18  B  18  B</td>
<td>18  B  18  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Prairie City Road/Easton Valley Parkway</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>46  D  31  C</td>
<td>48  D  33  C</td>
<td>48  D  33  C</td>
<td>48  D  33  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Prairie City Road/ Street D</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Control</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1(17)  A(C) 1(14)  A(B)</td>
<td>1(17)  A(C) 1(14)  A(B)</td>
<td>1(17)  A(C) 1(14)  A(B)</td>
<td>1(17)  A(C) 1(14)  A(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Internal Road / Street A</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7  A  8  A</td>
<td>8  A  9  A</td>
<td>8  A  9  A</td>
<td>8  A  9  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Easton Valley Parkway/Oak Avenue Parkway</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>33  C  24  C</td>
<td>35  D  27  C</td>
<td>35  D  27  C</td>
<td>35  D  27  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Oak Avenue Parkway/ Street D</td>
<td>Two-Way Stop Control</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3(16)  A(C) 3(21)  A(C)</td>
<td>3(15)  A(C) 3(20)  A(C)</td>
<td>3(15)  A(C) 3(20)  A(C)</td>
<td>3(15)  A(C) 3(20)  A(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Oak Avenue Parkway/Street A</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16  B  16  B</td>
<td>16  B  16  B</td>
<td>16  B  16  B</td>
<td>16  B  16  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Scott Road (East)/Easton Valley Parkway</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24  C  49  D</td>
<td>23  C  52  D</td>
<td>23  C  52  D</td>
<td>23  C  52  D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Scott Road (East)/Street A</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15  B  16  B</td>
<td>15  B  18  B</td>
<td>15  B  18  B</td>
<td>15  B  18  B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ¹ For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for the overall intersection. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for the worst individual movement. All results are rounded to the nearest second.

Source: Fehr and Peers 2015, Table 11

---

**Impacts to Freeway Facilities under Cumulative Conditions**

Project trips were assigned to the study facilities in accordance with the trip generation and distribution assumptions described previously. Table 4.16-3 shows the cumulative plus project LOS results for the study freeway facilities. The detailed technical calculations are provided in Appendix D of the transportation impact study (see Appendix B).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Cumulative No Project</th>
<th>Cumulative Plus Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>U.S. 50, Folsom Blvd. to Prairie City Rd.</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>28.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50 between Prairie City Rd. Ramps</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prairie City Rd. On-Ramp</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50, Prairie City Rd. to Oak Ave.</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50 between Oak Ave. Ramps</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Ave. Loop On-Ramp</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50, Oak Ave. to Scott Rd.</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>22.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50, Easton Ramps</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Rd. Loop On-Ramp</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50, Scott Rd. to Empire Ranch Rd</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>16.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>U.S. 50, Empire Ranch Rd. to E. Bidwell Rd.</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50 between E. Bidwell Rd. Ramps</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Bidwell Rd. Loop On-Ramp</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50, E. Bidwell Rd. to Oak Ave.</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>23.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50 between Oak Ave. Ramps</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Ave. Loop On-Ramp</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50, Oak Ave. to Prairie City Rd.</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. 50 between Prairie City Rd. Ramps</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prairie City Rd. Loop On-Ramp</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prairie City Rd. to Folsom Blvd.</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>24.7**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *CM 2000 used to analyze this intersection because HCM 2010 methodology only supports strict NEMA phasing.

**Bold** indicates unacceptable operations.

*Bold* indicates significant impact.

1 For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for the overall intersection. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for the worst individual movement. All results are rounded to the nearest second.

Source: Fehr and Peers 2015, Table 12

As shown in Table 4.16-3, the operations of all freeway segments that were evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS and evaluated in this project analysis would not substantially differ from the projections included in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur. The conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis is required.

The project analysis prepared for Hillsborough at Easton included additional freeway segments that were not evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The analysis of these intersections was requested by the City and in
response to changed requirements of the Highway Capacity Manual. As shown in Table 4.16-3, the project would add traffic to the eastbound segment of US 50 between the Oak Avenue ramps, resulting in the LOS on this segment deteriorating to LOS F during the PM peak hour. The FPASP EIR/EIS evaluated the eastbound US 50 freeway segments from Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway and from Oak Avenue Parkway to East Bidwell Street-Scott Road. The segment between the Oak Avenue ramps falls within the two segments listed above. As described in Table 3A.15-32 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the segment between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway would operate unacceptably. No new significant impact would occur. Based on current traffic conditions, Fehr and Peers has recommended enhanced mitigation for this intersection as shown in Mitigation Measure 4.16-5 below. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, no new significant or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1: Prepare and Implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1a: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 1).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1b: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements at the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 2).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1c: The Applicant Shall Fund and Construct Improvements to the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 28).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1e: Fund and Construct Improvements to the Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Intersection 41).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1f: Fund and Construct Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road Intersection (Intersection 44).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1h: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 2).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1i: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection and to White Rock Road widening between the Rancho Cordova City limit to Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Intersection 3).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1j: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive (Roadway Segment 10).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1l: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the White Rock Road/Windfield Way Intersection (El Dorado County Intersection 3).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1o: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound US 50 as an alternative to improvements at the Folsom Boulevard/US 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 4).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1p: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/ State Route 16 Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 12).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1q: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).
**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1r:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 3).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1s:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 4).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1u:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Westbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 16).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1v:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 18).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1w:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 4).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1x:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Diverge (Freeway Diverge 5).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1y:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Direct Merge (Freeway Merge 6).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1z:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover On-Ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway Off-Ramp Weave (Freeway Weave 8).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1aa:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Merge (Freeway Merge 9).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1dd:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 23).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ee:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 29).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ff:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 32).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1gg:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Direct Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 33).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1hh:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard Diverge (Freeway Diverge 34).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ii:** Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Hazel Avenue Direct Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 38).

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2a:** Develop Commercial Support Services and Mixed-use Development Concurrent with Housing Development, and Develop and Provide Options for Alternative Transportation Modes.

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2b:** Participate in the City’s Transportation System Management Fee Program.

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2c:** Participate with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association.

**Mitigation Measure 3A.15-3:** Pay Full Cost of Identified Improvements that Are Not Funded by the City’s Fee Program.
Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4a: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 2).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4b: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwel Street Intersection (Folsom Intersection 6).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-7c: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the East Bidwel Street/Nesmith Court Intersection (Folsom Intersection 7).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4d: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the East Bidwel Street/Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 21).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4e: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Serpa Way/Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 23).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4f: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 24).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4g: The Applicant Shall Fund and Construct Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Folsom Intersection 33).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4i: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 3).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4j: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Sacramento County Roadway Segments 5-7).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4k: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 8).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4l: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Sacramento County Roadway Segment s 12-13).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4m: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 22).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4n: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 28).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4o: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road Intersection (El Dorado County 1).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4p: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 1).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4q: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4r: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 3).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4s: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 5).
Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4t: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (Freeway Segment 6).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4u: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Slip Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 6).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4v: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover On Ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway Off Ramp Weave (Freeway Weave 7).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4w: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 8).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4x: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 27).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4y: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 35).

In addition to the mitigation measures in the EIR/EIS (listed above), the updated traffic study provided the following mitigation measures that would be required for the project (Fehr and Peers 2015).

Mitigation Measure 4.16-1: Prairie City Road/Iron Point Road.

Before the issuance of a building permit, the project applicant shall pay the appropriate fee to the City of Folsom to retimer the traffic signal at the Prairie City Road/Iron Point Road intersection to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. The fee will be determined by the City of Folsom based on their standard rates for traffic signal retiming pursuant to Section 12.04.060 of the City's Municipal Code. Implementation of this improvement would result in acceptable operation (Fehr and Peers 2015).

Mitigation Measure 4.16-2: East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road.

Project applicant shall pay a fair share fee towards the following improvements to the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersection: Modify westbound approach to include three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane. This mitigation would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. Mitigation Measure 4.16-3: Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road.

The project applicant shall pay a fee towards constructing a westbound left-turn lane at the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.16-4: Scott Road (East)/White Rock Road.

The project applicant shall pay a fee towards adding a southbound left-turn lane and installation of a traffic signal at the Scott Road (East)/White Rock Road intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.16-5: East Bidwell/Scott Road.

The project applicant shall pay the applicable capital improvement program fee, which includes the construction of auxiliary lanes on U.S. 50 from Sunrise Boulevard to East Bidwell Street/Scott Road.
### 4.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the Project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-1 to 3A.16-6 and 3A.18-1 to 3A.18-6, Impacts 3A.16-1, 3A.16-2, 3A.18-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, 3A.16-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-1 to 3A.16-3 and 3A.18-1 to 3A.18-6, Impacts 3A.16-1, 3A.16-2, 3A.18-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, 3A.16-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>Setting p. 4-68</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-1 to 3A.18-6, Impact 3A.18-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-1 to 3A.16-3, Impacts 3A.16-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, 3A.16-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-3 to 3A.16-4, Impacts 3A.16-6, 3A.16-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.16-4, Impacts 3A.16-6, 3A.16-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Create demand for natural gas, electricity, telephone, and other utility services that cannot be met.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-5 to 3A.16-7, Impacts 3A.16-8, 3A.16-9, 3A.16-10, 3A.16-11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Result in inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-5 to 3A.16-6, 3A.16-8, Impact 3A.16-12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.17.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to utilities and service systems as described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.16 under Utilities and Service Systems has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011.

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
As described below under b), the project site is not currently served by a municipal wastewater collection system. However, the proposed wastewater infrastructure for the FPASP area is described on pages 2-26 to 2-31 and as described therein, the system would be designed to meet RWQCP and City wastewater treatment requirements and wastewater would ultimately be conveyed to the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District regional facility for treatment and disposal. The regional facility treats wastewater in compliance with its RWQCB Waste Discharge Requirement permit. While some infrastructure associated with the approved private school would be redesigned for residential development, the overall wastewater system would continue to comply with RWQCB requirements. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described in the EIR/EIS under Impacts 3A.16-1, 3A.16-2, 3A.18-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5, the project site is not served by a municipal wastewater collection system and both on-site and off-site wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure need to be designed. The EIR/EIS analyzed the potential demand on facilities for the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, El Dorado Irrigation District, and El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant. The EIR/EIS concluded that the impacts to these facilities could be potentially significant. A technical memo was prepared in March 2016 (MacKay & Somps 20116b) that compared the sanitary sewer demand of the Hillsborough at Easton site under the approved FPASP to the demand under the project. The project would decrease demand on sanitary sewer by 0.03 million gallons per day. Therefore, there would be no impacts beyond that already discussed in the FPASP EIR/EIS. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.16-1, 3A.18-2a, 3A.18-2b, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5, the impacts would be reduced to less than significant for all impacts except for the potentially significant and unavoidable impacts addressing environmental effects associated with improvements to treatment plant facilities. These conclusions are the same as that presented in the EIR/EIS. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
The approved FPASP would require new storm water drainage facilities. These were included in the approved FPASP and the potential significant environmental effects were analyzed throughout the EIR/EIS. MacKay & Somps prepared a technical memo that reviewed the stormwater drainage demands of project in comparison to the approved FPASP and evaluated whether the storm drainage facilities as planned in the Folsom Plan Area Storm Drainage Master Plan (FPASDMP) were adequate to serve the project (MacKay & Somps 2014b). MacKay & Somps determined that modifications in the detention/hydromodification basins (which are included in the design of the proposed project) would allow the project to be consistent with the FPASDMP. Therefore, no new off-site infrastructure or changes to the approved backbone infrastructure would be required. These design changes can be accommodated in the plan area. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

As analyzed in the EIR/EIS under Impact 3A.18-1, the proposed water supply would be adequate to meet the projected water demand by the FPASP in both normal and critically dry years. However, the EIR/EIS concluded that the impact to water supplies was potentially significant because of the possibility that the water infrastructure to accommodate the FPASP may not be developed or coordinated fully with the development of houses and other water using land types. To reduce this potential impact to less than significant, Mitigation Measure 3A.18-1 required all applicants to submit proof of surface water supply availability. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

In October 2015, MacKay & Somps evaluated the water demand of the project in comparison to the approved FPASP for the Hillsborough at Easton. MacKay & Somps determined that, with the changes to land uses, the water demand would be decreased to 1,251 acre-feet per year compared to the approved plan (1,295 acre-feet per year) because the school was estimated to have a higher water demand than what would be required by the additional residential units proposed under the project. Therefore, the project would not exceed water demands estimated in the Folsom Specific Plan Area SB 6.10 Water Assessment prepared for the FPASP. Further, sufficient water supplies are available to meet the project’s long-term water demands. Finally, the project would continue to comply with mitigation recommended in the FPASP.

In November 2012, the City considered and adopted an addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS that assessed the environmental impacts of changing the approved water supply for the FPASP to the Revised Proposed Off-Site Water Facility Alternative, which would use water obtained through the City’s conservation activities and exchange of supplies with the City’s east area (City of Folsom 2012). The addendum concluded that water supplies under the Off-Site Water Facility Alternative would be more secure than the originally considered water supply plan, and landowners in the FPASP would be required to implement the previously adopted mitigation measures, which require submittal of proof of surface water supply availability and adequate water service infrastructure prior to approval of new development (Water Addendum, pp. 3-18 to 3-19.) Thus, with these mitigation measures in place, it is reasonable to conclude that development in the FPASP, including this project, would not outpace the City’s available water supplies. As discussed in Response to Comment 7-15 of the Russell Ranch Final EIR (City of Folsom 2015), the City has reviewed its water supply extensively to ensure that “the City will meet its diversion in ‘dry’ and ‘extremely dry’ conditions” (City of Folsom 2015), such as is being experienced in the current drought. The City “has considered and analyzed in its most recent Urban Water Management Plan (adopted June 14, 2011) the effects of implementing conservation measures in increasingly stricter stages that are designed to reduce water use City-wide” (City of Folsom 2015).

Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand, in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Under Impacts 3A.16-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5, the EIR/EIS analyzed the potential demand on wastewater facilities for the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, El Dorado Irrigation District, and El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant. A technical memo was prepared in March 2016 (MacKay & Somps 2016b) that compared the sanitary sewer demand of the Hillsborough at Easton area under the approved FPASP to the demand under the project. The Hillsborough at Easton project would decrease demand on sanitary sewer by 0.03 million gallons per day. The project would continue to comply with Mitigation Measures 3A.18-2a, 3A.18-2b, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5 in the FPASP which address ensuring adequate wastewater treatment capacity. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the potential for inadequate capacity to serve the project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because the applicant would be required to reach out to service providers to ensure adequate capacity is available and submit the proof of adequate capacity to the City before
the City would issue building permits. Because no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Impact 3A.16-6 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzed short-term generation of solid waste during project construction while Impact 3A.16-7 analyzed increased long-term generation of solid waste. The EIR/EIS found that the estimated waste generated both long- and short-term by the project could be accommodated within the existing landfills. For project, there would be more solid waste generated by new residents (estimated at 1,116 additional persons) and new employees. Based on the California Integrated Waste Management Board generation rates for Sacramento County (0.36 ton per resident per year, 1.7 tons of waste per employee per year) as found in the EIR/EIS (pages 3A.16-4 and 3A.16-31), residents would generate an additional 401.76 tons of solid waste per year and employees approximately 311.1 fewer tons of solid waste per year (assuming 183 fewer employees based on an average 255 square feet per employee as calculated from the Draft EIR/EIS). The approximately 91 additional tons per year could be accommodated in the remaining capacity of the Kiefer Landfill. This additional waste would account for less than 0.001 percent of the 10,800 maximum tons per day capacity. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

In Impacts 3A.16-6 and 3A.16-7, the EIR/EIS describes how the FPASP would comply with statutes and regulations related to solid waste. These impacts (Impact 3A.16-6 and 3A.16-7) were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation measures were required. The project would continue to comply with these statues and regulations. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

h) Create demand for natural gas, electricity, telephone, and other utility services that cannot be met.

In Impacts 3A.16-8, 3A.16-9, 3A.16-10, 3A.16-11, the EIR/EIS analyzed the demand for utilities and services not already covered in other discussions. The EIR/EIS found that the impacts to electricity service, natural gas, telecommunications service, and cable television and communications service would be less than significant and no mitigation measures were required. The project would not result in substantial land use changes that would substantially change estimated demands for these services. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

i) Result in inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

As described in Impact 3A.16-12, the FPASP would increase the consumption of energy. However, the FPASP would need to comply with Building Energy Efficiency Standards included in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and implement an Air Quality Management Plan. This impact (Impact 3A.16-12) was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required. The project would continue to comply with Title 24 requirements. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project was approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.16-1: Submit Proof of Adequate On- and Off-Site Wastewater Conveyance Facilities and Implement On- and Off-Site Infrastructure Service Systems or Ensure That Adequate Financing Is Secured.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.16-3: Demonstrate Adequate SRWTP Wastewater Treatment Capacity.
Mitigation Measure 3A.16-4: Submit Proof of Adequate EID Off-Site Wastewater Conveyance Facilities and Implement EID Off-Site Infrastructure Service Systems or Ensure That Adequate Financing Is Secured.

Mitigation Measure 3A.16-5: Demonstrate Adequate El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity.

Mitigation Measure 3A.18-1: Submit Proof of Surface Water Supply Availability.

Mitigation Measure 3A.18-2a: Submit Proof of Adequate Off-Site Water Conveyance Facilities and Implement Off-Site Infrastructure Service System or Ensure That Adequate Financing Is Secured.

Mitigation Measure 3A.18-2b: Demonstrate Adequate Off-Site Water Treatment Capacity (if the Off-Site Water Treatment Plant Option is Selected).

CONCLUSION
No changes in circumstances would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts related to utilities and service systems, compared to the analysis presented in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, the conclusions of the certified Final EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis is required.
### 4.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
<td>Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, discussed throughout environmental checklist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to 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 an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 4-1 to 4-20 Impacts pp. 4-20 to 4-64</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, discussed throughout environmental checklist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Since the EIR/EIS was certified, there have been regulatory changes with regards to air quality and greenhouse gases. However, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts to air quality or greenhouse gases were identified.

All approved mitigation in the EIR/EIS or contained in this document would continue to be implemented with the proposed project. Therefore, no new significant impacts would occur with implementation of the proposed project.
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PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PROJECT TITLE
Folsom Heights General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment

PROPOSAL
Request for approval of: Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) Final EIR/EIS, General Plan Amendment and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Amendment

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Approve, based upon findings

OWNER / APPLICANT
Folsom Heights, LLC

LOCATION
The Folsom Heights project site is located along the north-eastern boundary of the FPASP area, just south of U.S. Highway 50, along the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line (see Figure 1)

SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The project area is undeveloped grassland, currently used for cattle grazing. Developed land north of the project area consists of large residential and commercial developments. The topography of the area consists of gently rolling hills.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS
SF Single Family
SFHD Single Family High Density
MLD Multifamily Low Density
GC General Commercial
P-QP Public / Quasi Public
OS Open Space

ZONING
SP-SF Single Family
SP-SFHD Single Family High Density
SP-MLD Multifamily Low Density
SP-GC General Commercial
SP-P/QP Public / Quasi Public
SP-OS1 Preserve Open Space
SP-OS2 Passive Open Space

ADJACENT LAND USES / ZONING:
North: US Highway 50
East: Open Space and single-family residential homes located in El Dorado County.

South: Open Space and vacant, undeveloped property approved for single-family residential development (Russel Ranch).

West: Open Space and vacant, undeveloped property approved for single-family residential development (Russel Ranch).

PREVIOUS ACTIONS

1. Local Agency Formation Commission approval of Annexation of 3500 acres to Folsom in 2011
2. Approval of Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in 2011
3. Approval of Tier I Development Agreement in 2011
4. Approval of Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan in 2014
5. Approval of First Amended and Restated Tier I Development Agreement in 2014

FUTURE ACTIONS

1. Approval of Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan
2. Approval of Tentative Subdivision Map
3. Approval of Design Guidelines
4. Approval of Open Space Management and Financing Plan
5. Approval of and Recordation of Subdivision Maps
6. Issuance of Improvement Plans
7. Issuance of Grading and Building Permits

ATTACHED REFERENCE MATERIAL

1. Location Map
2. Folsom Heights GPA Exhibit
3. Folsom Heights SPA Exhibit
4. Composite Land Use Map with proposed Folsom Heights Land Uses
5. Approved FPASP with Proposed Folsom Heights Land Use
6. Dwelling Unit Allocation Map
7. Land Use Summary
8. Bike Trail Exhibit from Parks and Recreation Commission Staff Report
9. Environmental Checklist and Addendum for Folsom Heights Specific Plan Amendment
PROJECT PLANNER

George Djan, AICP, Contract Planner

BACKGROUND

The subject site is located in the Folsom Plan Area and is generally located at the southeast corner of Highway 50 and Prairie City Road and White Rock Road and Prairie City Road. The proposed project site is part of the approved Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP), which is a comprehensively planned community that proposes new development based upon principles of “Smart Growth” and Transit Oriented Development. The FPASP area is generally bounded by Prairie City Road on the west, Highway 50 (US 50) on the north, and White Rock Road on the south and the Sacramento County/El Dorado County boundary on the east. The adopted FPASP included 10,210 residential units at various densities on a total of 1,477.2 acres; 362.8 acres designated for commercial and industrial use, including a regional shopping center; public/quasi-public uses; elementary, middle, and high schools on 179.3 acres; 121.7 acres of community and neighborhood parks; storm water detention basins; 1,053.1 acres of open-space areas and open-space preserves; and major roads with landscaping.

Subsequent to the original approval of the FPASP, the City Council has approved the Russell Ranch SPA, the Westland/Eagle SPA, Mangini Ranch, and the White Rock Springs Ranch projects. With an increase in dwelling units in the Westland/Eagle project, the total number of dwelling units in the FPASP was increased from 10,210 to 10,817.

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL

The applicant’s proposal will amend the FPASP and Folsom General Plan to:

1. Reduce the General Commercial (GC) acreage by 23 acres (from 34.5 acres to 11.5 acres).
2. Increase the Single-Family (SF) acreage by 2.7 acres (from 35 acres to 37.7 acres), with a corresponding increase of 19 dwelling units.
3. Increase the Single-Family High Density (SFHD) acreage by 27.2 acres (from 31 acres to 58.2 acres), with a corresponding increase of 109 dwelling units.
4. Reduce the Multi-Family Low Density (MLD) acreage by 13 acres (from 27.9 acres to 14.9 acres) with a corresponding decrease of 128 dwelling units.
5. Increase Open Space (OS) acreage by 4.1 acres (from 43.1 acres to 47.2 acres).
6. Decrease Open Space Highway (Hwy RW) acreage by 0.7 acres (from 8.7 acres to 8 acres).
7. Provide 1.8 acres of Public/Quasi Public land for purposes of constructing a water tank.

The total number of dwelling units will not change and will remain at 530, same as was allocated to Folsom Heights in the FPASP in 2011.

The General Plan/Specific Plan amendment includes a “floating” 1-acre private amenity facility to be located with Folsom Heights. Actual location and type of amenity will be determined at Tentative Subdivision Map stage.

The applicant’s proposal does not include any policy changes or amendments to development standards. Upon approval of the proposed project, a number of Figures and Tables in the FPASP
would be updated to reflect the approvals. Staff and the applicant have agreed that this effort will be more efficient with one comprehensive update of the Specific Plan document when the outcome of other proposed FPASPs amendments by other applicants are known. Staff is recommending that the comprehensive update be completed as a condition of approval of the proposed FPASP amendments.

No changes are proposed to the FPASP circulation plan, although local streets will be aligned with roadways in adjoining Russell Ranch where necessary.

Below, Table 1-1 shows the adopted land use summary, Table 1-2 shows the proposed land use summary for the project, and Table 1-3 shows the difference in land use acreage, dwelling units, population, and commercial square footage that would result from the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-1</th>
<th>Adopted FPASP Land Use Summary (Folsom Heights Project Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gross Area (Acres)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use District (MU)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation and Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Site (POP)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 50</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Folsom Heights</td>
<td>189.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use falls within the specified density range and the total residential unit count does not exceed the FPASP area maximum of 10,210 dwelling units.
2. Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multifamily unit.
3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 5,199,409 SF is not exceeded.
### Table 1-2 Proposed Folsom Heights Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/ac)</th>
<th>Target DU</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>125,235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation and Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Site (PQP)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 50</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Folsom Heights</strong></td>
<td><strong>189.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>530</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,425</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate.
2. Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multifamily unit.
3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 3,336,612 SF is not exceeded.

### Table 1-3 Summary of Changes Associated with the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>+2.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>+27.2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>+319</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>-249</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>+4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Site (PQP)</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 50</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+125</td>
<td>-255,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Numbers may not match exactly because of small rounding errors.
- Source: Adapted by Ascent Environmental 2016
PROJECT ANALYSIS

General Plan & Specific Plan Amendments

The following is staff’s evaluation of the applicant’s proposed land use changes.

1. Reduction of Commercial acreage. The most significant element of the land use changes is the reduction of commercial acreage from 34.5 acres to 11.5 acres. The General Commercial (GC) land use designation provides for a wide range of highway oriented retail, office, manufacturing, lodging and service uses. The applicant cites topography as one of the primary reasons for reducing the acreage. Commercial development would require more significant grading than residential uses. The other reason is to “right-size” the commercial site for the intended use as neighborhood commercial center, capitalizing on good freeway access and visibility. The desire is to ensure reasonable market absorption of commercial development and to serve the neighboring residential uses.

With the changing retail landscape with increasing proportion of sales online, staff has no objection to the reduction of the commercial acreage, especially given the need for significant grading to accommodate the uses. There have been other studies in the plan area examining the optimum amount of commercial space needed in the plan area and in the City as a whole. The reduction is relatively minor, and staff supports the land use change.

2. Residential land use changes. The most significant modifications to residential land use involve a reduction in the Multi-Family Low Density (MLD) by 13 acres and an increase of 27.2 acres in the Single-family High Density (SFHD). A significant portion of this increase is also derived from the GC land use category. The number of dwelling units will remain the same, which means the density will be lower than the current. The approved plan density is 5.6 dwelling units per acre, compared with 4.8 dwelling units per acre for the proposed amendments. Along the east boundary where the slopes are generally steeper, the SF land use category has been increased slightly to create larger lots which are more compatible with the existing residences. These lots also provide room to capture slopes within the lots and still provide for reasonable building pads. The increased SFHD in the middle provides a transition between the larger lots on the east and the MLD parcels along Empire Ranch Road.

Staff has had the opportunity to review preliminary layouts and grading for the project and find the proposed land use modifications acceptable based on the increased compatibility with the adjoining residences to the east and the reduced grading resulting from the land use changes.

3. Open Space. The proposed plan will increase the amount of open space by 4.1 acres in the OS zone. Section 7.08C of the City Charter (also known as Measure W) requires 30% of the FPASP area to be maintained as natural open space to preserve oak woodlands and sensitive habitat areas. Section 7.08C also restricts the definition of open space: “Natural open space shall not include active park sites, residential yard areas, golf courses, parking lots, and their associated landscaping.

The 30% requirement is implemented on a plan area-wide basis. While most of the individual projects in the Folsom Plan Area meet or exceed the 30% threshold, others such as Folsom Heights do not meet the 30%. The original FPASP showed 43.1 acres or 27% of
open space in Folsom Heights. The proposed plan will increase the open space to 47.2 acres. Thus, the proposed plan helps improve the percentage of open space in the FPASP area. Table 2 shows the OS acreage at the time of original approval, and the current snapshot of OS acreage, based on recent SPA approvals and pending approvals. Assuming the pending projects are approved, there will be a net gain of 3.3 acres of OS compared to the 2011 original approval. The key point is the overall FPASP meets or exceeds the 30% requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project / Application</th>
<th>Change in OS Acres from 2011</th>
<th>Acres of Plan Area Open Space</th>
<th>% of Plan Area Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPASP 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,063.3</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved Russell Ranch</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1,072.9</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved Mangini Ranch Phase 1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1,075.2</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved Westland/Eagle SPA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,075.2</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed Hillsborough SPA</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>1,059.3</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed White Rock Springs Ranch</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,060.6</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Car Trust</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1,060.9</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed Broadstone Estates</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,062.5</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed Folsom Heights</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1,066.6</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total FPASP</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1,066.6</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2011 FPASP Plan Area Acreage: 3,513.4

Note: This table is subject to change for the proposed Projects / Applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>actual 30% Measure W requirement acreage</th>
<th>1,054.0 acres open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>surplus OS acreage in adopted FPASP 2011</td>
<td>9.3 acres open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surplus OS ac. in approved &amp; proposed projects (2016)</td>
<td>3.3 acres open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total surplus acreage in FPASP (current 'snapshot')</td>
<td>12.6 acres open space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Specific Plan provides two distinct open space categories within the open space land use designation. The first zone, preserve open space (SP-OS1), is the more restrictive of the two and is intended to preserve and protect wetlands, vernal pools, ponds, creeks and tributaries under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed plan shows a reduction of 2.4 acres of SP-OS1, reflecting updated acreages of wetland and other regulated biological resources within the Folsom Heights property. The second zone, passive open space (SP-OS2) is less restrictive and is intended to provide passive recreational uses and buffers, including trails. The proposed plan shows an increase of 6.5 acres of SP-OS2. The refinement to OS boundaries and acreages is intended preserve open space resources, including hillsides. Staff supports the OS boundary adjustments reflecting a net increase of 4.1 acres in open space.

**Utility Site (PQP).** The proposal includes designation of 1.8 acres of GC-zoned land to PQP for purposes of constructing a water tank to serve the FPASP. Staff supports this designation as it provides needed water facilities for the project.

**Land Use Compatibility.** The properties surrounding the project site include primarily residential land uses to the east, south and west. To the north, the project site is bordered by Highway 50. Folsom Heights is buffered by open space on almost all sides, with the exception
of a small portion on the southwest boundary with Russell Ranch. The GC land use on the north side provides a buffer between the residential uses and Highway 50. All of the proposed land uses are compatible with the adjacent land uses and are compatible internally.

With the proposed land use changes, Folsom Heights remains consistent with the FPASP community vision, design framework, and planning principles. We recommend approval of the land use changes.

**Services and Utilities**
Because the proposed number of dwelling units are the same and the GC commercial acreage is reduced, the project’s demand for water, sewer, police, fire protection, schools and parks are the same or less than envisioned in the original approval. No additional capacity or services increase will result with approval of the proposed modifications. As discussed in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, water and sewer to the subject site will be served by El Dorado Irrigation District (EID).

**Special Conditions**
There is on-going discussion between the City of Folsom and FPASP landowners regarding the future location of a City Corporation Yard. Until this issue is resolved to the satisfaction of the City, it is proposed that a condition be imposed requiring that an acceptable Corporation Yard site be identified prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPASP area.

A similar situation exists regarding the location of a future high school and middle school in the FPASP area. Discussions are on-going between the Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD) and FPASP landowners regarding the location of a future high school and middle school serving the plan area. Until this issue is resolved to the satisfaction of the City and FCUSD, it is proposed that a condition be imposed requiring that acceptable high school and middle school sites be identified prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPASP area.

**PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION**

On April 5, 2016, the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting unanimously approved the Folsom Heights project with the following conditions:

1. Condition the Folsom Heights Specific Plan Amendment and development Plans to include the Class I bike trails as indicated in the adopted FPASP with the additional Class I bike trail neighborhood connection within the Folsom Heights Development Area as shown on Attachment 1 (exhibit found in Attachment No. 8).
2. The Folsom Heights Specific Plan Amendment parkland dedication obligation increases by 0.63-acres.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has prepared the attached checklist, which analyzes the proposed changes to the FPASP. The conclusion drawn from the analysis is that none of the changes or revisions proposed by the project would result in significant new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, 15164, and 15168. Accordingly, an Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Environmental Impact Report has been prepared for this project. The complete analysis is included in the attached documentation.

RECOMMENDED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE ADDENDUM TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN EIR;

AND

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE FOLSOM HEIGHTS PROJECT;

AND

MOVE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN FOR THE FOLSOM HEIGHTS PROJECT WITH CONDITIONS 1 THROUGH 6.

GENERAL FINDINGS

A. NOTICE OF HEARING HAS BEEN GIVEN AT THE TIME AND IN THE MANNER REQUIRED BY LAW

B. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CODE OF THE CITY

CEQA FINDINGS

C. A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT WAS PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA AND NEPA

D. AN ADDENDUM TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA.
E. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED THE ADDENDUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT BEFORE MAKING A DECISION REGARDING THE PROJECT.

F. THE ADDENDUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REFLECTS THE INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM.

G. NONE OF THE CONDITIONS DESCRIBED IN SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES CALLING FOR THE PREPARATION OF A SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT HAVE OCCURRED.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FINDING

H. THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CITY OF FOLSOM GENERAL PLAN.

I. THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE CITY’S GENERAL PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES.

J. THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65352.3 IN THAT NO TRIBES REQUESTED CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT FINDING

K. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN IS CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY’S GENERAL PLAN (AS AMENDED), ZONING CODE, AND THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

DAVID E. MILLER, AICP
Public Works and Community Development Director
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The Folsom Heights Specific Plan Amendment and development Plans shall include the Class I bike trails as indicated in the adopted FPASP with the additional Class I bike trail neighborhood connection within the Folsom Heights Development Area.

2. The Folsom Heights Specific Plan Amendment parkland dedication obligation increases by 0.63-acres.

3. The Owner/Applicant shall update the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan to include all new or modified tables, maps, text, etc. to reflect any and all modifications that will result from approval of the project. The owner/applicant shall submit an electronic version of the Specific Plan that accounts for all revisions as a result of this project to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

4. Prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or first building permit if development may occur without any subdivision), a site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4 of the ARDA, as may be amended or as otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard, with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City’s determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City.

The City intends to impose this condition equitably throughout the Plan Area. If the City fails to impose such a condition with, at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), this condition of approval shall be null and void as to Owner/Applicant’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final small lot map for Owner/Applicant’s Project. If the City approves any other final small lot map for a project within the Plan Area and the Corporation Yard site has not been approved as provided for herein, Owner/Applicant may seek relief from the terms of this condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council.

5. The final locations for a site suitable and feasible for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area have not been approved by the Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

Prior to approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or first building permit if development may occur without any subdivision), the sites for the future high school and middle schools in the Folsom Plan Area will be identified and approved by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District.
The City intends to impose this condition equitably throughout the Plan Area as and to each and every Participating Landowner who seeks any future specific plan amendment, tentative subdivision map or ARDA amendment in connection with its proposed development. If the City fails to impose such a condition with, at least substantially similar terms, although precise language may differ (whether through a tentative subdivision map condition of approval, amendment to the specific plan or to a development agreement, or other agreement between the City and a Participating Landowner), this condition of approval shall be null and void as to Owner/Applicant’s Project, and shall not be used as a reason to prevent approval of any final small lot map for Owner/Applicant’s Project. If the City approves any other final small lot map for a project within the Plan Area and the future high school and middle school sites have not been approved as provided for herein, Owner/Applicant may seek relief from the terms of this condition by appeal to the City Manager, with the right to review by the City Council.

6. Owner/Applicant agrees to amend the ARDA with respect to the Folsom Heights project as shown below:

A. Section 1.5.1.1 is hereby added to the ARDA:

Section 1.5.1.1 Consent to Amend PFFP for Additional Reclaimed/Recycled Water System in Backbone Infrastructure. Pursuant to Section 1.5.1, Developer expressly consents to the City amending the PFFP in connection with an update to the Recycled Water Analysis Appendix to the Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan in order to provide funding for additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements to serve Zones 4, 5 and 6 of the FPASP east of Placerville Road, including but not limited to conveyance system and related backbone pipeline. An exhibit depicting said additional reclaimed/recycled water system backbone pipeline improvements prepared as part of the Water System Master Plan update and PFFP amendment will be incorporated into the Restated Development Agreement as Exhibit 1.5.1.1. All provisions in the Restated Agreement relating to PFFP shall include the amendment provided herein and the provisions of Section 2.2.4(4) of the Restated Agreement regarding the potential responsibility for Landowner’s Development to provide funding for additional off-site transmission, on-site storage and other necessary infrastructure shall apply with respect thereto.

B. Section 1.6 is hereby added to the ARDA:

Section 1.6 Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. The City has amended the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (i.e., Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104) by Ordinance No. 1243, to eliminate Second Dwelling Units (also referred to as “granny flats”) as an alternative means of meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements. Landowner acknowledges there is no vested right to use this alternative means for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirements and that this alternative shall not be available to Landowner from and after the date of Ordinance No. 1243. Other than the elimination of the “granny flat” option, the Parties agree that all other alternatives for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing
requirements remain vested to the full extent provided for in the Restated Agreement.

C. Section 2.5.3 of the ARDA is hereby revised and replaced in its entirety as follows:

Section 2.5.3 – Requirements for Subsequent Plans. The provisions of Subsections (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Agreement continue to apply and are not affected by this revision. Subsections (A) and (B) of Section 2.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement are hereby revised to read as follows:

"A. Prior to Approval of First Tentative Small Lot Map:

(1) Public Right-of-Way and Land Dedication Plan; and

(2) Design Guidelines.

"B. Prior to Approval of First Final Small Lot Map in the FPA (or First Building Permit if Development May Occur Without Any Subdivision) or as otherwise specified below:

(1) Open Space Management and Financing Plan;

(2) Drainage Facilities Maintenance and Financing Plan;

(3) Formation of the Sewer and Off-Site Water CFD as provided in the PFFP to fund a portion of the Plan Area sewer and water infrastructure, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the sewer and water infrastructure, on a building permit by building permit basis (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to by Landowner and the City) that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;

(4) Formation of the Aquatic Center CFD related to the recreational facilities that may include an aquatic center, sports complex and/or community center, provided, however, Landowner may elect to exclude the Property, or any portion thereof, from such CFD, subject to Landowner consenting to a map condition and City and Landowner executing an agreement specifying how the Property, or excluded portion thereof, will pay its share of the recreational facilities, on a building permit by building permit basis, (or other payment methodology mutually agreed to between Landowner and the City), that would otherwise be funded by inclusion thereof in the CFD, consistent with the PFFP;
(5) Formation of the Parks, Trails, Landscape Corridors, Medians and Open Space Maintenance CFD (the “Services CFD”), the Storm Drainage Maintenance CFD (unless such drainage maintenance is included in the Services CFD), and the Street Maintenance District/Lighting Maintenance District CFD (unless such street maintenance is included in the Services CFD), as provided in the PFPP;

(6) Adoption of the New Plan Area Fees, including the New Plan Area Fees for City Facilities, the SPIF, and the SPRF, as provided in the PFPP and listed on Exhibit 2.2.4 attached hereto;

(7) Dedication or grant of the rights of way and easements for all Backbone Lands for roadways and utilities within the portion of the Property affected by the Small-Lot Map or anywhere within the Property within thirty (30) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for the dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(8) For each final Small Lot Map, offers of dedication of the Public Parcel(s) described in Section 3.8.5 below located within the portion of the Property affected by the final Small Lot Map, or within sixty (60) days of Landowner’s receipt of a written request for dedication thereof from the City, whichever occurs first;

(9) A site consistent with the requirements of Section 2.2.3.4, as may be amended or otherwise agreed to between the City and the Participating Landowners, shall be identified as acceptable to the City as suitable and feasible for use as the new Corporation Yard with access to sewer, water and all required utility services. The City’s determination of feasibility may include the identification of an alternative site, consistent with the foregoing, as a back-up for the primary site, as well as an evaluation of the time, cost and likelihood of obtaining any necessary entitlements or other governmental approvals for use of the land as a corporation yard, with the final determination of feasibility subject to the sole and reasonable discretion of the City. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion; and

(10) A site or sites identified as suitable by the City, in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District, for use as the future high school and middle school in the Folsom Plan Area shall be identified and approved by the City in consultation with the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. If a supplemental fee is required to support the development of such site(s), Landowner agrees to support the establishment of such fee in accordance with
the Mitigation Fee Act and to pay such fee, so long as such fee is equitably shared by all similar development within the Plan Area. If Landowner proposes final maps in phases, Landowner may apply to the City Manager to permit individual phases to move forward to final map if substantial progress is being made to identify an acceptable site as described above. The City Manager’s determination of substantial progress shall be in his/her sole discretion.

D. Section 4.2.2.1 of the ARDA is hereby revised and replaced in its entirety as follows:

SPIF Reimbursement for Park Dedication Limited to Community Park West Dedication: Payment of SPIF Park Land Equalization Fee Component Upon Approval of a Final Map for Each Subdivision After Exhaustion of Landowner’s Park Land Credits. In no case shall SPIF reimbursement apply for required dedications of parkland pursuant to the City’s Quimby ordinance. In other words, SPIF reimbursement for over-dedication of park land is applicable only for the landowner dedicating the Community Park West (“CPW”) site, the only Landowner dedicating over and above the dedication requirements provided in City ordinances. In place of the City’s Quimby ordinance and specifically any requirement stated therein for payment of an “in-lieu fee,” the SPIF will include a separate component for park land equalization to be paid by all other Landowners (the “Under-dedicating Owners”) to compensate the over-dedicating owner of the CPW site. As more particularly provided by the SPIF Ordinance (now existing or to be established by the City Council, as amended from time to time), each Under-Dedicating Owner will have a different Park Land Equalization Fee for its property (based, in part, on the amount of park land being dedicated by such Under-Dedicating Owner and credited against its fair share park land obligation) and will begin paying its share of this fee after exhausting the park land credits associated with its own park land dedications. As provided by the SPIF Ordinance, once such fee becomes payable, the Park Land Equalization Fee will be due for an entire Small-Lot Map as each map exceeds the park land dedication credit. For example in an 800 unit project with four subdivision maps and a 357 unit parkland dedication credit, the Parkland Equalization fee shall be due for each map that exceeds the 357th unit and calculated by the units in that subdivision times the existing fee. Landowner acknowledges that the obligation to pay this fee may be included as a condition of each tentative subdivision map for which the payment will become due (after application of applicable park land dedication credits). Prior to approval of each Final Small-Lot Map within the Property, in accordance with the SPIF Ordinance, Landowner shall confirm in writing with the City either that (i) the park land equalization component of the SPIF is not then payable due to its offsetting park land dedication credits or (ii) the amount of the SPIF fee component for park land equalization then due and payable with respect to such Small-Lot Map. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to Landowner if the Property that is the subject of this
Agreement includes the CPW site. The references herein to “CPW site” includes both the site identified in Figure 9.1 in the Specific Plan and the Alternate Park site specified in Section 2.2.3 and as depicted in Exhibit 2.2.3.2 until such time as the location of the Community Park West is determined as set forth in Section 2.2.3.
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Composite Land Use Map with proposed
Folsom Heights land uses
FIGURE 4: ADOPTED FPASp & APPROVED AMENDMENTS + PROPOSED FOLSOM HEIGHTS PROJECT
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Land Use Summary
FIGURE 2: GENERAL PLAN/SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT

陆域使用摘要

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>土地使用</th>
<th>存量面积</th>
<th>提议面积</th>
<th>差值</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>35.0±</td>
<td>37.7±</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHD</td>
<td>31.0±</td>
<td>58.2±</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>27.9±</td>
<td>14.9±</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>34.5±</td>
<td>11.5±</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQP</td>
<td>0.0±</td>
<td>1.8±</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>43.1±</td>
<td>47.2±</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS (Highway RW)</td>
<td>8.7±</td>
<td>8.0±</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>道路</td>
<td>9.5±</td>
<td>10.4±</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>总计</td>
<td>189.7±</td>
<td>189.7±</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

组合盆地
1. 私人设施；实际位置将根据草图和/or最终地图确定。
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ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Approved FPASP Land Use Summary Table with Proposed Folsom Heights Land Use
### FIGURE 5: APPROVED FPASP + PROPOSED FOLSOM HEIGHTS PROJECT LAND USE SUMMARY TABLE

#### Land Use Summary Table - Existing FPASP plus Proposed Folsom Heights

3/21/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (DU/AC)</th>
<th>Target DU (1)</th>
<th>% of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR (2)</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>509.5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>4,763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHD</td>
<td>700.9</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>11,151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>250.2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>4,423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHD</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL Residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,542.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9,938</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,845</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>100,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/OP</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1,165,666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>280,962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>280,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-GC</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>191,664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-RC</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>214,664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-IND/OP</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>139,828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-MLD</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-MMD</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-MHD</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-P</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>270,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-GC</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>302,481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-RC</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>185,666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-IND/OP</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>185,666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-MLD</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-MMD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-MHD</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-P</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL Commercial/Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>279.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,132,969</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL Commercial/Residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.7%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,279</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,480</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL Commercial/Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P- Community West</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P- Community East</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P- Neighborhood</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P- Local</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P- Private</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP- MS/HS</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP- ES</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP- Country Day</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP- Cell Tower</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP- Potable Water</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP- Sewer Facility</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL Parks/Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>319.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.1%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,132,969</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS- Open Space</td>
<td>1,125.8</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roadways</td>
<td>178.9</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178.9</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FPASP Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,913.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,325</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,132,969</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BACKGROUND AND ACTION TRIGGERING THE ADDENDUM

This addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EIS) for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project evaluates an amendment to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP). Specifically, this addendum analyzes the effects of a decrease in the area of general commercial land use in the Folsom Heights plan area and increase in the acreage of residential development. The changed residential uses would include a decrease in multi-family and an increase in single-family land uses, but there would be no additional dwelling units added to the site. The decrease in general commercial land uses would result in the reduction of commercial areas by approximately 250,000 square feet.

As the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Folsom has determined that, in accordance with Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed reductions in nonresidential space and other changes differ sufficiently from the development scenario described in the Final EIR/EIS for the adopted FPASP to warrant preparation of an addendum.

PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES

The environmental process for the FPASP involved the preparation of the following documents that are relevant to the consideration of the proposed amendment to FPASP for the Folsom Heights Plan Area.

- Draft EIR/EIS for the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan Project, Volumes I-III and Appendices, June 2010;
- FEIR for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, May 2011;
- CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, May 2011; and

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT GUIDELINES REGARDING AN ADDENDUM TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Altered conditions, changes, or additions to the description of a project that occur after certification of an EIR may require additional analysis under CEQA. The legal principles that guide decisions regarding whether additional environmental documentation is required are provided in the State CEQA Guidelines, which establish three mechanisms to address these changes: a subsequent environmental impact report (SEIR), a Supplement to an EIR, and an Addendum to an EIR.
Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines describes the conditions under which a SEIR would be prepared. In summary, when an EIR has been certified for a project, no Subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

   (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;

   (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

   (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or

   (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Section 15163 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that a lead agency may choose to prepare a supplement to an EIR rather than a Subsequent EIR if:

(1) any of the conditions described above for Section 15162 would require the preparation of a SEIR; and

(2) only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.

An addendum is appropriate where a previously certified EIR has been prepared and some changes or revisions to the project are proposed, or the circumstances surrounding the project have changed, but none of the changes or revisions would result in significant new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, consistent with CEQA Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, 15164, and 15168.

This addendum is intended to evaluate and confirm CEQA compliance for proposed amendment to the FPASP, which would be a change relative to what is described and evaluated in the FPASP Final EIR/EIS. This addendum is organized as an environmental checklist, and is intended to evaluate all environmental topic areas for any changes in circumstances or the project description, as compared to the approved Final EIR/EIS, and determine whether such changes were or were not adequately covered in the certified EIR/EIS. This checklist is not the traditional CEQA Environmental Checklist, per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. As explained below, the purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the checklist categories in terms of any “changed condition” (i.e., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a different environmental impact significance conclusion from the FPASP EIR/EIS. The column titles of the checklist have been modified from the Appendix G presentation to help answer the questions to be addressed pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, 15163, 15164 and 15168.
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## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°C</td>
<td>degrees Celsius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
<td>degrees Fahrenheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 32</td>
<td>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Area of Potential Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 40</td>
<td>Aerojet Superfund site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATCMs</td>
<td>air toxic control measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Bollard Acoustical Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>best management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>federal Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS</td>
<td>California Ambient Air Quality Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>methane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNELs</td>
<td>community noise equivalent levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>compressed natural gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ₑ</td>
<td>CO₂-equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diesel PM</td>
<td>diesel-powered engines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWR</td>
<td>California Department of Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>El Dorado Irrigation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR/EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAPA</td>
<td>First Amended Programmatic Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP</td>
<td>Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWP</td>
<td>global warming potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFCs</td>
<td>hydrofluorocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMP</td>
<td>Historic Property Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>heating, ventilation, and air conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFCo</td>
<td>Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₁₀n</td>
<td>day-night average noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LID</td>
<td>low impact development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMT</td>
<td>million metric tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>nitrous oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>National Highway Traffic Safety Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>naturally occurring asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>oxides of nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>National Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>programmatic agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE</td>
<td>tetrachloroethene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCs</td>
<td>perfluorocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHPS</td>
<td>Preliminary Historic Properties Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>peak particle velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECs</td>
<td>recognized environmental conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>reactive organic gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENLs</td>
<td>Single-event noise levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF₆</td>
<td>sulfur hexafluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
<td>Sacramento Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specific Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRCSD</td>
<td>Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRWTP</td>
<td>Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVAB</td>
<td>Sacramento Valley Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>storm water pollution prevention plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>toxic air contaminant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>trichloroethene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUs</td>
<td>transport refrigeration units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VdB</td>
<td>vibration decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>volatile organic compounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT HISTORY

On June 28, 2011, the Folsom City Council approved the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) for development of up to 10,210 residential homes with a range of housing types, styles, and densities along with commercial, industrial/office park, and mixed-use land uses, open space, public schools, parks, and supporting infrastructure. The development would be located on approximately 3,514 acres (Resolution No. 8863). The City and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) prepared a joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the FPASP that evaluated the environmental impacts associated with development of the entire plan area based on the land use and zoning designations identified in the specific plan. The City was the Lead Agency with respect to preparation of the EIR and USACE was the Lead Agency with respect to preparation of the EIS.

The area proposed for the Folsom Heights development was included within the FPASP. The development is located on the north-eastern edge of the FPASP along the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line. The site is owned by Folsom Heights, LLC, and the owners have brought forward a development application that responds to current and future market conditions for general commercial and residential development. Accordingly, the applicants proposed an amendment to the adopted FPASP that would reduce the area of general commercial land use in the Folsom Heights plan area and increase the acreage of residential development.

The EIR/EIS was prepared at the program “first-tier” level of environmental review consistent with the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Sections 15152 and 15168. The program-level analysis considered the broad environmental impacts of the overall specific plan. In addition, the EIR/EIS also included a more detailed analysis of specific topic areas beyond the program level, including: Aesthetics; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; and Land Use Planning and Agricultural Resources. The EIR/EIS acknowledged that development of the FPASP area would occur in multiple phases. As those phases are proposed, such as the Folsom Heights Specific Plan Amendment (SPA or project), they are being evaluated to determine whether the entitlements/actions proposed fall within the scope of the approved EIR/EIS and incorporate all applicable performance standards and mitigation measures identified therein. Should the subsequent development phases not be consistent with the approved FPASP, additional environmental review through the subsequent review provisions of CEQA for changes to previously reviewed and approved projects may be warranted (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164).

Consistent with the process described, the City is evaluating the Folsom Heights application to determine whether this project is consistent with the FPASP and whether and what type of additional environmental review would be required. This environmental checklist has been prepared to determine whether any additional environmental review would be required for the City to consider adoption of the changes in the FPASP. This analysis considers whether there are changes proposed in the previously reviewed and approved FPASP or changed environmental conditions that are of sufficient magnitude to result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts, as compared to those considered in the FPASP EIR/EIS, and also whether there is new information of substantial importance showing that new or substantially more severe environmental impacts would occur compared to that evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS.
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2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The owners of a portion of the FPASP area known as Folsom Heights have brought forward a development application. The Folsom Heights project would result in a detailed site development plan for approximately 190 acres located on the north-eastern boundary of the FPASP. In general, the proposed application is largely consistent with the land uses proposed and approved for this portion of the FPASP. The Folsom Heights project would include the following planning entitlements: General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Specific Plan Amendment (SPA).

The SPA for the Folsom Heights project would result in the reallocation/relocation of some land uses within the project area, but proposed land use types would be the same as that approved within the FPASP. The net result of these proposed land use changes would be a decrease of approximately 23 acres of General Commercial land uses, an increase of approximately four acres of open space, an increase of 1.8 acres of public/quasi-public uses (to site a water tank), and an increase of approximately 17 acres of residential land uses. However, no increases in the number of dwelling units from that approved under the FPASP would occur. Therefore, the overall density of residential development would decrease.

The proposed land use and zoning modifications require the City’s approval of a GPA and SPA as well as the preparation and adoption of an environmental document that will examine and identify any potential significant adverse environmental impacts that may result from implementation.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The FPASP area is located within the City of Folsom, south of U.S. Highway 50 and north of White Rock Road, between Prairie City Road and the El Dorado County line (Exhibit 2-1). The Folsom Heights project area is located along the north-eastern boundary of the FPASP area, just south of U.S. Highway 50, along the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line (Exhibit 2-2 and Exhibit 2-3).

2.3 EXISTING SETTING

The project area is undeveloped grassland, currently used for cattle grazing. Developed land north of the project area consists of large residential and commercial developments. The topography of the area consists of gently rolling hills.
2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The FPASP’s objectives, as described in the EIR/EIS for the FPASP (City of Folsom 2010: p. 1-7) are the following:

1. Be consistent with the City of Folsom’s General Plan and implement SACOG Smart Growth Principles.

2. Expand the City’s boundaries based on the ultimate boundaries of development that the City can reasonably control and service, and do so in a manner that would foster orderly urban development and discourage leapfrog development and urban sprawl.

3. Annex those parcels of land adjacent to the City limit and within the City’s Sphere of Influence whose development could have significant visual, traffic, public service, and environmental impacts on the City so that the City may influence the ultimate development of those parcels.

4. Provide a large-scale mixed-use and mixed-density residential housing development within the City of Folsom, south of U.S. 50.

5. Develop several distinct neighborhoods within the project site, connected by a substantial open space area and recreational trail network.

6. Provide neighborhood- and regional-serving retail areas within the project site.

7. Provide a mix of housing types within the project site to diversify the City’s housing stock.

8. Provide a combined high school/middle school and the appropriate elementary schools on site sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

9. Provide the appropriate number and size of onsite community and neighborhood parks sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

10. Generate positive fiscal impacts for the City through development within the project site.

11. Secure a sufficient and reliable water supply consistent with the requirements of Measure W and objectives of the Water Forum Agreement to support planned development within the SPA, which the City estimates to be 5,600 acre-feet per year.

12. Construct the necessary water supply delivery and treatment infrastructure to ensure the safe and reliable delivery of up to 5,600 acre-feet per year to the FSPAP.

2.5 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT

2.5.1 Changes to Section 4: Land Use & Zoning

The project includes several changes to the FPASP that require amendments to the land use and zoning designations. Table 2-1 shows the adopted land use summary, Table 2-2 shows the proposed land use summary for the project, and Table 2-3 shows the difference in land use acreage, dwelling units, population, and commercial square footage that would result from the project. As shown in the tables below, there would be an increase in residentially-designated land and a decrease in commercially-designated land. In addition to the changes shown in the below tables, the project would increase the amount of open space and include 1.8 acres of Public/Quasi-Public areas.
### Table 2-1: Adopted FPASP Land Use Summary (Folsom Heights Project Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/ac)</th>
<th>Target DU</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>93.99</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>530</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use District (MU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 to 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 376,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation and Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Site (PQP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 50</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36 125,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Folsom Heights</strong></td>
<td><strong>189.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>530</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,300</strong> 376,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use falls within the specified density range and the total residential unit count does not exceed the FPASP area maximum of 11,230 dwelling units.
2. Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multifamily unit.
3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 3,338,378 SF is not exceeded.

### Table 2-2: Proposed Folsom Heights Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/ac)</th>
<th>Target DU</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
<th>Target FAR</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>39.72</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>4 to 7</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Residential</td>
<td>112.83</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>530</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 125,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Commercial</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>47.23</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-2 Proposed Folsom Heights Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>% of Site</th>
<th>Density Range (du/acs)</th>
<th>Target DU¹</th>
<th>Percentage of Allocated Units</th>
<th>Projected Population²</th>
<th>Target FAR³</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (sf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulation and Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Site (PQP)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 50</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Folsom Heights</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>530</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,425</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>125,126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Target dwelling unit allocation for each land use is a planning estimate. Actual total dwelling units for each land use may be higher or lower as long as the total for each land use falls within the specified density range and the total residential unit count does not exceed the FPASP area maximum of 11,230 dwelling units.
2. Population calculated using 2.92 persons per single family unit and 1.94 persons per multifamily unit.
3. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of building area to parcel area. The target FAR may be higher or lower for each land use as long as the Plan Area maximum of 3,388,378 SF is not exceeded.

### Table 2-3 Summary of Changes Associated with the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Projected Population (persons)</th>
<th>Potential Bldg. Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SF)</td>
<td>+2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family High Density (SFHD)</td>
<td>+27.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+319</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family Low Density (MLD)</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-249</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-251,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>+4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Site (PQP)</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 50</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+125</td>
<td>-251,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may not match exactly because of small rounding errors.
Source: Adapted by Ascent Environmental 2016

### 2.5.2 Changes to Section 5: Housing Strategies

The project includes several amendments to Section 5 of the FPASP. Amendments to the housing goals and policies listed in FPASP Section 5.2 are proposed to be consistent with the most current City of Folsom Housing Element. Additional amendments to this section of the FPASP include changes to Section 5.5 Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHN), Section 5.6 Affordable Housing, and Subsection 5.6.1 Affordable Housing Ordinance to be consistent with changes to State Housing Law and the adoption of an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance by the City of Folsom in 2013.

### 2.5.3 Changes to Section 8: Open Space

The project includes changes to the locations of Open Space designated lands (see Exhibit 2-4), and the total area of land designated for Open Space would increase by 4.1 acres.
2.6 REQUIRED DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

2.6.1 Lead Agency

Table 2-4, below, shows the entitlements, approvals, and permits needed to develop the project as it moves forward through the entitlement process. The entitlements in bold are those that would be required with consideration of this Addendum. It should be noted that if the Addendum is approved, no physical development would commence until such time the applicant secures all entitlements noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-4</th>
<th>Entitlements, Approvals and Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entitlement/Approval or Permit Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development Permit</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan (Land Use) Amendment</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan (Rezone) Amendment</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreement</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Folsom City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **BOLD** – Items in **bold** are under consideration as part of this Addendum.

2.6.2 Responsible Agencies

In addition to the list of entitlements, approvals, and/or permits identified in Table 2-4 above that must be obtained from the City of Folsom, the following approvals, consultations, and/or permits may be required from other agencies prior to physical development of the site. However, none of the entitlements listed below would be required prior to consideration of this Addendum.

**FEDERAL ACTIONS/PERMITS**

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Department of the Army permit under Section 404 of the CWA for discharges of dredge or fill material into waters of the U.S. Consultation for impacts on cultural resources pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Consultation for impacts on federally listed species pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA.

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: concurrence with Section 404 CWA permit.

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: ESA consultation and issuance of incidental-take authorization for the take of federally listed endangered and threatened species.

- National Marine Fisheries Service: ESA consultation and issuance of incidental-take authorization for the take of federally listed endangered and threatened species.
STATE ACTIONS/PERMITS

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento Valley—Central Sierra Region: California Endangered Species Act consultation and issuance of take authorization (if needed) (California Fish and Game Code Section 2081), streambed alteration agreement (California Fish and Game Code Section 1602), and protection of raptors (California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5).

- California Department of Transportation: encroachment permits; approval of landscaping plans and specifications for landscape corridor adjacent to U.S. Highway 50.

- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 5): National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater permit (Notice of Intent to proceed under General Construction Permit) for disturbance of more than 1 acre; discharge permit for stormwater; general order for dewatering; and Section 401 CWA certification or waste discharge requirements; Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification; NPDES permit coverage for hydrostatic testing of pipeline (coverage expected under General Order for Low Threat Discharges to Surface Water).

- State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO): approval of a Programmatic Agreement and/or MOU for Section 106 compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

- California Department of Public Health: approval of an amendment to the City’s Public Water System Permit.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL ACTIONS/PERMITS

- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District: authority to construct (for devices that emit air pollutants), health risk assessment, and Air Quality Management Plan consistency determination.

- El Dorado Irrigation District: commitment to serve letter based on a facility plan report.

- El Dorado County: approval of roadway encroachment permit for pipeline construction.

- Sacramento County: approval of roadway encroachment permit for pipeline construction, rezoning, use permit, and approval of grading permit.

- City of Folsom: roadway encroachment permit for pipeline construction, tree removal permit (if needed), rezoning, and use permit.
3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

3.1 EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The purpose of this checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any "changed condition" (i.e., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in environmental impact significance conclusions different from those found in the 2011 EIR. The row titles of the checklist include the full range of environmental topics, as presented in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. The column titles of the checklist have been modified from the Appendix G presentation to help answer the questions to be addressed pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact because it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the EIR/EIS. For instance, the environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist because the impacts associated with the proposed project were adequately addressed in the EIR/EIS, and the environmental impact significance conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain applicable. The purpose of each column of the checklist is described below.

3.1.1 Where Impact was Analyzed

This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the EIR/EIS where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic. Unless otherwise specified, all references point to the Draft EIR/EIS document.

3.1.2 Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts?

The significance of the changes proposed to the approved FPASP, as it is described in the certified FPASP EIR/EIS, is indicated in the columns to the right of the environmental issues.

3.1.3 Any new Circumstances Involving New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there have been changes to the project site or the vicinity (circumstances under which the project is undertaken) that have occurred subsequent to the prior environmental documents, which would result in the current project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior environmental documents or having substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

3.1.4 Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete is available, requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigation measures remain valid. If the new information shows that: (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental.
documents; or (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; or (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects or the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the Mitigation Measure or alternative; or (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the Mitigation Measure or alternative, the question would be answered “yes” requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplement to the EIR. However, if the additional analysis completed as part of this Environmental Checklist Review finds that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified significant environmental impacts are not found to be substantially more severe, the question would be answered “no” and no additional EIR documentation (supplement to the EIR or subsequent EIR) would be required.

Notably, where the only basis for preparing a subsequent EIR or a supplement to an EIR is a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact, the need for the new EIR can be avoided if the project applicant agrees to one or more mitigation measures that can reduce the significant effect(s) at issue to less than significant levels. (See River Valley Preservation Project v. Metropolitan Transit Development Board (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 154, 168.)

3.1.5  Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?

This column indicates whether the prior environmental documents and adopted CEQA Findings provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigation measures have already been implemented. A “yes” response will be provided in either instance. If “NA” is indicated, this Environmental Checklist Review concludes that there was no impact, or the impact was less-than-significant and, therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

3.2  DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION SECTIONS

3.2.1  Discussion

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category to clarify the answers. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the project relates to the issue, and the status of any mitigation that may be required or that has already been implemented.

3.2.2  Mitigation Measures

Applicable mitigation measures from the prior environmental review that would apply to the proposed amendment are listed under each environmental category. New mitigation measures are included, if needed.

3.2.3  Conclusions

A discussion of the conclusion relating to the need for additional environmental documentation is contained in each section.
3.2.4 Acronyms Used in Checklist Tables

Acronyms used in the Environmental Checklist tables and discussions include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIR/EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

4.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</th>
<th>Do Any New Circumstances Involve New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aesthetics. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.1-2 to 3A.1-22 Impacts 3A.1-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but impact still remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.1-26 Impacts 3A.1-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, issue addressed but mitigation is still not feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.1-1 to 3A.1-20 Impacts 3A.1-3 and 3A.1-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but impact still remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.1-22 Impacts 3A.1-5, 3A.1-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to aesthetics, described in the EIR/EIS Section 3A.1 Aesthetics - Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

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

As described in the Aesthetics setting (see page 3A.1-2) of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the project site and surrounding area is part of a large stretch of undeveloped land along U.S. 50 in eastern Sacramento County that contains oak woodlands and rock outcroppings; it is considered to be a scenic vista. Because the FPASP contains high levels of vividness, intactness, and unity, and because of its location along U.S. 50 where it is seen by thousands of motorists, viewer sensitivity is considered to be high. FPASP implementation would substantially degrade this scenic vista. In Impact 3A.1-1, the EIR/EIS concluded that viewsheds that include the FPASP are part of thousands of acres of open space that would no longer exist. Instead, this area would contain development that would substantially degrade the existing scenic view of the landscape. This area would become of similar visual quality to nearby developed land, and would no longer be considered a unique or scenic vista. The impact to a scenic vista was determined to be significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.1-1 was concluded to reduce the impact of substantial alteration of a scenic vista, but not to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation would require the applicant to construct and maintain a landscape corridor adjacent to U.S. 50. No other feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts associated with the alteration of scenic vistas from project development to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

The visual characteristics of the site have not changed since the preparation of the FPASP EIR/EIS. The project would affect the same area already analyzed and proposed changes to the plan would not substantially alter the development type or density at the site such that different or more severe aesthetic
impacts would result. Further, the project would comply with all appropriate mitigation identified in the EIR/EIS. Overall, substantial and adverse impacts to scenic vistas would remain and would be similar to what would occur under the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur; therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

At the time of the certification of the EIR/EIS there were no officially designated State Scenic Highways or National Scenic Byways with views of the site. However, Scott Road south of White Rock Road was identified as a designated scenic corridor in Sacramento County because it is considered to be located within an especially scenic rural portion of Sacramento County. As described in the FPASP EIR/EIS, project implementation would substantially damage views from the portion of Scott Road designated as a scenic corridor. No mitigation measures were found feasible to reduce or eliminate this impact, therefore, the impact was concluded to remain significant and unavoidable. No new scenic corridor designations have occurred since approval of the FPASP. Scott Road continues to remain as a designated scenic corridor; therefore, the same visual impacts to this corridor would occur with implementation of the project as described in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Because the project would develop the site with a similar development pattern and land uses as described in the FPASP EIR/EIS, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

Impact 3A.1-3 of the EIR/EIS describes permanent changes to the visual character of the FPASP area, while Impact 3A.1-4 describes temporary, short-term construction-related changes to visual character. At full buildout, the visual character of the FPASP (including Folsom Heights) would consist of developed urban land uses with intermittent areas of open space and parks. The development is required to preserve at least 30 percent as natural open space. However, motorists on surrounding roadways and other sensitive viewers would no longer have views of expansive grasslands within the project site.

Implementation of the FPASP would result in conversion of grassy hillsides to urban areas, generally consisting of housing units and commercial developments. Views would be permanently altered to urban development, substantially degrading viewsheds located on Scott Road, Placerville Road, White Rock Road, U.S. 50, and for people located within the community of El Dorado Hills, the City of Folsom, and nearby rural residences. In addition, the presence and movement of heavy construction equipment and staging areas could temporarily degrade the existing visual character and/or quality of the FPASP and surrounding area for existing developed land uses. Given the large scale of this urban development and the rural nature of its setting, the EIR/EIS concluded that the degradation of visual character at the FPASP would be significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1 and 3A.7-4 in the FPASP EIR/EIS would reduce significant impacts associated with substantial adverse effects on changes to visual character by reducing the extent of grading within the FPASP and providing a 50-foot-wide landscaped corridor between U.S. 50 and the FPASP. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.1-4 would reduce significant impacts associated with temporary visual-quality degradation for developed land uses from concurrent construction staging areas by providing visual screening. However, the EIR/EIS concluded that implementation of screening may not always be feasible. Overall, it was determined that even with implementation of mitigation, the FPASP would substantially alter a scenic vista and the impact was concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

The project would affect the same area analyzed for development in the FPASP EIR/EIS and proposed changes would not substantially alter the development type or density at the site. No changes to the visual character of the site or surrounding areas have occurred since approval of the EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur, and the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
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d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed amendment to the FPASP would not result in substantial changes in land use within the specific plan area. Two impacts in the EIR/EIS described how the FPASP would contribute to the creation of a new source of substantial light or glare and new skyglow (Impacts 3A.1-5 and 3A.1-6). Because of the scale of proposed FPASP development and because FPASP implementation would introduce a substantial quantity of light into a rural landscape, overall light and glare effects were determined to be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5 would reduce significant impacts associated with new sources of light and glare to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation would be applicable to the project. No changes in the proposed nighttime lighting conditions for the Folsom Heights area have occurred since approval of the FPASP. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures were adopted with the FPASP and would continue to remain applicable if the project is approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.1-1: Construct and maintain a landscape corridor adjacent to U.S. 50.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.1-4: Screen construction staging areas.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5: Establish and require conformance to lighting standards and prepare and implement a lighting plan.

The FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that impacts to light and glare would be reduced to a less-than-significant level; however, impacts related to skyglow would remain significant and unavoidable. This conclusion would not change with implementation of the project.

CONCLUSION

No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to aesthetics.
## 4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.10-2, 3A.10-5, 3A.10-6 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.10-2 to 3A.10-4, 3A.10-6, 3A.10-7 Impacts 3A.10-3 and 3A.10-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>Not addressed, criterion was not part of Appendix G when EIR/EIS was certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land?</td>
<td>Not addressed, criterion was not part of Appendix G when EIR/EIS was certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>Not addressed, criterion was not part of Appendix G when EIR/EIS was certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to Agriculture and Forest Resources, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.10 Land Use and Agricultural Resources – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011. However, Appendix G changed since the EIR/EIS was certified with the additions of checklist items c), d), and e), above.

**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?**

As described in the EIR/EIS, the FPASP does not include any agricultural land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as defined in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. There is no impact. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designations for the site have not changed since approval of the FPASP. Therefore, no impacts to farmland resources would occur.
with the project. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?
As described in Table 3A.10-1 of the EIR/EIS, there are no parcels within the Folsom Heights project area that are under Williamson Act contract. Approximately 1,530 acres of the SPA consist of agricultural lands under existing Williamson Act contracts; therefore, Impact 3A.10-3 assumes that implementation of the FPASP would require the cancellation of one or more Williamson Act contracts before their expiration date. The FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that impacts associated with conflicts with zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts would be significant (Impact 3A.10-3) and no feasible mitigation measures were available to ensure that the impact is less than significant. Although this impact was considered significant and unavoidable for the FPASP EIR/EIS, none of the affected Williamson Act parcels are within the Folsom Heights project area. Therefore, there would be no impact to Williamson Act lands with implementation of the project. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?
The FPASP EIR/EIR did not address forestry issues. Nonetheless, there is no forest land or timberland on or near the project area. Therefore, there would be no conflicts with lands designated for forestry uses and no impact would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
The FPASP EIR/EIR did not address forestry issues. Nonetheless, there is no forest land or timberland on or near the project area. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land and no impact would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
The project area was rezoned as part of the FPASP approval from agricultural land use designations to urban designations. While the project includes some changes to the land use designations onsite, proposed designations would continue to be urban, similar to approved land uses. The project would not involve the conversion of farmland that was not previously evaluated in the EIR/EIS and no new impacts would occur. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
There were no mitigation measures included in the EIR/EIS for this topic.

CONCLUSION
Since the EIR/EIS was certified, no new circumstances have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and implementation of the project would not result in any new significant impacts associated with agriculture and forest resources.
4.3 AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2-10 to 3A.2-10; Impact 3A.2-1 and Impact 3A.2-2</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2-2 to 3A.2-8; Impact 3A.2-5, Impact 3A.2-5, Impact 3A.2-7, and Impact 3A.2-3</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>and Cumulative analysis on p. 4-22 to 4-23</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but impact remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2-7 to 3A.2-10 and 3A.2-20 to 3A.2-23; Impact 3A.2-4; and Cumulative analysis on p. 4-23 to 4-26</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.2-9; Impact 3A.2-6</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to Air Quality, described in EIR/EIS Sections 3A.2 and 38.2 under Air Quality, has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011. The Sacramento Valley Air Basin is nonattainment with respect to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for ozone and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM$_{2.5}$); and also nonattainment of the CAAQS for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM$_{10}$) (SMAQMD 2013). There has also been no substantial change to how the Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) recommends evaluating the air quality impacts of proposed development projects (SMAQMD 2009).

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

Construction-Generated Emissions of NO$_x$

As stated under Impact 3A.2-1 in the FPASP EIR/EIS, the mass emissions threshold for oxides of nitrogen (NO$_x$) established by SMAQMD was used to determine whether construction-generated emission of NO$_x$, an ozone precursor, would conflict with implementation of SMAQMD’s federal and State ozone attainment plans and/or contribute substantially or result in an exceedance of the NAAQS and CAAQS for ozone. The analysis determined that maximum daily emissions of NO$_x$ generated by construction of the FPASP would exceed SMAQMD’s recommended threshold of 85 pounds per day (lbs./day). It also acknowledged that some portions of the FPASP, such as the Folsom Heights project site, would be undergoing construction while...
other portions of the FPASP would not. Thus, the level of maximum daily emissions of NOx generated by construction of the project would also exceed SMAQMD's mass emission threshold of 85 lbs./day. The types of emissions-generating construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the adopted plan for Folsom Heights, as well as the quantity of land that would be developed and the intensity and pace of construction. Therefore, the maximum daily level of NOx generated by construction of the project would be approximately the same as determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

Implementation of SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, and payment of an off-site mitigation fee to off-set construction-generated NOx emissions, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1b of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce emissions of NOx associated with construction of the project to levels that do not exceed SMAQMD's threshold of significance of 85 lbs/day. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a and 3A.2-1b adopted as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts related to NOx emissions.

Construction-Generated Emissions of PM10
The FPASP EIR/EIS provides a program-level analysis of construction-generated PM10 emissions under Impact 3A.2-1. SMAQMD recommends that project-level analysis be conducted to determine the maximum concentration of PM10 by performing air dispersion modeling with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) AERMOD model if the maximum daily acreage of ground disturbance would exceed 15 acres. However, dispersion modeling was not performed for this program-level analysis because detailed information about grading activities and the locations and occupancy timing of future planned on-site receptors was not known at the time of writing the FPASP EIR/EIS. The FPASP EIR/EIS determined it would be likely that more than 15 acres of ground disturbance activity would occur in one day and; thus, concluded that that ground-disturbing activities associated with site construction (i.e., grading, earth movement) would result in concentrations of PM10 that exceed or substantially contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS. These exceedances would conflict with SMAQMD's air quality planning efforts.

Implementation of SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices for Soil Disturbance Areas, and Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices for Unpaved Roads, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce PM10 concentrations generated during construction. Nonetheless, resultant PM10 concentrations could potentially exceed or substantially contribute to the CAAQS and NAAQS because the intensity of construction activity and the acreage of ground disturbance that could occur at any one point in time could be substantially high and/or take place in close proximity to existing or future planned sensitive receptors (e.g., residents, schools). Therefore, PM10 emissions associated with construction would be significant and unavoidable unless the results of a detailed project-level analysis, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c, support another impact conclusion. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c requires a detailed project-level analysis after project phasing has been determined and tentative maps and improvement plans have been prepared.

Construction of land uses in the Folsom Heights project would also likely involve more than 15 acres of grading in a single day. Thus, construction-generated concentrations of PM10 could also exceed or substantially contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS and conflict with SMAQMD planning efforts. However, because the intensity of grading activity, the types of ground disturbance equipment used, and the types of soils disturbed would be similar, PM10 concentrations resulting from construction of the project are not anticipated to be substantially greater than was analyzed in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Nonetheless, project-level analysis will be needed, based on dispersion modeling, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c adopted as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to PM10 emissions.

Long-Term, Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursor Emissions
In the 2010 FPASP EIR/EIS, operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors were evaluated for the entire FPASP using the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS) 2007 version 9.2.4, which was the widely-accepted emissions modeling tool at that time. URBEMIS has been superseded by the contemporary air quality modeling tool for use in CEQA analysis in California: The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod).
SMAQMD started recommending use of CalEEMod to estimate emissions of land use development projects in April 2013. The new model does not constitute "new information" as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 because a similar model estimating criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions was available at the time of the EIR/EIS. However, revised emissions modeling was conducted to ascertain what changes might have arisen in the recommended methodologies and emission factors since 2010. More specifically, CalEEMod was used to model both the adopted Folsom Heights plan and the proposed Folsom Heights SPA to determine whether the levels of operational emissions from these two planning scenarios would be substantially different. This modeling is based on default model setting for both scenarios.

Mobile-source emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors would result from employee commute trips, visitor trips, and other associated vehicle trips (e.g., deliveries of supplies, maintenance vehicles). Table 4.3-1 summarizes the modeled operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors of both the adopted plan and the amended plan. As discussed in the project description, in general, the proposed application is largely consistent with the land uses proposed and approved for this portion of the FPASP.

| Table 4.3-1 Summary of Maximum Daily Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors for the Adopted and Amended Folsom Heights Plan in 2020¹ |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Emissions Source                                             | ROG (lbs./day) | NOₓ (lbs./day) | PM₁₀ (lbs./day) | PM₂.₅ (lbs./day) |
| Adopted Folsom Heights Plan                                  |               |               |               |               |
| Vehicle Trips                                                 | 37            | 107           | 60            | 17            |
| Area Sources²                                                 | 1,269         | 17            | 214           | 214           |
| Natural Gas Combustion                                        | Less than 1   | 5             | Less than 1   | Less than 1   |
| Total                                                        | 1,307         | 129           | 274           | 231           |
| Amended Folsom Heights Plan                                  |               |               |               |               |
| Vehicle Trips                                                 | 28            | 82            | 46            | 13            |
| Area Sources²                                                 | 1,461         | 20            | 248           | 248           |
| Natural Gas Combustion                                        | Less than 1   | 4             | Less than 1   | Less than 1   |
| Total                                                        | 1,489         | 106           | 294           | 261           |
| Difference                                                    | 182           | -23           | 20            | 30            |
| SMAQMD CEQA Thresholds                                        | 65            | 65            | 80³           | 82³           |

Notes: See Appendix A for detail on model inputs, assumptions, and modeling parameters.

¹ Emission estimates shown in this table do not account for the emission reductions that would be achieved by implementation of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Air Quality Mitigation Measure 3A.2.2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS.

² Area sources of emissions include landscaping equipment, architectural coatings, and consumer products (e.g., kitchen aerosols, cleaning supplies, cosmetics, and toiletries).

³ SMAQMD Board of Directors rescinded the 2002 concentration based thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ and adopted the new mass emissions PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ thresholds on May 28, 2015, via resolution AQMD2015-022. The thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ are zero (0), unless all feasible BACT/BMPs are applied; if all feasible BACT/BMPs are applied, then the thresholds are the amount shown. BACT is best available control technology and BMPs are best management practices (SMAQMD 2015b).

ROG = reactive organic gases
NOₓ = oxides of nitrogen
PM₁₀ = respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less
PM₂.₅ = respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less
lbs./day = pounds per day
BACT = best available control technology
BMPs = best management practices

Source: Modeling and calculations conducted by Ascent Environmental 2016.

Also shown in Table 4.3-1, maximum daily emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and NOₓ for the Folsom Heights plan under the adopted FPASP and the project would exceed SMAQMD’s mass emission thresholds. Therefore, the operational emissions associated with the project would still be expected to violate or contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation or conflict with air quality planning efforts to bring the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) into attainment of the CAAQS and NAAQS for ozone.
Also shown in Table 4.3-1, operational emissions of ROG, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ under the amended plan would be approximately 182, 20 and 30 lbs/day greater, respectively, than estimated for the adopted plan. These increases would not be considered to be substantial as such are similar in magnitude to the adopted plan and, in fact, NOx emissions under the amended plan would be 23 lbs/day less than the adopted plan. And, as discussed in the project description, in general, the proposed application is largely consistent with the land uses proposed and approved for this portion of the FPASP.

This impact would be significant and unavoidable, which is the same conclusion reached for Impact 3A.2-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. This impact is within the scope of the impact evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS and Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 includes feasible best practices for reduction of operational emissions from land use-related sources, and no additional measures are recommended. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. While emissions were modeled to be slightly higher than presented in the FPASP EIR/EIS, this increase would not be substantial and in fact, NOx emissions would decrease under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from criteria air pollutants or precursors as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

**Construction-Generated Emissions of NOx and PM$_{10}$**

As discussed in (a), above, the types of emission-generating construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the adopted Folsom Heights plan, as well as the quantity of land that would be developed, the amount of ground disturbance that exceeds 15 acres per day, and the intensity and pace of construction. Therefore, the maximum daily level of NOx, an ozone precursor, and PM$_{10}$ generated by construction of the amended Folsom Heights plan would be approximately the same as determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Implementation of SMAQMD’s Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, and payment of an off-site mitigation fee to off-set construction-generated NOx emissions, as required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1b of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce emissions of NOx associated with construction of the project to levels that do not exceed SMAQMD’s threshold of significance of 85 lbs/day. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a and 3A.2-1b adopted as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts related to NOx emissions.

Implementation of the dust control measures required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a of the FPASP EIR/EIS, would reduce PM$_{10}$ concentrations generated during construction but resultant PM$_{10}$ concentrations could potentially exceed or substantially contribute to the CAAQS and NAAQS because the intensity of construction activity and the acreage of ground disturbance that could occur at any one point in time could be substantially high and/or take place in close proximity to existing or future planned sensitive receptors. PM$_{10}$ concentrations resulting from construction of the project are not anticipated to be substantially greater than was analyzed in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Long-Term, Operation-Related (Regional) Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursor Emissions**

Also shown in Table 4.3-1 in (a), above, maximum daily emissions from operation of the project would exceed SMAQMD’s mass emission thresholds, but would not be substantially greater than the adopted Folsom Heights plan and, in fact, NOx emissions decrease under the project. All applicable mitigation measures were recommended in Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, and would minimize operation-related emissions, but not to less-than-significant levels. For these reasons, operation of the project could result in or substantially contribute to a violation of air quality standards related to ozone, which is the same conclusion reached in the FPASP EIR/EIS Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
Mobile-Source CO Concentrations

The potential for FPASP-induced traffic congestion at area intersections to result in relatively high concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) near sensitive receptors is discussed under Impact 3A.2-3 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. Applying the “Second Tier” screening methodology recommended in SMAQMD’s Guide to Air Quality Assessment (SMAQMD 2009) this analysis determined that FPASP-induced congestion would not result in or contribute to exceedances of the CAAQS or NAAQS for CO at affected intersections because none of these intersections would experience a traffic volume that exceeds 31,600 vehicles per hour. Thus, Impact 3A.2-3 was determined to be less than significant.

The project as amended would result in less vehicle trips and a lesser degree of daily vehicle miles traveled than this area under the adopted FPASP and; thus, it would not result in any intersection experiencing a traffic volume more than 31,600 vehicles per hour. This impact would be within the scope of the impact already evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS, and would be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Pages 4-22 through 4-29 of the FPASP EIR/EIS evaluated cumulative air quality impacts of the FPASP, which includes those attributable to the development in the area of the Folsom Heights plan under the adopted FPASP. Cumulative impacts on air quality associated with the project would be similar and are within the scope of the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

As discussed in (a), above, the adopted Specific Plan would result in exceedances of SMAQMD’s significance criteria for NOx and PM10 during project construction and operation. The amount of emissions generated during project construction and operation would be substantial compared with other projects in the region, and would be cumulatively considerable and; therefore, significant. In addition, all applicable mitigation measures were recommended in and adopted as Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a, 3A.2-1b, and 3A.2-2 would minimize construction- and operation-related emissions, respectively, but not to less-than-significant levels. For these reasons, project construction and operation could result in or substantially contribute to a violation of air quality standards related to ozone and PM10 on a cumulative basis.

Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a, 3A.2-1b, and 3A.2-2 were required to minimize the project’s construction- and operation-related emissions. These mitigation measures include feasible best practices for reducing construction and operation-related emissions. No additional mitigation is recommended. The adopted FPASP would involve substantial development, and would generate emissions that would be considered substantial in the region. This cumulative impact on air quality would remain significant and unavoidable for the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

The FPASP EIR/EIS also evaluated cumulative air quality impacts associated with localized CO concentrations from traffic congestion at buildout of the FPASP. This cumulative impact was found to be less than significant. The project is within the scope of this impact analysis, and cumulative air quality impacts for localized CO would also be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Toxic Air Contaminant Concentrations

Temporary, Short-Term Emissions from Construction Equipment

Emissions of particulate exhaust from diesel-powered engines (diesel PM) including diesel-powered construction equipment were identified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC) by the California Air Resources
Board (ARB) in 1998. Impact 3A.2-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that diesel PM emissions generated during construction of the land uses on the FPASP site, including the Folsom Heights area, could expose nearby residents and schools to levels that exceed applicable standards as some phases of the development plan are built out while construction of other phases continues in both the Folsom Heights area and other portions of the FPASP area. This would particularly be the case when some new residents occupy dwelling units while other land uses are still under construction and some residents may be exposed to diesel PM generated by construction activity in all directions at varying stages of construction. Because construction activities could expose sensitive receptors to levels of health risk that exceed applicable standards, the FPASP EIR/EIS determined this impact to be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a in the FPASP EIR/EIS requires project applicants of all phases to develop a plan that reduces the exposure of sensitive receptors, including residents and school children, to construction-generated TACs. Each plan shall be developed by the project applicant(s) in consultation with SMAQMD and each plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval before the approval of any grading plans. While implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a would lessen health-related risks associated with the use of off-road diesel powered equipment during construction activity, exposure to construction-generated TAC emissions would not necessarily be reduced to less-than-significant levels and, therefore, the potential exposure of receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions would be considered to be significant and unavoidable. This would also be true for the project because it would be built out over multiple years, and some residential dwelling units, and possibly the proposed elementary school, could be occupied and operational while nearby land uses are still under construction. Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Stationary-Source Emissions
Impact 3A.2-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that any stationary sources of TACs developed under the FPASP or in close proximity to the FPASP planning area (e.g., dry cleaning operations, gasoline-dispensing facilities, and diesel-fueled backup generators, and restaurants using charbroilers) would be subject to the permitting requirements of SMAQMD and; consequently, operation of any stationary sources would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs at levels exceeding SMAQMD's significance threshold. Therefore, this direct impact is considered less than significant. This would also be true for the project and; thus, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Emissions from On-Site Operational Mobile Sources
Impact 3A.2-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that buildout of the FPASP could potentially involve substantial volumes of TAC-emitting truck activity occurring in close proximity to nearby sensitive receptors and; therefore, that this impact would be potentially significant. The FPASP EIR/EIS made this determination because the types of commercial and industrial land uses developed under the FPASP and their location relative to residential land uses were unknown at the time of the analysis. The FPASP EIR/EIS included implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.2-4b, which includes the following measures to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs from on-site mobile sources:

▲ Proposed commercial and industrial land uses that have the potential to emit TACs or host TAC-generating activity (e.g., loading docks) shall be located away from existing and proposed on-site sensitive receptors such that they do not expose sensitive receptors to TAC emissions that exceed an incremental increase of 10 in 1 million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0.

▲ Where necessary to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to an incremental increase of 10 in 1 million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0, proposed commercial and industrial land uses that would host diesel trucks shall incorporate idle reduction strategies that reduce the main propulsion engine idling time through alternative technologies such as IdleAire, electrification of truck parking, and alternative energy sources for transport refrigeration units (TRUs), to allow diesel engines to be completely turned off.

▲ Signs shall be posted at all loading docks and truck loading areas which indicate that diesel-powered delivery trucks must be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises to reduce idling emissions. This measure is consistent with the air toxic control measures (ATCMs) to Limit Diesel-
Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling, which was approved by the California Office of Administrative Law in January 2005.

The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that implementation of the above measures that are part of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b would lessen health-related risks associated with on-site mobile-source TACs, including truck activity at land uses proposed in the FPASP.

The project would not include any industrial land uses and the only commercial land uses that would not be anticipated to include more than a few loading docks or support a high level truck activity. Therefore, as a result of the project, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from TAC exposure form on-site truck activity. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**TAC Exposure from Remediation Activity**
Impact 3A.2-4 in the FPASP EIR/EIS also discussed whether remediation activity on the Aerojet General Corporation parcel along the western property boundary of the FPAP, which has been classified as a Superfund site, would result in TAC exposure of land uses developed under the FPASP. A report prepared by ARCADIS (2007) entitled Draft Ambient Air Evaluation of Aerojet Area 40 examined potential health risks to future adult and child recreationists on the adjacent portion of the FPAP that would remain open space from associated with volatile organic compounds (VOCs) potentially migrating from ground water into the ambient air. The report analyzed groundwater analytical data for the VOC plume located in the northern portion of Area 40. The primary chemicals of potential concern in the VOC plume include trichloroethylene (TCE) and tetrachloroethene (PCE). Exposure and risk to adult and child recreationists were estimated using standard EPA and California risk assessment practices. The analysis determined that the hazard indices (a.k.a., hazard quotients) used for determining levels of non-cancer risk would be 0.010 and 0.000025 from TCE and PCE exposure, respectively. It also determined that cancer risk levels would be 0.8 in one million from TCE exposure and 0.01 in one million from PCE exposure. Because all of the estimated risk levels would be below the SMAQMD's recommended thresholds of significance for health risk (i.e., a hazard index less than 1.0 at the maximally exposed individual and a cancer risk level less than 1.0 in one million), airborne exposure of recreationists on the SPA to off-gassing VOC emissions from the contaminated groundwater plume was determined to be a less-than-significant impact. The project would experience even lower levels of risk because it is located further from the remediation site. Therefore, as a result of the project, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from TAC exposure because of remediation activities on the Aerojet site. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Land Use Compatibility with TACs Generated at Off-Site Corporation Yard**
As part of the discussion under Impact 3A.2-4, the FPASP EIR/EIS addressed the possibility that residential land uses developed near White Rock Road could be exposed to potentially high concentrations of diesel PM generated by trucks and other equipment that are staged at a corporation yard the City plans to locate near the south side of White Rock Road and east of Prairie City Road. Because the types and number of equipment and activities at the future corporation yard were not known at the time the analysis was conducted for the FPASP EIR/EIS, and because it was not known whether activities at the corporation yard could potentially expose future residents to substantial levels of diesel PM exhaust, the analysis conservatively determined this impact to be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b of the FPASP EIR/EIS requires that the multi-family residences proposed across White Rock Road in the FPASP be set back as far as possible from the boundary of the future corporation yard and/or relocated to another area.

TAC-generating equipment stored at the corporation yard would include approximately 12 transit buses and vans, three vacuum trucks; five street sweepers; three fork lifts; three boom trucks; two tractor trailers; two asphalt machines; one dump truck; two water trucks, and two fleet response service vehicles (Nugen, pers. comm. 2015). The City may also decide to locate its solid waste collection fleet at the new corporation yard, consisting of 36 diesel-powered solid waste collection trucks (Kent, pers. comm. 2015). Four to six fuel pumps—gasoline, diesel, and potentially compressed natural gas (CNG)—would be located at the corporation yard, as well as 16 bay repair stations for vehicle repair and maintenance. The City estimates that approximately 50 to 60 trucks would enter or leave the corporation yard each day, assuming it is used by the City's solid waste collection fleet (Nugen, pers. comm. 2015).
ARB’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective provides guidance on land use compatibility with various sources of TACs (ARB 2005). The handbook is not a law or adopted policy but offers advisory recommendations for the siting of sensitive receptors near uses associated with TACs, such as freeways and high-traffic roads, commercial distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, dry cleaners, gasoline stations, and industrial facilities, to help keep sensitive receptors from being exposed to substantial doses of TACs. The handbook’s discussion of truck distribution facilities is applicable to this analysis because the corporation yard would serve as central point of activity for multiple diesel-powered vehicles. In its handbook ARB recommends that lead agencies avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating TRUs per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week (ARB 2005:4). ARB also recommends that lead agencies take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid locating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points because, in addition to on-site emissions, truck travel in and out of distribution centers contributes to the local pollution impact (ARB 2005:4,11).

Overall, the amount of diesel PM generated at the future corporation yard and the resultant level of health risk exposure at nearby receptors (i.e., residential land uses in the project area) would be less than the type of truck distribution centers discussed in ARB’s handbook. The total number of diesel-powered vehicles at the future corporation yard would be less than 100, even if the City’s solid waste collection fleet is moved to the site, and no TRUs would be operated. Unlike a typical truck distribution center there would be no “yard trucks” used to move containers around the corporation yard that is typical of truck distribution centers. Because the entry and exit points to the corporation yard would be from Prairie City Road, not all trucks would pass by the proposed residential locations along White Rock Road when arriving or departing. Furthermore, truck idling is restricted by ARB regulations, particularly the Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling rule which prohibits the driver to idle its primary diesel engine for more than five minutes (CCR Title 13, Section 2485). ARB also continues to implement its Diesel Risk Reduction Plan to substantially reduce emissions of diesel PM from existing and new trucks (ARB 2000).

In summary, because the center of the corporation yard would be more than 1,000 feet from the proposed residential area, because the number of diesel engines at the corporation yard would not be more than 100 and there would be no TRUs, and the reductions in diesel PM resulting from ARB’s regulatory efforts, it is not anticipated that residential land uses developed under the project would be exposed to substantial levels of health risk from TACs emitted at the future corporation yard. This impact would be less than significant.

Note that when the corporation yard is proposed it would be required to undergo its own environmental review pursuant to CEQA and additional analysis will be necessary, particularly if the type of TAC-generating sources operating at the corporation yard will be different than described in this analysis.

Land Use Compatibility with U.S. 50
Impact 3A.2-4 in the FPASP EIR/EIS also examined whether the northern portion of the FPASP would be exposed to high concentrations of mobile-source TACs from the high volumes of traffic that travel on U.S. 50. The analysis concluded that impact of exposure to TAC emission from U.S. 50 would be less than significant because no schools, residences, or other sensitive receptors would be developed within the 500-foot setback distance recommended in ARB’s guidance document entitled Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (ARB 2005). The potential for the land uses developed under the project to be exposed to high concentrations of TAC’s generated on U.S. 50 would also be less than significant because they would be even more distant from the freeway. Therefore, this impact would be within the scope of the impact already evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS, and would also be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Land Use Compatibility with High-Volume Arterial Roadways
As part of the cumulative impact analysis in section 4.1.7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the previous analysis examined health risk exposure levels from traffic on nearby high-volume arterial roadways to new residential land uses proposed under the FPASP. The FPASP EIR/EIS analyzed this impact because relatively high volumes of diesel-powered trucks associated with nearby sand and gravel quarries would travel on arterial roadways that pass by the proposed residential land uses and diesel PM emitted by this traffic could expose nearby residents to relatively high levels of health risk. Quarry trucks are expected to use segments of Prairie
City Road, White Rock Road, Scott Road, and possibly Oak Avenue. The analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS employed guidance from SMAQMD's *Recommended Protocol for Evaluating the Location of Sensitive Land Uses Adjacent to Major Roadways, Version 2.3* (SMAQMD 2010). SMAQMD suggests using its protocol to determine whether it recommends that site-specific dispersion modeling and health risk calculations be conducted to further evaluate levels of health risk exposure associated with an individual project. The protocol consists of look-up tables that account for the volume of traffic on the roadway being examined, the roadway orientation (e.g., east-west or north-south), the distance between the receptor and roadway, and the orientation of the receptor relative to the roadway (e.g., a receptor located 50 feet north of a roadway segment that runs east-west). The analysis found that risk exposure levels could potentially be high enough to warrant a site-specific HRA for some of the roadway segments that pass by the project site, including the segments of Prairie City Road north of White Rock Road, White Rock Road between Prairie City Road and Scott Road South, White Rock Road east of Scott Road South, and Oak Avenue north of White Rock Road, as shown in Table 4-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS.

The analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS was conservative; however, because of uncertainty about when residential land uses on the FPASP site would be developed and occupied, the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS assumed that exposure to residents could begin as early as 2010 and; thus, used screening factors based on 2010 emission rates. This assumption was conservative because emissions of diesel PM from trucks are expected to decrease in the future as stricter, emission-reducing regulations come into effect, and as new trucks replace older trucks.

Moreover, this impact determination is consistent with the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS, which determined that levels of health risk exposure would decrease over time. As shown in Table 4-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the exposure levels would decrease along all studied roadway segments from 2010 to 2030. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction-Generated Emissions of Naturally Occurring Asbestos**

Impact 3A.2-5 in the FPASP EIR/EIS examined whether construction-related ground disturbance activities (i.e., grading, rock blasting) could generate fugitive PM$_{10}$ dust that contains naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). Based on a report by the California Geologic Survey, portions of the FPASP area, including portions of the project, include areas that are moderately likely to contain NOA (California Geologic Survey 2006). The analysis explains that the serpentine soils may be disturbed during site grading and rock blasting activities, potentially exposing residents of the nearby residential neighborhoods in El Dorado County or neighborhoods that have already been developed in the FPASP to asbestos during project construction. Without appropriate controls, sensitive receptors near construction sites could be exposed to localized high levels of re-entrained fugitive PM$_{10}$ dust, potentially including NOA. As a result, this direct impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.2-5 would reduce impacts associated with generation of fugitive dust that potentially contains NOA by requiring site-specific investigations and, where the presence of NOA is determined, implementation of a dust control plan that is approved by SMAQMD that would reduce impacts related to construction in serpentine soils. Implementation of these measures would reduce the potentially significant impact associated with exposure to NOA during construction to a less-than-significant level. The potential for sensitive receptors to be exposed to NOA under the project is not substantially greater than determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe air quality impacts would occur from NOA exposure as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

**Short-Term Use of Construction Equipment**

Impact 3A.2-6 of the FPASP EIR/EIS explains that construction activities associated with the development of on-site land uses could result in odorous emissions from diesel exhaust generated by construction equipment. Because the level of grading along the eastern, hilly side of the FPASP area would be particularly intense and require multiple pieces of heavy-duty, diesel-powered equipment (e.g., graders, dozers) and it was determined that a substantial number of people in the residential areas to the east in El Dorado Hills area could be exposed to objectionable odorous diesel exhaust emissions, the FPASP EIR/EIS required
implementation of exhaust reduction measures listed in Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a to reduce the level of exposure it was nonetheless determined that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

For these reasons, odorous emissions generated during construction under the project would also be less than significant.

**Long-Term Operation of On-Site Land Uses**
Impact 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that receptors could be exposed to objectionable odors from delivery trucks visiting commercial land uses, from sewer lift stations, and from the development of convenience uses such as fast food restaurants that may emit odors. Because these sources could expose a substantial number of proposed on-site receptors to objectionable odors the analysis determined this impact to be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS requires the following measures to address these operational sources of odorous emissions:

- The odor-producing potential of land uses shall be considered when the exact type of facility that would occupy areas zoned for commercial, industrial, or mixed-use land uses is determined. Facilities that have the potential to emit objectionable odors shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors.

- Before the approval of building permits, odor control devices shall be identified to mitigate the exposure of receptors to objectionable odors if a potential odor-producing source is to occupy an area zoned for commercial, industrial, or mixed-use land uses. The identified odor control devices shall be installed before the issuance of certificates of occupancy for the potentially odor-producing use. The odor-producing potential of a source and control devices shall be determined in coordination with SMAQMD and based on the number of complaints associated with existing sources of the same nature.

- Truck loading docks and delivery areas shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors.

- Signs shall be posted at all loading docks and truck loading areas which indicate that diesel-powered delivery trucks must be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises to reduce idling emissions. This measure is consistent with the ATCM to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling, which was approved by California’s Office of Administrative Law in January 2005. (This measure is also required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b to limit TAC emissions.)

- Proposed commercial and industrial land uses that have the potential to host diesel trucks shall incorporate idle reduction strategies that reduce the main propulsion engine idling time through alternative technologies such as, IdleAire, electrification of truck parking, and alternative energy sources for TRUs, to allow diesel engines to be completely turned off. (This measure is also required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b to limit TAC emissions.)

The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that implementation of these measures to address on-site operational sources of odorous emissions would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

The potential for on-site emission sources in the project to expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors is the same as for the FPASP, including the Folsom Heights plan. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe odor impacts from on-site sources would occur as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Land Use Compatibility with Off-Site Corporation Yard**
In the discussion of odor impacts, Impact 3A.2-6 of the FPASP EIR/EIS also determined that the corporation yard could be a source of odoriferous exhaust emissions that would expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Similar to the TAC impact analysis, this analysis was conservative because it was not known at the time what types of odor-generating activity could take place at the future site of the corporation.
yard. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6 of the FPASP EIR/EIS requires the residences to be set back "as far as possible" and this impact was determined to be to be significant and unavoidable.

Since the analysis was written for the FPASP EIR/EIS, more detail is now known about the types of odor sources that may be located at the future corporation yard and its proximity to proposed sensitive land uses. Thus, this new information is used to conduct a more detailed impact analysis in this environmental document.

Equipment stored at the corporation yard would include approximately 12 transit busses and vans, three vacuum trucks; five street sweepers; three fork lifts; three boom trucks; two tractor trailers; two asphalt machines; one dump truck; two water trucks, and two fleet response service vehicles (Nugen, pers. comm. 2015). The City may also decide to locate its solid waste collection fleet at the new corporation yard, consisting of 36 solid waste collection trucks (Kent, pers. comm. 2015). Most of these vehicles would be diesel-powered and emit odorous diesel exhaust.

Locating some solid waste collection activities at the future corporation yard is also being considered by the City. The collection trucks that pick up recyclables and yard waste may haul these materials to the corporation yard so they can be consolidated and picked up by larger haul trucks. The Purchase and Sale Agreement between the City and the seller explicitly states that the property cannot be used as a solid waste transfer station for municipal garbage other than temporary storage of debris from tree removal, e-waste, and household hazardous waste (Aerojet Rocketdyne Inc. and City of Folsom 2014:6). No putrescible waste such as landfill-bound solid waste, food scraps, or finished compost would be stored or processed at the corporation yard (Gary, pers. comm. 2015). Therefore, diesel exhaust would be the only odorous emission generated at the site and SMAQMD does not recommend a setback distance for land uses that harbor a large number of diesel powered vehicles or equipment (SMAQMD 2014a:7-4). For these reasons, as well as the dispersive properties of diesel exhaust (Zhu et al. 2012:1), it is not anticipated that diesel exhaust generated at the corporation yard would expose a substantial number of people to unwanted odors. This impact would be less than significant.

Note that when the corporation yard is proposed it will be required to undergo its own environmental review pursuant to CEQA and additional analysis will be necessary, particularly if the types of odor sources located at the corporation yard will be different than described in this analysis.

**Land Use Compatibility with Off-Site Agricultural Land Uses**

Impact 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS explained that land uses developed on the southern side of the FPASP area could be exposed to odors generated by neighboring agricultural land uses, including livestock grazing that takes place just south of White Rock Road. Adversely affected portions of the FPASP include the southernmost areas of the project area. Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6 in the FPASP EIR/EIS requires the following measures to address exposure to odorous emissions from agricultural operations:

- The deeds to all properties located within the [FPASP area] that are within one mile of an on- or off-site area zoned or used for agricultural use (including livestock grazing) shall be accompanied by a written disclosure from the transferor, in a form approved by the City of Folsom, advising any transferee of the potential adverse odor impacts from surrounding agricultural operations, which disclosure shall direct the transferee to contact the County of Sacramento concerning any such property within the County zoned for agricultural uses within one mile of the subject property being transferred.

Because increasing the setback distance between on-site residents and the existing off-site agricultural lands would not necessarily reduce the intensity or frequency of these residents’ exposure to odorous exhaust emissions, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

The potential for on-site residential land uses to be exposed to objectionable odors associated with off-site livestock grazing would be the same under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe odor impacts to on-site residences would occur as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

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

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1b: Pay Off-site Mitigation Fee to SMAQMD to Off-Set NOx Emissions Generated by Construction of On-Site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1c: Analyze and Disclose Projected PM10 Emission Concentrations at Nearby Sensitive Receptors Resulting from Construction of On-Site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1e: Implement EDCAQMD-Recommended Measures for Controlling Fugitive PM10 dust During Construction of the Two Roadway Connections in El Dorado County.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1f: Implement SMAQMD’s Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices during Construction of all Off-site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1g: Pay Off-site Mitigation Fee to SMAQMD to Off-Set NOx Emissions Generated by Construction of Off-site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1h: Analyze and Disclose Projected PM10 Emission Concentrations at Nearby Sensitive Receptors Resulting from Construction of Off-site Elements.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2: Implement All Measures Prescribed by the Air Quality Mitigation Plan to Reduce Operational Air Pollutant Emissions.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a: Develop and Implement a Plan to Reduce Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction-Generated Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4b: Implement Measures to Reduce Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Operational Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-5: Implement a Site Investigation to Determine the Presence of NOA and, if necessary, Prepare and Implement an Asbestos Dust Control Plan.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.2-6: Implement Measures to Control Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Operational Odorous Emissions.

CONCLUSION

As required by many of the air quality mitigation measures adopted as part of the FPASP, this report provides additional project-level air quality analysis. While the project-specific analyses provide additional detail for the project site, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air quality. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis is required.
## 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Biological Resources. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-7 to 3A.3-21 Impacts 3A.3-2 and 3A.3-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-21 to 3A.3-26 Impact 3A.3-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-5 to 3A.3-7, 3A.3-18 to 3A.3-21 Impact 3A.3-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.3-7 Impact 3A.3-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.3-23 to 3A.3-26 Impact 3A.3-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, mitigation has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.3-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Have the potential to cause a commercial and/or recreational fishery to drop below self-sustaining levels?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.3-17 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.1 Discussion

New information pertaining to biological resources on the project site has become available since the EIR/EIS was certified in 2011. After the EIR/EIS was certified, USFWS published a biological opinion relating to the FPASP (Formal Consultation on the Proposed Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Project [Corps# SPK-2007-02159]) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) entered into a streamed alteration agreement with the FPASP applicants (Master Streambed Alteration Agreement [Notification No. 1600-
2012-0198-R2] for Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan- Backbone Infrastructure Project. These documents contain guidance on how to treat special-status species, and provide conditions for the FPASP and associated projects. On March 24, 2016, an Ascent Environmental, Inc., biologist conducted a site visit to verify that conditions on the site have not changed since adoption of the EIR/EIS. The existing conditions of the site are similar as described in the EIR/EIS (Ascent Environmental, Inc. 2016). Mitigations were updated using other recently-certified environmental documents related to FPASP area projects.

The following discussion summarizes the new information and compares this information to the analysis presented in the EIR/EIS in Section 3A.3 Biological Resources – Land.

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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

The EIR/EIS evaluated the impact of the FPASP on 13 special-status plant and 28 special-status animal species which had the potential to occur within the FPASP area (Impacts 3A.3-2 and 3A.3-3). The certified EIR/EIS concluded that the following special-status species could be substantially affected by implementation of the FPASP: vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, conservancy fairy shrimp, and valley elderberry longhorn beetle, Swainson’s hawk, special-status raptors, western spadefoot, tricolored blackbird, and special-status bats. Impacts to all other special-status wildlife species were considered less than significant. Only special-status raptors are within the Folsom Heights area. The area provides for foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk; no breeding areas are present.

The EIR/EIS determined that implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.3-2a, 3A.3-2b, 3A.3-2c, 3A.3-2d, 3A.3-2e, 3A.3-2f, 3A.3-2g, and 3A.3-2h would reduce the impacts on special-status wildlife resulting from implementation of the FPASP; however, the EIR/EIS concluded that, even with the mitigation, the impact on Swainson’s hawk would remain significant and unavoidable. All other special-status species impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Other projects in the FPASP area have been approved and the following revised mitigation (3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, 3A.3-4a, 3A.3-4b, 4.4-1, 4.4-4, 4.4-5, 4.4-6, and 4.4-7) was included similar to the mitigations found in other certified environmental documents (such as the Westland Specific Plan Amendment Addendum) to address the impacts related to implementation of the project. However, no new impacts from those identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS were identified. Rather, the mitigations addresses impacts to special-status species on a project level at the Folsom Heights project site. With the implementation of mitigation measures included below, the project’s impact on special-status species would be less than significant. Further, the project-specific mitigation provided below would also ensure that the project would have a less-than-significant impact on Swainson’s hawk. The mitigation measures presented below would replace the measures adopted in the FPASP EIR/EIS. While revised mitigation is provided, the project would still contribute to the cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact on Swainson’s hawk habitat because the project would continue to be part of a larger set of projects (i.e., FPASP) which would permanently remove and convert Swainson’s hawk habitat to urban uses. The FPASP EIR/EIS identified that no additional feasible mitigation is available to mitigate the cumulative impact on Swainson’s hawk. This condition has not changed. Therefore, while the project-specific mitigation requirements for impacts to biological resources have been refined, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe biological impacts would occur with implementation of the project. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

In Impact 3A.3-4, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact on riparian habitat and valley needle grassland. Mitigation was recommended to reduce impacts to these habitats (Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, 3A.3-4a, and 3A.3-4b) which would require stormwater,
erosion, and sediment control plans; Clean Water Act Section 404 permits; a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement; and surveys to identify and map Valley needle grassland. However, these habitats occur in areas where some off-site improvements are proposed (i.e., U.S. 50 roadway intersections). The off-site improvements would be implemented by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and would not be subject to the City’s direct control. Therefore, the EIR/EIS determined that this impact would be potentially significant and unavoidable because the City could not guarantee that Caltrans would comply with the recommended mitigation. This condition would not change with the project. However, based upon a certified environmental document for another FPASP project (Westland Specific Plan Amendment Addendum), there are some project-level mitigation measures for impacts to these species. These measures are presented below as Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, 3A.3-4a, and 3A.3-4b. Mitigation Measure 3A.3-1a requires the applicant to create storm water drainage, erosion, and sediment control plans to protect wetland areas. Mitigation Measure 3A.3-1b requires the applicant to implement the Section 401 and 404 permits and certifications. Mitigation Measure 3A.3-4a would require the applicant to amend and implement the Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement to address potential impacts on riparian habitat. Mitigation Measure 3A.3-4b requires the applicant to avoid and minimize impacts on valley needle grassland. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, 3A.3-4a, and 3A.3-4b (which replace EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, 3A.3-4a, and 3A.3-4b for this project), the project would have a less-than-significant impact on riparian habitat and valley needle grassland. Further, based on Ascent Environmental’s survey of the site, no new impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities were identified. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?

The EIR/EIS (Impact 3A.3-1) evaluated the impact of the FPASP on federally protected wetlands. The EIR/EIS concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact on federally protected wetlands because the FPASP would cause some wetland areas to be filled. In the EIR/EIS, the impact was considered significant and unavoidable even with Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a and 3A.3-1b. Specific project-level mitigation measures (3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, and 3A.3-4a) are included below that require stormwater, erosion, and sediment control plans; obtaining and implementing Section 404 permit and Section 401 water quality certification; and implementation of the Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement. Because the applicant would be required to mitigate for impacts to waters of the U.S. using the same ratios per feature specified in the original permits, the project would still be covered by EIR/EIS.

Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, and 3A.3-4a (as found below) would replace EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.3-1a, 3A.3-1b, and 3A.3-4a for this project. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the project would have a less-than-significant impact to wetland resources and no residual significant and unavoidable impacts would remain. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

In Impact 3A.3-6, the EIR/EIS evaluated the impact of the FPASP on wildlife movement and concluded that the impact would be less than significant. The project would generally develop the site with the same pattern and density of urban and open space uses. No changes in habitat or migration patterns has occurred since the FPASP was approved. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

In Impact 3A.3-5, the EIR/EIS evaluated whether the FPASP would conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The EIR/EIS concluded that the removal of blue oak woodland and individual oak trees and other trees would conflict with local ordinances protecting these resources and result in a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.3-5 would lessen the impacts on blue oak woodland and other trees because it would require the applicant to conduct a tree survey and prepare and implement an oak woodland mitigation plan, and other measures to avoid and minimize impacts on oak woodlands. However, the Folsom Heights project area does not contain oak trees and, therefore, no impacts to oak woodland or individual oak trees would occur.

The project would not result in any new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts; therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

As discussed in Impact 3A.3-7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS, there is no adopted conservation plan for this area. Therefore, no impact was identified. No new conservation plans have been adopted since approval of the FPASP. Therefore, there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts that would occur pertaining to conflicts with adopted conservation plans. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

g) Have the potential to cause a commercial and/or recreational fishery to drop below self-sustaining levels?

No special-status fish species are known or have potential to occur within the Carson Creek watershed, which is the watershed that occurs within the project area. No changes to this environmental condition have occurred. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts to fishery resources would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures replace what was in the EIR/EIS for this project and were revised to include the more specific requirements where applicable for the project. Please note that these are numbered as found in the Draft EIS/EIR but have been updated beyond what could be found in the MMRP for the FPASP. Where a mitigation measure does not directly correlate to a mitigation measure from the MMRP, the numbering corresponds to this document's outline. For instance, Mitigation Measure 3A.3-2a pertains to both preconstruction monitoring and mitigation plans for Swainson's hawk. In this document, these two activities are broken into two separate mitigations (4.4-4 and 4.4-5).

Mitigation Measure 3A.3-1a: Mitigation for erosion impacts.

To minimize indirect effects on water quality and wetland hydrology, the project applicant shall include a storm water drainage plan and an erosion and sediment control plan in the improvement plans and shall submit these plans to the City Public Works Department for review and approval. Before approval of these improvement plans, the project applicant shall obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System MS4 Municipal Stormwater Permit and Grading Permit, comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance and County drainage and storm water quality standards, and commit to implementing all measures in their drainage plans and erosion and sediment control plans to avoid and minimize erosion and runoff into Carson Creek and all wetlands and other waters that would remain within the FPASP area.

The project applicant shall implement storm water quality treatment controls consistent with the Storm Water Quality Design Manual for Sacramento and South Placer Regions (Sacramento Stormwater Quality Control Partnership 2007). Appropriate runoff controls such as berms, storm gates, off-stream detention basins, overflow collection areas, filtration systems, and sediment traps shall be implemented to control
siltation and the potential discharge of pollutants. Development plans shall incorporate low impact
development (LID) features, such as pervious strips, permeable pavements, bioretention ponds, vegetated
swales, disconnected rain gutter downspouts, and rain gardens, where appropriate. Use of LID features is
recommended by EPA to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and stream geomorphology.
Crossings of wetlands shall be done in accordance with the Section 404 permits which allow for free-
spanning bridge systems, the use of bottomless culverts that do not alter the natural stream bed; and/or
oversized box culverts that are backfilled with a natural substrate. Consistent with the USACE permits, where
installation of box culverts is planned, restoration of a natural streambed/substrate shall be required.
Details of all crossings shall be submitted to the USACE for approval prior to each phase of development.

In addition to complying with City ordinances, the project applicant shall obtain a General Construction Storm
Water Permit from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), prepare a storm water
pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), and implement best management practices (BMPs) to reduce water
quality effects during construction.

Each project phase shall result in no net change to peak flows into Carson Creek and associated tributaries.
The project applicant shall establish a baseline of conditions for drainage on-site. The baseline-flow
conditions shall be established for 2-, 5-, 10-, and 20-year storm events. These baseline conditions shall be
used to develop monitoring standards for the storm water system within the project area. The baseline
conditions, monitoring standards, and a monitoring program shall be submitted to the USACE and the City
for their approval. Water quality and detention basins shall be designed and constructed to ensure that the
performance standards are met and shall be designed as off-stream detention basins. Discharge sites into
Carson Creek and associated tributaries shall be monitored to ensure that pre-project conditions are being
met. Corrective measures shall be implemented as necessary. The mitigation measures will be satisfied
when the monitoring standards are met for 5 consecutive years without undertaking corrective measures to
meet the performance standard.

Mitigation Measure 3A.3-1b: Implement Clean Water Act Section 404 Permits and Section 401
Water Quality Certifications.

Before the approval of grading and improvement plans and before any groundbreaking activity associated with
each distinct project phase, the owner/applicant shall secure all USACE necessary permits obtained under
Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act or the State’s Porter-Cologne Act and implement all permit
conditions for the proposed Central Valley project. All permits, regulatory approvals, and permit conditions for
effects on wetland habitats shall be secured and conditions implemented before implementation of any
grading activities within 250 feet (or lesser distance as approved by the applicable agencies) of waters of the
U.S. or wetland habitats, including waters of the State, that potentially support federally listed species, or within
100 feet (or lesser distance as approved by the applicable agencies) of any other waters of the U.S. or wetland
habitats, including waters of the State. The owner/applicant shall adhere to all conditions outlined in the
permits. The owner/applicant shall commit to replace, restore, or enhance on a “no net loss” basis (in
accordance with USACE and the Central Valley RWQCB) the acreage of all wetlands and other Waters of the
U.S. that would be removed, lost, and/or degraded with implementation of the project. Wetland habitat shall be
restored, enhanced, and/or replaced at an acreage and location and by methods agreeable to USACE, the
Central Valley RWQCB, and the City, as appropriate, depending on agency jurisdiction, and as determined
during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes. The boundaries of the 404 permit, including
required buffer, shall be shown on the grading plans.

All mitigation requirements to satisfy the requirements of the City and the Central Valley RWQCB, for impacts
on the non-jurisdictional wetlands beyond the jurisdiction of USACE, shall be determined and implemented
before grading plans are approved.

All wetland mitigation compliance reports submitted to USACE shall also be copied concurrently to the City.
Mitigation Measure 3A.3-4a: Implement Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement.
The owner/applicant shall amend, if necessary, and implement the original Section 1602 Master Streambed Alteration Agreement received from CDFW for all construction activities that would occur in the bed and bank of CDFW jurisdictional features within the project and Wildlife site. As outlined in the Master Streambed Alteration Agreement, the owner/applicant shall submit a Sub-Notification Form (SNF) to CDFW 60 days prior to grading and/or the commencement of construction to notify California Department of Fish and Wildlife of the project.

Any conditions of issuance of the Master Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be implemented as part of those project construction activities that would adversely affect the bed and bank within on-site drainage channels subject to CDFW jurisdiction. The agreement shall be executed by the owner/applicant and CDFW before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any construction activities in any project phase that could potentially affect the bed and bank of on-site drainage channels under CDFW jurisdiction.

Mitigation Measure 3A.3-4b: Valley needlegrass grassland avoidance and minimization measures.
Prior to ground-breaking activities including grading or construction, high visibility construction fencing should be placed around all Valley needlegrass grassland to be preserved. The construction fencing should not be removed until completion of construction activities.

- All Valley needlegrass grassland areas slated for removal should be replaced at a 1:1 acreage on-site within the preserve areas.

- Needlegrass plants in areas slated for removal should be salvaged, to the extent feasible, and replanted within the preserve areas. If this is infeasible, then seedlings/saplings from a local nursery should be obtained.

- A mitigation plan outlining methods to be used, success criteria to be met, and adaptive management strategies will be completed prior to project construction.

At a minimum, unless agreed upon otherwise with regulatory agencies, the Valley needlegrass grassland creation areas shall be monitored twice annually for the first year and once annually for the 4 subsequent years for a total of 5 years; success criteria shall be established to ensure an 80 percent success rate is met by the 5th year, and adaptive management techniques shall be implemented to ensure that the 80 percent success rate is met by the 5th year or as otherwise agreed upon in consultation with CDFW. This plan may be combined with the Operations and Management Plan for the open space preserves.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Conduct environmental awareness training for construction employees.
Before beginning construction activities, the project applicant shall employ a qualified biologist to develop and conduct environmental awareness training for construction employees. The training shall describe the importance of on-site biological resources, including special-status wildlife habitats. The biologist shall explain the importance of other responsibilities related to the protection of wildlife during construction such as inspecting open trenches and looking under vehicles and machinery before moving them to ensure there are no lizards, snakes, small mammals, or other wildlife that could become trapped, injured, or killed in construction areas or under equipment.

The environmental awareness program shall be provided to all construction personnel to brief them on the life history of special-status species in or adjacent to the project area, the need to avoid impacts on sensitive biological resources, any terms and conditions required by state and federal Agencies, and the penalties for not complying with biological mitigation requirements. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the contractor's superintendent shall ensure that the personnel receive the mandatory training before starting work. An environmental awareness handout that describes and illustrates sensitive resources to be avoided during project construction and identifies all relevant permit conditions shall be provided to each person.
Mitigation Measure 4.4-4: Conduct preconstruction Swainson’s hawk and other raptor surveys.

To mitigate impacts on Swainson’s hawk and other raptors (for Folsom Heights, northern harrier could potentially nest on-site), a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct preconstruction surveys and to identify active nests on and within 0.5 mile of the project area if construction begins during March through August. The surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction activities/staging. Guidelines provided in Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson’s Hawk Nesting Surveys In the Central Valley (Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000) shall be followed for surveys for Swainson’s hawk. If no active/occupied nests are found, no further mitigation is required.

If active nests are found, impacts on nesting Swainson’s hawks and other raptors shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers around the nests. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until the young have fledged, the nest is no longer active, or until a qualified biologist has determined in coordination with CDFW that reducing the buffer would not result in nest abandonment. CDFW guidelines recommend implementation of 0.25- or 0.5-mile-wide buffers, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and the City, in consultation with CDFW, determine that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-5: Prepare and implement Swainson’s hawk mitigation plan.

To mitigate for the loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, the project applicant shall identify permanent impacts to foraging habitat and prepare and implement a Swainson’s hawk mitigation plan including, but not limited to, the requirements described below.

Before the approval of grading and improvement plans or before any ground-disturbing activities, whichever occurs first for each phase, the project applicant, to the satisfaction of the City, shall secure suitable Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to ensure 1:1 mitigation (or other agreed upon ratio) of habitat value for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat that is permanently lost as a result of the project phase, as determined by the City after consultation with CDFW and a qualified biologist.

The 1:1 ratio (or other agreed-upon ratio) shall be based on Swainson’s hawk nesting distribution and an assessment of habitat quality, availability, and use within the project area. The mitigation ratio shall be consistent with the 1994 Department of Fish and Game’s Swainson’s Hawk Guidelines included in the Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks (Buteo swainsoni) in the Central Valley of California (Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000). These call for the following mitigation ratios for loss of foraging habitat in these categories: 1:1 if within one mile of an active nest site, 0.75:1 if over one mile but less than five miles, and 0.5:1 if over five miles and less than 10 miles from an active nest. Such mitigation shall be accomplished through purchase of credits at an approved mitigation bank, or the transfer of fee title or perpetual conservation easement. If non-bank mitigation is proposed, the mitigation land shall be located within the known foraging area and within Sacramento County. The City, after consultation with CDFW, shall determine the appropriateness of the mitigation land.

The project applicant shall transfer said Swainson’s hawk mitigation land, through either conservation easement or fee title, to a third-party, nonprofit conservation organization (Conservation Operator), with the City and CDFW named as third-party beneficiaries. The Conservation Operator shall be a qualified conservation easement land manager that manages land as its primary function. Additionally, the Conservation Operator shall be a tax-exempt nonprofit conservation organization that meets the criteria of Civil Code Section 815.3(a) and shall be selected or approved by the City, after consultation with CDFW. After consultation with CDFW and the Conservation Operator, the City shall approve the content and form of the conservation easement. The City, CDFW, and the Conservation Operator shall each have the power to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. The Conservation Operator shall monitor the easement in perpetuity to assure compliance with the terms of the easement.

After consultation with the City, the project applicant, CDFW, and the Conservation Operator, shall establish an endowment or some other financial mechanism that is sufficient to fund in perpetuity the operation,
maintenance, management, and enforcement of the conservation easement. If an endowment is used, either the endowment funds shall be submitted to the City for impacts on lands within the City’s jurisdiction to an appropriate third-party nonprofit conservation agency, or they shall be submitted directly to the third-party nonprofit conservation agency in exchange for an agreement to manage and maintain the lands in perpetuity. The Conservation Operator shall not sell, lease, or transfer any interest of any conservation easement or mitigation land it acquires without prior written approval of the City and CDFW.

If the Conservation Operator ceases to exist, the duty to hold, administer, manage, maintain, and enforce the interest shall be transferred to another entity acceptable to the City and CDFW. The City shall ensure that mitigation habitat established for impacts on habitat within the City’s planning area is properly established and is functioning as habitat by conducting regular monitoring of the mitigation site(s) for the first ten years after establishment of the easement.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-6: Conduct preconstruction burrowing owl survey.
To mitigate impacts on burrowing owl, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct preconstruction surveys to identify active burrows within the project area. The surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction. The preconstruction survey shall follow the protocols outlined in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012). Burrowing owls may be present on-site during any season.

If active burrows are found, a mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval before any ground-disturbing activities. The City shall consult with CDFW. The mitigation plan may consist of installation of one-way doors (during the non-breeding season) on all burrows to allow owls to exit, but not reenter, and construction of artificial burrows within the project vicinity, as needed; however, burrow owl exclusions during the breeding season (February 1-August 31) may only be used if a qualified biologist verifies that the burrow does not contain eggs or dependent young. If active burrows contain eggs and/or young, no construction shall occur within a minimum of 50 meters (164 feet) of the burrow until young have fledged. During the non-breeding season, once it is confirmed that there are no owls inside burrows, the burrows may be collapsed.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-7: Preconstruction nesting bird survey.
The project applicant shall conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey of all areas associated with construction activities on the project site within 14 days prior to commencement of construction during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31).

If active nests are found, a no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established. The buffer distance shall be established by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW. The buffer shall be maintained until the fledglings are capable of flight and become independent of the nest, to be determined by a qualified biologist. Once the young are independent of the nest, no further measures are necessary. Pre-construction nesting surveys are not required for construction activity outside of the nesting season.

CONCLUSION
While additional biological surveys of the site have been conducted and a refined mitigation program for the project has been recommended, this information is consistent with the activities recommended in the mitigation adopted for the FPASP. No new significant or substantially more severe biological impacts would occur with the project. In some cases, based on the refined mitigation program, the biological impacts associated with the project would be reduced compared to the impacts described in the EIR/EIS. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.5-2 to 3B.5-5, Impact 3A.5-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.5-1 to 3B.5-3, Impacts 3A.5-1 and 3A.5-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-13 to 3A.7-17, Impact 3A.7-10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.5-13 to 3A.5-15, Impact 3A.5-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Discussion

Since the adoption of the FPASP and certification of the EIR/EIS, and consistent with the mitigation adopted in the FPASP, the FPASP applicants entered into a programmatic agreement (PA) with USACE to fulfill the requirements in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The PA was amended in 2013 and the project is subject to the requirements of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement (FAPA) to meet obligations under all applicable state and federal requirements that were in place at the time of its execution.

The FAPA provides the framework for compliance and requires that each individual development, including the project, must comply with specific terms that include, but are not limited to, development of a project-specific Area of Potential Effects (APE), a geoarchaeological investigation, an updated records search, good-faith identification efforts including pedestrian surveys, evaluation of significance of resources, a finding of effect, and the resolution of adverse effects to significant cultural resources. Furthermore, the FAPA requires that all work done in compliance with the FAPA be carried out in accordance with the overall research design and Preliminary Historic Properties Synthesis (PHPS) that has been prepared for the FPASP. The PHPS was renamed the Historic Property Management Plan (HPMP) in conjunction with the execution of the FAPA in 2013.

SENATE BILL 18

Senate Bill (SB) 18 was signed into law in September 2004 and became effective in March 2005. SB 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) requires city and county governments to consult with California Native American tribes early in the planning process with the intent of protecting traditional tribal cultural places. The purpose of involving tribes at the early stage of planning efforts is to allow consideration of tribal cultural places in the context of broad local land use policy before project-level land use decisions are made by a local government. As such, SB 18 applies to the adoption or substantial amendment of general or specific plans. The process by which consultation must occur in these cases was published by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research through its Tribal Consultation Guidelines: Supplement to General Plan Guidelines (November 14, 2005).
Because the Project is seeking an SPA to the FPASP, the City was required to initiate consultation under SB 18. On March 7, 2016, the City requested an SB 18 contact list from the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). On March 23, 2016, the NAHC responded with a list of eight California Native American tribes and individuals who had notified the NAHC of their desire to consult under SB 18 in the vicinity of the Project. On March 23, 2016, the City mailed SB 18 notification letters to the eight individuals, Rhonda Morningstar Pope (Buena Vista Rancheria), Don Ryberg (T’si-Akim Maidu), Yvonne Miller (Ione Band of Miwok Indians), Gene Whitehouse (United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria), Cosme Valdez (Nashville-El Dorado Miwok), Raymond Hitchcock (Wilton Rancheria), Nicholas Fonseca (Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians), and Grayson Coney (T’si-Akim Maidu), offering them an opportunity to consult within the 90-day comment period, scheduled to end on June 21, 2016.

The will City send the tribes a 45-day notice of the City Council hearing (anticipated on May 13, 2016), and a 10-day notice (anticipated June 17, 2016). These notices will provide the tribes with information about the City Council hearing, but in accordance with the statute, do not open up a new consultation window.

ASSEMBLY BILL 52

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) established a formal consultation process for California Native American tribes as part of CEQA and equates significant impacts on tribal cultural resources with significant environmental impacts (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21084.2). AB 52 consultation requirements went into effect on July 1, 2015 for all projects that had not already published a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, or published a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report prior to that date (Section 11 [c]). Specifically, AB 52 requires that “prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, the lead agency shall begin consultation” (21808.3.1 [a]), and that “the lead agency may certify an environmental impact report or adopt a mitigated negative declaration for a project with a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource only if” consultation is formally concluded (21082.3[d]).

However, in the case of the current project, the lead agency has prepared this addendum to a previously certified EIR, in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. An addendum was determined to be the most appropriate document because none of the conditions described in Section 15162, calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR, have occurred. The addendum addresses minor technical changes or additions, and confirms that the project is consistent with what was previously analyzed under the certified EIR. As such, the addendum will not be released or circulated for public review and will not result in an additional certification; therefore, the AB 52 procedures specified in PRC Sections 21080.3.1(d) and 21080.3.2 do not apply and no tribal consultation under AB 52 is required.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

Impacts under the approved FPASP to historical resources within the FPASP area are described in Impact 3A.5-1. Impacts were determined to be potentially significant because the FPASP would develop in areas containing known historic resources. Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b were recommended and required the applicants to enter into a PA with USACE for the comprehensive evaluation of resources within the FPASP as well as an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources and methods to avoid or minimize damage to resources. As described in the mitigation, the PA would establish an APE and provide a framework for data gathering so that the applicant, City, and USACE would have a more thorough understanding of the resources present in the area and how best to address these resources. Although implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b in the EIR/EIS would reduce the impact to known prehistoric and historic-era cultural resources, the EIR/EIS concluded that the impact would remain potentially significant and unavoidable because some of the affected resources would not be within the City’s jurisdiction and the City would not have control over their protection and preservation.
As described above, the applicant will enter into a PA with USACE and conduct a subsequent review of historic resources pertaining the Folsom Heights project area. That review will determined the specific locations and qualities of historic resources present on the site. Based on the information in this review, the project applicants will make modifications to the project design to facilitate complete avoidance of on-site resources through re-routing infrastructure or extending conservation easements over sites, and to enhance public interpretation opportunities using interpretive panels along proposed bike trails. Direct and indirect adverse effects to historic resources will be reduced through the preparation of a HPMP, extensive archival research, and through detailed LIDAR and aerial mapping. While these are not sufficient to reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level, the information gathered through the extensive surveys, Native American consultation, and reviews of records will be used to refine the mitigation measures adopted in the EIR/EIS.

The mitigation measures from the EIR/EIS addressing historic resources will be refined to more specifically address the Folsom Heights project area. Implementation of these modified mitigation measures (3A.5-1a and 3A.5-1b) will further reduce the potential for the Folsom Heights project to affect historic resources; however, because these detailed evaluations have not yet been performed, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid.

b) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

The EIR/EIS analyzed potential destruction or damage to known (Impact 3A.5-1) or unknown (Impact 3A.5-2) archeological resources and concluded that there would be potentially significant impacts because of the potential destruction and removal of these resources. The EIR/EIS recommended Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a, 3A.5-1b, and 3A.5-2 which would reduce the impact to archaeological resources by requiring a PA, an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources and methods to avoid or minimize damage to resources, construction personnel education, and on-site monitoring during construction activities. However, the EIR/EIS concluded that this impact would remain potentially significant and unavoidable because some of the affected resources would not be within the City’s jurisdiction and the City would not have control over their protection and preservation and because not all resources would be avoided under the approved FPASP.

As described previously, the applicant will enter into a PA and subsequent review of cultural resources. As described under a), the applicant will make changes, as needed, to the project to avoid impacts to known resources. Implementation of these modified mitigation measures (3A.5-1a, 3A.5-1b, and 3A.5-2) will further reduce the potential for the Folsom Heights project to affect archaeological resources; however, because these detailed evaluations have not yet been performed, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid.

c) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Impact 3A.7-10 of the EIR/EIS analyzed the potential for damage to unique paleontological resources during earthmoving activities in the FPASP area. The EIR/EIS concluded that most of the SPA, including the Folsom Heights project area, are underlain by the Salt Springs Slate, Copper Hill Volcanics, and Gopher Canyon Volcanics. Because of the way in which these rocks formed, they would not contain vertebrate fossils or fossil plant assemblages. Therefore, construction activities that occur in these rock formations would have no impact on unique paleontological resources.

Because the development under the project would result in a similar footprint for ground disturbance as the approved FPASP, the impact conclusions pertaining to paleontological resources remain unchanged. As described in Impact 3A.7-10 of the Draft EIR/EIS, construction activities that occur in the project area would have no impact on unique paleontological resources. No new significant impacts or substantially more...
severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
The EIR/EIS analyzed potential destruction or damage to human remains in Impact 3A.5-3 and concluded that the impact was potentially significant because ground-disturbing activities may inadvertently disinter or destroy interred human remains. The EIR/EIS recommended Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3, which would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level because it would require the applicant to halt ground-disturbing activities if remains are uncovered and follow the requirements of the California Health and Safety Code.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3 has been updated to include a statement requiring the applicant to submit to the City proof of compliance and this updated version is presented below and replaces Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3 in the EIR/EIS. No new information regarding human remains has been identified requiring new analysis or verification. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measure was adopted with the FPASP and would continue to remain applicable if the project was approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-10: Conduct construction personnel education, stop work if paleontological resources are discovered, assess the significance of the find, and prepare and implement a recovery plan as required.

In addition to the mitigation measure in the EIR/EIS (listed above), the following mitigation measures replace what was in the EIR/EIS for this project and were revised to include the more specific requirements found in the HPTP and FAPA.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1a: Comply with the Programmatic Agreement.
The PA will provide a management framework for identifying historic properties, determining adverse effects, and resolving those adverse effects as required under Section 106 of the NHPA.

The project and all of its earlier components, including backbone and non-backbone portions of the property, will be subjected to cultural resources studies prepared under the PA and subsequent FAPA. If historical resources are identified, mitigation of significant impacts will be proposed through HPTPs all with concurrence by SHPO. The applicable mitigation measures from the HPTPs are provided below, relative to Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b, 3A.5-2, and 3A.5-3.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b: Cultural resource inventory, treatment, and evaluation mitigation.
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 California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) listing criteria and significance thresholds that apply under CEQA. Before 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) of all project phases, with applicable agency oversight, shall perform the following actions:

- The project applicant shall retain the services of a qualified archaeologist to perform an inventory of cultural resources within each individual development phase or off-site element 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 (under the agency's direction) shall obtain the services of a qualified archaeologist who shall determine if implementation of the individual project development 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) of all project phases (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) of all project phases 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 shall 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: Cultural resource construction training and stop work mitigation.

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 upon 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).

The project applicant in coordination with USACE shall ensure that an archaeological sensitivity training program is developed and implemented during a pre-construction meeting for construction supervisors. The sensitivity training program shall provide information about notification procedures when potential archaeological material is discovered, procedures for coordination between construction personnel and monitoring personnel, and information about other treatment or issues that may arise if cultural resources (including human remains) are discovered during project construction. This protocol shall be communicated to all new construction personnel during orientation and on a poster that is placed in a visible location inside the construction job trailer. The phone number of the USACE cultural resources staff member shall also be included.

The on-site sensitivity training shall be carried out each time a new contractor will begin work in the APE and at the beginning of each construction season by each contractor.

In the event that unanticipated discoveries of additional Historic Properties, defined in 36 CFR 800.16 (l), are made during the construction of the project, the USACE shall ensure that they will be protected by implementing the following measures:

The construction manager, or archaeological monitor, if given the authority to halt construction activities, shall ensure that work in that area is immediately halted within a 100-foot radius of the unanticipated discovery until the find is examined by a person meeting the professional qualifications standards specified in Section 2.2 of Attachment G of the HPMP (Westwood et al. 2013). The Construction Manager, or archaeological monitor, if present, shall notify the USACE within 24 hours of the discovery.

The USACE shall notify the SHPO within one working day of an unanticipated discovery, and may initiate interim treatment measures in accordance with this HPTP. Once the USACE makes a formal determination of eligibility for the resource, the USACE will notify the SHPO within 48 hours of the determination and afford the SHPO an opportunity to comment on appropriate treatment. The SHPO shall respond within 72 hours of the request to consult. Failure of the SHPO to respond within 72 hours shall not prohibit the USACE from implementing the treatment measures.

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3: Human remains mitigation.

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 California Native American Heritage Commission (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 Most Likely Descendant (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 reinstate 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).

CONCLUSION
While consultation with regulatory agencies regarding cultural resources mitigation has not yet occurred for the Folsom Heights project, this mitigation program is consistent with the activities recommended in the mitigation adopted for the FPASP. No new significant or substantially more severe cultural resources impacts would occur with the project. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
### 4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-3 to 3A.7-5, 3A.7-18, 3A.7-19 Impacts 3A.7-1, 3A.7-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Prisco 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-5 to 3A.7-6 Impact 3A.7-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.7-6 Impacts 3A.7-4, 3A.7-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-8 of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.7-11 Impact 3A.7-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.7-11 Impact 3A.7-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.6.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to geology and soils, described in the EIR/EIS Section 3A.7 Geology, Soils, Mineral, and Paleontological Resources – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS. The regional and local settings remain the same as stated Section 3A.7.
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 California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)

The project would not change the land development pattern or types of built structures in the Folsom Heights project area and would result in substantially the same footprint of ground disturbance as was evaluated under the adopted FPASP. As described on page 3A.7-3 of the EIR/EIS, the project is located approximately 50 miles from the northern segment of the Cleveland Hills Fault, located near Lake Oroville, the nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The project area is not underlain by or adjacent to any known faults. Because the damage from surface fault rupture is generally limited to a linear zone a few yards wide, the potential for surface fault rupture to cause damage to proposed structures is negligible. The certified EIR/EIS found that there was no need to discuss this issue any further. No new information regarding earthquake faults been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The EIR/EIS provides analysis of the potential for ground shaking to occur that could damage structures during strong earthquakes generated along faults in the region (Impact 3A.7-1). As described in the EIR/EIS, the potential for damage from strong seismic ground shaking is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a and 3A.7-1b would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level. No new information regarding seismic ground shaking been identified requiring new analysis or verification. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

The EIR/EIS analyzed the potential for seismic-related ground failure (Impact 3A.7-2), and found that it is unlikely that on- or off-site soils would be subject to liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. Therefore, direct impacts related to potential damage to structures from seismically-induced liquefaction are considered less than significant. No new information regarding seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction have been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

iv) Landslides?

The area in which the project is located is made of rolling hills with low to no potential for landslides. As described on page 3A.7-6 of the EIR/EIS, no landslides have been recorded in the vicinity of the project. As discussed on page 3B.7-5, the landslide potential for native and engineered slopes depends on the gradient, localized geology and soils, amount of rainfall, amount of excavation, and seismic activity. Only a narrow strip along the County’s eastern boundary, from the Placer County line to the Cosumnes River, is considered to have landslide potential at specific locations. Because the project area is not within the area for landslide potential, this topic was not addressed in an impact discussion. Even so, implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a and 3A.7-1b would reduce any potential impact related to landslides and other soil instability by requiring site-specific geotechnical reports and earthwork monitoring. All project facilities would be designed in accordance with the latest California Building Codes that include soil stability requirements and protections from landslides. No new information regarding landslides has been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Because the project would not substantially change the type of development that would occur at the site, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
The EIR/EIS analyzed the potential for construction activities to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil (Impact 3A.7-3). As described in the EIR/EIS, project implementation would involve intensive grading and construction activities. The impacts from these activities would be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.7-3 along with Mitigation Measure 3A.9-1 would reduce potentially significant construction-related erosion to a less-than-significant level. The project would result in the same types and intensity of construction activities as those evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS. No new information regarding on- or off-site erosion has been identified requiring new analysis or verification. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described in Impacts 3A.7-4 and 3A.7-5 of the EIR/EIS, implementation of the FPASP would result in potentially significant impacts regarding potential geologic hazards from construction in bedrock/rock outcroppings and seasonal subsurface water flows from surface infiltration. By implementing Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a, 3A.7-4, and 3A.7-5, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. No changes in soils at the site have occurred since the EIR/EIS was certified; therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?
As described in Impact 3A.7-6 of the EIR/EIS, the project area does contain soils with moderate to high shrink-swell potential, indicating the soils are expansive. The EIR/EIS found that this impact would be potentially significant. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.7-1a and 3A.7-1b, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. No changes in soils at the site have occurred since the EIR/EIS was certified. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
As described in the EIR/EIS, the FPASP, as well as the project, would use piped sewer service from Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and/or El Dorado Irrigation District. Septic systems would not be required and there would be no impact. This condition has not changed. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-1a: Prepare site-specific geotechnical report per CBC requirements and implement appropriate recommendations.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-1b: Monitor earthwork during earthmoving activities.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-3: Prepare and implement the appropriate grading and erosion control plan.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.7-4: Prepare a seismic refraction survey and obtain appropriate permits for all onsite and offsite elements East of Old Placerville Road.
Mitigation Measure 3A.7-5: Divert seasonal water flows away from building foundations.

The EIR/EIS concluded that mitigation measures were adequate to reduce the risk regarding geology and soils to a less-than-significant level.

CONCLUSION

No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to geology and soils.
4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:</td>
<td>Environmental Setting p. 3A.4.1 to 3A.4.4 and updated below; Regulatory Setting p. 3A.4.4 to 3A.4.9 and updated below; Impact 3A.4.1 and Impact 3A.4.2.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 Discussion

Since the Draft FPASP EIR/EIS was certified in 2011, new information about the science of climate change has become available and the relationship between greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and land use planning has become better understood. For these reasons, updated and comprehensive environmental and regulatory settings are provided in this document.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Physical Scientific Basis

Certain gases in the earth’s atmosphere, classified as GHG emissions, play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters the earth’s atmosphere from space. A portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth’s surface and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected back toward space. This absorbed radiation is then emitted from the earth as low-frequency infrared radiation. The frequencies at which bodies emit radiation are proportional to temperature. The earth has a much lower temperature than the sun; therefore, the earth emits lower frequency radiation. Most solar radiation passes through GHGs; however, infrared radiation is absorbed by these gases. As a result, radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead “trapped,” resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the greenhouse effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on Earth. Without the greenhouse effect, Earth would not be able to support life as we know it.

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are believed 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. It is “extremely likely” that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in GHG concentrations and other anthropogenic forces together (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] 2014:3, 5).

Climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Whereas pollutants with localized air
quality effects have relatively short atmospheric lifetimes (about one day). GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes (one to several thousand years). GHGs persist in the atmosphere for long enough time periods to be dispersed around the globe. Although the exact lifetime of any particular GHG molecule is dependent on multiple variables and cannot be pinpointed, it is understood that more CO₂ is emitted into the atmosphere than is sequestered by ocean uptake, vegetation, and other forms of sequestration. CO₂ sinks, or reservoirs, include vegetation and the ocean, which absorb CO₂ through sequestration and dissolution, respectively, two of the most common processes of CO₂ sequestration. Of the total annual human-caused CO₂ emissions, approximately 55 percent is sequestered through ocean and land uptakes every year, averaged over the last 50 years, whereas the remaining 45 percent of human-caused CO₂ emissions remains stored in the atmosphere (IPCC 2013:467).

The quantity of GHGs that it takes to ultimately result in climate change is not precisely known; suffice it to say, the quantity is enormous, and no single project alone would measurably contribute to a noticeable incremental change in the global average temperature, or to global, local, or micro climates. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

**Greenhouse Gas Emission Sources**

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the transportation, industrial/manufacturing, utility, residential, commercial, and agricultural sectors (ARB 2014a). In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation (ARB 2014a). Emissions of CO₂ are, largely, byproducts of fossil fuel combustion. CH₄, a highly potent GHG, primarily results from off-gassing (the release of chemicals from nonmetallic substances under ambient or greater pressure conditions) and is largely associated with agricultural practices and landfills. N₂O is also largely attributable to agricultural practices and soil management. Additionally, high-GWP gases have atmospheric insulative properties that are hundred to tens of thousands of times greater than that of CO₂. HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆ are some of the most common types of high-global warming potential (GWP) gases and result from a variety of industrial processes. HFCs and PFCs are used as refrigerants and can be emitted through evaporation and leakage. SF₆ is a powerful electrical insulator used in power transmission and semiconductor manufacturing and is emitted through evaporation and leakage into the atmosphere.

**Effects of Climate Change on the Environment**

IPCC was established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme to provide the world with a scientific view on climate change and its potential effects. According to the IPCC global average temperature is expected to increase relative to the 1986-2005 period by 0.3–4.8°C (0.5-8.6 °F) by the end of the 21st century (2081-2100), depending on future GHG emission scenarios (IPCC 2014:SPM-8). This temperature range represents the lower and higher bounds of five mitigation scenarios analyzed by the IPCC – two stringent scenarios, two intermediate scenarios, and a worst-case scenario. Temperatures in California are projected to increase 2.7 °F above 2000 averages by 2050 and, depending on global emission levels, 4.1–8.6 °F by 2100 (California Energy Commission [CEC] 2012:2).

Physical conditions beyond average temperatures could be indirectly affected by the accumulation of GHG emissions. For example, changes in weather patterns resulting from increases in global average temperature are expected to result in a decreased volume of precipitation falling as snow in California and an overall reduction in snowpack in the Sierra Nevada. Based upon historical data and modeling, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) projects that the Sierra snowpack will experience a 25 to 40 percent reduction from its historic average by 2050 (DWR 2008:4). An increase in precipitation falling as rain rather than snow also could lead to increased potential for floods because water that would normally be held in the Sierra Nevada until spring could flow into the Central Valley concurrently with winter storm events (CEC 2012:5). This scenario would place more pressure on California’s levee/flood control system.

Another outcome of global climate change is sea level rise. Sea level rose approximately seven inches during the last century. The National Research Council (NRC), in their 2012 report on Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington projects that the sea level along the California coastline will change
between -1 inch (fall) to 24 inches (rise) between 2000 and 2050 and 4 to 66 inches (rise) between 2000 and the end of this century. This projection is based on projected future ice loss at the poles, steric and ocean dynamics, seismic trends affecting land subsidence, and other numerical models and extrapolations, accounting for increasing levels of uncertainty in future years (NRC 2012:6).

As the existing climate throughout California changes over time, the ranges of various plant and wildlife species could shift or be reduced, depending on the favored temperature and moisture regimes of each species. In the worst cases, some species would become extinct or be extirpated from the state if suitable conditions are no longer available (CEC 2012:11 and 12).

Changes in precipitation patterns and increased temperatures are expected to alter the distribution and character of natural vegetation and associated moisture content of plants and soils. An increase in frequency of extreme heat events and drought are also expected. These changes are expected to lead to increased frequency and intensity of large wildfires (CEC 2012:11).

Regulatory Setting
Greenhouse gas emissions and responses to global climate change are regulated by a variety of federal, state, and local laws and policies. Key regulatory and conservation planning issues applicable to the proposed project are discussed below.

Federal

Supreme Court Ruling of CO₂ as a Pollutant
EPA is the federal agency responsible for implementing the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and its amendments. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled on April 2, 2007 that CO₂ is an air pollutant as defined under the CAA, and that EPA has the authority to regulate emissions of GHGs. The ruling in this case resulted in EPA taking steps to regulate GHG emissions and lent support for state and local agencies’ efforts to reduce GHG emissions.

National Program to Cut Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Improve Fuel Economy for Cars and Trucks
On August 28, 2014, EPA and the California Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) finalized a new national program that would reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy for all new cars and trucks sold in the United States (NHTSA 2012). EPA proposed the first-ever national GHG emissions standards under the CAA, and NHTSA proposed Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. This proposed national program allows automobile manufacturers to build a single light-duty national fleet that satisfies all requirements under both Federal programs and the standards of California and other states. While this program will increase fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks by Model Year 2025, additional phases are being developed by NHTS and EPA that address GHG emission standards for new medium- and heavy-duty trucks (NHTSA 2014).

State

Executive Order B-30-15
On April 20, 2015 Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. signed Executive Order B-30-15 to establish a California GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The Governor’s executive order aligns California’s GHG reduction targets with those of leading international governments such as the 28-nation European Union which adopted the same target in October 2014. California is on track to meet or exceed the current target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32, discussed below). California’s new emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 will make it possible to reach the ultimate goal of reducing emissions 80 percent under 1990 levels by 2050. This is in line with the scientifically established levels needed in the U.S. to limit global warming below 2 degrees Celsius (°C)—the warming threshold at which
there will likely be major climate disruptions such as super droughts and rising sea levels according to scientific consensus.

Executive Order S-3-05
Executive Order S-3-05, signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2005, proclaims that California is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. It declares that increased temperatures could reduce the Sierra Nevada snowpack, further exacerbate California’s air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To combat these concerns, the Executive Order established total GHG emission targets for the State. Specifically, emissions are to be reduced to the 2000 level by 2010, the 1990 level by 2020, and to 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050.

As described below, legislation was passed in 2006 to limit GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, but no additional reductions were specifically enumerated in the legislation.

Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
In September 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). AB 32 establishes regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and a cap on statewide GHG emissions. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 also requires that these reductions “...shall remain in effect unless otherwise amended or repealed. (b) It is the intent of the Legislature that the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit continue in existence and be used to maintain and continue reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases beyond 2020. (c) The [Air Resources Board] shall make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on how to continue reductions of greenhouse gas emissions beyond 2020.” [California Health and Safety Code, Division 25.5, Part 3, Section 38551]

AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan and Update
In December 2008, ARB adopted its Climate Change Scoping Plan, which contains the main strategies California will implement to achieve a reduction of approximately 118 million metric tons (MMT) of CO2-equivalent (CO2e) emissions, or approximately 21.7 percent from the state’s projected 2020 emission level of 545 MMT of CO2e under a business-as-usual scenario (this is a reduction of 47 MMT CO2e, or almost 10 percent, from 2008 emissions). ARB’s original 2020 projection was 596 MMT CO2e, but this revised 2020 projection takes into account the economic downturn that occurred in 2008 (ARB 2011a). The Scoping Plan reapproved by ARB in August 2011 includes the Final Supplement to the Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document, which further examined various alternatives to Scoping Plan measures. The Scoping Plan also includes ARB-recommended GHG reductions for each emissions sector of the state’s GHG inventory. ARB estimates the largest reductions in GHG emissions to be achieved by 2020 will be by implementing the following measures and standards (ARB 2011a):

- improved emissions standards for light-duty vehicles (estimated reductions of 26.1 MMT CO2e),
- the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (15.0 MMT CO2e),
- energy efficiency measures in buildings and appliances (11.9 MMT CO2e),
- a renewable portfolio and electricity standards for electricity production (23.4 MMT CO2e), and
- the Cap-and-Trade Regulation for certain types of stationary emission sources (e.g., power plants).

In May 2014, ARB released and has since adopted the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan to identify the next steps in reaching AB 32 goals and evaluate the progress that has been made between 2000 and 2012 (ARB 2014b:4 and 5). According to the update, California is on track to meet the near-term 2020 GHG limit and is well positioned to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 (ARB 2014b:ES-2). The update also reports the trends in GHG emissions from various emission sectors.

The update also elaborates on potential GHG reduction goals beyond 2020:

California will develop a mid-term target to frame the next suite of emission reduction measures and ensure continued progress toward scientifically-based targets. This target should be consistent with the level of reduction needed [by 2050] in the developed world to stabilize warming at 2°C (3.6°F)
[above pre-industrial levels] and align with targets and commitments elsewhere. The European Union has adopted an emissions reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The United Kingdom has committed to reduce its emissions by 50 percent below 1990 levels within the 2022–2027 timeframe, and Germany has set its own 2030 emissions target of 55 percent below 1990 levels. The United States, in support of the Copenhagen Accord, pledged emission reductions of 42 percent below 2005 levels in 2030 (which, for California, translates to 35 percent below 1990 levels).

This level of reduction is achievable in California. In fact, if California realizes the expected benefits of existing policy goals (such as 12,000 megawatts [MW] of renewable distributed generation by 2020, net zero energy homes after 2020, existing building retrofits under AB 758, and others) it could reduce emissions by 2030 to levels squarely in line with those needed in the developed world and to stay on track to reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Additional measures, including locally driven measures and those necessary to meet federal air quality standards in 2032, could lead to even greater emission reductions (ARB 2014b:34).

As supported by many of California’s climate scientists and economists, a key next step needed to build on California’s framework for climate action is to establish a mid-term statewide emission reduction target. Cumulative emissions drive climate change, and a continuum of action is needed to reduce emissions not just to stated limits in 2020 or 2050, but also every year in between (ARB 2014b:56).

The update summarizes sector-specific actions needed to stay on the path toward the 2050 target. While the update acknowledges certain reduction targets by others (such as in the Copenhagen Accord), it stops short of recommending a specific target for California, instead acknowledging that mid-term targets need to be set “consistent with the level of reduction needed [by 2050] in the developed world to stabilize warming at 2°C (3.6°F) [above pre-industrial levels].”

Actions are recommended for the energy sector, transportation (clean cars, expanded zero-emission vehicle program, fuels policies, etc.), land use (compliance with regional sustainability planning targets), agriculture, water use (more stringent efficiency and conservation standards, runoff capture, etc.), waste (elimination of organic material disposal, expanded recycling, use of Cap and Trade program, etc.), green building (strengthen Green Building Standards), and other sectors. Many of the actions that result in meeting targets will need to be driven by new or modified regulations.

At the time of writing of this document, however, no specific reduction goal beyond 2020 has been recommended or formally adopted by ARB or the California State Legislature other than the 2050 goal included in Executive Order S-3-05 (discussed above). As noted in the discussion of AB 32, above, the ARB is tasked with making a recommendation for targets beyond 2020 as part of the legislation.

**Senate Bill 375**

SB 375, signed by the Governor in September 2008, aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG emission reduction targets for cars and light duty trucks, and land use and housing allocation. SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy, showing prescribed land use allocation in each MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan. ARB, in consultation with the MPOs, is to provide each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in their respective regions for 2020 and 2035.

The applicable MPO in the project region is the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), which includes Placer County except for of the Lake Tahoe Basin. SACOG adopted its SCS in 2012. SACOG was tasked by ARB to achieve a 9 percent per capita reduction by 2020 and a 16 percent per capita reduction by 2035, which ARB confirmed the region would achieve by implementing its Sustainable Communities Strategy (ARB 2013).
Advanced Clean Cars Program
In January 2012, ARB approved the Advanced Clean Cars program which combines the control of GHG emissions and criteria air pollutants, as well as requirements for greater numbers of zero-emission vehicles, into a single package of standards for vehicle model years 2017 through 2025. The new rules strengthen the GHG standard for 2017 models and beyond. This will be achieved through existing technologies, the use of stronger and lighter materials, and more efficient drivetrains and engines. The program’s zero-emission vehicle regulation requires battery, fuel cell, and/or plug-in hybrid electric vehicles to account for up to 15 percent of California’s new vehicle sales by 2025. The program also includes a clean fuels outlet regulation designed to support the commercialization of zero-emission hydrogen fuel cell vehicles planned by vehicle manufacturers by 2015 by requiring increased numbers of hydrogen fueling stations throughout the state. The number of stations will grow as vehicle manufacturers sell more fuel cell vehicles. By 2025, when the rules will be fully implemented, the statewide fleet of new cars and light trucks will emit 34 percent fewer GHG emissions and 75 percent fewer smog-forming emissions than the statewide fleet in 2016 (ARB 2011b).

Senate Bill 97 of 2007
SB 97 directed the California Natural Resources Agency to adopt amendments to the CEQA Guidelines to specifically address GHG emissions. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010. This EIR complies with these Amendments and the CEQA checklist questions added to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines in response to SB 97 are discussed under the Significance Criteria heading below.

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

Construction-Generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Construction-related GHG emissions were analyzed under Impact 3A.4-1 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. Modeling was conducted using the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS 2007) and estimated that approximately 50,456 MT CO₂e would be generated by construction activity during the multiple-decade buildout period of the FPASP, including the adopted Folsom Heights plan. Because of the intensity and duration of construction activities associated with all development under the FPASP, including the project, and presuming that this level of construction-generated GHG emissions would be substantial compared to other construction projects in the region and in the State, the analysis determined that construction-generated GHG emission levels would have a substantial contribution to GHGs that cause climate change. Therefore, the analysis concluded, GHG emissions associated with construction under the FPASP would result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to this significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

SMAQMD did not have a recommended threshold for evaluating construction-related GHGs at the time of the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. Since that time, however, SMAQMD has developed a mass emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO₂e/year for determining whether construction-generated GHG emissions are significant (SMAQMD 2014a:6-12). Based on 50,456 MT CO₂e provided in the FPASP EIR/EIS for construction of the entire FPASP, GHG emissions generated by construction of the FPASP (including the Folsom Heights plan) would exceed SMAQMD’s threshold.

The types of emissions-generating construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the adopted Folsom Heights plan, as well as the quantity of land that would be developed and the intensity and pace of construction. Overall, development within the Folsom Heights site under the amended plan would be similar in area, size, and intensity to what was approved under the FPASP. For these reasons it is not anticipated that the project would result in any new circumstances involving new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts pertaining to construction-generated GHG emissions then were identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.4-1a, which focuses on reducing construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, would also result in reductions in construction-generated GHGs. Similarly, implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.4-1b, which requires applicants to pay an off-site
mitigation fee to SMAQMD to offset construction-generated emissions of NOx would also result in reductions in construction-generated GHGs. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 3A.4-1 requires implementation of additional measures to minimize construction-generated GHG emissions. These mitigation measures would generally result in the same reductions in GHG emissions under the project as the adopted FPASP. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis would be required.

**Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
GHG emissions and associated climate change impacts of the approved FPASP were evaluated in Section 4.7 of the 2010 Draft FPASP EIR/EIS. The methods of analysis for GHG estimation have evolved since the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. Since that time, the Urban Emissions model (URBEMIS) that was used in the FPASP EIR/EIS analysis was replaced with the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). CalEEMod is now the widely-recognized modeling tool by air districts in California for estimating GHG emissions for development projects, including SMAQMD (SMAQMD 2014a:6-7). Also, SMAQMD now recommends a specific threshold of significance for evaluating GHG emissions from land use development projects, as discussed above. The replacement of URBEMIS with CalEEMod, as well as the new threshold and guidance recommended by SMAQMD, do not constitute “new information” as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, because information was known about GHGs at the time the FPASP was prepared and modeling methodologies similar to what is now used were available to estimate emissions. In this environmental review, an analysis is conducted to evaluate the project’s impacts in the context of the current regulatory environment, to apply SMAQMD’s threshold and methodology and, more specifically, to evaluate whether the project would have substantially more severe impacts with respect to climate change than the approved plan. As part of this analysis, mass GHG emissions were estimated for two separate scenarios, listed in Table 4.7-1, and discussed in further detail below.

### Table 4.7-1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MT CO2e/year)²</th>
<th>Approved Specific Plan for Folsom Heights Site, 2018</th>
<th>Amended Folsom Heights Plan, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources²</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption³</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>2,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources (vehicle trips)⁴</td>
<td>10,213</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste⁵</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water⁵</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mass GHG Emissions</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,492</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,485</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-3,007</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Appendix A for detail on model inputs, assumptions, and modeling parameters.

1. Emission estimates shown in this table do not account for the emission reductions that would be achieved by implementation of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Air Quality Mitigation Plan, which is required by Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS.

2. Area sources of emissions include landscaping equipment and off-road equipment.

3. Emissions associated with electricity consumption, including electricity consumption associated with water consumption, would be greater under the No-Action-Taken Scenario because no reductions would be realized from the implementation of renewable requirements in the electric power generation industry and new efficiency standards for the heating and cooling of building interiors and water heating.

4. Emissions from vehicle trips would be greater under the No-Action-Taken Scenario because no reductions would result from regulations governing vehicle emission standards for GHGs, including the vehicle emission standards from Advanced Clean Cars and the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard. These regulations provide increasingly stringent emission standards over time.

5. No substantial difference would be expected in emissions associated with wastewater treatment, the generation of solid waste, landscaping.

MT = metric tons  
CO2e = carbon dioxide-equivalent  
SP = service population (i.e., residents + jobs)

Source: Modeling and calculations conducted by Ascent Environmental 2016.
Emission levels were estimated using CalEEMod Version 2013.2. Detailed assumptions and input parameters are provided in Appendix A.

As shown above, the mass emission level generated by operation of the approved FPASP for the Folsom Heights plan and project would exceed the threshold of 1,100 MT CO\(_2\)e/year. However, the project would generate less GHGs annually than the approved Folsom Heights plan.

Therefore, GHG emissions associated with operation of the project would not result in any new circumstances involving new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts related to GHG emissions than were identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Furthermore, the emissions estimates summarized in Table 4.7-1 in combination with this analysis fulfill the requirement of Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2a to complete a project-specific analysis of the amended Folsom Heights plan.

The analysis under Impact 3A.4-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that the FPASP would result in the loss of blue oak woodland and individual oak trees, which are a form of carbon storage and sequester carbon from the atmosphere. Therefore, the applicant still must fulfill the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2b in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2b requires the applicant to participate in and implement an urban and community forestry program and/or off-site tree program to offset loss in carbon sequestration associated with any removal of onsite trees.

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

Construction-Generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions
As discussed in (a), above, the types and amount of GHG-generating construction activity, as well as the reductions resulting from required mitigation, would generally be the same under the project as the approved FPASP for the Folsom Heights site. Also, construction-generated GHG emissions would exceed SMAQMD’s mass emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO\(_2\)e/year under both the approved plan and the project. Therefore, construction-generated emissions under the approved plan and the project would be a substantial contribution to global climate change and would conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. However, because construction activity would generally be the same under the project as the approved plan, the project would not result in any new circumstances involving new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts pertaining to construction-generated GHG emissions then were identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS.

Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions
As discussed in (a), above, the project would have less GHG emissions than under the adopted Folsom Heights plan. Therefore, operational GHG emissions under the project would not be considered a cumulative contribution to climate change. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts.

Impacts of Climate Change on the Project
Section 3A.4.2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS discusses impacts on the FPASP related to global climate change. This section discusses ways in which global climate change could alter the physical environment in California including increased average temperatures; modifications to the timing, amount, and form (rain versus snow) of precipitation; changes in the timing and amount of runoff; reduced water supply; deterioration of water quality; elevated sea level; and effects on agriculture. The analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that (1) either the climate change effect from these changes would not have the potential to substantially affect the FPASP area, or (2) because of significant uncertainty in projecting future conditions related to the climate change effect, it would be too speculative to reach a meaningful conclusion regarding the significance of any reasonably foreseeable direct impact on physical conditions in the project vicinity and, therefore, impacts are too speculative for meaningful consideration. No substantial changes in the understanding of climate change science have occurred since the FPASP was approved. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis is required.
Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.4-1: Implement Additional Measures to Control Construction-Generated GHG Emissions.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2a: Implement Additional Measures to Reduce Operational GHG Emissions.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.4-2b: Participate in and Implement an Urban and Community Forestry Program and/or Off-Site Tree Program to Off-Set Loss of On-Site Trees.

CONCLUSION
This report updates the environmental setting addressing GHG’s and provides additional project-level GHG analysis. While the updated information and the project-specific analyses provide additional detail for the project site, the proposed amendment to the FPASP would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to greenhouse gases. Therefore, no additional analysis is required.
## 4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-11, 3A.8-12 Impact 3A.8-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-13 Impact 3A.8-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-13 Impact 3A.8-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-2 to 3A.8-9 Impact 3A.8-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-18 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on the project area?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-18, 3A.8-19 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.8-14 Impact 3A.8-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-18, 3A.8-19 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Create a significant hazard to the public through use of explosive materials in grading or earth-moving activities?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-13, 3A.8-14 Impact 3A.8-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Expose project residents to excessive electrical or magnetic fields?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-7, 3A.8-11, 3A.8-12, 3A.8-13, 3A.8-15 Impact 3A.8-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Create public health hazards from increased exposure to mosquitoes by providing substantial new habitat for mosquitoes or other vectors?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.8-10, 3A.8-15 Impact 3A.8-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to hazards and hazardous materials, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011. The EIR/EIS included three criteria that are not included in the current Appendix G of the CEQA guidelines.

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The EIR/EIS analysis of the adopted FPASP (Impact 3A.8-1) considered the potential for the public to be exposed to hazardous materials through the increased use, storage, and disposal of household hazardous materials and for commercial and industrial development to result in increased use, storage, and/or disposal of hazardous materials during routine operations. The EIR/EIS analysis concluded that the impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. The project would not change the overall pattern of development of the types of hazardous materials that would be used, handled, or transported to the site. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

As discussed in the EIR/EIS, potential sources of hazards and hazardous materials on the FPASP include structures that may contain asbestos-containing materials and lead paint, polychlorinated biphenyls, abandoned mine shafts, and chemicals from mining activities. However, as described on page 3A.8-7 of the Draft EIR/EIS, a review of agency databases, including the Cortese List, did not identify any recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the Folsom Heights property. As there was no evidence of RECs for this site, no further investigation was recommended. No changes to the conditions of the site or the presence of hazardous materials has occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

As discussed above, there are no known hazardous material sites present in the Folsom Heights area. No changes to the conditions of the site or the presence of hazardous materials has occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

As discussed in Impact 3A.8-3, a portion of the Aerojet Superfund site (Area 40) is located in the FPASP area, and is undergoing investigation and remediation under the direction of EPA and DTSC. The EIR/EIS concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact because Area 40 is in the area which is planned for development and it has the potential to create a public health hazard. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.8-3a, 3A.8-3b, and 3A.8-3c, which would require that remediation activities are fully disclosed, coordinated with development to ensure construction doesn’t affect remediation, and the applicants provide notice to the City that they have fulfilled DTSC requirements, the impact would be reduced to less than significant. However, Area 40 is outside of the Folsom Heights project area and the project would have no impact to this site; therefore, adopted mitigation would not be applicable to the project. As described under b), the Folsom Heights project area is not located on a list of hazardous
materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur and the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described on page 3A.8-18 of the EIR/EIS, the project area is not located within two miles of a public, public-use, or private airport, nor is it within and airport land use plan area. The nearest airport, Sacramento Mather Airport, is located approximately seven miles southwest of the SPA. Therefore, impacts related to airport or private airfield safety were not discussed in the EIR/EIS. No new airports have been developed near the project area. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described on page 3A.8-19 of the EIR/EIS, the project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Impacts related to private airfield safety were not discussed in the EIR/EIS. No new airports have been developed near the project area. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
As described in Impact 3A.8-4, implementation of the project would require permits from the City of Folsom to ensure that the project provides sufficient hydrant locations, street width, circulation, and project access for fire and emergency response units. Implementation of the project would not conflict with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. The impact was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required. No changes to these circumstances have occurred. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described on page 3A.8-18 of the EIR/EIS, the FPASP was not located in an area with significant risk related to wildland fires and no detailed analysis related to this topic was evaluated. No changes to the location of the project have occurred and no changes to the risks from wildfires has occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

i) Create a significant hazard to the public through use of explosive materials in grading or earth-moving activities?
As described in Impact 3A.8-5, implementation of the project may require blasting as a part of excavation and removal of rock from the eastern slopes of the FPASP within the Folsom Heights plan area. The EIS/EIR concluded that the potential for accidents resulting in injuries or fatalities was a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure Mitigation Measure 3A.8-5 would require the applicant to prepare and implement a blasting safety plan in consultation with a qualified blasting contractor. With implementation of this mitigation measure that would also include securing permits from the appropriate agencies, the impact would be reduced to less than significant. No changes to the risks from the use of explosive materials has occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
j) **Expose project residents to excessive electrical or magnetic fields?**
As described in Impact 3A.8-6, The FPASP is traversed by two 230- kilovolt (kV), one 115-kV, and one 69-kV electrical transmission lines on steel lattice towers within a single 400-foot-wide right-of-way, with lines spread throughout the easement to approximately 50 feet from the edges of the right-of-way. These lines are located on the far west of the FPASP area and over 2 miles from the Folsom Heights boundary, and the signals would dissipate and not expose persons within the Folsom Heights area to excessive electrical or magnetic fields. Therefore, there is no impact. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

k) **Create public health hazards from increased exposure to mosquitoes by providing substantial new habitat for mosquitoes or other vectors?**
As described in Impact 3A.8-7, implementation of the FPASP includes a variety of features that are considered to be mosquito attractants, including 16 detention basins, storm drains, and roadside ditches. Typical stormwater facilities create habitat for mosquitoes that are attracted to above-ground, clean water sources, and underground, polluted (nutrient rich) sources. Because stormwater infrastructure would be located in close proximity to proposed development, diseases, such as West Nile Virus, could be easily spread within the population through mosquito vectors. The EIR/EIS found that there would be a potentially significant impact because the FPASP did not include mosquito prevention BMPs. Mitigation Measure 3A.8-7 required the applicants to prepare and implement a vector control plan in consultation with the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District. With this mitigation, the risk to human health because of mosquito-borne disease would be reduced to less than significant.

The project would be subject to the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3A.8-7. No changes related to possible exposure to mosquito- or other vector-borne disease have occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Mitigation Measures**
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if the project was approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.8-5: Prepare and implement a blasting safety plan in consultation with a qualified blaster.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.8-7: Prepare and implement a vector control plan in consultation with the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District.

**CONCLUSION**
No new circumstances or project changes related to hazards and hazardous materials have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts. No additional analysis is required.
# 4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Hydrology and Water Quality: Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>Setting pp. A.9-10 to 3A.9-23 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (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?)</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-5 to 3A.9-6 Impact 3A.9-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-1 to 3A.9-5 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-1 to 3A.9-5 Impacts 3A.9-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-1 to 3A.9-5 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-6 to 3A.9-9 Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-5 to 3A.9-1.7 Impact 3A.9-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.9-5 to 3A.9-1.7 Impact 3A.9-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death invoking flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.9-20 Impact 3A.9-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-5 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to hydrology and water quality, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.9 Hydrology and Water Quality – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
The EIR/EIS addressed water quality impacts related to the approved FPASP in Section 3A.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. As described in Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3, the FPASP could result in significant impacts to water quality because of soil disturbance during construction and alteration of water flows over the site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3 would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level by requiring a project-specific stormwater water quality maintenance plan. No substantial changes to the development plans for the Folsom Heights project area would occur with the project. The project would continue to comply with mitigation requirements outlined in the adopted mitigation for the FPASP. With implementation of this mitigation, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
The EIR/EIS addressed the FPASP's effect on groundwater recharge in Impact 3A.9-6. As described in this impact, the FPASP would introduce new impervious surfaces and there is poor natural groundwater recharge in the area. Most substantial recharge would occur along active stream channels. Impact 3A.9-6 concluded that the impact on groundwater recharge would be less-than-significant because those areas within the FPASP that are most conducive to groundwater recharge (e.g., the Carson Creek stream and tributary corridors) would generally be maintained in open space and as retention basins. No mitigation was required. The project would not substantially change development patterns and the amount of impermeable surfaces from that approved in the FPASP. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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 on- or off-site erosion or siltation?
As discussed in Impact 3A.9-1 and Impact 3A.9-3, construction activities associated with development of the FPASP would create the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation both within and downstream of the FPASP and this was determined to be a significant impact. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3, which require a project-specific storm water pollution prevention plan and water quality maintenance plan, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The project would not substantially change development patterns and the amount of impermeable surfaces from that approved in the FPASP. In addition, a project-specific storm water pollution prevention plan would be prepared consistent with Mitigation Measures 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
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 on- or off-site flooding?
The certified EIR/EIS addresses impacts resulting from alteration of drainage patterns and drainage capacity under the approved FPASP in Impact 3A.9-2. As described in this impact, urbanization of the FPASP area would increase runoff volume and peak flows, which could contribute to downstream flooding and erosion. Increased runoff to existing and proposed culverts within and downstream of the FPASP area could result in overtopping and flooding because of inadequate capacity for urbanized flow-rates, and could lead to bank erosion, elevated flood levels and increased runoff. The EIR/EIS concluded that there was a potentially significant impact related to stormwater runoff and the subsequent risk of flooding. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.9-2 would reduce the potentially significant impact associated with the potential increased risk of flooding from increased stormwater runoff to a less-than-significant level because it requires the applicant to prepare, submit, and implement a final drainage plan. The project would not substantially change development or drainage patterns from that approved in the FPASP. Further, the project would continue to comply with mitigation requirements outlined in the adopted mitigation for the FPASP. With implementation of this mitigation, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described in Impacts 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3, the conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses would have both short- and long-term effects on stormwater runoff. The project would not substantially change development or drainage patterns from that approved in the FPASP. Nonetheless, the impacts on drainage were found to be significant because the conversion of undeveloped land to urban land uses would have both short- and long-term effects on stormwater runoff. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.9-1 and 3A.9-3 which requires a project-specific storm water pollution prevention plan and water quality maintenance plan, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, there would be no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
The potential for the project to substantially degrade water quality is addressed in a) and e). There are no other unaddressed water quality impacts.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
The EIR/EIS addressed impacts related to flood hazards in Impact 3A.9-5. A delineation of the proposed 200-year floodplain was developed for the FPASP. Development under the FPASP including the Folsom Heights project area would be subject to the requirements of SB 5 which disallow development in a flood hazard zone unless 200-year flood protection is provided. Because of this protection, the impact related to building in a floodplain would be less than significant. Floodplain designations for the site have not changed since approval of the FPASP. Further, the project would continue to be required to comply with the requirements of SB 5. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?
This is addressed under g), above.
i) 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?
As described in Impact 3A.9-4, there is a potentially significant risk of flooding because of the failure of a dam upstream of the FPASP. Mitigation Measure 3A.9-4 would reduce this risk to a less-than-significant level by requiring the applicant to inspect and evaluate existing dams within and upstream of the project site and make improvements if necessary. This mitigation would continue to apply to the project. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
The FPASP, including the Folsom Heights project area, is not located in an area prone to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows. No impact would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to remain applicable if project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.9-1: Acquire appropriate regulatory permits and prepare and implement SWPPP and BMPs.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.9-2: Prepare and submit final drainage plans and implement requirements contained in those plans.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.9-3: Develop and implement a BMP and water quality maintenance plan.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.9-4: Inspect and evaluate existing dams within and upstream of the project site and make improvements if necessary.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the proposed amendment to the FPASP would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to hydrology and water quality.
4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.10-1 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.10-4 to 3A.10-28 Impacts 3A.10-1 and 3A.10-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.3-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to land use and planning, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.10 under Land Use and Agricultural Resources – Land and Section 3A.3 under Biological Resources – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

a) Physically divide an established community?
As discussed in the certified EIR/EIS on page 3A.10-29, the project is located in an area which consists of livestock grazing lands. The only existing single-family residence and associated agricultural outbuildings are located on the western side of the SPA and would be outside of the Folsom Heights project area. Therefore, project implementation would not physically divide an established community and this issue was not evaluated in the EIR/EIS. No changes in development at the site have occurred since approval of the FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
Impacts 3A.10-1 and 3A.10-2 in the EIR/EIS address consistency of the then-proposed FPASP with Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) Guidelines and the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint. The LAFCo Guidelines were relevant because the FPASP area was required to be annexed into the City of Folsom. Since the adoption of the FPASP, the area was annexed into the City and this impact discussion is no longer relevant.

As discussed on page 3A.10-39 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the FPASP was found to be consistent with the SACOG Sacramento Region Preferred Blueprint Scenario. As stated in Impact 3A.10-2, the FPASP provides fewer dwelling units than what is identified in the Blueprint. The Folsom Heights project would not change the number of dwelling units proposed under the FPASP. In addition, the project would continue to be consistent with the smart growth principles within the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint.
This project includes an amendment to the adopted FPASP. This project will remain consistent with the community vision, design framework, and planning principles. The changes to the land uses and backbone infrastructure will be evaluated and, if approved, the FPASP will be amended to include the changes. Because the project includes amending the FPASP, and the project remains consistent with other applicable plans and policies, impacts would be less than significant. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?
As stated in Impact 3A.3-7, there is no adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan that covers the area in which project is located and no new plans have been adopted since approval of the FPASP. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures were needed for the certified EIR/EIS regarding land use and planning. No additional mitigation measures are required for project for this topic.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to land use and planning.
4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Mineral Resources. Would the Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-12 and 3A.7-13, Impacts 3A.7-8, 3A.7-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.7-12 and 3A.7-13, Impacts 3A.7-8, 3A.7-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to mineral resources, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.7 Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources - Land has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011.

a) 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 b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

As described in Impacts 3A.7-8 and 3A.7-9, the FPASP area contains mineral resource zones for construction aggregate and kaolin clay. While the EIR/EIS found that the possible loss of the construction aggregate would be a less-than-significant impact, the possible loss of kaolin clay was determined to be potentially significant because it is unknown whether there could be an economically valuable deposit of kaolin clay that would be lost with development of the FPASP. While Mitigation Measure 3A.7-9 was included to determine if economically valuable mineral resources are present, they would still be lost because of the development. The impact was concluded to remain potentially significant and unavoidable. The Folsom Heights plan area is not located in the area with potential mineral resources including the kaolin clay resources. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to impacts to mineral resources. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts and the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

This topic is addressed above, under a).

Mitigation Measures
None required for the project.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to mineral resources.
### 4.12 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the DEIR/DEIS.</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts?</th>
<th>Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents' Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Noise. Would the project result in:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.11-12 to 3A.11-17 Impacts 3A.11-4, 3A.11-5, and 3A.11-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.11-4 Impact 3A.11-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5 to 3A.11-11 Impacts 3A.11-4, 3A.11-5, and 3A.11-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but remains significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5 to 3A.11-11 Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5, 3A.11-10, 3A.11-11 Impact 3A.11-6 overflight</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.11-5, 3A.11-10, 3A.11-11 No Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.12.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to noise and vibration, described in FPASP EIR/EIS Sections 3A.11 Noise – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR in. No new noise sources have been introduced near the planning area since the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared.

**a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?**

**Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Traffic Noise Levels from Project Operation**

Long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased stationary-source noise levels from operation of the FPASP were analyzed under Impact 3A.11-5 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. Traffic noise levels with and without buildout of the FPASP, under both existing and future baseline conditions, were modeled using the Federal Highway Administration’s Highway Noise Prediction Model for all the roadway segments in the traffic study area, including roadways in the City of Folsom, unincorporated areas of Sacramento County, the City of Rancho Cordova, El Dorado County, and nearby segments of U.S. 50. The modeling estimates showed that
buildout of the FPASP would result in net increases in community noise equivalent levels (CNELs) along affected roadway segments in comparison to existing no project conditions that range from 6.7 to 10.0 decibels (dB). Traffic noise level increases along many roadway segments were considered substantial because they exceed 3.0 dB CNEL where existing or projected future traffic noise levels range between 60 and 65 dB CNEL, or 1.5 dB CNEL where existing or projected future traffic noise levels are greater than 65 dB day-night average noise level ($L_{DA}$)/CNEL. Because there were numerous roadway segments for which project buildout of the FPASP would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors this analysis determined this impact would be significant. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS required individual project applicants to ensure that specific Sound Transmission Class ratings are achieved by all noise-sensitive buildings built in the FPASP. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 also requires project applicants to conduct a site-specific analysis to determine predicted roadway noise impacts attributable to the project in accordance with adopted City noise standards and implement measures to reduce these impacts. Because the feasibility and effectiveness of mitigation is uncertain at this time the FPASP EIR/EIS determined this impact to be significant and unavoidable.

The project generally consists of the same types of collector roads that connect to area arterials as the approved FPASP. Overall, the project would generate less VMT than was approved. Thus, the size of the traffic noise increases resulting from trips generated by the project would not be substantially greater than determined under impact 3A.11-5 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. As with the approved FPASP, additional detail about the severity and locations of receptors affected by these impacts will be understood when site-specific noise analyses are conducted to fulfill the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4.

**Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Stationary-Source Noise Levels from Project Operation**

Impact 3A.11-5 in the FPASP EIR/EIS discussed the potential impacts of long-term exposure of sensitive receptors, both existing and future, to increased stationary-source noise levels from project operation. The FPASP EIR/EIS addressed this impact area as it relates to a variety of stationary sources, including rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment; mechanical equipment; emergency electrical generators; parking lot activities; and loading dock operations. The respective noise impacts from these and other stationary sources were discussed and had significance determinations individually by source type.

The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that noises from mechanical HVAC could be primary noise sources associated with proposed residential, commercial, and industrial uses with the potential for significant impacts on nearby receptors. The FPASP EIR/EIS also determined that emergency generator, parking lot, and loading dock and delivery activities could have potentially significant impacts on sensitive receptors for long-term exposure due to the potential for the receptors to be located within range of noise levels exceeding applicable noise standards. For noise impacts from emergency facilities and outdoor recreational and educational activities, it was assumed that the normal operation of these facilities would be exempt from the Folsom City Noise Ordinance. Thus, the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that long-term noise impacts from emergency facilities and outdoor recreational and educational activities would be less than significant. Whether or not the project would change the significance determinations made by the FPASP EIR/EIS is discussed in more detail for each of the other stationary noise sources below.

**Mechanical HVAC Equipment**

Although the FPASP EIR/EIS did not anticipate noise from mechanical HVAC systems to exceed stationary-source noise standards at noise-sensitive land uses, the potential for impacts still exists. None of the changes to the layout of land uses in the project would result in substantial changes to this impact or an increase in its severity. Residential mechanical HVAC equipment could still impact adjacent residences; and, the commercial land uses would still be adjacent to residential land uses under the proposed amended specific plan. Thus, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from mechanical HVAC noise levels as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding this noise impact remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Emergency Generators, Parking Lot, and Loading Dock and Delivery Activities**

As discussed in the FPASP EIR/EIS, emergency generators, parking lot activity, and loading dock and delivery activities would most likely occur at industrial/office park and commercial land uses. These noise sources
could result in significant impacts on sensitive receptors as far as 1,200 feet. As discussed in the project description, in general, the proposed application is largely consistent with the land uses proposed and approved for this portion of the FPASP. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise associated with emergency generators, parking lot activity, and loading dock and delivery activities as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Emergency Facilities and Outdoor Recreational and Educational Activities
The FPASP EIR/EIS stated that the Folsom City Municipal Code exempts noise associated with the operation of emergency facilities and from unlighted public parks, public playgrounds, and public or private schools from the hours of 7 a.m. to dusk, and from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. for such facilities that are lighted. As discussed in the project description, in general, the proposed application is largely consistent with the land uses proposed and approved for this portion of the FPASP. Thus, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise generated by emergency facilities and outdoor recreational and educational activities as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Compatibility of Proposed On-Site Land Uses with the Ambient Noise Environment
Under Impact 3A.11-7, the FPASP EIR/EIS analyzed whether noise-sensitive land use developed under the FPASP would be exposed to excessive noise levels from off-site noise sources, including activity at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area and activities at the Aerojet General Corporation site located several miles to the west of the Folsom Heights site, and roadway traffic.

The analysis determined that no portions of the FPASP, including the Folsom Heights site, would be exposed to noise levels generated at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area that exceed applicable standards. This would also be the case for the land uses developed under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise generated at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding noise generated at the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Land owned by the Aerojet General Corporation is located just west of the Folsom Heights. The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that activities at the Aerojet facility, including testing of rocket and aircraft engines, would not exceed the City’s nontransportation noise standards because these noise-generating activities would be located a sufficient distance from any noise-sensitive land uses, would occur during less noise-sensitive daytime hours, and their duration would be relatively short. This would also be the case for the land uses developed under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from noise generated at the Aerojet General Corporation site as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding noise generated at the Aerojet General Corporation site remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Regarding traffic noise; however, the analysis under Impact 3A.11-7 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that some of the noise-sensitive land uses developed on the Folsom Heights site could be exposed to traffic noise levels under future traffic conditions that exceed the City’s land-use compatibility standard of 60 dB CNEL. As discussed in the project description, in general, the proposed application is largely consistent with the land uses proposed and approved for this portion of the FPASP. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 of the FPASP EIR/EIS requires individual project applicants to ensure that specific Sound Transmission Class ratings are achieved by all noise-sensitive buildings built in the FPASP. Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 also requires project applicants to conduct a site-specific analysis to determine predicted roadway noise impacts attributable to the project in accordance with adopted City noise standards and implement measures to reduce these impacts, including but not limited to sound barriers. The FPASP EIR/EIS determined that this mitigation would reduce on-site traffic noise levels at proposed noise-sensitive land uses to levels conditionally acceptable with mitigation (i.e., 65 dB L_{Aeq}/CNEL). This would also be the case for the land uses under the project. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from traffic noise generated on area roadways as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS regarding land use compatibility with traffic corridors remain valid. As with the approved FPASP, additional detail about the
severity and locations of receptors affected by these impacts will be understood when site-specific noise analyses are conducted to fulfill the requirements of Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4.

Overall, no new or substantially severe significant effects would occur with implementation of the project; therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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

Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Potential Groundborne Noise and Vibration from Project Construction

Impacts from potential construction-related short-term groundborne noise and vibration on sensitive receptors were analyzed under Impact 3A.11-3 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. The FPASP EIR/EIS identified bulldozing and blasting activities as the source of maximum groundborne noise and vibration levels that would result from the construction of the FPASP. According to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), levels associated with the use of a large bulldozer and blasting are 0.089 and 1.13 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) (87 and 109 vibration decibels [VdB]) at 25 feet, respectively, as shown in Table 3A.11-17 in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Caltrans-recommended vibration exposure thresholds of 0.2 in/sec PPV for the protection of normal residential buildings and 0.08 in/sec PPV for the protection of old or historically significant structures (Caltrans 2004:17). In addition, with respect to prevention of human disturbance, bulldozing and blasting could exceed the FTA-recommended level of 78 VdB within 50 and 275 feet, respectively.

The analysis determined that, although bulldozing activities would not exceed the Caltrans-recommended thresholds for residential buildings, any blasting performed within 80 feet of a receptor could exceed the vibration threshold. Existing off-site residences along the eastern border of the FPASP area in El Dorado County, the closest sensitive receptors to the FPASP border (and Folsom Heights), could be located within 80 feet of FPASP blasting activities. Thus, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that short-term construction could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne noise or vibration levels and determined a direct significant impact with no indirect impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.11-3 would reduce project-generated groundborne noise and vibration levels and the exposure thereof by setting standards for blasting and bulldozing activities. Even with the mitigation measure, the impact was found to be significant and unavoidable. No additional measures are available to reduce the impact beyond what was provided for in the EIR/EIS.

The sensitive receptors would not be exposed to noise and vibration levels substantially greater than those determined in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, no new or substantially more severe impacts would occur from construction-generated groundborne vibration or groundborne noise as a result of the project. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Refer to a) for discussion about whether the project would result in a more substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels relative to the approved FPASP.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Equipment Noise from Project Construction

The FPASP EIR/EIS provides a program-level analysis of short-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased equipment noise from project construction under Impact 3A.11-1. Based on the modeling conducted for the FPASP EIR/EIS, construction noise levels could exceed 55 dB L_{10} within 850 feet of an activity center (e.g., the acoustical center of areas where construction activities are focused). During
nighttime hours, the modeling also estimated construction noise levels could exceed 50 and 45 dB $L_{eq}$ within 1,300, and 2,000 feet of the activity centers, respectively. These noise level limits were based on noise standards and thresholds discussed in Section 3A.11.2 in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Because existing and future sensitive receptors located in both the City of Folsom and El Dorado County are located within these project-generated noise contours, the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that exposure of sensitive receptors to equipment noise levels would exceed applicable noise standards and result in a direct, significant impact. As discussed in Section 4.3.1 a) regarding air pollutant emissions, construction activities under the project would be expected to be similar to those characterized in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Construction activities under the project would require similar types and numbers of equipment operating at similar levels of intensity. In addition, as discussed in b) above, the closest existing sensitive receptors to the Folsom Heights site are located adjacent to the eastern Folsom Heights boundary, within 80 feet of the proposed area of construction. Future sensitive receptors may also be present on-site as remaining portions of plan area undergo construction. Thus, construction activity under the project would expose sensitive receptors to equipment noise levels that would exceed applicable noise standards. However, noise-sensitive receptors would not be exposed to construction noise levels that are new or substantially more severe than would occur from under the approved FPASP. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Traffic Noise Levels from Project Construction**

Impact 3A. 11-2 of the FPASP EIR/EIS explained that construction of the FPASP would result in additional vehicle trips on the local roadway network from worker commute and the transport of equipment and materials. This analysis determined that additional construction-related vehicles trips would not result in noise level increases greater than 3 dB CNEL and; therefore, the FPASP EIR/EIS concluded that the short-term increase traffic noise levels due to construction-generated vehicle trips would be a less-than-significant impact.

The number of additional vehicle trips associated with construction activity under the project would not anticipated to be substantially more severe because the same types of land uses would be developed. Thus, this impact would be within the scope of the impact already evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS and would also be less than significant. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?

As explained in the FPASP EIR/EIS Mather Airport is located approximately seven miles southwest of the FPASP area, including the Folsom Heights site. The runways at this airport are oriented southwest to northeast. The Mather Airport Master Plan has been updated since the time the FPASP EIR/EIS was prepared. The update largely accounts for projected increases in future aircraft operations at Mather Airport. It is anticipated that most, if not all, regional air cargo demand will be handled by Mather Airport instead of Sacramento International Airport and that general aviation use at Mather Airport will also increase. These changes will result in more take offs and landings during both daytime and nighttime hours. The noise analysis in the EIR for the 2013 Mather Airport Master Plan indicates that the future projected 65 dB CNEL contour for Mather Airport extends across a portion of White Rock Road that is approximately 3,000 feet of Nimbus Road (County of Sacramento 2014: 9-64). The eastern end of this 65 dB CNEL contour is more than three miles west of the southwest corner of the Folsom Heights site. The noise contour maps presented in the EIR do not show the extent of the 60 dB CNEL contour, but because the extent of the maps do not even include the Folsom Heights site and because the future projected 65 dB CNEL contour would be more than three miles away, it is anticipated that land uses developed in the Folsom Heights site would not be subject to aircraft noise levels that exceed the 60 dB CNEL standard stated in City of Folsom General Plan Policy 30.4 (City of Folsom 1988:26-12). Also, as explained in the FPASP EIR/EIS, the nearest 60 dB CNEL noise contour developed in 2005 is approximately 5,000 feet to the west of the FPASP area. Please note, aviation easements exist on property within the FPASP.
The CNEL is not the only metric for analyzing the potential noise effects of aircraft operations around airports. As stated in Policy 30.4 of the City of Folsom General Plan noise element, noise from single occurrences such as the passage of aircraft should also be evaluated in terms of single event noise levels (SENLs). The maximum noise level created by such an event may have the potential to result in activity interference even though the cumulative noise exposure in terms of CNEL is within acceptable limits. The potential for sleep disturbance is usually of primary concern, and should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis (City of Folsom 1988:26-12).

In this fashion, the EIR for the 2013 Mather Airport Master Plan also provides detailed discussion about aircraft-generated SENLs and their effect on sleep at residential land uses. The analysis uses a methodology developed by the American National Standards Institute and the Acoustical Society of America to predict sleep disturbance, which is measured by the resultant percent of the population potentially awakened at least once during the night.

The analysis mapped eastern Sacramento County, including portions of Folsom north of U.S. 50, and western El Dorado County to show the level of sleep disturbance at existing residential areas under 2012 conditions, 2018 conditions, and 2035 conditions. This mapping shows percent ranges including 0 to 1 percent, 1.1 to 4.0 percent, 4.1 to 7.0 percent, 7.1 to 10.0 percent, and additional, higher ranges. While the analysis did not map the Folsom Heights area, some understanding about the level of sleep disturbance at this location can be interpolated based on the mapped results for nearby areas. This analysis assumes that the level of sleep disturbance in the portions of Folsom south of U.S. 50, including the Folsom Heights plan area, would be comparable to areas of Folsom north of U.S. 50 because these two areas are approximately the same distance from the flight tracks that approach and depart the airport. The mapping for 2012 show the 1.1-to-4.0 and, 4.1-to-7.0 percent ranges in Folsom. Increases in aircraft activity at Mather Airport would expose some portions of Folsom to the 7.1-to-10.0 percent range in 2018, and even more areas of Folsom to the 7.1-to-10.0 percent range in 2035 (County of Sacramento 2014: 9-75, 9-76, 9-78).

One key consideration about this analysis is that the estimates of the percent of population potentially awakened assume that the residential dwelling units have their windows open. Please note that closed windows typically result in a 25-30 dB reduction in interior noise levels.

The awakenings analysis in the EIR for the 2013 Mather Airport Master Plan does not reach an impact conclusion (County of Sacramento 2014: 9-72). It states the following:

This “information only” discussion of single event noise provides data on the potential for awakenings and/or classroom disruption, applying the latest technical guidance for quantifying these issues. This approach allows the decision makers and public evaluating the [2013 Mather Airport Master Plan] to draw their own conclusions regarding the significance of the analysis in the context of the larger project. City of Folsom staff also regard this as an “information only” analysis in this environmental review because even though aircraft SENLs have been the subject of various CEQA court cases no government agency has identified a consistently used threshold for determining what level of sleep disturbance is significant. The existence of Mather Airport and the fact it is expected to host increasing levels of aircraft activity was known at the time the FPASP EIR/EIS was written. The level of expected growth in operations at Mather Airport is not considered a new circumstance involving new or substantially more severe impacts than existed at the time FPASP EIR/EIS was written. Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

In addition, Bollard Acoustical Consultants (BAC), Inc. prepared an analysis of aircraft single-event noise at the Hillsborough project area (located 2 miles west of the project site and closer to Mather Airport) property (October 2015). The analysis was conducted to evaluate the potential for sleep disturbance associated with single-event aircraft operations at Mather Airport. This study concluded that the probability of awakening associated with nighttime aircraft operations would be very low at the Hillsborough property and stated that the presence of existing and projected increases in future nighttime aircraft operations at Mather Airport would be fully disclosed to prospective residents of this development. Also, interior noise levels would be well below the City of Folsom 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard applicable to new residential
developments. The study recognized that individual sensitivities to noise can vary, and that aircraft single-
event noise exposure would vary with changing aircraft types and atmospheric conditions, it was
nonetheless BAC's professional opinion that adequate mitigation measures are in place and that the
Hillsborough project site would not be adversely impacted by aircraft noise relative to the sleep disturbance
issue. The Folsom Heights project site is located even further from Mather Airport and; thus, would be
expected to have the same conclusion or even less of an impact.

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?
As stated in the FPASP EIR/EIS the FPASP area is not located within two miles of a public, public-use, or
private airport. The nearest airport, Sacramento Mather Airport, is located approximately seven miles
southwest of the project site. No new private airstrips have been developed within the FPASP area since that
time. Therefore, there are no new circumstances or new information requiring new analysis or verification.
Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were referenced in the FPASP EIR/EIS analysis and would continue to
remain applicable if the project were approved.

▲ Mitigation Measure 3A.1-1: Construct and Maintain a Landscape Corridor Adjacent to U.S. 50.

▲ Mitigation Measure 3A.1-4: Screen Construction Staging Areas.

▲ Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5: Establish and Require Conformance to Lighting Standards and Prepare and
Implement a Lighting Plan.

The EIR/EIS concluded that the impacts of roadway noise would remain significant and unavoidable even
with implementation of recommended mitigation. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce
or eliminate the impacts.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any substantially important new
information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the FPASP
EIR/EIS remain valid and approval project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant
noise impacts. No further analysis is required.
4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Population and Housing. Would the project:</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.13-1 to 3A.13-6 Impacts 3A.13-1, 3A.13-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.13-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.13-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>Impact 3A.13-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the regulatory settings related to population and housing, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.13 under Population, Employment and Housing – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011. As described in the project description, there would be no change to the number of proposed dwelling units, but there would be an estimated increase of 125 additional residents in the approved FPASP for this area.

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)?

As described in the EIR/EIS under Impacts 3A.13-1 and 3A.13-2, the FPASP would directly induce population growth through construction of new homes and businesses over the buildout period. Because population growth is not considered in and of itself to be a significant environmental impact, this was concluded to be a less-than-significant impact. While there would be a greater population within the Folsom Heights project area than anticipated in the certified EIR/EIS, this additional population would not be substantial by itself and would not lead to new indirect impacts associated with the expansion of roads or other public services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

Other potentially new significant or substantially more severe impacts related to the development of homes, jobs, and infrastructure to accommodate additional population growth are evaluated in all topic areas throughout this environmental checklist.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

As described in Impact 3A.13-3, the FPASP would result in the removal of a single housing unit. This was determined to be a less-than-significant impact. No changes to this condition would occur with implementation of the project, and this housing unit is not within the Folsom Heights project area. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
This topic is discussed under b).

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation measures were needed for the certified EIR/EIS regarding population and housing. No additional mitigation measures are required for the project for this issue.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to population and housing.
### 4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Fire protection?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.14-1 to 3A.14-2 Impacts 3A.14-1, 3A.14-2, 3A.14-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Police protection?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.14-2 to 3A.14-3 Impact 3A.14-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Schools?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.14-3 to 3A.14-5 Impacts 3A.14-5, 3A.14-6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Parks?</td>
<td>See below in Section 4.15, Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.14.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to public services, described in EIR/EIS Sections 3A.14 under Public Services – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

**a)** Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

**Fire protection?**

Impacts 3A.14-1, 3A.14-2, and 3A.14-3 address how the construction of the project would affect emergency response services and create increased demand for fire protection and for fire flow. The EIR/EIS found that there would be a significant impact on emergency response. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1, this impact would be reduced to less than significant because the applicant would be required to prepare and implement traffic control plans during construction activities to ensure that emergency access is not impeded. Further, the potentially significant impacts to fire protection and fire flow would be mitigated.
to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2, which would require
the applicant to incorporate fire code requirements into all plans and submit these plans for approval to the
fire department. The project would not substantially change development densities from that approved
in the FPASP. Further, the project would continue to comply with mitigation requirements outlined in the adopted
mitigation for the FPASP. With implementation of this mitigation, no new significant impacts or substantially
more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further
analysis is required.

Police protection?
As described in Impact 3A.14-4, applicants would be required to fund and construct sufficient police
facilities and personnel to serve the planned development. Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3,
Title 3.80, “Capital Improvement New Construction Fee,” new development is responsible for the full cost of
additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City’s
capital improvement new construction fees. The impact was determined to be less than significant and no
mitigation was required. The project would not substantially change development densities from that
approved in the FPASP. Further, the project would subject to the same funding requirements for police
services. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the
findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Schools?
As discussed in Impacts 3A.14-5 and 3A.14-6, the applicants would be required to pay school impact fees
and would fund all costs associated with school facilities. Because of this, the EIR/EIS concluded that the
FPASP’s impact to schools would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. The project would not
substantially change development densities from that approved in the FPASP and the same number of
housing units would be developed. Further, the project would subject to the same school impact fees and
funding requirements for school services. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts
would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were adopted with the FPASP and would continue to remain applicable if
the project was approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1: Prepare and implement a construction traffic control plan.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2: 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.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.14-3: Incorporate fire flow requirements into project designs.

CONCLUSION
No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been found requiring
new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of the
project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to public services.
4.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.12-1 to 3A.12-11 Impacts 3A.12-1, 3A.12-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.12-1 to 3A.12-11 Impact 3A.12-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the regulatory settings related to recreation, described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.12 under Parks and Recreation – Land, has occurred since certification of the EIR/EIS in 2011.

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The EIR/EIS addresses impacts associated with parks and recreation under Impacts 3A.12-1 and 3A.12-2. Under the project, the population of the Folsom Heights site would be 125 more persons than what was identified for this area in the approved FPASP. However, the project includes 4.1 additional acres of open space than what was approved in the FPASP. Using the City’s standard of 5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents, the project must provide at least five acres of parkland on-site. The proposed site plan would provide 47.2 acres of open space, which exceeds the City’s parkland requirements. The EIR/EIS concluded that the impact to existing parks and facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation was required. The proposed project would not change this conclusion and would improve the parkland amenities at the site. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

As described in Impact 3A.12-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the potential for new or expanded recreational facilities to have an adverse physical effect on the environment was analyzed in all topic areas throughout the EIR/EIS as part of the project. Those impacts have been described throughout this environmental checklist.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures were identified in for the certified EIR/EIS regarding recreation, nor are any additional mitigation measures required the project.

CONCLUSION

No new circumstances or project changes have occurred nor has any new information been identified requiring new analysis or verification. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and approval of project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to recreation.
### 4.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.15-8 to 3A.15-24 Impacts 3A.15-1, 3A.15-1a, 3A.15-1b, 3A.15-1c, 3A.15-1d, 3A.15-1e, 3A.15-1f, 3A.15-1g, 3A.15-1h, 3A.15-1i, 3A.15-1j, 3A.15-1k, 3A.15-1l, 3A.15-1m, 3A.15-1n, 3A.15-1o, 3A.15-1p, 3A.15-1q, 3A.15-1r, 3A.15-1s, 3A.15-1t, 3A.15-1u, 3A.15-1v, 3A.15-1w, 3A.15-1x, 3A.15-1y, 3A.15-1z, 3A.15-1aa, 3A.15-1bb, 3A.15-1cc, 3A.15-1dd, 3A.15-1ee, 3A.15-1ff, 3A.15-1gg, 3A.15-1hh, 3A.15-1ii, 3A.15-2, 3A.15-3, 3A.15-4, 3A.15-4a, 3A.15-4b, 3A.15-4c, 3A.15-4d, 3A.15-4e, 3A.15-4f, 3A.15-4g, 3A.15-4h, 3A.15-4i, 3A.15-4k, 3A.15-4l, 3A.15-4m, 3A.15-4n, 3A.15-4o, 3A.15-4p, 3A.15-4q, 3A.15-4r, 3A.15-4s, 3A.15-4t, 3A.15-4u, 3A.15-4v, 3A.15-4w, 3A.15-4x, 3A.15-4y,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.15-8 to 3A.15-24 Impacts 3A.15-1, 3A.15-1a, 3A.15-1b, 3A.15-1c, 3A.15-1d, 3A.15-1e, 3A.15-1f, 3A.15-1g, 3A.15-1h, 3A.15-1i, 3A.15-1j, 3A.15-1k, 3A.15-1l, 3A.15-1m, 3A.15-1n, 3A.15-1o, 3A.15-1p, 3A.15-1q, 3A.15-1r, 3A.15-1s, 3A.15-1t, 3A.15-1u, 3A.15-1v, 3A.15-1w, 3A.15-1x, 3A.15-1y, 3A.15-1z, 3A.15-1aa, 3A.15-1bb, 3A.15-1cc, 3A.15-1dd, 3A.15-1ee, 3A.15-1ff, 3A.15-1gg, 3A.15-1hh, 3A.15-1ii, 3A.15-2, 3A.15-3, 3A.15-4, 3A.15-4a, 3A.15-4b, 3A.15-4c, 3A.15-4d, 3A.15-4e, 3A.15-4f, 3A.15-4g, 3A.15-4h, 3A.15-4i, 3A.15-4k, 3A.15-4l, 3A.15-4m, 3A.15-4n, 3A.15-4o, 3A.15-4p, 3A.15-4q, 3A.15-4r, 3A.15-4s, 3A.15-4t, 3A.15-4u, 3A.15-4v, 3A.15-4w, 3A.15-4x, 3A.15-4y,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.16.1 Discussion

The following is an update to Section 3A.15 Traffic and Transportation and provides a comparison of the project to the adopted FPASP. The traffic analysis for the certified EIR/EIS was conducted by DKS Associates in 2009. Since the FPASP was approved, no infrastructure or development work has taken place on the site. The FPASP traffic analysis provided a gross assessment of traffic impacts in the FPASP area including the Folsom Heights project area. The impacts were determined based on the entire plan’s effects on the roadway network. While certain development projects were known at the time the FPASP was prepared and land use data from these projects were used in the assumptions and analysis, the FPASP EIR/EIS analysis did not carve-out or assign specific impacts to each of the developments within the FPASP. The analysis recognized that subsequent individual traffic assessments may be prepared, if necessary, as developments were proposed.

Consistent with the assumptions of the FPASP and at the City’s direction, MRO Engineers, Inc. prepared an updated traffic analysis, Traffic Analysis for Folsom Heights Project – Folsom, California (MRO Engineers, Inc. 2016), to determine if project-related traffic impacts of the proposed Folsom Heights project were adequately addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. This determination was based primarily upon a comparison of the relative trip generation values for the two land use plans. If the proposed land use plan was estimated to generate an equal (or lower) number of trips in the key analysis periods compared to the project approved under the FPASP, then the traffic impacts are expected to similarly be equal to or lower than the impacts documented in the Final EIR/EIS for the FPASP. In addition, the traffic analysis considered whether projected traffic conditions have changed in the vicinity of the Folsom Heights project since the Final EIR/EIS was certified.

While an evaluation of existing plus project conditions is a requirement of CEQA, it should be noted that for longer-term (i.e., 20 years) buildout projects such as the FPASP and Folsom Heights project, the impacts identified under the existing plus project condition would not actually occur. That is because it would be physically impossible for the entire project (i.e., all development proposed under the Folsom Heights site plan) to develop over a short time period such that the total project-related vehicle trips would be applied to the existing roadway network. Rather, the project would be developed over a 20-year time period with different and overlapping stages of construction and development. With each new development phase an increment of the projected trips would be added to the roadway network. Similarly, agencies such as the City, County, and Caltrans would continue to implement their planned transportation improvements over the same time period responding to the changed traffic volumes and patterns, thereby improving the roadway network to better handle additional traffic. Therefore, while this scenario would not be physically realized, the planning exercise of evaluating the impacts of the project on existing conditions is conducted to provide agency decision makers a picture of what traffic conditions would look like if the project were wholly applied...
to the existing roadway network and what improvements would be needed to meet those demands. However, because of the long-term nature and size of the project (and the FPASP), it is not realistic to expect that the physical condition where the entire project would be applied to the existing roadway network is feasible.

Transportation agencies such as the City, typically employ a longer-term view of transportation planning because of the substantial investment required to implement traffic infrastructure improvements. Agencies typically plan improvements in logical increments to prevent the installation and subsequent removal and reconstruction of traffic facilities as growth and development occurs in an area. Therefore, agencies typically look to cumulative growth and development projections to understand the long-term traffic infrastructure needs. Where demands for new infrastructure occur, the agencies would plan incremental improvements that would ultimately lead to the long-term buildout condition for the roadway or intersection. Then all projects that would contribute to the demands for that infrastructure would be required to contribute to its implementation.

Planning for facilities in this manner is beneficial because agencies recognize that an assessment of project impacts is a representation of conditions (either existing or projected) at the moment in time the analysis is prepared and does not necessarily account for the full build out condition. Therefore, the cumulative plus project scenario represents a project’s true contribution to impacts on the roadway network especially where that project is a longer-term land use plan. The existing plus project scenario identifies potential impacts that could occur as the project is developed and the cumulative network improvements are being implemented over time. Therefore, the impacts identified under the existing plus project scenario are best used by agencies to determine the timing of when specific cumulative improvements need to be made or how to incrementally implement improvements to the roadway network as it builds out to the cumulative projection.

For longer-term projects, agencies plan for the cumulative traffic network because when large projects such as FPASP are proposed, there is very little predictability in the timing and location of where specific development projects would occur. The economic conditions and market demand for certain types of development (e.g., retail vs. commercial vs. residential) ultimately determine which projects are developed and when. Therefore, by taking a longer-term view (i.e., cumulative projection) of infrastructure needs, the agency can make individual adjustments to the roadway network where needed to respond to individual development demands. As it relates to the project, the cumulative plus project scenario provides the City the best assessment, most realistic of how the project would affect the transportation network in comparison to the projections included in the FPASP EIR/EIS. If the project’s cumulative plus project impacts are substantially different from those projected in the FPASP EIR/EIS, then the City would understand that the changes proposed under the project could adversely affect the planned roadway network. However, if the results of the cumulative plus project scenario show that operation of the cumulative roadway network is the same or better that previous projections under the FPASP EIR/EIS, then no significant changes would occur.

**Impacts to Intersection or Roadway Level of Service**

MRO Engineers, Inc., evaluated existing and existing plus project traffic conditions on area intersections for the project (i.e., full development of the FPASP was not included). As shown in Table 4 of the transportation analysis (MRO Engineers, Inc. 2016), the proposed Folsom Heights project would generate approximately 5,100 fewer daily trips than the project as analyzed under the FPASP EIR/EIS. In the AM peak hour, the project would generate approximately 50 fewer trips, and in the PM peak hour it would generate approximately 470 fewer trips than assumed under the approved FPASP. This would be a less-than-significant impact and no additional mitigation is needed. Impacts 3A.15-1q, 3A.15-1r, 3A.15-1t, 3A.15-1u, 3A.15-1v, 3A.15-1w, 3A.15-1x, 3A.15-1y, 3A.15-1z, 3A.15-1aa, 3A.15-1bb, 3A.15-1cc, 3A.15-1dd, 3A.15-1ee, 3A.15-1ff, 3A.15-1gg, 3A.15-1hh, and 3A.15-1ii in the FPASP EIR/EIS analyzed the potential impacts caused by the adoption of the FPASP. While mitigation measures were included (listed below) to address these impacts, some remained significant and unavoidable. As described in the revised traffic study, the project does not result in any new significant or substantially more severe impacts to intersection or freeway facilities. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid.
**Impacts to the Transit System**
The project would not disrupt existing or planned transit services or facilities, or create inconsistencies with any adopted plans, guidelines, policies or standards related to transit. Therefore, this impact is considered less-than-significant and no mitigation is needed.

**Impacts to Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**
The project would construct curb, gutter, and sidewalks on all project roadways to facilitate any potential pedestrian demand. The curb, gutter, and sidewalks would be designed and constructed to meet City standards. The project would not disrupt existing or planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities or create inconsistencies with any adopted plans, guidelines, policies or standards related to bicycle or pedestrian systems. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**Impacts because of Construction-Related Activities**
Similar to that identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS in Impact 3A.14-1, construction of the project may include disruptions to the transportation network near the site, including the possibility of temporary lane closures, street closures, sidewalk closures, and bikeway closures; however, access to all nearby parcels would be maintained. Pedestrian and bicycle access in the vicinity of the project site may be disrupted. Heavy vehicles would access the site and may need to be staged for construction. These activities could result in degraded roadway operating conditions and degraded emergency access. Therefore, the impacts are considered significant for the FPASP and project. Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1 would require the applicant to implement a construction management plan that would ensure that adequate emergency response access would be maintained throughout development of the project. The project would be subject to this mitigation. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

**Impacts to Intersections in Cumulative Conditions**
The traffic analysis also compared cumulative conditions level of service (LOS) results for selected key intersections. The Final EIR/EIS addressed traffic operations in the year 2030 at 26 intersections within the pre-existing Folsom city limits and an additional 30 intersections in the annexation area (including four existing intersections along White Rock Road). More recently, a detailed traffic analysis was completed for the Russell Ranch project, which is located adjacent to the Folsom Heights project area. The traffic study prepared for the Russell Ranch project reflects current traffic conditions in the Folsom Heights project vicinity because of the proximity of the Russell Ranch project to the Folsom Heights project area. That analysis, which was completed by Fehr & Peers, addressed traffic operations at 32 intersections in the year 2035 (MRO Engineers, Inc. 2016).

Table 4.16-1 illustrates the comparison of Cumulative Plus Project LOS results for those intersections for the AM and PM peak hours. The Cumulative Plus Project scenario includes buildout of the entire FPASP land use plan (including the approved Folsom Heights land use plan), as well as expected growth throughout the Sacramento region (MRO Engineers, Inc. 2016).

More variation is seen in the PM peak hour, although the differences are not substantial. At two locations (Empire Ranch Road/Broadstone Parkway and Empire Ranch Road/U.S. Highway 50 Westbound Ramps), the year 2035 LOS is projected to be better than the year 2030 values. Two additional locations (Empire Ranch Road/Iron Point Road and Empire Ranch Road/White Rock Road) are projected to have slightly worse LOS values (MRO Engineers, Inc. 2016). The FPASP EIR/EIS identified this intersection as having a significant impact and requires Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4f to address the projected impact. Therefore, this impact is addressed in the FPASP EIR/EIS and the proposed Folsom Heights project would generate few trips that could contribute to delay at this intersection. The conclusions of the FPASP EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Cumulative Plus Project Conditions</th>
<th>FPASp (Year 2030)</th>
<th>Russell Ranch (Year 2035)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay²</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Ranch Rd./Broadstone Pkwy.</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Ranch Rd./Iron Point Rd.</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Ranch Rd./U.S. Hwy. 50 WB Ramps</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Ranch Rd./U.S. Hwy. 50 EB Ramps</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Ranch Rd./White Rock Rd.</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
3. Average control delay in seconds per vehicle.
Source: MRO Engineers, Inc. 2016

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were adopted with the FPASp and would continue to remain applicable if the project were approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1a: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements to the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road intersection (Intersection 1).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1b: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements at the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection (Intersection 2).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1c: The applicant shall fund and construct improvements to the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road intersection (Intersection 28).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1e: Fund and construct improvements to the Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway intersection (Intersection 41).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1f: Fund and construct improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road intersection (Intersection 44).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1h: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 2).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1i: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection and to White Rock Road widening between the Rancho Cordova City limit to Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Intersection 3).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1j: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive (Roadway Segment 10).
- Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1k: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the White Rock Road/Windfield Way intersection (El Dorado County Intersection 3).
Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1o: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 as an alternative to improvements at the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection (Caltrans Intersection 4).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1p: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the Grant Line Road/State Route 16 intersection (Caltrans Intersection 12).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1q: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1r: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 3).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1s: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 4).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1u: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on westbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 16).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1v: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 18).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1w: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 eastbound / Folsom Boulevard ramp merge (Freeway Merge 4).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1x: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 eastbound / Prairie City Road diverge (Freeway Diverge 5).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1y: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 eastbound / Prairie City Road direct merge (Freeway Merge 6).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1z: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 eastbound / Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp weave (Freeway Weave 8).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1aa: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway loop merge (Freeway Merge 9).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1dd: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 23).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ee: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 westbound / Oak Avenue Parkway loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 29).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ff: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 westbound / Prairie City Road loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 32).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1gg: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 westbound / Prairie City Road direct ramp merge (Freeway Merge 33).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1hh: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 eastbound / Folsom Boulevard diverge (Freeway Diverge 34).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ii: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 westbound / Hazel Avenue direct ramp merge (Freeway Merge 38).
Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2a: Develop commercial support services and mixed-use development concurrent with housing development, and develop and provide options for alternative transportation modes.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2b: Participate in the city's Transportation System Management Fee Program.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2c: Participate with the U.S. 50 corridor transportation management association.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-3: Pay full cost of identified improvements that are not funded by the city's fee program.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4a: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements to the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection (Folsom Intersection 2).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4b: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street intersection (Folsom Intersection 6).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-7c: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements to the East Bidwell Street/Nesmith Court intersection (Folsom Intersection 7).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4d: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements to the East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road intersection (Folsom Intersection 21).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4e: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements to the Serpa Way/Iron Point Road intersection (Folsom Intersection 23).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4f: The applicant shall pay a fair share to fund the construction of improvements to the Empire Ranch Road/Iron Point Road intersection (Folsom Intersection 24).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4g: The Applicant shall fund and construct improvements to the oak avenue Parkway/Easton Valley Parkway intersection (Folsom Intersection 33).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4i: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 3).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4j: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Sacramento County Roadway Segments 5-7).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4k: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 8).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4l: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and U.S. 50 westbound ramps (Sacramento County Roadway Segment s 12-13).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4m: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 22).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4n: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 28).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4o: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road intersection (El Dorado County 1).
Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4p: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps intersection (Caltrans Intersection 1).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4q: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4r: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on eastbound U.S. 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 3).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4s: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 5).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4t: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on eastbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (Freeway Segment 6).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4u: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the U.S. 50 eastbound / Prairie City Road slip ramp merge (Freeway Merge 6).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4v: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on the U.S. 50 eastbound / Prairie City Road flyover on ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp weave (Freeway Weave 7).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4w: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 8).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4x: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 westbound / Empire Ranch Road loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 27).

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4y: Participate in fair share funding of improvements to reduce impacts on U.S. 50 westbound / Prairie City Road loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 35).

CONCLUSION
The updated transportation impact analysis is consistent with the analysis done for the approved FPASP. While minor adjustments are necessary to accommodate changes since the EIR/EIS was certified, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts to transportation. Therefore, the conclusions of the EIR/EIS remain valid.
## 4.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigate Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-1 to 3A.16-3 and 3A.18-1 to 3A.18-6 Impacts 3A.16-1, 3A.16-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, 3A.16-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-1 to 3A.16-3 and 3A.18-1 to 3A.18-6 Impacts 3A.16-1, 3A.16-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, 3A.16-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>Setting p. 4-68</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.18-1 to 3A.18-6 Impact 3A.18-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-1 to 3A.16-3 Impacts 3A.16-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, 3A.16-5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-3 to 3A.16-4 Impacts 3A.16-6, 3A.16-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>Setting p. 3A.16-4 Impacts 3A.16-6, 3A.16-7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Create demand for natural gas, electricity, telephone, and other utility services that cannot be met.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-5 to 3A.16-7 Impacts 3A.16-8, 3A.16-9, 3A.16-10, 3A.16-11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Result in inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.</td>
<td>Setting pp. 3A.16-5 to 3A.16-6, 3A.16-8 Impact 3A.16-12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.17.1 Discussion

No substantial change in the environmental and regulatory settings related to utilities and service systems as described in EIR/EIS Section 3A.16 Utilities and Service Systems – Land has occurred since certification of the EIR in 2011.

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
As described below under b), the project area is not currently served by a municipal wastewater collection system. However, the proposed wastewater infrastructure for the FPASP area is described on pages 2-26 to 2-31 of the EIR/EIS and as described therein, the system would be designed to meet RWQCB and City wastewater treatment requirements and wastewater would ultimately be conveyed to the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District regional facility for treatment and disposal. The regional facility treats wastewater in compliance with its RWQCB Waste Discharge Requirement permit. While some infrastructure associated with the approved private school would be redesigned for residential development, the overall wastewater system would continue to comply with RWQCB requirements. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

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?
As described in the EIR/EIS under Impacts 3A.16-1, 3A.16-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5, the project area is not served by a municipal wastewater collection system and both on-site and off-site wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure need to be designed. The EIR/EIS analyzed the potential demand on facilities for the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP), Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD), El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), and El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant. The EIR/EIS concluded that the impacts to these facilities could be potentially significant.

In March 2016, MacKay & Soms compared the sanitary sewer demand of the Folsom Heights project under the approved FPASP to the demand under the currently proposed project (MacKay & Soms 2016a). The project would decrease demand on sanitary sewer by 0.004 million gallons per day compared to the adopted FPASP. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.16-1, 3A.16-2a, 3A.16-2b, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5, the impacts would be reduced to less than significant for all impacts except for the potentially significant and unavoidable impacts addressing environmental effects associated with improvements to treatment plant facilities. Because the project would decrease wastewater conveyance and treatment demand, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
The approved FPASP would require new storm water drainage facilities. These were included in the approved FPASP and the potential significant environmental effects were analyzed throughout the EIR/EIS. The project would not substantially change development patterns and the amount of drainage infrastructure required to serve the site from that approved in the FPASP and no new off-site infrastructure or changes to the approved backbone infrastructure would be required. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur, and the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

As analyzed in the EIR/EIS under Impact 3A.18-1, the proposed water supply would be adequate to meet the projected water demand by the FPASP in both normal and critically dry years. However, the EIR/EIS concluded that the impact to water supplies was potentially significant because of the possibility that the water infrastructure to accommodate the FPASP may not be developed or coordinated fully with the development of houses and other water using land types. To reduce this potential impact to less than significant, Mitigation Measure 3A.18-1 required all applicants to submit proof of surface water supply availability. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

In March 2016, MacKay & Soms evaluated the water demand of the project in comparison to the approved FPASP for Folsom Heights. MacKay & Soms determined that, with the changes to land uses, the water demand would decrease by 14 acre-feet per normal year and 15 acre-feet per dry year compared to the approved plan (MacKay & Soms 2016b). Because the proposed project would result in a slight decrease in water demand, the conclusions are the same as that presented in the EIR/EIS. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur.

In November 2012, the City considered and adopted an addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS that assessed the environmental impacts of changing the approved water supply for the FPASP to the Revised Proposed Off-Site Water Facility Alternative, which would use water obtained through the City’s conservation activities and exchange of supplies with the City’s east area (City of Folsom 2012). The addendum concluded that water supplies under the Off-Site Water Facility Alternative would be more secure than the originally considered water supply plan, and landowners in the FPASP would continue to be subject to the previously adopted mitigation measures, which require submittal of proof of surface water supply availability and adequate water service infrastructure prior to approval of new development (Water Addendum, pp. 3-18 to 3-19.) Thus, with these mitigation measures in place, it is reasonable to conclude that development in the FPASP, including this project, would not outpace the City’s available water supplies. Water for the project would be provided by EID, and prior to approval of the project, EID will review the project and provide proof that there is adequate water supply to serve the project.

Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand, in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Under Impacts 3A.16-2, 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5, the EIR/EIS analyzed the potential demand on wastewater facilities for the SRWTP, SRCSD, EID, and El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant. The SRCSD facility was found to have adequate capacity to serve the FPASP while the SRWTP, EID, and El Dorado Hills facilities may need to be upgraded or it is unknown whether they would have capacity. For this reason, the EIR/EIS required Mitigation Measures 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5 that required the project applicant to demonstrate that the appropriate facilities had capacity in the tentative map stage. With implementation of these measures, the impact would be less than significant.

In March 2016, MacKay & Soms compared the sanitary sewer demand of the Folsom Heights project under the approved FPASP to the demand under the project (MacKay & Soms 2016a). The project would decrease demand on sanitary sewer by 0.004 million gallons per day compared to the adopted FPASP. To reduce the potential impact regarding adequate capacity, the project would need to comply with Mitigation Measures 3A.16-3, 3A.16-4, and 3A.16-5 recommended in the FPASP. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the potential for inadequate capacity to serve the project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because the applicant would be required to reach out to service providers to ensure adequate capacity is available and submit the proof of adequate capacity to the City before the City would
issue building permits. Because no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?
Impact 3A.16-6 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzed short-term generation of solid waste during project construction while Impact 3A.16-7 analyzed increased long-term generation of solid waste. The EIR/EIS found that the estimated waste generated both long- and short-term by the project could be accommodated within the existing landfills. For the project, there would be more solid waste generated by new residents and less solid waste from employees. The California Integrated Waste Management Board estimates solid waste generation rates for Sacramento County as 0.36 ton per resident per year and 1.8 tons of waste per employee per year, as found in the EIR/EIS (pages 3A.16-4 and 3A.16-31). Based on these generation rates, the project would generate less solid waste overall because there would be a significantly higher reduction in employees (approximately 987 based on 255 square feet per employee as calculated using the Draft EIR/EIS), which have a higher solid waste generation rate than residents. Overall, there would be a decrease in the estimated solid waste generated by the project as compared to the adopted FPASP. No new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
In Impacts 3A.16-6 and 3A.16-7, the EIR/EIS describes how the FPASP would comply with statutes and regulations related to solid waste. These impacts (Impact 3A.16-6 and 3A.16-7) were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation measures were required. The project would continue to comply with these statutes and regulations. Because there are no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts, the findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

h) Create demand for natural gas, electricity, telephone, and other utility services that cannot be met.
In Impacts 3A.16-8, 3A.16-9, 3A.16-10, 3A.16-11, the EIR/EIS analyzed the demand for utilities and services not already covered in other discussions. The EIR/EIS found that the impacts to electricity service, natural gas, telecommunications service, and cable television and communications service would be less than significant and no mitigation measures were required. The project would not result in substantial land use changes that would substantially change estimated demands for these services. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

i) Result in inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.
As described in Impact 3A.16-12, the FPASP would increase the consumption of energy. However, the FPASP would need to comply with Building Energy Efficiency Standards included in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and implement an Air Quality Management Plan. This impact (Impact 3A.16-12) was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required. The project would continue to comply with Title 24 requirements. Therefore, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur. The findings of the certified EIR/EIS remain valid and no further analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures
The following mitigation measures were adopted with the FPASP and would continue to remain applicable if the project was approved.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.16-1: Submit proof of adequate on- and off-site wastewater conveyance facilities and implement on- and off-site infrastructure service systems or ensure that adequate financing is secured.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.16-3: Demonstrate adequate SRWTP wastewater treatment capacity.
- Mitigation Measure 3A.16-4: Submit proof of adequate EID off-site wastewater conveyance facilities and implement EID off-site infrastructure service systems or ensure that adequate financing is secured.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.16-5: Demonstrate adequate El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant capacity.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.18-1: Submit proof of surface water supply availability.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.18-2a: Submit proof of adequate off-site water conveyance facilities and implement off-site infrastructure service system or ensure that adequate financing is secured.

- Mitigation Measure 3A.18-2b: Demonstrate adequate off-site water treatment capacity (if the off-site water treatment plant option is selected).

CONCLUSION
No changes in circumstances would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts related to utilities and service systems, compared to the analysis presented in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, the conclusions of the certified Final EIR/EIS remain valid and no additional analysis is required.
### 4.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue Area</th>
<th>Where Impact Was Analyzed in the EIR/EIS</th>
<th>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</th>
<th>Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</th>
<th>Do Prior Environmental Documents Mitigations Address/Resolve Impacts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Mandatory Findings of Significance.</td>
<td>Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, discussed throughout environmental checklist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to 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 an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>Setting pp. 4-1 to 4-20 Impacts pp. 4-20 to 4-64</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (<em>Cumulatively considerable</em> means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, discussed throughout environmental checklist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCLUSION

Since the EIR/EIS was certified, there have been regulatory changes with regards to agricultural resources, air quality, and GHGs. However, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts to agricultural resources, air quality, or GHGs were identified.

All approved mitigation in the EIR/EIS or contained in this document would continue to be implemented with the proposed project. Therefore, no new significant impacts would occur with implementation of the proposed project.
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