Pursuant to Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, members of the Folsom Planning Commission and staff may participate in this meeting via teleconference.

Due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) public health emergency, the City of Folsom is allowing remote public input during Commission meetings. Members of the public are encouraged to participate by e-mailing comments to kmullett@folsom.ca.us. E-mailed comments must be received no later than thirty minutes before the meeting and will be read aloud at the meeting during the agenda item. Please make your comments brief. Written comments submitted and read into the public record must adhere to the principles of the three-minute speaking time permitted for in-person public comment at Commission meetings. Members of the public wishing to participate in this meeting via teleconference may email kmullett@folsom.ca.us no later than thirty minutes before the meeting to obtain call-in information. Each meeting may have different call-in information. Verbal comments via teleconference must adhere to the principles of the three-minute speaking time permitted for in-person public comment at Planning Commission meetings.

Members of the public may continue to participate in the meeting in person at Folsom City Hall, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom CA while maintaining appropriate social distancing.

CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION: Kevin Duewel, Bill Miklos, Ralph Peña, Barbara Leary, Vice Chair Eileen Reynolds, Daniel West, Chair Justin Raithel

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 May 5, 2021 will be presented for approval.
PUBLI C HEARING

1. PN 20-193, Folsom Ranch Medical Center Addendum to Final EIR for the FPASP, Planned Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, and Development Agreement Amendment

A Public Hearing to consider a request from Dignity Health for approval of a Planned Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, and Development Agreement Amendment for development of a 530,000-square-foot medical center (Folsom Ranch Medical Center) on a 27.44-acre site located at the northeast corner of the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway within the Folsom Plan Area (APN 072-3190-047). The zoning classification for the site is SP-GC-PD, while the General Plan land-use designation is GC. An Environmental Checklist and Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan has been prepared for the project in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164). (Project Planner: Steve Banks/Applicant: Dignity Health)

2. PN 20-254, Mangini Phase 3 Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, and Minor Administrative Modifications

A Public Hearing to consider a request from TCS Improvement Company, LLC for approval of a Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map and a Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the development of 260 single family homes on a 52-acre portion of a 173-acre project site. The Project also includes Minor Administrative Modifications (MAMs) to transfer development rights (25-unit transfer) and minor land use boundary refinements. The site is located west of the future Savannah Parkway and north and south of Mangini Parkway in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (APNs 072-0060-077 & 100). An Environmental Checklist prepared determined that the Project qualifies for the exemption provided in CEQA Guidelines 15182(c), since it is consistent with the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. (Project Planner: Kathy Pease, Contract Planner/Applicant: TCS Improvement Company LLC)

PUBLI C MEETING

3. PN 21-066, 4803 White Pine Court Detached Garage Design Review and Determination that the Project is Exempt from CEQA

A Public Meeting to consider a request from JMC Homes for approval of a Design Review application for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pine Court. The zoning classification for the site is SP-SF, while the General Plan land-use designation is SF. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with Government Code section 65457 and sections 15303 and 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines and CEQA Guidelines section 15303 (construction of small structures). (Project Planner: Josh Kinkade/Applicant: JMC Homes)

PLANNING COMMISSION / PLANNING MANAGER REPORT

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for June 2, 2021. 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 (916) 461-6231 and FAX number is (916) 355-7274.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in the meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at (916) 461-6231, (916) 355-7274 (fax) or kmullett@folsom.ca.us. Requests must be made as early as possible and at least two-full business days before the start of the meeting.

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
CALL TO ORDER PLANNING COMMISSION: Bill Miklos, Ralph Peña, Barbara Leary, Vice Chair Eileen Reynolds, Daniel West, Kevin Duewel, Chair Justin Raithel

ABSENT: None

CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: None

MINUTES: The minutes of March 17, 2021 were approved as submitted.

NEW BUSINESS

1. PN 20-263, Mangini Ranch Lot 16 Apartments Design Review, Minor Administrative Modifications, and Determination that the Project is Exempt from CEQA

A Public Meeting to consider a request from Van Daele Homes for approval of Design Review and Minor Administrative Modifications for development of a 278-unit market-rate apartment community (Mangini Ranch Lot 16 Apartments) on a 9.3-acre site located north of White Rock Road near the northeast corner of the intersection of White Rock Road and East Bidwell Street (APN 072-3380-005). The zoning classification for the site is SP-MHD-PD, while the General Plan land-use designation is MHD. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with Government Code section 65457 and section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Project Planner: Steve Banks/Applicant: Van Daele Homes)

COMMISSIONER LEARY MOVED TO
- APPROVE THE CEQA EXEMPTION FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15182(C), AND
- APPROVE DESIGN REVIEW OF THE APPLICANT’S SITE DEVELOPMENT AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN DETAILS FOR THE PROPOSED 278-UNIT RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT COMMUNITY, AND
- APPROVE A MINOR ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION FOR REFINEMENT OF THE OPEN SPACE AND PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF MEETING ROADWAY DESIGN STANDARDS, MAXIMIZING DEVELOPMENT EFFICIENCIES, PRESERVING NATURAL RESOURCES, AND ACCOMMODATING A CLASS I TRAIL PER ATTACHMENT 15, AND
- APPROVE A MINOR ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION TO TRANSFER 35 ALLOCATED DWELLING UNITS FROM ANOTHER PARCEL WITHIN THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN TO THE MANGINI RANCH LOT 16 APARTMENTS PROJECT SITE PER ATTACHMENT 15
THESE APPROVALS ARE SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED FINDINGS (FINDINGS A-J) AND THE RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL NOS. 1-48 WITH MODIFICATIONS:

- Deletion of Condition No. 7. The owner/applicant acknowledges that the State adopted amendments to Section 65850 of the California Government Code (specifically Section 65850(g)), effective January 1, 2018, to allow for the implementation of inclusionary housing requirements in residential rental units, upon adoption of an ordinance by the City. In the event that the City amends its Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO) with respect to inclusionary requirements for rental housing units prior to owner/applicant’s submittal of a complete application for a building permit for the Mangini Ranch Lot 16 Apartments Project, the owner/applicant (or successor in interest) shall be subject to said rental unit inclusionary requirements, as amended.

- Modification on Timing of Requirement of Condition No. 35. When Required: BO

- 45. The proposed project shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s Declarations, and restrictions relative to water usage and conservation 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.”

COMMISSIONER WEST SECONDED THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER MIKLOS MOVED TO MAKE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO STRIKE THE ADDED LANGUAGE FROM CONDITION NO. 45 TO READ AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN.

COMMISSIONER WEST SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: MIKLOS, PEÑA, LEARY, REYNOLDS, WEST, DUEWL, RAITHEL
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: NONE

WORKSHOP

2. PN 19-051, Zoning Code Update – Review of Home Occupation Permit Regulations
Staff is returning to the Commission for an update on progress on the new Zoning Code and review of Home Occupation Permit Regulations. (Project Planner: Principal Planner, Desmond Parrington)

1. Reid Bellis addressed the Planning Commission in support of updating the HOP regulations to allow storefronts and more flexibility.

2. Steve Johns addressed the Planning Commission in support of Mr. Bellis’ business and in support of HOP changes.

3. Brenda Young addressed the Planning Commission in opposition of more flexibility and storefronts in residential areas.

4. Robert Goss sent a public comment letter to be read into the record for the Planning Commission in support of changes to allow more flexibility and provided suggested edits to the Zoning Code.

Summary of Commissioner comments:
- All Commissioners agreed that there was a need to update the HOP regulations
- Some Commissioners did not understand why this needed to be addressed now rather than as part of the zoning code update process
- Most of the Commission felt that it was unclear in the ordinance what businesses or business activity required a home occupation permit and that it should be better defined
- All Commissioners agreed that ‘what is a storefront’ should be defined
• Commissioners were split on the idea of allowing storefronts in residential areas
• All Commissioners wanted to allow increased deliveries
• Several Commissioners wanted to revisit hours so that home-based businesses closed at 8 pm rather than 10 pm
• Most Commissioners did not support allowing businesses that are not allowed in BP or C-1 zones.
• Commissioners were split on allowing increasing the size of signage
• All Commissioners were against sign illumination
• Storage of certain types of materials should not be allowed (i.e., chemicals, ammunition, alcohol, etc.)
• Most Commissioners agreed that we needed list of prohibited businesses
• All Commissioners agreed that mobile businesses that conduct work off-site should not be treated differently due to potential impacts from parking of commercial vehicles and employees
• Commissioners were not against home-based businesses including tech and small manufacturing if no "negative externalities" (i.e., negative spillover effects or nuisances)
• Commissioners did not want to allow more employees on site
• Most Commissioners were ok with current limits on number of clients per day (8/day) but a few supported increasing numbers to 12 or 16 per day and possibly requiring appointment only
• Commissioners were split about whether to get rid of the no more than 2 persons at one time requirement
• Most Commissioners were ok with on-site sales but felt the ordinance needed to better define on-site sales and the types of sales that would be allowed
• Several Commissioners were concerned about the City overregulating these given the number of people that work from home
• All Commissioners wanted a second Commission workshop to focus on the key areas for further discussion and to give direction to staff on what should be in the ordinance

PLANNING COMMISSION / PLANNING MANAGER REPORT

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be held June 2, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Kelly Mullett, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

APPROVED:

______________________________
Justin Raithel, CHAIR
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: Folsom Ranch Medical Center
File #: PN-20-193
Requests: Addendum to Final EIR
Planned Development Permit
Conditional Use Permit
Development Agreement Amendment

Location: The proposed Folsom Ranch Medical Center project is located at
the northeast corner of the intersection of East Bidwell Street and
Alder Creek Parkway within the Folsom Plan Area

Staff Contact: Steve Banks, Principal Planner, 916-461-6207
sbanks@folsom.ca.us

Property Owner/Applicant
Name: Dignity Health/Robert O'Hare
Address: 10901 Gold Center Drive, Suite 300
Rancho Cordova CA 95630

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion recommend that the
Planning Commission adopt an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for
the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan prepared for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center
project (PN 20-193), approve a Planned Development Permit and a Conditional Use
Permit, and recommend that the City Council approve a Development Agreement
Amendment for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project, subject to the findings
(Findings A-W) and conditions of approval (Conditions 1-51) attached to this report.

Project Summary: The proposed project includes development of a 530,000-square-
foot Medical Center (Folsom Ranch Medical Center) on a 27.44-acre site situated at the
northeast corner of the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway
within the Folsom Plan Area. The proposed Medical Center project, which will be
developed in five phases over the course of approximately 23 years, includes a six-story
400,000-square-foot acute care hospital with 300 beds, two three-story 65,000-square-
foot medical office buildings, and a ground-level heliport facility. In addition, the proposed
The project includes a number of significant off-site improvements including roadway and utility improvements, grading improvements on three adjacent parcels, construction of a hydromodification basin, construction of a storm drain swale, and excavation of a borrow site.

The following are the specific entitlements requested with the proposed project.

- A **Planned Development Permit** which contains detailed development and architectural standards for the proposed 530,000-square-foot Medical Center.

- A **Conditional Use Permit** for the development and operation of a private-use hospital heliport facility at the Medical Center.

- A **Development Agreement Amendment** to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement to incorporate in the definition of “entitlements” that are vested the entitlements requested by the project applicant including the Planned Development Permit, the Planned Development Guidelines, the Conditional Use Permit, and the Site Plan. The Development Agreement Amendment also seeks to take into account the longer construction timeline for the project, memorialize agreements relative to project site access, memorialize agreements relative to water infrastructure and connections, memorialize agreements relative to street lighting and landscape frontage maintenance, memorialize agreements relative to preparation for the future Class I trail, and acknowledge the potential for future modifications to the Medical Center that may be required by the California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.

These proposed actions are described in detail and analyzed later in this report.

**Table of Contents:**
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[Signature]

PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director
BACKGROUND AND SETTING

Background:

The proposed project site is part of the approved Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP), a comprehensively planned community that proposes new development based "Smart Growth" and Transit Oriented Development principles. The FPASP, approved in 2011, is a development plan for over 3,500 acres of previously undeveloped land located south of U.S. Highway 50, north of White Rock Road, east of Prairie City Road, and west of the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line in the southeastern portion of the City.

The FPASP includes a mix of residential, commercial, employment and public uses, complemented by recreational 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. The Specific Plan is consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Principles and the requirements of SB 375 (Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act).

The FPASP includes 11,461 residential units at various densities on approximately 1,630 acres; 310 acres designated for commercial and industrial use; +/-130 acres designated for public/quasi-public uses, elementary/middle school/high schools, and community/neighborhood parks; and +/-1,110 acres for open-space areas.

On September 22, 2015, the City Council approved an Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR/EIS, a General Plan Amendment, a Specific Plan Amendment, and Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement for the Westland-Eagle project. The Westland-Eagle project included a significant reduction in the amount of retail commercial land area and an increase in the number of allowed residential dwelling units within the Folsom Plan Area. The net result of these land use modifications was a decrease of 1,445,710 square feet of commercial building area and an increase of 922 residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the Westland-Eagle project contained modifications to the FPASP including elimination of the Entertainment Overlay Zone, relocation of more intense land uses toward Alder Creek Parkway, strengthening focus of the town center, relocation of Alder Creek Parkway, and realignment of Old Placerville Road. The proposed project is located within the previously approved Westland-Eagle project area.

On December 4, 2019, the Planning Commission approved a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide a 54.30-acre property (FPASP Parcel 85A) located at the northeast corner of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway into four individual parcels for future sale and development. The City Council approved the Final Map and it was thereafter
recorded on May 22, 2020. The four new parcels created by the Parcel Map were 27.44 acres (Parcel 1), 3.97 acres (Parcel 2), 8.39 acres (Parcel 3), and 7.35 acres (Parcel 4) in size respectively. The Parcel Map also included dedication of 7.15-acres of land as public right-of-way for future development of public roadways and associated improvements. Dignity Health, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation, acquired Parcel 1 on June 5, 2020. The proposed Medical Center is located on the largest (Parcel 1) of the four parcels that were created by the Tentative Parcel Map as shown in Figure 1 below.

FIGURE 1: PARCEL 85A FINAL MAP
On March 17, 2020, the Community Development Director approved a Minor Administrative Modification (MAM) for the transfer of development rights to shift residential units and commercial gross square feet among four parcels (Parcels 61, 77, 78, and 85A) located within the Folsom Plan Area for the purpose of meeting the development intent of the subject properties. As mentioned previously, the proposed Medical Center project is located on a 27.44-acre portion of the larger parcel known as Parcel 85A. A detailed discussion of the MAM and the modifications affecting this site is included in the General Plan and Specific Plan Consistency section of this staff report.

**Physical Setting**

The rectangular-shaped 27.44-acre project site, which features gently rolling terrain, contains a variety non-native grasses and a small grove of willow trees. Existing topography on the site ranges from 450-feet to 400-feet in elevation and generally falls in the southwest direction. The project site is bounded by U.S. Highway 50 to the north with the Folsom Pointe shopping center beyond, Alder Creek Parkway to the south with the Enclave Subdivision beyond, East Bidwell Street to the west with future commercial development beyond, and future McCarthy Way and future multi-family development to the east with Westwood Drive beyond. An aerial photograph of the project site is shown in Figure 2 below.

**FIGURE 2: AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF PROJECT SITE**
APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL

The applicant, Dignity Health, is requesting approval of a Planned Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, and Development Agreement Amendment for development of a 530,000-square-foot Medical Center (Folsom Ranch Medical Center) on a 27.44-acre site located at the northeast corner of the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway within the Folsom Plan Area.

As noted above, the applicant is requesting approval of three entitlements and adoption of an Addendum to allow for development of the proposed Medical Center. The first entitlement is a request for approval of a Planned Development Permit which contains specific development and architectural standards for the proposed 530,000-square-foot Medical Center. Planned Development Guidelines (Attachment 14) have been submitted which provide the framework for the Planned Development Permit including deviations from the development standards established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Municipal Code in order to accommodate an acute care hospital, medical office buildings, a heliport, site design and planning, building architecture, landscaping, site lighting, and signage. Specific modifications to the development standards include:

1. Increase Maximum Building Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 0.25 to 0.55
2. Increase Maximum Building Height from 50 feet to 60 feet (Office Buildings)
3. Increase Maximum Building Height from 50 feet to 120 feet (Hospital Building)
4. Sign Criteria Modifications
   - Increase Number of Wall Signs for Office and Hospital Buildings
   - Increase Maximum Sign Area for Office and Hospital Buildings
   - Increase Maximum Letter Height for Office Buildings and Hospital Buildings
   - Allow Illumination of Office and Hospital Building Wall Signs
   - Increase Maximum Height of Freeway Pylon Sign
   - Increase Maximum Sign Area of Freeway Pylon Sign
5. Apply Folsom Municipal Code Requirements for Required Bicycle Parking Spaces
6. Reduce Amount of Required Vehicle Loading/Unloading Spaces

The second entitlement is a request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for development and operation of a ground-level heliport within the western portion of the project site, near the hospital’s emergency department ambulance entrance. The heliport, which will be designed and constructed with the second phase of the Medical Center (approximately 2028), is intended to accommodate patient transport to the hospital for emergency care and also to transport of patients to other area hospitals where a higher level of emergency care is available. The heliport will feature a broom finish concrete landing area, an eight-foot-wide connecting concrete pathway, and pavement markings, signage, and lighting as required by the California Department of Transportation Aviation...
Division and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The third entitlement is a request for approval of a Development Agreement Amendment (Attachment 16) to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement to incorporate in the definition of “entitlements” that are vested the entitlements requested by the project applicant including the Planned Development Permit, the Planned Development Guidelines, the Conditional Use Permit, and the Site Plan. The Development Agreement Amendment also seeks to account for the longer construction timeline for the project, memorialize agreements relative to project site access, memorialize agreements relative to water infrastructure and connections, memorialize agreements relative to street and landscape frontage maintenance, memorialize agreements relative to preparation for the future Class I trail, and acknowledge the potential for future modifications to the Medical Center that may be required by the California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.

The proposed Medical Center includes development of a six-story 400,000-square-foot acute care hospital with 300 beds, two three-story 65,000-square-foot medical office buildings, a 20,000-square-foot central utility plant, and a ground-level heliport facility. With respect to building design, the applicant has submitted Planned Development Guidelines which are intended to provide the architectural framework for development of the Medical Center buildings including guidance relative to building design, building materials, and building colors. Each of the Medical Center buildings will require future Design Review approval by the Planning Commission to ensure consistency with the proposed Folsom Ranch Medical Center Planned Development Guidelines.

The proposed Medical Center, which will be developed in five different phases, is expected to be fully developed within approximately 23 years. The table on the following page lists the specific details regarding each of the five phases of development for the Medical Center:

TABLE 1: FOLSOM RANCH MEDICAL CENTER PHASING EXHIBIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Central Plant*</th>
<th>Occupied Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Medical Office Building 1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>65,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Hospital (100 Beds)</td>
<td>15,000 SF*</td>
<td>160,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Heliport</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Medical Office Building 2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>65,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>Hospital Expansion (100 Beds)</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>120,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000 SF*</td>
<td>530,000 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Central Utility Plant areas are estimated and not included in total development area.
The proposed development phases and timing are flexible and are based on current estimates and may vary as the Medical Center is developed and population and patient needs dictate. Another factor impacting development timing is the completion of site improvement work and coordination with construction seasons given that the infrastructure and roads needed to serve the project.

The applicant's vision for the Medical Center is to provide a broad range of healthcare services to serve the local community and the greater Sacramento region. Specifically, the Medical Center is expected to provide a variety of medical services including the following:

- Acute-Care Hospital
- Medical Office Buildings
- Outpatient Clinics (including Urgent Care)
- Free-standing Emergency Departments
- Ambulatory Surgery Centers
- Wellness-Related Clinics and Retail Facilities
- Imaging Center and Mobile Imaging and Treatment
- Mobile Trailer Pad(s) for Mobile Prefabricated Modular Structures or Temporary Emergency Management Services

In relation to site design, the six-story hospital building has been centrally positioned in the middle of the project site, with a three-story medical office building located to the north and a three-story medical office building located to the south of the hospital respectively. The central plant building and heliport are located directly to the west of the hospital building adjacent to East Bidwell Street and the U.S. Highway eastbound onramp. The applicant has submitted Planned Development Guidelines for the Medical Center with the goal of creating a medical campus that defines its place within the community, provides an environment that promotes patient safety and accessibility, creates open spaces and safe pedestrian pathways, clearly identifies building entrances and pedestrian pathways, and integrates the project with surrounding development relative to vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity. The Planned Development Guidelines also provide specific site design guidance relative to vehicle access, pedestrian access, wayfinding, edge considerations, loading and storage, site furniture, future building pads, and mobile modular structures.

General access to the project site is currently provided by East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway. Parcel 85A is otherwise undeveloped. The proposed project includes a number of roadway improvements required to serve the project site including the construction of McCarthy Way between Alder Creek Parkway and Placerville Road and the construction of Mercy Drive between McCarthy Way and Westwood Drive. In addition, as part of scheduled Folsom Plan Area Backbone Infrastructure improvements, Westwood Drive will be constructed between Alder Creek Parkway and Placerville Road with a future traffic signal at the intersection of Westwood Drive and Alder Creek Parkway.
Vehicle access to the project site includes three new driveways that will be located on the west side of McCarthy Way and a single driveway that will be located on the east side of East Bidwell Street. A round-a-bout design feature is proposed at the primary driveway entrance at the intersection of McCarthy Way and Mercy Drive. A left-turn pocket is also proposed on southbound East Bidwell Street for sole use by emergency service vehicles to access the East Bidwell Street Driveway.

As part of the Planned Development Permit, the applicant requested that three different access scenarios be evaluated for the Medical Center project including: (1) signalizing the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way; (2) installing a round-a-bout at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way; and (3) physically restricting left-turn access from eastbound Alder Creek to McCarthy Way with a raised median, with primary eastbound access to McCarthy Way from Alder Creek Parkway being a left-turn movement at Westwood Drive, followed by a left-turn movement at Mercy Drive. The applicant's preferred access to the project site is via the signalized intersection at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way as they believe this is a critical priority to facilitate both emergency and non-emergency patient and visitor access as well as employee access to the Medical Center.

Upon review of the applicant's preferred access scenario, City staff determined that a traffic signal located at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way would not meet the City design standard for traffic signal spacing (1,320 feet required) as it would only be 700 feet from the intersections of East Bidwell Street/Alder Creek Parkway and Alder Creek Parkway/Westwood Drive respectively. A traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way is also not reflected in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. In addition, City staff has concerns regarding potential traffic-related impacts associated with placing a traffic signal at this specific location (discussed in more detail within the Traffic/Access/Circulation portion of this staff report).

It is important to note that the traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way would not need to be installed until the Phase 4 (approximately 2034) of the Medical Center project. The configuration of Alder Creek Parkway at the future McCarthy Way (i.e., "S shaped" or "porkchop" median) currently allows for left turn access and the Transportation Impact Study (Attachment 20) concluded that this left turn movement could continue as either an unsignalized or signalized intersection. A microsimulation analysis provided in the appendix of the Transportation Impact Study indicated that, both this intersection along with the East Bidwell Street/Alder Creek Parkway intersection, would operate with acceptable queues and delays if the Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way intersection is signalized. The proposed site plan, which includes the applicant's preferred access scenario, is shown in Figure 3 on the following page.
FIGURE 3: PROPOSED SITE PLAN

As shown on the submitted Site Plan above, internal vehicle circulation consists of a series of 25-foot-wide drive aisles that provide access between the four project driveways, the hospital building, and the two office buildings. Pedestrian circulation is provided by new sidewalks located along the street frontages of East Bidwell Street, Alder Creek Parkway, and McCarthy Way as well as by a series of new pedestrian pathways that provide connectivity throughout the project site and to the perimeter sidewalks. A future Class I trail is also located in the northwest corner of the project site adjacent to the U.S. Highway 50 eastbound onramp. Additional on-site improvements include: 1,275 parking spaces (includes combination of uncovered and solar-covered spaces), 56 bicycle parking spaces, electric vehicle charging stations, underground utilities, underground water storage tanks, a heliport, site lighting, site landscaping, retaining walls, and project identification signs.

As noted above, the project site is presently undeveloped. Therefore, the proposed project also includes a number of significant off-site improvements including roadway and utility improvements, grading improvements on three adjacent parcels, construction of a hydromodification basin, construction of a storm drain swale, and excavation of a borrow site. Roadway and utility improvements, which would be constructed along East Bidwell Street, Alder Creek Parkway, Westwood Drive, and Placerville Road include grading of the roadway alignments, and associated storm drain, sewer, water, and dry utilities. Grading improvements include mass grading of three adjacent parcels that are part of the larger Parcel 85A that was recently subdivided; no other development activity is proposed
or approved for these three parcels. Construction of an off-site storm drain outfall swale and an off-site hydromodification basin (Basin No. 8) are proposed to convey and treat storm drainage. The swale is located just west of the Alder Creek Parkway and East Bidwell Street intersection, while the hydromodification basin is southwest of the project site, just north of the proposed Savannah Parkway roadway alignment. Lastly, excavation at a borrow site, which is approximately 400 feet west of East Bidwell Street, is proposed to provide fill material to widen the west side of the East Bidwell Street roadway.

In addition to the off-site improvement referenced above, the proposed project includes modifications to the water delivery system for the Folsom Plan Area in order to provide required emergency water backup storage and sufficient water pressure to serve the proposed project. The 2014 Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan indicates that the proposed project site is located within what is identified as the Zone 3 water service area. There are five water zones in the Folsom Plan Area with Zone 5 being furthest east (highest elevation) and Zone 1 being further west (lowest elevation). Based on utility studies prepared for the proposed Medical Center project, it was determined that the required minimum water pressure for the hospital building is 80 psi. In order to achieve the minimum water pressure necessary to serve the project, the applicant is proposing to connect to the Zone 4 water service area. To accommodate shifting the proposed project into the Zone 4 water service area, additional Zone 4 water piping will be required to be installed and the Zone 4 water tank capacity will need to be expanded. A detailed discussion of this topic is covered in the Water Supply and Infrastructure section of this staff report.
The following sections provide an analysis of the applicant's proposal. Staff's analysis includes:

A. General Plan and Specific Plan Consistency
B. Planned Development Permit
   - Development Standards
   - Building Architecture and Design
C. Conditional Use Permit
D. Development Agreement Amendment
E. Traffic/Access/Circulation
F. Parking and Loading
G. Noise and Vibration Impacts
H. Walls
I. Signage
J. Site Lighting
K. Trash/Recycling
L. Existing and Proposed Landscaping
M. Oak Tree Impacts
N. Trails
O. Grading and Drainage
P. Frontage Improvements
Q. Water Supply and Infrastructure
R. Off-Site Improvements
S. Conformance with Relevant Folsom General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Objectives and Policies

A. General Plan and Specific Plan Consistency

The 27.44-acre project site has a General Plan land use designation of GC (General Commercial) and a Specific Plan land use designation of SP-GC-PD (Specific Plan-General Commercial-Planned Development Permit District). The project is consistent with both the General Plan land use designation and the Specific Plan land use designation, as hospital and medical offices are identified as a permitted land uses within
the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. In addition, the proposed project meets the development requirements established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Table A.11) with respect to lot area, building setbacks, landscape coverage, distance between buildings, and parking. However, the proposed project is requesting approval to deviate from the established development standards with respect to maximum building floor area ratio, maximum building height, maximum signage, required bicycle parking, and required vehicle loading/unloading spaces. Development standards for the proposed project are discussed later within the Planned Development Permit section of this staff report.

On March 17, 2020, the City approved a Minor Administrative Modification (MAM) to shift commercial and residential square footage among multiple parcels (Parcels 61, 77, 78, and 85A) located within the Folsom Plan Area including the subject parcel in order to meet the maximum development intent of the properties involved. The resulting Transfer of Development Rights resulted in the subject property being allocated 530,000 gross square feet for a mixture of different commercial land uses (GC-RC, GC-GC, and GC-IND/OP). As discussed in the Project Description, the proposed Medical Center project includes a variety intended land uses including an acute-care hospital, medical office buildings, outpatient clinics, urgent care, free-standing emergency departments, ambulatory surgery centers, wellness related clinics, retail facilities, an imaging center, and mobile imaging and treatment. All the anticipated uses described above are considered permitted land uses on the subject parcel as described within the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

As mentioned in the Project Description section of this staff report, the proposed project includes development and operation of a heliport on the west side of the Medical Center site. The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC, Section 17.22.050) do not provide specific guidance as to whether a heliport is considered a non-permitted, permitted, or conditionally permitted land use within a Specific Plan-General Commercial, Planned Development District. However, based upon the nature of the proposed use and its potential impacts, the Community Development Director determined that as part of the proposed project, a heliport would be a permitted use within a Specific Plan-General Commercial, Planned Development District (SP-GC-PD) upon issuance of a Conditional Use Permit by the Planning Commission. A full discussion of the planned heliport is contained within the Conditional Use Permit section of this staff report.

B. 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. The following are proposed as part of the applicant's Planned Development Permit:
• Development Standards and Planned Development Guidelines
• Building Architecture and Design

Development Standards and Planned Development Guidelines
Planned Development Guidelines (Attachment 14) have been submitted which provide the framework for the Planned Development Permit including deviations from the development standards established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Municipal Code in order to accommodate an acute care hospital, medical office buildings, a heliport, site design and planning, building architecture, landscaping, site lighting, and signage. Specific changes to the development standards include:

1. Increase Maximum Building Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 0.25 to 0.55
2. Increase Maximum Building Height from 50 feet to 60 feet (Office Buildings)
3. Increase Maximum Building Height from 50 feet to 120 feet (Hospital Building)
4. Sign Criteria Modifications
   o Increase Number of Wall Signs for Office and Hospital Buildings
   o Increase Maximum Sign Area for Office and Hospital Buildings
   o Increase Maximum Letter Height for Office Buildings and Hospital Buildings
   o Allow Illumination of Office and Hospital Building Wall Signs
   o Increase Maximum Height of Freeway Pylon Sign
   o Increase Maximum Sign Area of Freeway Pylon Sign
5. Apply Folsom Municipal Code Requirements for Required Bicycle Parking Spaces
6. Reduce Amount of Required Vehicle Loading/Unloading Spaces

The proposed project includes a request to increase the maximum building floor area ratio (FAR) established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP, Table A.11) from 0.25 to 0.55 for the overall Medical Center project site. The applicant has indicated that the proposed increase in maximum FAR is necessary in order to maximize the site and building efficiency for development of the Medical Center. In particular, the applicant states that the proposed six-story hospital and three-story medical office buildings are appropriately sized to meet the health care needs of the surrounding community and that a FAR of 0.55 is required to achieve this goal.

The maximum FAR in the General Plan for GC land uses is 0.5, while maximum FAR established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan for the GC land use category is 0.25. While allowing medical services land uses in the GC land use category, the FPASP did not envision a hospital land use. The General Plan includes a land use designation of Public and Quasi-Public Facility (PQP) which corresponds with the hospital building. PQP land use is defined as supporting the needs of the community by providing health uses, and the FAR for the PQP land uses in the FPASP ranges from 0.2 up to a maximum of 1.0. According to the applicant, the proposed Medical Center will provide significant public amenities and community benefit not only to the City of Folsom, but also to the surrounding region. In order to provide a full-service hospital, a minimum FAR of 0.55 is
requested by the applicant for the project site to accommodate the grossing and support space anticipated for a full-service hospital. The applicant states that this FAR increase will translate into appropriate building footprints with efficient program layouts and onsite surface parking with open areas for a positive contribution to the visual environment.

Upon review of the submitted site plan, building renderings, and Planned Development Guidelines, staff has determined that the proposed increase in FAR would not result in any visual or aesthetic impacts as the project site is located in an area planned for intensive commercial development in the future. In addition, staff has determined that the proposed increase in FAR would not result in any traffic, access, or circulation-related impacts based on the results of the Transportation Impact Study (Attachment 20) prepared for the project. As a result, staff is supportive of the applicant's proposed FAR increase from 0.25 to 0.55 for the project site to accommodate development of the Medical Center.

The proposed project includes a request to increase the maximum height established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP, Table A.11) for the GC land use category from 50 feet to 120 feet. Specifically, the applicant is proposing to increase the maximum building height for the two medical office buildings from 50 feet to 60 feet and to increase the maximum building height for the hospital building from 50 feet to 120 feet (exclusive of mechanical equipment and roof screens). The applicant states that the increase in building height is necessary in order to maximize the site and building efficiency for medical office buildings and a hospital. The applicant also states that the increase in building height is required because medical office buildings and hospitals typically have higher floor to floor dimensions due to interstitial space requirements for mechanical, plumbing, electrical, low voltage and medical gas systems.

In reviewing the request for an increase to the maximum building height for the medical office buildings and hospital, staff took into consideration existing and future land uses in the vicinity of proposed project. The project site is bounded by an undeveloped commercial property (future hotel site) to the north with U.S. Highway 50 beyond, Alder Creek Parkway to the south with an undeveloped commercial property (Shops at Folsom Ranch) and an under construction single-family residential subdivision (Enclave at Folsom Ranch) beyond, East Bidwell Street to the west with an undeveloped commercial property beyond, and future McCarthy Way to the east with undeveloped multi-family residential properties and Westwood Drive beyond.

The southernmost three-story medical office building is located approximately 550 feet from the nearest future single-family residence to the south across Alder Creek Parkway and approximately 400 feet from the undeveloped multi-family property located across future McCarthy Way to the east. The six-story hospital building is located approximately 700 feet from the nearest future single-family residence to the south across Alder Creek Parkway and approximately 350 feet from the undeveloped multi-family properties located across future McCarthy Way to the east. Based on the planned development of commercial uses in the project area, the substantial distance of the proposed buildings
from residential development, and the community benefits associated with the medical campus, staff has determined that the proposed building height increase for the medical office buildings and hospital is appropriate.

The submitted Planned Development Guidelines include a Sign Criteria that proposes several modifications to the standards established by the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC, Chapter 17.59) for hospital and medical office uses including increasing the number of allowable wall signs, increasing the maximum sign area for wall signs, increasing the maximum letter height for wall signs, increasing the maximum height of the proposed freeway pylon sign, and increasing the maximum sign area for the freeway pylon sign. A detailed discussion of the Sign Criteria and the proposed modifications is included in the Signage section of this staff report.

The proposed project includes a request to apply the Folsom Municipal Code requirements for the number of required bicycle parking spaces for both the medical office buildings and the hospital building. In addition, the proposed project includes a request to reduce the number of required vehicle loading and unloading spaces for the medical office buildings and the hospital building. A thorough review of these proposed modifications is contained with the Parking section of this staff report.

Building Architecture and Design
As detailed in the Project Description section of this report, the proposed Medical Center project includes development of a six-story hospital building, two three-story medical office buildings, a single-story central plant building, and two mobile modular structures. The submitted Planned Development Guidelines contain architectural guidelines which provide the framework for development of the medical campus buildings including guidance relative to building design, building materials, and building colors. Listed below are some of the specific recommendations from the Guidelines:

- Buildings shall be well-proportioned, constructed of high-quality materials, and should demonstrate an attention to care and craftsmanship.

- Building forms shall distinguish main public entries versus emergency and staff entrances.

- Hierarchy and rhythm should be used to create building forms that are cohesive, balanced, and approachable.

- Articulation and naturally cast shadows are important aspects of building facade design that can animate and bring visual interest to built structures.

- Buildings on this campus should exhibit a sound understanding of massing including a base, middle, and top massing, the human scale, and the macro scale.
• High quality, emphasis on natural materials that demonstrate professional craftsmanship.

• Exterior building materials shall form a complimentary palette of textures and colors. Warm-tone, approachable materials and colors shall establish the primary palette.

• Natural stone of hewn, rough cut, flame honed or polished texture; integrally colored synthetic plaster, textured finish; pre-finished metal panels of composite or plate aluminum construction shall constitute the primary exterior wall finishes and accent materials.

Shown in the figures below and on the following pages are conceptual building renderings of the medical office and hospital buildings.

FIGURE 4: NORTHWESTERN VIEW OF ENTIRE MEDICAL CENTER
FIGURE 5: WESTERN ELEVATION OF HOSPITAL BUILDING

FIGURE 6: EASTERN ELEVATION OF HOSPITAL BUILDING
As no specific architectural and design details for the Medical Center were submitted with the subject development application, each of the buildings will require future Design Review approval by the Planning Commission to ensure consistency with the proposed Planned Development Guidelines. Condition No. 47 is included to reflect this requirement.

C. **Conditional Use Permit**

The applicant is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit for development and operation of a ground-level heliport within the western portion of the project site. The heliport, which will be constructed with the Phase 2 of the Medical Center (2028), is intended to accommodate patient transport to the hospital for emergency care and also transport of patients to other area hospitals where a higher level of emergency care is available. In terms of operation, the heliport is expected to accommodate 1-2 flights per week, however, there may be fluctuations based on demand. In addition, the heliport will
be available to accommodate flights seven days per week and 24 hours per day. With respect to design, the heliport will feature a broom finish concrete landing area, an 8-foot-wide connecting concrete pathway, and pavement markings, signage, and lighting as required by the California Department of Transportation Aviation Division and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The heliport will be designed to accommodate aircraft similar to the Airbus H145 helicopter model and constructed and operated in accordance with the guidance and requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Final approach and takeoff area would be coordinated with FAA and Caltrans and will incorporate required lighting requirements for safe landing and departure of helicopters. The heliport would be lighted in accordance with FAA requirements, including, but not limited to, obstruction lighting, landing pad perimeter lighting, and other related lighting. Helicopters will use typical running lights, which would include red and green right-of-way lights on the sides of the aircraft and a strobe light to indicate the helicopter’s position in low-visibility conditions. The preliminary design for the heliport including conceptual standards for landing and takeoff are shown in Figure 9 below:

FIGURE 9: PRELIMINARY HELIPORT DESIGN
In order to approve this request for a Conditional Use Permit to develop and operate a heliport at the Folsom Ranch Medical Center, 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 potential impacts associated with helicopters landing and taking off from the heliport as this represents a new noise source in the project area. The effects of helicopter noise on the surrounding project area were evaluated in a project-specific Helicopter Noise Technical Report prepared by Crawford Murphy & Tilly (Appendix G to the Addendum/Attachment 22). The Noise Report utilized the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT), which is the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved noise model for quantifying aircraft noise and includes parameters such as the number of anticipated helicopter operations, flight paths used to access the heliport, specific helicopter types, and the time of day at which operations are expected to occur.

The Noise Report determined that the 60 dB contours for helicopter noise would not extend beyond 200 feet from the proposed heliport location, which is primarily within the limits of the proposed Medical Center property and does not include any existing or potential future residential land uses. Therefore, no existing or planned off-site residential uses would be exposed to helicopter noise levels that exceed the City’s 60- and 65-dB standards for low-density and high-density residential land uses, respectively. In addition, the Noise Report determined that the proposed heliport operations would not result in any new significant noise-related impacts that were not previously addressed by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR/EIS.

Based on this information, staff supports the Conditional Use Permit for development and operation of a heliport at the Folsom Ranch Medical Center as proposed. However, in the event the City finds evidence that the heliport use has resulted in a substantial adverse effect on the health, and/or general welfare of users of adjacent or proximate property or has a substantial adverse impact on public facilities or services, the Community Development 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. Condition No. 8 is included to reflect this requirement.

**D. Development Agreement Amendment**

The City and Landowner’s predecessor (Eagle Commercial Partners, LLC) previously entered into the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement By and Between the City of Folsom and Landowner Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan on July 15, 2014. 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. On November 12, 2015, Eagle Commercial Partners, LLC and the City entered into Amendment No. 1 to First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan. The applicant is proposing Amendment No. 2 to the First Amended and Restated Development Agreement by and between the City of Folsom and Dignity Health.

As described above, the applicant is requesting approval of a Development Agreement Amendment (Attachment 16) to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement to incorporate in the definition of "entitlements" that are vested the entitlements requested by the project applicant including the Planned Development Permit, the Planned Development Guidelines, the Conditional Use Permit, and the Site Plan. The Development Agreement Amendment also seeks to take into account the longer construction timeline for the project, memorialize agreements relative to project site access, memorialize agreements relative to water infrastructure and connections, memorialize agreements relative to frontage landscaping and maintenance, memorialize agreements relative to preparation for the future Class I trail, and acknowledge the potential for future modifications to the Medical Center that may be required by the California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development. One of the primary purposes of this Development Agreement Amendment is to provide flexibility in the approval and term for subsequent entitlements, specifically in relation to development of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center. This flexibility is required because development of the Medical Center presents significant benefits to the City and the region and there are unique characteristics in the buildout of the Medical Center buildings and related structures including the following:

- Development of the Medical Center will occur over a long period of time, with a phased timeline for construction and potential adjustments to physical structures as medical delivery systems change over time.

- The California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development ("OSHPD") is required to approve the hospital building design which may result in required changes to the design of the Medical Center buildings and related structures.

- The Medical Center will generate significant employment and other economic benefits to the City.

- The Medical Center will provide needed expansion of access to health care services for the City and other jurisdictions in the region.

- A significant capital investment is required for the Medical Center buildings and related structures; and

- The status of Landowner as a nonprofit public benefit corporation.
In light of the unique circumstances associated with the proposed Medical Center referenced above, the term of the Development Agreement Amendment is proposed to be extended to June 30, 2056 or until the 530,000-square-foot Medical Center has been built out, whichever is later.

The Development Agreement Amendment also address issues related to site access, agreements relative to water infrastructure and connections, agreements relative to street lighting and landscape frontage maintenance, and agreements relative to preparation for the future Class I trail. Each of the specific elements of the Development Agreement Amendment referenced above are discussed in detail within various sections of this staff report. City staff is supportive of the Development Agreement Amendment as proposed. The Planning Commission will be making a recommendation regarding the Development Agreement Amendment to the City Council as Development Agreements require City Council review and approval.

E. Traffic/Access/Circulation

The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan established a series of plans and policies for the circulation system within the entire Plan Area. The FPASP circulation system was designed with a sustainable community focus on the movement of people and provides a number of mobility alternatives such as walking, cycling, carpooling, and viable forms of public transportation in addition to vehicular circulation. The circulation plan evaluated regional travel, both in terms of connectivity and capacity as well as local internal connections and access. The circulation plan also addressed the concerns of regional traffic, including parallel capacity to U.S. Highway 50, and connectivity with surrounding jurisdictions while considering community-wide connectivity, alternative modes of travel, and the provision of complete streets.

The 2011 Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement included not only a detailed analysis of traffic-related impacts within the Plan Area, but also an evaluation of traffic-related impacts on the surrounding communities. In total, there are fifty-five traffic-related mitigation measures associated with development of the FPASP which are included as conditions of approval for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project. Many of these mitigation measures are expected to reduce traffic impacts to East Bidwell Street. Included among the mitigation measures are requirements to: fund and construct roadway improvements within the Plan Area, pay a fair-share contribution for construction of improvements north of U.S. Highway 50, participate in the City’s Transportation System Management Fee Program, and Participate in the U.S. Highway 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association. The Folsom Ranch Medical Center project is subject to all traffic-related mitigation measures required by the 2011 FPASP EIR/EIS (Condition No. 51).

On May 5, 2015, Fehr & Peers completed a Traffic Impact Analysis for the Westland-Eagle Specific Plan Amendment project (an Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS was certified in association with the Westland-Eagle Specific Plan Amendment) and
determined that the traffic impacts associated with that project had been adequately addressed in the 2011 Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR/EIS with inclusion of some minor adjustments to account for changes that have occurred since the EIR/EIS was certified. The adjustments include requiring the project to modify the westbound approach to the East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road intersection to include three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane. In addition, the project was required to pay a fair-share contribution towards improvements to the East Bidwell Street/Alder Creek Parkway intersection including the addition of a channelized westbound right-turn lane.

On December 1, 2017, T.KEAR Transportation Planning & Management completed a Transportation Impact Study for the Mangini Ranch Phase 2 Subdivision project to ensure that no additional impacts would occur that were not previously identified and addressed by the 2011 FPASP EIR/EIS and the 2015 Westland-Eagle Specific Plan Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS. The Study determined that, with planned street and intersection improvements, the Mangini Ranch Phase 2 Subdivision project would not create any new significant impacts when compared to the FPASP EIR/EIS and the Westland-Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum.

Existing Roadway Network and Conditions
The project site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway. Significant roadways in the project vicinity include U.S. Highway 50, East Bidwell Street, Alder Creek Parkway, and Westwood Drive. U.S. Highway 50 is a six-lane east-west highway that passes through Folsom and connects the Sacramento region to Lake Tahoe and points beyond. East Bidwell Street, which is currently a two-lane north-sound roadway in the vicinity of the project site, runs from White Rock Road northward until it connects to Riley Street. Alder Creek Parkway is currently a two-lane east-west roadway that travels from East Bidwell Street eastward to Placerville Road and beyond into the Russell Ranch Subdivision. Westwood Drive, which is two-lane north-south roadway that is currently under construction, will eventually run from Mangini Parkway northward up to Placerville Road.

Existing roadway conditions at the McCarthy Way and Alder Creek Parkway intersection include a left-turn pocket on eastbound Alder Creek Parkway at future McCarthy Way and a westbound left-turn pocket on Alder Creek Parkway at the entrance to the Enclave Subdivision. The two existing left-turn pockets are expected to remain in place until such time that they are unsafe or there is a trigger to require modifications to this intersection (e.g., signalization of McCarthy Way). The intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway currently features three-way stop sign control. The westbound approach to East Bidwell Street/Alder Creek Parkway intersection from Alder Creek Parkway includes a right-turn lane and a left-turn pocket. The northbound and southbound approaches to the East Bidwell Street/Alder Creek Parkway intersection both include a through-lane and right-turn and left-turn lanes respectively to provide access to eastbound Alder Creek Parkway. There is currently no traffic control at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive, although there is an eastbound left-turn pocket from Alder Creek Parkway onto future Westwood Drive. An aerial photograph of
the existing roadway conditions and an exhibit showing existing conditions plus approved roadways associated with the Parcel 85A Tentative Parcel Map project are shown below and on the following page.

FIGURE 10: AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF EXISTING ROADWAY CONDITIONS
FIGURE 11: EXISTING CONDITIONS PLUS APPROVED ROADWAYS

On April 23, 2021, DKS Associates completed a Transportation Analysis (Analysis) and CEQA Impact Study (included as Attachment 20) to evaluate traffic, access, and circulation impacts associated with the proposed project. The Analysis evaluated traffic operations at the following 19 study intersections in the vicinity of the project site:

- East Bidwell Street and Iron Point Road
- East Bidwell Street and Placerville Road
- East Bidwell Street and US 50 WB Ramps
- East Bidwell Street and US 50 EB Ramps
- Placerville Road and Westwood Drive
- Rowberry Way and Alder Creek Parkway
- 1st Street and Alder Creek Parkway
• 3rd Street and Alder Creek Parkway
• East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway
• McCarthy Way and Alder Creek Parkway
• Westwood Drive and Alder Creek Parkway
• Placerville Road and Alder Creek Parkway
• East Bidwell Street and Old Ranch Road
• East Bidwell Street and Savannah Parkway
• Westwood Drive and Savannah Parkway
• East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway
• East Bidwell Street and Regency Parkway
• East Bidwell Street and White Rock Road
• Placerville Road and White Rock Road

Six different scenarios were evaluated in reviewing traffic operations at the 19 study intersections including Existing Conditions (2021) and the five different development phases of the proposed project. The fifth development phase, while planned for 2045 and representing full buildout, was analyzed under Cumulative Conditions (2040) based on the current year travel demand model utilized by the Transportation Analysis.

As discussed in the Project Description, the applicant is proposing the addition of future signalized access control at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way, and City staff is concerned that a signal at this intersection is inconsistent with the approved Specific Plan and City design standards among other things. The Analysis evaluated intersection operations at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way for Cumulative Conditions to determine potential interactions between closely spaced intersections including the potential for queue spillback at upstream adjacent intersections. The Analysis concluded that there would not be a significant impact associated with the future signalization of the Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way intersection, but the Analysis also includes significant assumptions about geometric changes, operational changes and impacts to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service that City staff does not support at this time. A more detailed discussion of project site access as it relates to the proposed traffic signal is provided in the Site Access and On-Site Circulation section of this staff report.

The majority of infrastructure and ultimate roadway cross-sections for the Folsom Plan Area identified in the FPASP have not been constructed yet, however they are critical to handling the expected traffic growth associated with planned development throughout the region including the subject project. The following table shows the programmed infrastructure improvements and expansions identified to correspond with the phased expansion of land use identified for the submitted development application. The table also identifies any improvements either associated with the project, or that become deficient with the addition of project-related trips.
FIGURE 12: PROGRAMMED SCHEDULE OF PLAN AREA INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PHASE 1 (2023)</th>
<th>PHASE 2 (2028)</th>
<th>PHASE 3 (2030)</th>
<th>PHASE 4 (2034)</th>
<th>PHASE 5 (2040)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIDENING OF EAST BIDWELL STREET FROM US 50 TO WHITE ROCK ROAD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDENING OF ALDER CREEK PARKWAY FROM EAST BIDWELL STREET TO PLACERVILLE ROAD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF WESTWOOD DRIVE BETWEEN ALDER CREEK PARKWAY AND PLACERVILLE ROAD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF ALDER CREEK PARKWAY WEST OF EAST BIDWELL ST INCLUDING INTERSECTIONS OF ALDER CREEK PARKWAY WITH 1ST STREET AND 3RD STREET</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF MCCARTHY WAY BETWEEN ALDER CREEK PARKWAY TO PLACERVILLE ROAD</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF EMERGENCY ACCESS MIDBLOCK HALF SIGNAL ON EAST BIDWELL STREET</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF EMPIRE RANCH ROAD US 50 INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF SAVANNAH PARKWAY WEST OF EAST BIDWELL ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF ROWBERRY ROAD US 50 OVERCROSSING</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDENING OF WHITE ROCK ROAD FOR CAPITAL SOUTHEAST CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNALIZATION OF ALDER CREEK PARKWAY AND WESTWOOD DRIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 'C' indicates an improvement programmed by the City;  
'b' indicates an improvement associated with the Project;  
'D' indicates an improvement required due to deficiency associated with Project trips  
',-' indicates an improvement that is not programmed nor required due to a deficiency

The Analysis projected that the proposed Folsom Ranch Medical Center project is expected to generate a total of 11,220 daily vehicle-trips on weekend days, with 914 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 1,017 trips occurring in the PM peak hour. Based on the expected number of project-related vehicle trips, the Analysis concluded that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on vehicle level of service (LOS) at any of the study intersections or freeway segments with following two exceptions:

- **Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way:**  
The Analysis determined that the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way would exceed the General Plan threshold for southbound queuing and delay in the PM peak hour under Cumulative Conditions. To address this deficiency, the Analysis recommends that a 250-foot-long channelized southbound left-turn lane be constructed along McCarthy Way leading into an extended
westbound right-turn lane at the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway. To minimize weaving, the Analysis recommends that the southbound right-turn lane be signed and/or striped for vehicles planning to go north on East Bidwell Street.

- **U.S. Highway 50:**
  The Analysis determined that two merge-diverge influence areas on U.S. Highway 50 in the vicinity of the project site would exceed vehicle density thresholds during Phase 1 (2023) development of the proposed project. The Analysis states that this operational deficiency will be addressed as part of the planned Empire Ranch Road/U.S. Highway 50 Interchange Improvement project that is currently programmed in Sacramento Area Council of Government’s Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

To address the identified deficiencies and to provide safe and efficient traffic operations, staff recommends that the following measures associated with each of the five proposed development phases be implemented to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department (Condition No. 41):

- **Phase 1 Roadway Improvements (2023)**
  - The owner/applicant shall construct McCarthy Way between Alder Creek Parkway and Placerville Road along with multiple access points to the site, consistent with City of Folsom Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards and City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and Details.
  - The owner/applicant shall construct an additional 250-foot right-turn lane for southbound McCarthy Way approaching Alder Creek Parkway connecting to a right-turn pocket for westbound Alder Creek Parkway approaching East Bidwell Street. The owner/applicant shall also construct a full extension of the right-turn pocket on westbound Alder Creek Parkway from McCarthy Way to East Bidwell Street. The owner/applicant shall adjust the location of the parking lot curb along the south and east edge of the project site accordingly.

- **Phase 2 Roadway Improvements (2028)**
  - The owner/applicant shall construct a southbound emergency vehicle-only left-turn movement into the East Bidwell Street access point along with installation of a half-signal that will be triggered through emergency signal preemption to stop northbound traffic for enough time for the vehicle to safety complete the turning maneuver.
• Phase 3 Roadway Improvements (2030)
  o No roadway improvements required.

• Phase 4 Roadway Improvements (2034)
  o Should the owner/applicant desire to construct a traffic signal at Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way intersection as an element of Phase 4 development, the owner/applicant shall first be required to perform a supplemental traffic analysis to assess the operational impacts associated with signalization of the intersection.

The dates identified for each phase are planning estimates. The improvements are tied to the actual commencement of each phase.

As shown in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Figure 7.29), a future transit corridor is planned to be located adjacent to the project site within the Alder Creek Parkway right-of-way. The transit corridor includes a 38-foot-wide planted median that eventually as transit demand increases, will be reduced to 16-feet to allow for construction of two additional travel lanes for either dedicated or mixed-flow regional “Hi Bus” transit service (high frequency bus service). In addition, it anticipated that BRT stops will eventually be placed along eastbound and westbound Alder Creek Parkway to serve the proposed Medical Center project.

Key considerations associated with the future BRT operations in the Alder Creek Parkway right-of-way include consistency with the planned alignment west of East Bidwell Street, the ease of making a right-turn to and left-turn from the planned alignment along Westwood Drive, potential conflicts between transit and general traffic, and safety and accessibility for transit riders. The westbound center-running alignment provides consistency with the Specific Plan and adjacent design alignments while also providing a high level of transit performance with minimal conflicts with other vehicles. It is the preferred alignment in all scenarios. Eastbound BRT operations have the option of either center-running or right-running. The following are considerations associated with eastbound BRT operations:

• While center-running operations provide similar consistency with plans and adjacent designs, it results in lower transit performance due to resulting conflicts with left-turning vehicles at McCarthy Way and at Westwood Drive and a dedicated transit phase at Westwood Drive to make the extended right-turn movement.

• Right-running operations in a Business Access Transit Lane (driveway and right-turn access only) improves transit operations, minimizes conflicts with heavy left-turn volumes, and results in a lower right-of-way impact. The right-running would however require a transition at East Bidwell Street using a dedicated transit queue jump phase and would increase crossing distance for eastbound passengers.
Based on consistency with the approved Specific Plan and Transit Corridor Plan, and the design of adjacent developments, staff recommends that the both the westbound and eastbound BRT operations be center-running within the Alder Creek Parkway right-of-way. Although it will be Sacramento Regional Transit, in consultation with the City, that will determine the ultimate location of BRT, Condition No. 41 is included to reflect this requirement and the Development Agreement Amendment acknowledges the Specific Plan reference to BRT.

The Governors’ Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has published guidance recommending a CEQA threshold for transportation impacts of land use projects of a 15 percent Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction per capita, relative to either city or regional averages, based on California’s Climate Scoping Plan. Qualitative assessment of VMT reduction was determined to be acceptable to screen projects. Under State Law (SB 743), VMT became the only CEQA threshold of significance for transportation impacts on July 1, 2020.

At this time, the City has not adopted VMT thresholds; therefore, the VMT analysis prepared for the proposed project was based primarily on the technical guidance published by the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts (Technical Advisory). The OPR Technical Advisory does not include a recommended significance threshold for the proposed land use (i.e., hospital and medical offices). Therefore, the VMT analysis was conducted by separating the medical offices and hospital services and analyzing them independently.

Consistent with OPR Technical Advisory guidance for office land uses, the significance threshold of 85 percent of the existing baseline regional VMT (2016 SACOG regional VMT) per employee was used to analyze employee work-based trips generated by the medical offices of the project. That Analysis found that the VMT associated with work-based land uses of the proposed project and their employees exceed 85 percent of the VMT per employee regional average. The work-based land uses of the proposed project resulted in 14.33 VMT per employee compared to the work-based VMT threshold of 13.69 VMT per employee; thus, resulting in an exceedance of the VMT significance threshold of 4.5 percent. Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2c identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS would reduce impacts related to VMT though participation in the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association. However, employee participation in this program is voluntary; and thus, the rate of employee participation and the associated VMT reduction attributed to implementation of this mitigation measure is not fully known at this time. Therefore, consistent with Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2c, the Analysis recommended implementation of the following measure (Condition No. 44) to meet the recommended VMT threshold:

- During project operation, and consistent with Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2c, the owner/applicant shall ensure on-going employer membership and participation by Dignity Health in the SACOG 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association (U.S. 50 TMA). In addition, given that employee participation in the U.S. 50 TMA is voluntary, the owner/applicant shall be required to conduct biennial Dignity
Health employee surveys to ensure that at a minimum a 4.5 percent reduction in VMT (or 1,525 daily VMT) is achieved and maintained as part of project operations. Dignity Health shall be responsible for implementing biennial Dignity Health employee surveys to gauge participation with the various employee benefits offered by the U.S. 50 TMA. In order to ensure that the necessary reduction in VMT is being reported and achieved, the surveys shall include questions from which VMT reduction estimates can be estimated (e.g., how many days per week do you take alternative modes of transportation to work? How far do you live from your site of employment? etc.). Surveys and survey results shall be coordinated through and submitted to the U.S. 50 TMA, SACOG, and the City. If the required level of VMT reduction is not achieved, Dignity Health shall work with the City of Folsom and the TMA to identify other demand management related strategies to increase participation in the program and achieve the required reduction in VMT.

Project Access and On-Site Circulation
As discussed in the Project Description, vehicle access to the project site includes three new driveways that will be located on the west side of McCarthy Way and a single driveway that will be located on the east side of East Bidwell Street. A round-a-bout design feature is proposed at the primary driveway entrance at the intersection of McCarthy Way and Mercy Drive. A left-turn pocket is also proposed on southbound East Bidwell Street for exclusive use by emergency access vehicles to enter to the East Bidwell Street Driveway. A Vehicle Access and Circulation Exhibit and Pedestrian Circulation Exhibit associated with the proposed project are shown in Figures 13 and 14 on the following pages.
FIGURE 13: VEHICLE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION EXHIBIT
As part of the Planned Development Permit, the applicant is requesting that the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way be signalized in the future (Phase 4/Approximately 2034) to provide improved access to the project site. The applicant has stated that the signalization of the Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way intersection is an extremely high priority for Dignity Health in order to facilitate both emergency and non-emergency, patient, visitor, and employee access at this location. The applicant has submitted a Memorandum (Attachment 19) which discusses in further detail their preferred access scenario as well as two other alternative access scenarios for the proposed project.

On September 30, 2020, City staff provided a Memorandum (Attachment 18) to the applicant in which staff expressed concerns about the addition of a traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way. Given the current level of development in the Folsom Plan Area, staff believes that placing a traffic signal at this location is premature and could significantly limit the City’s opportunities to operate and
coordinate the overall traffic signal system in an efficient manner. In addition, staff has concerns regarding design standards and traffic operations, impacts to the future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, and public emergency access that is already planned along East Bidwell Street.

Staff recommends that the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way be designed to operate without any traffic controls at this time, other than stop-sign control for vehicles approaching Alder Creek Parkway from southbound McCarthy Way. Staff also recommends that the existing eastbound left-turn pocket on Alder Creek Parkway at McCarthy Way remain in place until such time that traffic conditions become unsafe or excessive delays occur. Condition No. 43 is included to reflect these requirements.

While City staff does not support installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way at this time, staff does acknowledge the operational needs identified by the applicant to install the signal at a future date with development of Phase 4 (2034) of the Medical Center. To facilitate the evaluation and installation of a traffic signal at this intersection in the future, staff recommends the following measures (Condition No. 42):

- The owner/applicant shall submit a Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis to the City that evaluates the traffic impacts associated with installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way. The scope of the Traffic Impact Analysis shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. The owner/applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with preparation of the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis.

- If the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis concludes that there is no significant traffic operational impact, the traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way may be installed by Landowner pursuant to the Conditions of Approval and consistent with technical specifications as approved by the City Engineer.

- If the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis identifies any significant traffic operational impacts that can be mitigated and the owner/applicant desires to install the traffic signal, the City will identify the required mitigation and the owner/applicant shall install the traffic signal along with the required mitigation.

- If the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis identifies any significant traffic operational impact that cannot be mitigated, the City will advise the owner/applicant and the traffic signal shall not be installed, and the intersection configuration approved as part of the original entitlements shall remain in place.
If the City determines that the left-turn access to the Medical Center at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way must be discontinued for any reason, the City shall (a) advise owner/applicant of the City's intention to discontinue access, (b) provide owner/applicant with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the City's determination to discontinue access, including an appeal to the City Council, and (c) consider the impact on safe and efficient public access to the hospital and emergency services, including any evidence owner/applicant may provide to City with respect to increased driving times.

City staff evaluated the operation and configuration of the project access system in terms of driveway spacing, driveway throat depth, and on-site circulation. City staff determined that the three proposed project driveways located on McCarthy Way and the single project driveway on East Bidwell Street provide adequate spacing from the nearest street intersections and meet the City's Design Standards for driveways located on collector streets and major arterials respectively. City staff also determined that the four proposed project driveways provide sufficient throat depth for inbound and outbound vehicles so as to avoid excessive vehicle queuing into the project site and onto adjacent public streets.

City staff also considered on-site circulation and determined that the project features a well-designed parking lot layout which minimizes offset drive aisles and provides adequate drive aisle widths of 25 feet or greater. In addition, City staff determined that there are abundant pedestrian facilities provided by the project including sidewalks, pedestrian walkways, and pedestrian connections which facilitate pedestrian movements in and around the project site.

To ensure implementation of the traffic control measures identified on the submitted site plan, staff recommends the following recommendations be included as conditions of approval for the project (Condition No. 43)

- "Stop" signs and appropriate pavement markings shall be installed at the exits to the four project driveways located on McCarthy Way and East Bidwell Street respectively to the satisfaction of the Community Development Departments.

- Additional warning signs and pavement markings (stamped concrete, brick pavers, etc.) shall be installed at the East Bidwell Street project driveway to alert pedestrians and bicyclists that emergency vehicles will be entering and exiting this driveway on a frequent basis and to be alert for incoming and outgoing vehicles to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

- Brick pavers, stamped concrete, or another type of similar colored 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 four project driveway entrances to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.
• Should the City determined that the existing eastbound left-turn pocket on Alder Creek at McCarthy Way needs to be eliminated, the owner/applicant shall be responsible for the installation of a full concrete median through the intersection and any other improvements associated with elimination of the left-turn pocket. The owner applicant shall also construct a pedestrian-actuated midblock protected crossing to coincide with implementation of BRT service to allow for safe pedestrian access to the BRT stop(s). Lastly, the owner/applicant shall construct a second eastbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive. The owner/applicant shall be responsible for a “fair share” contribution for the aforementioned improvements, with reimbursement or fee credit provided for any portion that the City deems above the owner/applicant’s responsibility.

F. Parking and Loading

As noted in the Project Description, the proposed project includes development of a 400,000-square-foot (300 beds) hospital building and two, 65,000-square-foot medical office buildings. The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Table A.14) requires that hospital buildings provide one parking space per every two hospital beds and that medical office buildings provide one parking space per every 1,000 square feet of floor area. As shown and described on the submitted site plan, the proposed project includes a total of 1,275 parking spaces including a combination of uncovered and solar-covered spaces. Staff has determined that the proposed project meets the parking requirements prescribed by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan by providing 1,275 parking spaces whereas a minimum of 990 parking spaces are required.

The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Table A.14) requires that office uses provide two bicycle parking spaces per 20 required vehicle parking spaces and one additional parking space for every ten additional vehicle parking spaces provided. The Folsom Municipal Code (FMC, Section 17.57.090), requires office uses to provide a minimum of five bicycle parking spaces for up to 25 required vehicle parking spaces and an additional bicycle parking space for every ten additional required vehicle parking spaces, with a maximum of 20 bicycle parking spaces being required. The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Municipal Code do not have any bicycle parking requirements for hospital uses.

The submitted site plan indicates that the proposed project will include a total of 56 bicycle parking spaces including 20 bicycle parking spaces at each of the medical office buildings and 16 parking spaces at the hospital building. The applicant is seeking approval through the Planned Development Permit process to utilize the parking requirements established by the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC Section 17.57.090) rather than the parking requirements established by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan for the proposed project. The applicant states that the parking requirements established by the Folsom Municipal Code are more applicable to the proposed project as most of the patients, visitors, and employees traveling to the Medical Center will be arriving by vehicle. The proposed
project meets the bicycle parking requirements established by the Folsom Municipal Code by providing 56 bicycle parking spaces whereas 40 bicycle parking spaces are required. Staff supports the applicant’s request to utilize the parking requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code based on their experience with bicycle usage at their other medical facilities in the Sacramento region.

As stated above, staff is supportive of the applicant’s request to utilize the parking requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code. However, in addition to providing bicycle parking spaces in designated spaces located outside of the medical office and hospital buildings (considered short-term bicycle parking), staff recommends that additional secured locations (bicycle storage room, bicycle storage locker, etc.) within or adjacent to the medical office and hospital buildings be provided to allow for long-term bicycle storage for employees. Condition No. 46 is included to reflect this requirement.

The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Table A.14) requires three loading/unloading spaces for office uses ranging in size from 50,000 to 99,000 square feet and three loading/unloading spaces for hospitals that range between 400,000 to 500,000 square feet. The applicant is seeking approval through the Planned Development Permit process to provide a total of six loading/unloading spaces for the entire Medical Center whereas nine loading/unloading spaces are required. The applicant states that the reduction in loading/unloading spaces is requested to minimize anticipated volumes and frequencies of truck traffic based on Dignity Health’s “just in time” delivery program. The applicant also states that high volumes of deliveries and truck traffic will be discouraged at the Medical Center as they stress the hospital system with the need for excessive storage areas. Staff supports the applicant’s request to reduce the number of required loading/unloading spaces at the Medical Center based on their experience with loading and unloading facilities at their other medical centers in the Sacramento area.

G. Noise and Vibration Impacts

Potential noise impacts that might result from development of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project are construction-related activities and operational activities. Construction-related noise would have a short-term effect, while operational noise would continue throughout the lifetime of the project. Construction activities under the project would require similar types and numbers of equipment operating at similar levels of intensity as already contemplated in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The closest sensitive receptors to the project are single-family residences (Enclave at Folsom Ranch) currently being constructed south of Alder Creek Parkway, approximately 150 feet away from the nearest project site boundary. If these residences are occupied during project construction, residents would experience a temporary increase in ambient noise level resulting from construction activities.

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. 32 is included to reflect these requirements.

In compliance with FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4, a site-specific Noise Analysis (Appendix F of Addendum) was conducted by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. in 2021 for the proposed project to evaluate future traffic noise levels and stationary operational noise levels associated with the proposed project. The Noise Analysis determined that the project would comply with the City’s interior noise standard of 45 dB for hospitals as well as California Building Code interior noise standard for hospitals of 45 dBL with respect to traffic noise levels. The Noise Analysis also evaluated potential noise impacts associated with truck movement throughout the project site. The results of the truck-related noise measurements show that on-site truck circulation noise would exceed the City’s interior noise level standard within the northern portion of the hospital building during nighttime hours. To address this potential impact, the Analysis recommends that windows on the northern façade of the hospital be upgraded to STC 35 or that heavy trucks be prohibited from utilizing the drive aisle located immediately north of the hospital during nighttime hours. Condition No. 51 is included to reflect this requirement.

The primary stationary noise sources associated with operations of the hospital and medical office buildings would include parking lots, loading dock operations, central plant equipment, and heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. Ambulances would also generate noise while arriving and departing the site. However, noise generated by ambulance sirens is exempt from City noise standards. The Noise Analysis determined that noise associated with loading dock activity would exceed the City’s interior noise level standard during nighttime hours along the western portion of the hospital building. To address this potential impact, the Analysis recommends that for noise sensitive areas of the hospital that are located directly adjacent to the loading dock area, windows on the western façade of the hospital within 100 feet of the loading docks should be upgraded to STC 35. Condition No. 51 is included to reflect this requirement.

Noise-generating mechanical equipment associated with hospital operations (pumps, boilers, compressors, generators, etc.) would be housed within the central plant building located along the western edge of the project site. The central plant building would have to provide at least 50 dB of sound attenuation in order to comply with the City’s noise standard for hospitals. Because the specific interior configuration and proposed construction of the central plant building is unknown at this time, the Noise Analysis recommends that the central plant building provide at least 50 dB of sound attenuation in the 63 to 4,000 Hertz frequency bands through building design/configuration and/or by using certain construction materials. Condition No. 51 is included to reflect this requirement.
Impacts from potential exposure of sensitive receptors to construction-related short-term groundborne noise and vibration were analyzed under Impact 3A.11-3 of the FPASP EIR/EIS. The FPASP EIR/EIS identified bulldozing and blasting activities as the sources of maximum groundborne noise and vibration levels that would result from the construction of the FPASP. The project would require some blasting and bulldozing as part of site preparation activities. As mentioned previously, the closest sensitive receptors to the project are single-family residences currently being constructed south of Alder Creek Parkway. These residences are located approximately 150 feet away from the nearest project site boundary, which is close enough to result in structural damage and human annoyance from blasting activities, according to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS. However, bulldozing activities would not result in either structural damage nor human annoyance at this distance. To mitigate the impact, the project would be required to implement FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure 3A.11-3, which would mitigate groundborne noise and vibration impacts associated with blasting and bulldozing activities. Condition No. 51 is included to reflect this requirement.

H. Walls

The proposed project includes a combination of retaining walls and screen walls. A retaining wall, which ranges from 3 feet to 7 feet in height is proposed along the project’s northern boundary. A screen wall, whose height is not known at this time, is proposed to shield the outdoor mechanical yard located adjacent to the central plant building in the western portion of the project. The submitted Planned Development Guidelines recommend that all proposed screen walls, retaining walls, and fences be designed to have consistent materials, styles, and colors to compliment the buildings within the Medical Center. Staff recommends that the final location, design, height, materials, and colors of the retaining walls and screen walls be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department to ensure consistency with the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Planned Development Guidelines. Condition No. 17 is included to reflect this requirement.

I. Signage

A Sign Criteria has been submitted as part of the Planned Development Guidelines for the purpose of ensuring appropriately designed signage and environmental graphics to provide a clear, comforting, and welcoming experience to visitors. The applicant states that the application of these signage guidelines is a key component in creating an initial impression which conveys the quality of care, professionalism, and promise of excellence provided at the Folsom Ranch Medical Center. The Sign Criteria includes a variety of different sign types to provide proper identification for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center including monument signs, porte cochere signs, freestanding pylon signs, skyline signs, distant read skyline signs, monument directional signs, two-post direction signs, and two-bladed signs. In addition, the Sign Criteria includes provision of alternative types of identification for the Medical Center including sign pageantry and religious symbols.
The applicant indicates that the selection of sign types and placement of signs are dependent on the viewer distance from the sign, rate of motion of the viewer, and critical wayfinding decision points. Freestanding Pylon and Distant Read Skyline, sign types are intended to be viewed from U.S. Highway 50, while Skyline sign types are used to reinforce the wayfinding sequence at connector streets. Monument signs are best placed at entry points to the campus, while Monument Directional signs are viewed from a vehicle traveling at lower speed within the campus boundaries. Onsite digital informational signage is proposed at Freestanding Pylon, Monument and Monument Directional sign types. As the proposed project is phased, Distant Read Skyline signage may be installed at one building and later be moved to another building as wayfinding sequences and criteria may be altered with each successive phase. The exhibits below and on the following page show the conceptual locations of the major signs and the different types of signs proposed for the Medical Center.

FIGURE 15: CONCEPTUAL LOCATIONS OF MAJOR FREESTANDING SIGNS
FIGURE 16: CONCEPTUAL SIGN TYPES
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As mentioned in the Project Description, the applicant is seeking approval through the Planned Development Permit process to deviate from the sign requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC, Section 17.59) relative to medical office and hospital uses. The applicant states that the medical campus requires maximum visualization from U.S. Highway 50 and other major roadways in the project vicinity to ensure that patients and families can have a safe wayfinding experience as they negotiate their way to the site. To achieve this goal, the applicant is requesting approval to make the following modifications as part of their Sign Criteria for the Medical Center:

- Increase Number of Wall Signs for Office and Hospital Buildings
- Increase Maximum Sign Area for Office and Hospital Buildings
- Increase Maximum Letter Height for Office Buildings and Hospital Buildings
- Allow Illumination of Office and Hospital Building Wall Signs
- Increase Maximum Height of Freeway Pylon Sign
- Increase Maximum Sign Area of Freeway Pylon Sign

With respect to wall signs, the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC Section 17.59.040 B) states that medical and hospital uses are permitted one non-illuminated wall sign with a maximum sign area of 50 square feet. As stated in the Sign Criteria, the applicant is proposing that a total of 3,750 square feet of wall sign area be provided for all wall signs on the medical campus buildings. The applicant is also requesting flexibility to place more than one sign on each building, although the actual number of signs that would be installed on each building is not known at this time and will be presented with each building design. In addition, the applicant is requesting that the wall signs be permitted to be illuminated with internal LED lighting to ensure that the signs are clearly visible from nearby roadways. Lastly, the applicant is proposing to increase the maximum allowable letter height for the wall signs facing the freeway from 60 inches to 120 inches to allow for the signs to be more legible for motorists traveling on U.S. Highway 50.

With respect to freeway pylon signs, the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC Section 17.59.040 E) states that medical and hospital uses located adjacent to the freeway are permitted one freestanding pylon sign with a maximum height of 18 feet (measured from crown of adjacent highway) and a maximum sign area of 300 square feet. As described in the Sign Criteria, the applicant is proposing one freestanding pylon sign that is 80 feet tall with a maximum sign area of 750 square feet. The exhibits shown on the following pages illustrate the size and scale of the proposed signs.
FIGURE 17: SIGNAGE SCALE EXHIBIT

FIGURE 18: DISTANT READ FREEWAY SIGNS (WESTBOUND HWY 50)
In reviewing the applicant’s request to deviate from multiple sign requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code, staff took into consideration a variety of factors including signage provided for similar medical centers in the Sacramento region and the signage and identification needs for medical centers in general. City staff visited a number of medical centers in the region to observe their respective signage and wayfinding programs including Sutter General Hospital in Sacramento, U.C, Davis Children’s Hospital in Sacramento, and Kaiser Permanente Medical Center in Roseville. Based on observations from visits to the aforementioned medical centers, staff concluded that the proposed Sign Criteria for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center is similar (number of signs, size of signs, illumination of signs) to existing signage programs for other medical centers in the region. City staff also recognizes that medical centers provide vital and essential services to communities and that providing adequate signage and wayfinding is a critical operational element. To ensure design and scale consistency with the future medical office and hospital buildings, staff recommends that the location of all wall signs be shown on the building elevations and renderings that are submitted for future Design Review Approval by the Planning Commission. In addition, staff recommends that the owner/applicant obtain a sign permit prior to installation of any signs that require a building permit. Condition No. 49 is included to reflect this requirement.

J. Site Lighting

As described in the Planned Development Guidelines, the applicant is proposing to use a combination of pole-mounted parking lot lighting, building-attached lighting (architecturally integrated down lighting and building-mounted sconce lighting), ground-mounted up lighting, and bollard lights along walkways and landscaped areas on the project site. All lighting would be designed to minimize light/glare impacts to the adjacent properties by ensuring that all exterior lighting is shielded and directed downward. Staff recommends that the final exterior building and site lighting plans be submitted for review
and approval by Community Development Department to ensure consistency with the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Planned Development Guidelines and for evaluation of location, height, aesthetics, level of illumination, glare and trespass prior to the issuance of any building permits. In addition, staff recommends all lighting is designed to be shielded and directed downward onto the project site and away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way. Condition No. 22 is included to reflect these requirements.

The heliport facility would be lit in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5390-2C (Heliport Design), Chapter 4 (Hospital Heliports), Section 415 (Heliport Lighting), respectively, including, but not limited to, obstruction lighting, landing pad perimeter lighting, and other related lighting. Helicopters would use typical running lights, which would include red and green right-of-way lights on the sides of the aircraft and a strobe light to indicate the helicopter’s position in low-visibility conditions.

K. Trash/Recycling

The applicant is proposing to utilize a combination of public (City of Folsom) and private trash, recycling, and medical waste collection services for the needs of the Medical Center. The proposed project includes a large trash and recycling area located on the west side of the hospital building. The proposed project also may include trash and recycling enclosures to serve the two medical office buildings. Staff recommends that the final trash and recycling collection plan associated with any City required services be reviewed and approved by the Solid Waste Division and the Community Development Department. In addition, staff recommends that the trash and recycling area and trash and recycling enclosures be screened to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. Condition No. 48 is included to reflect these requirements.

L. Existing and Proposed Landscaping

The project site, which consists primarily of undeveloped grassland with a few scattered non-protected trees and was previously used for cattle grazing. Alder Creek and some minor tributaries/drainage ditches run through the site. The topography of the site consists of gently rolling hills with slopes varying between 0 and 15 percent and surface elevations ranging from 405 to 470 feet above mean sea level. There are a number of protected oak trees located around the off-site hydromodification basin that will be constructed as part of the proposed project.

The proposed project will include landscaping along the project’s three street frontages and also landscaping interior to the project site. A landscape buffer (includes sidewalk) is proposed along each street frontage including a 30-foot-wide buffer along Alder Creek Parkway, a 20-foot-wide landscape buffer along East Bidwell Street, and an 18-foot-wide landscape buffer along McCarthy Way.
The submitted Planned Development Guidelines include Landscape Guidelines which are intended to provide recommendations relative to hardscape materials, irrigation systems, landscape plantings, and plant palettes. According to the applicant, landscape design plays an essential role in supporting Folsom Ranch Medical Center's overall site planning goals of safe and easy navigation, comfortable pedestrian circulation, and a positive user experience for patients, staff, and visitors. One of the unique landscape features proposed for the project includes a healing garden, which features fragrant plants, cool and calming colors, naturalistic massings and foliage with soft texture. In addition, the proposed landscape plan includes pollinator friendly plants that attract bees, hummingbirds, and butterflies and provide a habitat that will sustain healthy communities of beneficial insects and pollinators.

As shown on the landscape plans (Attachment 9), the applicant is proposing to install landscaping that features California-native and low water-use trees, shrubs, and groundcover selections intended to comply with the requirements of the Model Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance (MWELO). Proposed landscape improvements include a variety of drought-tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcover. Among the proposed trees are; Blue Oak, Calabrian Pine, Chinese Pistache, Golden Rain Tree, Interior Live Oak, Pink Crape Myrtle, Purple Leaf Plum, Strawberry Tree, and Valley Oak. Proposed shrubs and groundcover include; Alpine Strawberry, Berkeley Sedge, California Coffeeberry, Coast Rosemary, Creeping Fig, Deer Grass, Fortnight Lily, New Zealand Flax, Rockrose, and Star Jasmine. The preliminary landscape plan meets the City shade requirement (50%) by providing 50% 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. 36 is included to reflect this requirement.

To ensure a proper level of maintenance for the frontage landscaping located along East Bidwell Street, Alder Creek Parkway, and McCarthy Way, the applicant is seeking to enter into an agreement with the City in which the City agrees to maintain these frontage landscape improvements subject to receipt of funding through a mutually agreement financing mechanism. As part of this agreement, the applicant is also requesting that the City maintain the streetlights located along the frontage of McCarthy Way and East Bidwell Street. The exhibit on the following page shows the specific location of the frontage landscape and lighting improvements to be maintained by the City.
FIGURE 20: FRONTAGE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING EXHIBIT

M. Oak Tree Impacts

As discussed previously within this report, the development of the proposed project includes a number of off-site improvements including construction of a hydromodification basin (Basin No. 8) which is located west of East Bidwell Street (in the location as approved in the FPA Storm Drainage Master Plan). A 1.28-acre area of Blue Oak Woodland would be impacted by construction of the hydromodification basin. The impacts to Oak Woodland in general, and to this particular Blue Oak Woodland area, were previously analyzed as part of the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Westland Eagle SPA Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and the FPASP Backbone Infrastructure Mitigated Negative Declaration. The proposed project is subject to all mitigation measures identified by the prior environmental documents to address impacts to the Blue Oak Woodland area.
caused by construction of hydromodification basin.

An Arborist Report and Oak Tree Mitigation Strategy was prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting on April 28, 2021 (Attachment 21) in order to identify, map, and assess the condition of the oak trees located in the 1.28-acre Blue Oak Woodland area where the proposed hydromodification basin will be constructed. The Arborist Report identified 17 Blue Oaks Trees within the Blue Oak Woodland area, with 11 of the trees being in Fair Condition, five trees being in Good Condition, and one tree being in Poor Condition. The Arborist Report concluded that all 17 Oak Trees will need to be removed due to direct and indirect impacts (grading, trenching paving, soil disturbance, and pruning) associated with construction of the hydromodification basin.

As required by the FPASP EIR/EIS (Mitigation Measure 3A.3-5), the applicant is required to submit an Oak Tree Mitigation Plan consistent with the approved Oak Tree Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for the FPASP to mitigate for impacts to the 1.28-acre Blue Oak Woodland area located in the vicinity of the off-site hydromodification basin. Potential oak tree mitigation options include preserving off-site woodland habitat, use of the in-lieu fee program, and on-site oak tree plantings. Condition No. 51 is included to reflect this requirement.

N. Trails

The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Figure 7.32) indicates that a future Class I Bicycle Path is planned along a portion of the project site in the northwest corner of the property adjacent to the U.S. Highway 50 eastbound onramp. When completed, the Class I Bicycle Path is expected to run from Prairie City Road eastward to the El Dorado County line. The owner/applicant is responsible for site preparation for the future Bicycle Path, while the City is responsible for the construction and maintenance of the actual Bicycle Path. The owner/applicant will be responsible for rough grading and installation of the necessary retaining wall to accommodate the Class I Bicycle Path on the northern portion of the subject property as shown in Figure 7.32 of the Specific Plan prior to issuance of a building permit on the second expansion of the hospital (Phase 4/Anticipated 2034). In the proposed Amendment to the Development Agreement, the City agrees that the owner/applicant shall be relieved of the aforementioned obligation should the City amend the Specific Plan to re-locate the Class 1 Bicycle Path, or if the City has not identified funding for construction of the Class 1 Bicycle Path across the Property and the connection to East Bidwell Street at the time of issuance of a building permit on the second expansion of the hospital for Phase 4. "Identified funding" means either: (1) the Class 1 Bicycle Path is incorporated into a subsequent project to widen the East Bidwell Overcrossing structure of US Highway 50, or (2) the submission or application for federal, state or other grants which, together with the City's available matching funds, would be sufficient to construct the Class 1 Bicycle Path across the Property and the connection to East Bidwell Street. Condition No. 38 is included to reflect this requirement.
O. Grading and Drainage

Development of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project site necessitates the mass grading of the larger FPASP Parcel 85A and construction of on-site and off-site roadway and utility infrastructure. Existing topography on the overall site ranges from approximately 470 feet to 400 feet in elevation and generally falls in the southwest direction. The overall site will be mass graded to provide developable areas and achieve earthwork balance. On-site retaining walls (approximately 2-6 feet height) are anticipated to maintain maximum developable areas and intended road grades. Excavation at a borrow site located approximately 400 feet west of East Bidwell Street will provide fill material to widen the west side of East Bidwell Street. Fill material will be moved from the borrow site to the fill location by way of ground-disturbing equipment.

At build-out, surface runoff will generally flow to the southwest where it will be conveyed by off-site storm drain infrastructure to an off-site hydromodification basin (Basin No. 8) located west of East Bidwell Street in the location as approved in the FPA Storm Drainage Master Plan (Exhibit M, page 47) and FPA Specific Plan (Figure 12.4 Stormwater Plan, page 248). The first phase of the basin will be constructed with the development of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center, including the basin outlet control structure and spillway, a paved access road along the Savannah Parkway alignment and perimeter of the basin, and a storm drain outfall swale from the western terminus of Alder Creek Parkway to the existing downstream waterway.

P. Frontage Improvements

Existing improvements to Alder Creek Parkway include underground utilities, two travel lanes, a westbound turn-pocket (Enclave at Folsom Ranch Subdivision), an eastbound left-turn pocket (future McCarthy Way), a westbound left-turn lane at East Bidwell Street, bicycle lanes, and a raised median for landscaping. Existing improvements to East Bidwell Street include underground utilities, two travel lanes, a sidewalk, bicycle lanes, and a southbound left-turn lane at Alder Creek Parkway. Backbone improvements associated with the proposed project include widening of East Bidwell Street and providing a northbound right-turn pocket on the east side of East Bidwell Street. The owner/applicant will be required to install curbs, gutters, landscaping, and streetlights along the street frontages of Alder Creek Parkway and East Bidwell Street. (Condition No. 18). The recommended conditions of approval require the applicant to submit detailed plans for all curbs, gutters, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, and streetlights prior to construction to ensure compliance with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines, the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and Details, and the City of Folsom Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards.

To facilitate development of the proposed Medical Center, the owner/applicant will be required to construct the McCarthy Way roadway from Alder Creek Parkway north to Placerville Road, the Mercy Drive roadway from McCarthy Way east to Westwood Drive, and the Westwood Drive Roadway from Alder Creek Parkway to Placerville Road.
addition, the owner/applicant will be required to install curbs, gutters, bicycle lanes sidewalks, landscaping (only McCarthy Way), and streetlights along the street frontages of McCarthy Way, Mercy Drive, and Westwood Drive (Condition No. 18). The recommended conditions of approval require the applicant to submit detailed plans for all curbs, gutters, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, and streetlights prior to construction to ensure compliance with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines, the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and Details, and the City of Folsom Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards.

Q. Water Supply and Infrastructure

Water supply services would be provided to the Medical Center project by the City of Folsom under the Folsom Plan Area Water Supply Agreement. The Folsom Plan Area Water Supply Agreement covers an estimated water demand of 5,600 acre-feet per year, consistent with the water demand analyzed in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The water demand associated with the proposed project is estimated to be 156 acre-feet per year, a 126 acre-feet per year increase above previously considered demand for Parcel 85A. The project would result in a total water demand of 5,485 acre-feet-per-year for the entire FPASP. In addition, the proposed project would include two on-site underground water storage tanks. On-site storage tanks are required to meet California Plumbing Code requirements for emergency potable water supply to support 72 hours of continuing operation in the event of an emergency.

The Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan (Brown and Caldwell 2014) identifies five water pressure zones in the FPASP area. The proposed project is currently located within the Zone 3 water service area. Based on a hydraulic analysis (Appendix I to the Addendum/Attachment 22) that was prepared for the proposed Medical Center project, it was determined that the project would need to connect to the Zone 4 water service area in order to achieve the required minimum water pressure needed for the hospital building (80 psi). To accommodate shifting the proposed project into the Zone 4 water service area, additional Zone 4 water piping will be required to be installed and the Zone 4 water tank capacity will need to be expanded from 2 million gallons (MG) to 2.6 MG. The owner/applicant shall pay all costs and expenses for piping, tank size expansion from 2.0 MG to 2.6 MG, and construction to connect from Zone 4 to the Medical Center. Condition No. 34 is included to reflect this requirement.

On a temporary basis, until the completion of the Zone 4 infrastructure, the water infrastructure for the Medical Center will be provided through Zone 5. The owner/applicant will be responsible for all costs and expenses to connect water from Zone 5 to the Medical Center. Unless improvements or connections to Zone 4 are solely attributable to the proposed Medical Center, the owner/applicant will only be required to provide a fair-share contribution towards the construction of the Zone 4 infrastructure and may elect to participate in any special assessment/special tax funding mechanisms that are established by the City. The owner/applicant will also be required to coordinate with developers of other projects that also use Zone 4 infrastructure to determine the amounts
of their respective fair share contribution toward Zone 4 infrastructure. Condition No. 34 is included to reflect these requirements.

R. Off-Site Improvements

The proposed project also includes a number of significant off-site improvements (Attachment 12) including roadway and utility improvements, grading improvements on three adjacent parcels, construction of a hydromodification basin, construction of a storm drain swale, and excavation of a borrow site. The following is a detailed description of each of the proposed off-site improvements:

- Mass grading of Parcel 85A (includes subject parcel) and adjacent roadways resulting in contour graded developable parcels and subgrade along roadway alignments.

- Rough grading of a portion of Hydromodification Basin No. 8 including the access road along the Savannah Parkway alignment and perimeter of the basin.

- Rough grading of a storm drain outfall swale from the western terminus of Alder Creek Parkway to the existing downstream waterway.

- Excavation at a borrow site west of East Bidwell Street.

- Roadway and Utility improvements along East Bidwell, Alder Creek Parkway, Westwood Drive, Placerville Road, McCarthy Drive and Mercy Way including storm drain, sanitary sewer, potable and non-potable water, and dry utility infrastructure.

- Hydromodification Basin No. 8 improvements including a paved access road to East Bidwell Street and basin outlet control structure and spillway.

The extent of the proposed off-site improvements is shown in Figure 21 on the following page.
FIGURE 21: PRELIMINARY OFF-SITE GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
S. Conformance with Relevant Folsom General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Objectives and Policies

The recently approved City of Folsom 2035 General Plan outlines a number of goals, policies, and implementation programs designed to guide the physical, economic, and environmental growth of the City. In addition, the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan includes goals and policies intended to ensure successful development within the Folsom Plan Area. Staff has determined that the proposed project is consistent with both the General Plan and Specific Plan goals and policies. The following is a summary analysis of the project’s consistency with the Folsom General Plan and with key policies of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES

GP GOAL LU 1.1 (Land Use/Growth and Change)
Retain and enhance Folsom’s quality of life, unique identity, and sense of community while continuing to grow and change.

GP POLICY LU 1.1.12-1 (Infill Development)
Respect the local context: New development should improve the character and connectivity of the neighborhood in which it occurs. Physical design should respond to the scale and features of the surrounding community, while improving critical elements such as transparency and permeability.

**Analysis:** The proposed project is consistent with this policy in that the project features significant site and design improvements which will enhance the overall character of the area. In addition, the proposed project includes Planned Development Guidelines that ensure that the design of the Medical Center buildings and associated improvements will be complimentary to the existing and future residential and commercial development in the vicinity.

GP POLICY LU 1.1.15 (SACOG Blueprint Principles)
Strive to adhere to the Sacramento Regional Blueprint Growth Principles.

**Analysis:** The proposed project is consistent with this policy in that the project has been designed to adhere to the primary SACOG Blueprint Principles including Compact Development, Use of Existing Assets, and Quality Design. Compact Development involves creating environments that are more compactly built and use space in an efficient but attractive manner and helps to encourage more walking, biking, and transit use and shorter auto trips. Use of Existing Assets entails intensification of the existing use or redevelopment in order to make better use of existing public infrastructure, including roads. Quality Design focuses on the design details of any land development (such as relationship to the street, placement of buildings, sidewalks, street widths, landscaping, etc.), which are all factors that influence the attractiveness of living in a compact development and facilitate the ease of walking within and in and out of a community.
GP GOAL M 4.1 (Vehicle Traffic and Parking)
Ensure a safe and efficient network of streets for car and trucks, as well as provide an adequate supply of vehicle parking.

GP POLICY M 4.1.3 (Level of Service)
Strive to achieve a least traffic Level of Service “D” (or better) for local streets and roadways throughout the City. In designing transportation improvements, the City will prioritize use of smart technologies and innovative solutions that maximize efficiencies and safety while minimizing the physical footprint. 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. Staff will report to the City Council at regular intervals via the Capital improvement Program process for the Council to prioritize project integral to achieving Level of Service D or better.

Analysis: The proposed project is consistent with this policy in that the project will not result in a change in the level of service (LOS) at any of the 19 study intersections with programmed roadway infrastructure improvements. In addition, the proposed project would not result in any substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR/EIS.

GP GOAL M 4.2 (Vehicle Traffic and Parking)
Provide and manage a balanced approach to parking that meets economic development and sustainability goals.

GP POLICY M 4.2.4 (Electric Vehicle Charging Stations)
Encourage the installation of electric vehicle charging stations in parking spaces throughout the city, prioritizing installations at multi-family residential units.

Analysis: The proposed project is consistent with this policy in that the project includes 100 electric vehicle charging spaces/stations positioned at four strategic locations throughout the project site to serve the two medical office buildings and the hospital building. The number of proposed electric vehicle charging spaces/stations (100) is consistent with the California Green Buildings Standards Code’s provisions for multi-family residential development.

GP GOAL EP 2.1 (Employment Development)
Support efforts to increase employment in Folsom by encouraging the retention, attraction, and expansion of private sector business.

GP POLICY EP 2.1.1 (New Employment)
Encourage professional research and development, industrial, and office employers to located in Folsom to provide more job opportunities for Folsom residents.
Analysis: The proposed project is consistent with this policy in that the project is expected to employ approximately 2,662 medical and support services employees at full build-out of the Medical Center. In addition, the proposed project will service approximately 2,631 visitors on a daily basis.

GP GOAL LU 8.1 (Land Use/Employment)
Encourage, facilitate, and support the location of office, creative industry, technology, and industrial uses and retention of existing industry in appropriate locations.

GP POLICY LU 8.1.5 (Transit)
Encourage new employment uses to locate where they can be easily served by public transit. Transit centers should be incorporated into the project, where appropriate.

Analysis: The proposed project is consistent with this policy in that the project is located on a major transit corridor along Alder Creek Parkway as identified by the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (Figure 7.29). The transit corridor includes a 38-foot-wide planted median that eventually as transit demand increases, will be reduced to 16-feet to allow for construction of two additional travel lanes for either dedicated or mixed-flow regional “Hi Bus” transit service (high frequency bus service). In addition, it anticipated that Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stops will eventually be placed along eastbound and westbound Alder Creek Parkway to serve the proposed Medical Center project.

GP GOAL LU 9.1 (Land Use/Community Design)
Encourage community design that results in a distinctive, high-quality built environment with a character that creates memorable places and enriches the quality of life of Folsom’s residents.

GP POLICY LU 9.1.10 (Renewable and Alternative Energy Generation Systems)
Require the use of solar, wind, and other on-site renewable energy generation systems as part of the design of new planned developments.

Analysis: The proposed project is consistent with this policy in that the project includes the construction of a solar panel array for the covered employee parking area located on the west of the hospital building. In addition, the proposed project will be implementing energy efficiencies through the design of the medical office and buildings in compliance with the California Building Code and the California Green Code. The proposed project also includes the use of cool paving materials at various locations throughout the project site.

Conformance with Relevant Specific Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies
The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan identifies a number of goals, objectives, and policies designed to guide the physical, economic, and environmental growth of the Specific Plan
Area. Staff has determined that the proposed project is consistent with the Specific Plan goals, objectives, and policies as outlined and discussed below:

**SP OBJECTIVE 7.1 (Circulation)**
Consistent with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 and the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375), create a safe and efficient circulation system for all modes of travel.

**SP POLICY 7.1**
The roadway network in the Plan Area shall be organized in a grid-like pattern of streets and blocks, except where topography and natural features make it infeasible, for the majority of the Plan Area in order to create neighborhoods that encourage walking, biking, public transit, and other alternative modes of transportation.

**Analysis:** Consistent with the requirements of the California Complete Streets Act, the FPASP identified and planned for hierarchy of connect "complete streets" to ensure that pedestrian, bike, bus, and automobile modes of travel are designed to have direct and continuous connections throughout the Plan Area. Every option, from regional connector roadways to arterial and local streets, has been carefully planned and designed. Recent California legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (AB 32 and SB 375) has resulted in an increased market demand for public transit and housing located closer to service needs and employment centers. In response to these changes, the FPASP includes a regional transit corridor that will provide public transportation links between the major commercial, public, and multi-family residential land uses in the Plan Area.

The Folsom Ranch Medical Center project has been designed with multiple modes of transportation options (vehicles, bicycle, walking, access to transit) and internal drive aisles organized in a pattern consistent with the approved FPASP circulation plan. In particular, the Medical Center is located adjacent to Alder Creek Parkway, where a future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor is planned.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**
The City, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), has determined that, in accordance with Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project constitutes minor changes to the development scenario described in the Final EIR/EIS for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, warranting the preparation of an Addendum. 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 (Public Resources Code) Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163.
An Environmental Checklist and Addendum was prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 to evaluate whether the proposed project’s effects were adequately examined in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The Environmental Checklist and Addendum concluded that no changes associated with the proposed project and no changed circumstances trigger subsequent or supplemental environmental review. The Environmental Checklist and Addendum are included at Attachment 22 to this staff report. In addition, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are included as Attachment 23 to this staff report.

RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project, subject to the Findings and Conditions of Approval attached to this report.

Move to:

- Adopt an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan prepared for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project (PN 20-193) per Attachment 22; and

- Approve a Planned Development Permit which contains detailed development and architectural standards for the proposed 530,000-square-foot Medical Center; and

- Approve a Conditional Use Permit for the development and operation of a private-use hospital heliport facility at the Medical Center; and

Move to recommend that the City Council:

- Approve Amendment No. 2 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom South Specific Plan for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project.

These approvals are subject to the proposed findings below (Findings A-W) and the recommended conditions of approval (Conditions 1-51) attached to this report.

GENERAL FINDINGS

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

B. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AS AMENDED, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AS AMENDED, AND THE FOLSOM RANCH CENTRAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES.
CEQA FINDINGS

C. THE CITY, AS LEAD AGENCY, PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

D. AN ADDENDUM TO THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT WAS CERTIFIED BY THE CITY IN 2015 FOR THE WESTLAND EAGLE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA.

E. THE CITY HAS DETERMINED THAT THE FOLSOM RANCH MEDICAL CENTER PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AS AMENDED BY THE WESTLAND EAGLE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT.

F. THE CITY HAS DETERMINED THAT NONE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES DESCRIBED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21166 OR CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15162 GENERALLY REQUIRING THE PREPARATION OF A SUBSEQUENT EIR EXIST IN THIS CASE.

G. THE CITY HAS PREPARED AN ADDENDUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND HAS DETERMINED THAT NONE OF THE CHANGES OR REVISIONS PROPOSED BY THE PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND DOES NOT REQUIRE ANY MITIGATION MEASURES IN ADDITION TO THOSE IN THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND THE ADDENDUM FOR THE WESTLAND EAGLE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT PROJECT.


I. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED THE ADDENDUM WITH THE FINAL EIR BEFORE MAKING A DECISION ON THE PROJECT.
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS


K. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE CITY. THE MODIFICATION TO THOSE STANDARDS PROPOSED AS PART OF THIS PROJECT WILL RESULT IN A DEVELOPMENT THAT IS SUPERIOR TO THAT OBTAINED BY THE RIGID APPLICATION OF THE STANDARDS.

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

M. AS CONDITIONED, THE PROJECT WILL MAKE AVAILABLE NECESSARY PUBLIC FACILITIES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WATER, SEWER AND DRAINAGE, AND THE PROJECT WILL ADEQUATELY PROVIDE FOR THE FURNISHING OF SUCH FACILITIES.

N. THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT CAUSE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN MITIGATED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL.

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

P. 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.

Q. ADEQUATE PROVISION IS MADE FOR THE FURNISHING OF SANITATION SERVICES AND EMERGENCY PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES TO THE DEVELOPMENT.
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDING

R. AS CONDITIONED, THE ESTABLISHMENT, MAINTENANCE OR OPERATION OF THE USE APPLIED FOR WILL NOT, UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS PARTICULAR CASE, BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY, PEACE, MORALS, COMFORT, AND GENERAL WELFARE OF PERSONS RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, OR BE DETRIMENTAL OR INJURIOUS TO PROPERTY AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OR TO THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THE CITY.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT FINDINGS

S. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, GENERAL LAND USES AND PROGRAMS SPECIFIED IN THE CITY GENERAL PLAN (AS AMENDED) AND THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN (AS AMENDED).

T. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IS IN CONFORMITY WITH PUBLIC CONVENIENCE, GENERAL WELFARE, AND GOOD LAND USE PRACTICES.

U. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT 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.

V. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WILL NOT adversely affect the orderly development of property or the preservation of property values.

W. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 65864 THROUGH 65869.5.
Attachment 4

Conditions of Approval
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE FOLSOM RANCH MEDICAL CENTER PROJECT (PN 20-193)
NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF EAST BIDWELL STREET AND ALDER CREEK PARKWAY
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition of Approval</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:</td>
<td></td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Preliminary Site Plan, dated October 30, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Preliminary Utility Plan, dated March 5, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, dated March 5, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Preliminary Landscape Plans, dated March 5, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Preliminary Access and Circulation Plan, dated March 16, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Preliminary Off-Site Improvement Plans, dated March 5, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Planned Development Guidelines, dated February 3, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Folsom Ranch Medical Center Booklet (Separate Bound Document)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Development Agreement Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Transportation Analysis and CEQA Impact Study, dated April 23, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Arborist Report, dated April 28, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Environmental Checklist and Addendum for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Project, dated April, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Project, dated April, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit are approved for the development and operation of a 530,000 Medical Center project (Folsom Ranch Medical Center). Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above referenced items and these conditions of approval. Square footage is determined based upon occupied square footage as detailed in Planned Development Guidelines and Development Agreement Amendment.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Building plans, and all civil engineering, improvement, landscape and irrigation 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.</td>
<td>G, I, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The project approvals granted under this staff report (Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit) shall remain in effect for the term of the Development Agreement Amendment (June 30, 2056 or until the 530,000 square foot Medical Center has been built out, whichever is later). Provided that the relevant building (or other) permits for the heliport are obtained within this time period, the Conditional Use Permit will thereafter run with the land (i.e., be valid in perpetuity), subject to the revocation process in Condition 8. 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. The Development Agreement Amendment, which is subject to review and approval by the City Council, is valid until June 30, 2056 or until 530,000 occupied square feet associated with Medical Center has been built out, whichever is later.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The owner/applicant shall protect, 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, which claim, action or proceeding is brought within the time period provided therefore in Government Code Section 66499.37 or other applicable statutes of limitation. The City will promptly notify the owner/applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the City should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the owner/applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City or its agents, officers, and employees, pursuant to this condition. 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. The owner/applicant’s obligations under this condition shall apply regardless of whether a Final Map is ultimately recorded with respect to this project.

5. The owner/applicant shall comply with all provisions of Amendments No. 1 and 2 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement (collectively “Development Agreement”) and any approved amendments thereafter by and between the City and the owner/applicant of the project.
The owner/applicant shall 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 Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan FEIR/EIS, the South of 50 Backbone Infrastructure Project MND, the Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment to the FPASP and Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project Revised Proposed Off-Site Water Facility Alternative Amendment to the FPASP and Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and Folsom Ranch Medical Center Addendum to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan FEIR/EIS 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 in the mitigation measure column. Applicant shall fund on a Time and Materials basis all mitigation monitoring (e.g., staff and consultant time).
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. The City and the owner/applicant acknowledge that the Project is for medical uses and not residential housing. However, in light of the allowed uses under the Specific Plan, City has requested that owner/applicant acknowledge and owner/applicant hereby acknowledges that there is no vested right to use Second Dwelling Units as an 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. The owner/applicant further acknowledges that the State adopted amendments to Section 65850 of the California Government Code (specifically Section 65850(g)), effective January 1, 2018, to allow for the implementation of inclusionary housing requirements in residential rental units, upon adoption of an ordinance by the City. The owner/applicant is not currently contemplating any residential rental projects within the Property; however, in the event the City amends its Inclusionary Housing Ordinance with respect to rental housing pursuant to Section 65850(g), the owner/applicant (or a successor in interest) agrees that the Property shall be subject to said City Ordinance, as amended, should any residential rental project be proposed within the Property. Other than the elimination of the “granny flat” option and the possible future application of an inclusionary housing requirement on residential rental properties (upon the conditions stated herein), the City and the owner/applicant 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.

If the Community Development Director finds evidence that conditions of approval for Folsom Ranch Medical Center heliport 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 has 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, and after a consideration of the public health benefits provided by the availability of a heliport at the Medical Center, the Planning District Commission finds that any of the above-stated results have occurred, the Commission may modify or revoke the Conditional Use Permit.
### POLICE/SECURITY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th>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 considered:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A security guard on-duty at all times at the site or a six-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G, I, B PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>The owner/applicant shall pay all applicable taxes, fees and charges for the project at the rate and amount required by the Public Facilities Financing Plan and Amendments No. 1 and No. 2 to the Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall be subject to all Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Area development impact fees established at the time of approval consistent with the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP), Development Agreement and amendments thereto, unless exempt by previous agreement. The owner/applicant shall be subject to all applicable Folsom Plan Area plan-wide development impact fees in effect at the time of approval at the rates in effect when a building permit is issued. These fees may include, but are not limited to, the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Fee, Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee (SPIF), Solid Waste Fee, Corporation Yard Fee, Transportation Management Fee, Transit Fee, Highway 50 Interchange Fee, General Park Equipment Fee, Housing Trust Fee, etc. Any protest to such all fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions imposed on this project will begin on the date of final approval, or otherwise shall be governed by the terms of Amendments No. 1 and 2 to the Development Agreement. The fees shall be calculated at the fee rate set forth in the PFFP and the Development Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B CD (P), PW, PK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. 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 City shall provide notice to the owner/applicant of the outside counsel selected, the scope of work and hourly rates, and the owner/applicant shall reimburse the City for all outside legal fees and costs incurred and documented by the City for such services. The owner/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 owner/applicant shall be responsible for reimbursement to the City for the services regardless of whether a deposit is required.

14. If the City utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the project, the City shall provide notice to the owner/applicant of the outside consultant selected, the scope of work and hourly rates, and the owner/applicant shall reimburse the City for actual costs incurred and documented in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for City personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the grading plan, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.

15. 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 prior to approval of grading plans.

16. 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 prior to approval of any grading or improvement plan.

17. The final location, design, height, materials, and colors of the retaining walls and screen walls shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department to ensure consistency with the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Planned Development Guidelines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The improvement plans for the required public and private improvements (on-site and off-site) necessary to serve the project including but not limited to street and frontage improvements on East Bidwell Street, Alder Creek Parkway, McCarthy Way, Mercy Drive, Westwood Drive, and Placerville Road shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department prior to approval of a building permit for the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Public and private improvements (on-site and off-site), including roadways, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, bicycle lanes and trails, streetlights, underground infrastructure and all other improvements shall be provided in accordance with the latest edition of the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and Details and the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</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>I</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>For any improvements constructed on private property that are not under the ownership or control of the owner/applicant, all rights-of-entry, and if necessary, a permanent easement shall be obtained and provided to the City. All rights of entry, construction easements, either permanent or temporary and other easements shall be obtained as set forth in the Development Agreement, which shall be fully executed by all affected parties and shall be recorded with the Sacramento County Recorder, where applicable, prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant of all project phases shall submit a lighting plan for the project to the Community Development Department. The lighting plan shall be consistent with the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Planned Development Guidelines including but not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shield or screen lighting fixtures to direct the light downward and prevent light spill on adjacent properties;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Place and shield or screen flood and area lighting needed for construction activities, nighttime sporting activities, and/or security so as not to disturb adjacent residential areas and passing motorists;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For public lighting in residential neighborhoods, prohibit the use of light fixtures that are of unusually high intensity or that blink or flash;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use appropriate building materials (such as low-glare glass, low-glare building glaze or finish, neutral, earth toned colored paint and roofing materials), shielded or screened lighting, and appropriate signage in the office-commercial areas to prevent light and glare from adversely affecting motorists on nearby roadways; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design exterior on-site lighting as an integral part of the building and landscaping design in the Specific Plan Area. Lighting fixtures shall be architecturally consistent with the overall site design. Lights used on signage should be directed to light only the sign face with no off-site glare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |   | I  
|   |   | CD (P) |
|23. | The owner/applicant shall coordinate the planning, development and completion of this project with the various utility agencies (i.e., SMUD, PG&E, etc.). The owner/applicant shall provide the City with written confirmation of public utility service prior to approval of the on-site improvement plans. |
|   |   |   |
|   |   | I  
|   |   | CD (P)(E) |
|24. | The owner/applicant shall be responsible for replacing any, and all damaged or hazardous public sidewalk, curb, and gutter, and/or bicycle trail facilities along the site frontage and/or boundaries, including pre-existing conditions and construction damage, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. |
|   |   |   |
|   |   | I, OG  
|   |   | CD (E) |
|25. | All future utility lines lower than 69 KV that are to be built within the project shall be placed underground within and along the perimeter of the project at the developer’s cost. The owner/applicant shall dedicate to SMUD all necessary underground easements for the electrical facilities that will be necessary to service development of the project. |
|   |   |   |
|   |   | I  
|   |   | CD (E) |
26. The owner/applicant shall pay for, furnish, and install all infrastructure associated with the water meter fixed network system for any City-owned and maintained water meter for the project.

27. The owner/applicant shall provide sanitary sewer, water, and storm drainage improvements with corresponding easements, as necessary, in accordance with these studies and the latest edition of the City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and Details, and the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards. The storm drainage design shall provide for no net increase in run-off (applicable to watershed of Hyrdomodification Basin No. 8) under post-development conditions.

28. The storm drain 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.

In addition to compliance with City ordinances, the owner/applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that comply with the General Construction Stormwater Permit from the Central Valley RWQCB, to reduce water quality effects during construction.

29. During Construction, 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 official start of the rainy season (October 15).

30. The owner/applicant shall dedicate public utility easements for underground facilities on properties adjacent to the public streets. A minimum of twelve and one-half foot (12.5') wide Public Utility Easements for underground facilities (i.e., SMUD, Pacific Gas and Electric, cable television, telephone) shall be dedicated adjacent to all public rights-of-way. The owner/applicant shall dedicate additional width to accommodate extraordinary facilities as determined by the City. The width of the public utility easements adjacent to public right of way may be reduced with prior approval from public utility companies.

31. The owner/applicant shall dedicate the additional required right-of-way necessary for the construction of an additional 250-foot right-turn lane for southbound McCarthy Way approaching Alder Creek Parkway and the full extension of the right-turn pocket on westbound Alder Creek Parkway from McCarthy Way to East Bidwell Street.
### NOISE REQUIREMENTS

| 32. | 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. | I, B | CD (P)(B) |

### FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS

| 33. | The owner/applicant shall comply with the following Fire Department requirements:  
- The medical office and hospital building(s) shall have illuminated addresses visible from the street(s) or drive(s) fronting the property. Size and location of address identification shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal.  
- 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.  
- All fire protection devices shall be designed to be located on site: fire hydrants, fire department connections, post indicator valves, etc. 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" door. This room can be a shared with other building utilities. The room shall only be accessible from the exterior.  
- 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. | G, I, B | CD (P), FD |
**ENVIRONMENTAL AND WATER RESOURCE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS**

| 34. | The City, through approval of the Subsequent Entitlements and consideration of a Technical Memorandum titled “PA Parcel 85A Zone Supplemental Analysis” dated April 28, 2021, provided in support of the Addendum, has determined that the water infrastructure for the Medical Center will be provided through “Zone 4,” as that Zone is identified in Figure 12.1 of the Specific Plan. As a result, the owner/applicant shall be required to pay all costs and expenses for piping, tank size expansion from 2.0 MG to 2.6 MG, and construction to connect water from Zone 4 to the Medical Center.

On a temporary basis, until the completion of the Zone 4 infrastructure, the water infrastructure for the Medical Center will be provided through Zone 5, as that Zone is identified in Figure 12.1 of the Specific Plan. As a result, the owner/applicant shall bear all costs and expenses to connect water from Zone 5 to the Medical Center.

Unless improvements or connections to Zone 4 are solely attributable to the hospital uses included in the Project, the owner/applicant shall only be required to provide a fair-share contribution towards the construction of the Zone 4 infrastructure and may elect to participate in any special assessment/special tax funding mechanisms that are established by the City. The owner/applicant shall coordinate with developers of other projects that also use Zone 4 infrastructure to determine the amounts of their respective fair share contribution toward Zone 4 infrastructure. | I, G, B | CD E, EWR |
The owner/applicant shall comply with the following Environmental and Water Resource Department requirements:

- All water for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center (Medical Office Buildings, Hospital Building, Central Plant, etc.) shall be on the Zone 4 water line.

- An on-site looped water system shall be required.

- The water system shall be protected with USC Certified and approved RPPA and RPDA devices.

- A sewer manhole or cleanout shall be placed at the property line/right-of-way line to distinguish private vs public ownership.

- All on-site water and sewer shall be privately owned and maintained.

- If there is a kitchen or food preparation area, some type of grease control device shall be required.

- All proposed sewer within the right-of-way is to be 8-inch SDR-26 sewer pipe.

- Additional in-line valves are required to be added to the fire system. In-line valves shall be incorporated in the improvement plans. The additional valves will be required to be strategically placed in order to help isolate the backflow device if it needs to be repaired or replaced without shutting off the entire water system to the Medical Center.
<p>| 36. | Final landscape plans and specifications shall be prepared by a registered landscape architect and approved by the City prior to the approval of the first building permit. Said plans shall include all on-site and applicable off-site landscape specifications and details including a tree planting exhibit demonstrating sufficient diversity and appropriate species selection to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. The tree exhibit shall include all street trees, accent trees, parking lot shading trees, and mitigation trees proposed within the development. Said plans shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor's declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping. Landscaping shall meet shade requirements as outlined in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan where applicable. 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 the 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, view protection, 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. The owner/applicant shall comply with city-wide landscape rules or regulations on water usage. The owner/applicant shall comply with any state or local rules and regulations relating to landscape water usage and landscaping requirements necessitated to mitigate for drought conditions on all landscaping in the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project. | B | CD (P)(E) |
| 37. | 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, OG | CD (P)(E) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PARKS AND RECREATION REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall be responsible for rough grading and installation of the necessary retaining wall to accommodate the Class I Bicycle Path on the northern portion of the subject property as shown in Figure 7.32 of the Specific Plan prior to issuance of a building permit on the second expansion of the hospital (Phase 4/2034). However, the City agrees that the owner/applicant shall be relieved of the aforementioned obligation should the City amend the Specific Plan to re-locate the Class I Bicycle Path, or if the City has not identified funding for construction of the Class I Bicycle Path across the Property and the connection to East Bidwell Street at the time of issuance of a building permit on the second expansion of the hospital for Phase 4. “Identified funding” shall mean either: (1) the Class I Bicycle Path is incorporated into a subsequent project to widen the East Bidwell Overcrossing structure of US Highway 50 or (2) the submission or application for federal, state or other grants which, together with the City’s available matching funds, would be sufficient to construct the Class I Bicycle Path across the Property and the connection to East Bidwell Street.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E), PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>The owner/applicant shall enter into an agreement with City to pay for services to maintain the mutually agreed upon private frontage landscaping along East Bidwell Street, Alder Creek Parkway, and McCarthy Way. Included in the agreement shall be a description of the services to be paid by the owner/applicant for the City to maintain the privately owned streetlights along frontages of East Bidwell Street and McCarthy Way. Streetlights located along Alder Creek Parkway, which are included in CFD 18, and are publicly owned and maintained and not considered part of this agreement.</td>
<td>B, OG</td>
<td>CD (P)(E), PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>To accommodate the required width of the Class I Bicycle Path (minimum of 25 feet in width), a number of parking spaces (approximately 4 parking spaces) will need to be eliminated from the northwest corner of the project site to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department and the Parks and Recreation Department.</td>
<td>B, OG</td>
<td>CD (P)(E), PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the recommendations of the Transportation Impact Study dated April 23, 2021 and April 29, 2021 (Attachment 20), the following conditions of approval shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department:

- **Phase 1 Roadway Improvements (Anticipated 2023)**
  - The owner/applicant shall construct McCarthy Way between Alder Creek Parkway and Placerville Road along with multiple access points to the site, consistent with City of Folsom Design and Operational Standards City of Folsom Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards and City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications and Details.
    - The owner/applicant shall construct an additional 250-foot right-turn lane for southbound McCarthy Way approaching Alder Creek Parkway connecting to a right-turn pocket for westbound Alder Creek Parkway approaching East Bidwell Street. The owner/applicant shall also construct a full extension of the right-turn pocket on westbound Alder Creek Parkway from McCarthy Way to East Bidwell Street. The owner/applicant shall adjust the location of the parking lot curb along the south and east edge of the project site accordingly.

- **Phase 2 Roadway Improvements (Anticipated 2028)**
  - The owner/applicant shall construct a southbound emergency vehicle-only left-turn movement into the East Bidwell Street access point along with installation of a half-signal that will be triggered through emergency signal preemption to stop northbound traffic for enough time for the vehicle to safety complete the turning maneuver.

- **Phase 4 Roadway Improvements (Anticipated 2034)**
  - Should the owner/applicant desire to construct a traffic signal at the Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way intersection as an element of Phase 4 development, the owner/applicant shall first be required to perform a supplemental traffic analysis to assess the operational impacts associated with signalization of the intersection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. Cont.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Rapid Transit (Anticipated BRT) Alignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The westbound and eastbound BRT operations shall be center-running within the Alder Creek Parkway right-of-way to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department acknowledging that Sacramento Regional Transit, in consultation with the City, make the final determination of the location of BRT.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (E), PW, FD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To facilitate the evaluation and installation of a future traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way, staff recommends the following measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department and the Public Works Department:

- The owner/applicant shall submit a Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis to the City that evaluates the traffic impacts associated with installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way. The scope of the Traffic Impact Analysis shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. The owner/applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with preparation of the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis.

- If the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis concludes that there is no significant traffic operational impact, the traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way may be installed by Landowner pursuant to the Conditions of Approval and consistent with technical specifications as approved by the City Engineer.

- If the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis identifies any significant traffic operational impacts that can be mitigated and the owner/applicant desires to install the traffic signal, the City will identify the required mitigation and the owner/applicant shall install the traffic signal along with the required mitigation.

- In the event the Supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis identifies any significant traffic operational impact that cannot be mitigated, the City will advise the owner/applicant and the traffic signal shall not be installed, and the intersection configuration approved as part of the original entitlements shall remain in place.

- If the City determines that the left-turn access to the Medical Center at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way must be discontinued for any reason, the City shall (a) advise owner/applicant of the City’s intention to discontinue access, (b) provide owner/applicant with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the City’s determination to discontinue access, including an appeal to the City Council, and (c) consider the impact on safe and efficient public access to the hospital and emergency services, including any evidence owner/applicant may provide to City with respect to increased driving times.
To ensure implementation of the traffic control measures identified on the submitted site plan, staff recommends the following measures are included as conditions of approval for the project.

- "Stop" signs and appropriate pavement markings shall be installed at the exits to the four project driveways located on McCarthy Way and East Bidwell Street respectively to the satisfaction of the Community Development Departments.

- Additional warning signs and pavement markings (stamped concrete, brick pavers, etc.) shall be installed at the East Bidwell Street project driveway to alert pedestrians and bicyclists that emergency vehicles will be entering and exiting this driveway on a frequent basis and to be alert for incoming and outgoing vehicles to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

- Brick pavers, stamped concrete, or another type of similar colored 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 four project driveway entrances to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

- Should the City determined that the existing eastbound left-turn pocket on Alder Creek at McCarthy Way needs to be eliminated, the owner/applicant shall be responsible for the installation of a full concrete median through the intersection and any other improvements associated with elimination of the left-turn pocket. The owner applicant shall also construct a pedestrian-actuated midblock protected crossing to coincide with implementation of BRT service to allow for safe pedestrian access to the BRT stop(s). Lastly, the owner/applicant shall construct a second eastbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive. The owner/applicant shall be responsible for a "fair share" contribution for the aforementioned improvements, with reimbursement or fee credit provided for any portion that the City deems above the owner/applicant's responsibility. The owner/applicant shall enter into a Deferred Improvement Agreement with the City for construction of the aforementioned improvements.
## Architecture/Site Design Requirements

| 47. | Each of the buildings associated with the Folsom Ranch Medical Center including but not limited to the two medical office buildings, the hospital building, and the central plant building shall require future Design Review approval by the Planning Commission to ensure consistency with the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Planned Development Guidelines. If a proposed building is not in compliance with the Planned Development Guidelines a Planned Development Permit Modification will be required. | B | CD (P)(B) |
| 48. | The final trash and recycling collection plan associated with any City required services shall be reviewed and approved by the Solid Waste Division and the Community Development Department. In addition, the trash and recycling area and the trash and recycling enclosures shall be screened to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. Lastly, the final location, design, materials, and colors of any future trash/recycling enclosures shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. | B | CD (P) (E) |
| 49. | The location of all wall signs shall be shown on the building elevations and renderings that are submitted for future Design Review Approval by the Planning Commission. In addition, the owner/applicant shall obtain a sign permit prior to installation of any signs that require a building permit | B | CD (P) |

**MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS**

| 50. | The proposed project shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s Declarations, and restrictions relative to water usage and conservation 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, (Chapter 13.26 Water Conservation), or amended from time to time. | I, B, OG | CD (P)(E) |

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

| 51. | ✔️ **Folsom Ranch Medical Center Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP).** The owner/applicant shall implement all of the applicable mitigation measures from the FPASP (May 2011) MMRP, as amended by the Revised Proposed Water Supply Facility Alternative (November 2012), the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Backbone Infrastructure Mitigated Negative Declaration (December 2014), the Westland Eagle Specific Plan Amendment (September 2015), and the Folsom Ranch Medical Center Addendum (April 2021). The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center project is included as Attachment 23 to the staff report. | I, G, B, OG | CD (E)(P), PW, FD, EWR, PD, PR |
CONCLUSIONS
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 (P) Community Development Department</td>
<td>I Prior to approval of Improvement Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Planning Division</td>
<td>M Prior to approval of Final Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Engineering Division</td>
<td>B Prior to issuance of first Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Building Division</td>
<td>O Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Fire Division</td>
<td>G Prior to issuance of Grading Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW Public Works Department</td>
<td>DC During construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Park and Recreation Department</td>
<td>OG On-going requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preliminary Utility Plan, dated May 6, 2021
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Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan
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2. SITE PLAN DETAILS
PRELIMINARY GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN
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Preliminary Lighting Plan
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2. SITE PLAN DETAILS
LIGHTING & PHOTOMETRIC PLAN

Calculation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Avg/Min</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Entry</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Canopy</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Entry</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway_1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway_2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway_3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway_4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway_5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRELIMINARY PHOTOGRAPHIC LEVELS

PRELIMINARY LIGHTING FIXTURE SCHEDULE

PRELIMINARY PHASE 1 LIGHTING LAYOUT
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Preliminary Off-Site Improvement Plans
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3. PRELIMINARY OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENT PLANS
PARCEL 85A - PRELIMINARY GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN

[Diagram of Parcel 85A showing preliminary grading and drainage plan, including future Alder Creek Parkway, and adjacent streets and parcel boundaries.]
3. PRELIMINARY OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENT PLANS

PARCEL 85A - PRELIMINARY UTILITY PLAN
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1 | INTRODUCTION

The Planned Development Guidelines ("Guidelines") contained herein pertain to the Dignity Health Folsom Ranch Medical Center located within the Folsom Ranch development area. These Guidelines provide the framework for the Planned Development Permit, minor variances from the standards set forth in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) and Folsom Municipal Code, to accommodate an acute care hospital and medical office buildings, heliport, site design and planning, landscape, building exterior design, site lighting, and signage for the future development.

Dignity Health’s vision is to develop a dynamic new Folsom Ranch Medical Center providing a broad range of healthcare services to establish Folsom and Dignity Health as a destination and regional provider of health care services. The Medical Center includes the medical office buildings and hospital development. Folsom Ranch Medical Center will include primary and specialty care practices along with outpatient imaging, ambulatory surgery center, and other ancillary services. A new hospital with expanded acute services is envisioned in future phases of the Medical Center development.

The project intent is to observe the responsible best practices of Folsom’s Community Development and also to engage flexibility for a new Medical Center campus. This development submission is the framework for a human centered healing environment that will set new foundations for quality and innovation.
2 | PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The 27.44-acre site is located at the Northeast corner of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway. The site is identified as “Parcel 1,” and is located within the parcel identified by the FPASP as Parcel 85a, which extends to the intersection of Placerville Road and Westwood Drive. The Medical Center is planned for an ultimate build out of approximately 530,000 occupied square feet including a 300-bed 400,000 occupied square foot acute care hospital and two 65,000 occupied square foot medical office buildings. The development of this size is anticipated/strategized to serve the expanding population in the city of Folsom and its adjacent communities. Development of the site is intended to be accomplished over the course of approximately five individual phases. Although community needs and business conditions will affect both the order of phases and timing, it is generally anticipated that one medical office building will be constructed in the first phase as the most feasible and quickest pathway to providing high quality outpatient medical services to the growing community. Thereafter, the first phase of the main hospital will be constructed, offering critical acute-care services to include an emergency department, operating rooms with supporting services, imaging services, and patient beds. In order to serve the community and its surrounding region, a heliport for transfer of patients to or from the hospital is anticipated, in order to provide the highest level of care. The ultimate future buildout of the site as proposed is a coordinated response to the increased density of the surrounding residential community.

VICINITY MAP
3 | PARCEL 85A GRADING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS

The proposed development of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center necessitates the mass grading of the larger FPASP Parcel 85A (as shown and so identified in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan) and construction of onsite and offsite roadway and utility infrastructure.

Existing topography on the site ranges from approximately 470’ to 400’ in elevation and generally falls in the southwest direction. The site will be mass graded to provide developable areas and achieve earthwork balance. Onsite retaining walls (approximately 2’ to 6’ in height) are anticipated to maintain maximum developable areas and intended road grades. Excavation at a borrow site approximately 400’ west of East Bidwell Street will provide fill material to widen the west side of the East Bidwell roadway. Fill material will be moved from the borrow site to the fill location by way of ground-disturbing equipment.

At buildout, surface runoff will generally flow to the southwest where it will be conveyed by offsite storm drain infrastructure to the offsite Hydromodification Basin #8 (HMB#8) located west of East Bidwell Street in the location as approved in the FPA Storm Drainage Master Plan (Exhibit M, page 47) and FPA Specific Plan (Figure 12.4 Stormwater Plan, page 248). The first phase of the basin will be constructed with the development of the Folsom Medical Center, including the basin outlet control structure and spillway, a paved access road along the Savannah Parkway alignment and perimeter of the basin, and a storm drain outfall swale from the western terminus of Alder Creek Parkway to the existing downstream waterway. Refer to Parcel 85A - Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan Exhibit A.

Backbone Roadway improvements include the widening of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway and the construction of Westwood Drive. Two additional roadways, Mercy Drive and McCarthy Way, are proposed within Parcel 85A to facilitate access and circulation for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center. Refer to Parcel 85A - Preliminary Utility Plan Exhibit B.

Existing backbone utility infrastructure within Alder Creek Parkway is adequately sized to serve the development of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center. Utilities, including storm drain, sanitary sewer, potable and non-potable water, and dry utility infrastructure will be extended within East Bidwell Street, Westwood Drive and Placerville Road as well as within onsite streets Mercy Drive and McCarthy Way to provide service to the proposed development. Refer to Preliminary Utility Plan Exhibit B. Further detail about water supply to Folsom Ranch Medical Center can be found in Section 7 of these Guidelines under “Water Supply and Infrastructure.”

The following is a summary of grading and off site infrastructure improvements that support the Folsom
Ranch Medical Center:

- Mass grading of Parcel 85A and adjacent roadways resulting in contour graded developable parcels and subgrade along roadway alignments;
- Rough grading of a portion of Hydromodification Basin #8 (HMB#8) including the access road along the Savannah Parkway alignment and perimeter of the basin;
- Rough Grading of a storm drain outfall swale from the western terminus of Alder Creek Parkway to the existing downstream waterway;
- Excavation at a borrow site west of East Bidwell;
- Roadway and Utility improvements along East Bidwell, Alder Creek Parkway, Westwood Drive, Placerville Road, McCarthy Drive and Mercy Way including storm drain, sanitary sewer, potable and non-potable water, and dry utility infrastructure;
- HMB#8 improvements including a paved access road to East Bidwell and basin outlet control structure and spillway.

The infrastructure improvements will be completed in advance of any building construction on Parcel 1. While grading and other infrastructure development will occur on Parcels 2-4 and other off site locations, no entitlements on Parcel 2 thru 4 of Parcel 85A are included as part of this project.
4 | APPROVAL PROCEDURES

These Guidelines include the Dignity Health Folsom Ranch Medical Center Site Plan, Design Guidelines specific to the Medical Center, Landscape Plan, and Signage Criteria. Each are submitted for approval by the City of Folsom Planning Commission. The Site Plan Guidelines, and specific design and landscaping standards contained within the Guidelines shall govern the review of building permit submissions for this project. One master Planned Development Permit shall be issued for the entire Folsom Ranch Medical Center project upon approval by the Planning Commission. Construction of the individual buildings will occur in five or more phases. A Conditional Use Permit from the City of Folsom will be required for the development and use of the proposed heliport. While design standards are included in the Guidelines, specific design review and approval of the hospital and each medical office building will be considered by the Planning Commission in order to determine consistency with these Guidelines, the FPASP and the Community Design Guidelines.

The medical office buildings will be designed to comply with the California Building Code. The ground floor levels of both medical office buildings are proposed to be designed to California’s Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) 3 requirements.

Hospital design and construction is subject to California Building Code requirements along with the review and approval of California’s Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD). As acute care buildings, the hospital will be designed to comply with OSHPD 1 requirements. While the Guidelines are intended to be consistent with OSHPD requirements, it is possible that OSHPD may require design modifications as part of the State review process. In addition, hospital and medical office design evolves along with technology and community-based health needs, which may also affect the overall design requirements and site plan. Consistent with the FPASP Section 13.3 Administrative Procedures, Administrative Modifications and Amendments, the City of Folsom Community Development Department will have the authority to consider, and approve administratively, minor changes to the massing, design, site plan and/or Guidelines that remain consistent with the overall intent and purpose of the FPASP, the Community Design Guidelines, and these Guidelines. If the Community Development Director determines that Planning Commission review is appropriate, changes will be submitted to the Planning Commission for review.
Grading and Off site Infrastructure Improvements Approvals

Parcel 85A is subject to existing regulatory permits including the project’s USACE permit, 401 water quality certification, Biological Opinion and Master Lake and Streambed Alternation Agreement. The project is in various stages of compliance with these permits and authorizations and all outstanding conditions will be met prior to construction.

With respect to cultural resources, the proposed development is subject to compliance with provisions in the EIR/EIS for the Folsom Plan Area and the 2013 “First Amended Programmatic Agreement between the US Army Corps of Engineers and the California Office of Historic Preservation regarding the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, Sacramento County, California.” All pre-construction surveys, evaluations of significance, recording, and mitigation required by the City and US Army Corps of Engineers have been completed for the area subject to this application. A pre-construction compliance verification for the on-site and a portion of the off-site development area was issued by the Corps on March 5, 2020 and the State Historic Preservation Officer concurred on April 16, 2020. A pre-construction compliance verification for the balance of the off-site infrastructure is currently in review by the Corps and will be issued prior to the commencement of construction-related activities. The project will be subject to construction-related requirements that are specified in Chapter 3 - Parcel 85A Grading, Infrastructure and Off Site Improvements.
5 | PERMITTED USES

The City approved a Minor Administrative Modification (MAM) that affected several parcels (APNs 072-3190-030 and 072-3190-046), and which includes Parcel 85A, on March 17, 2020. The MAM shifted residential and commercial gross square footage (GSF) within multiple parcels in order to meet the maximum development intent of the properties involved. The resulting Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) has resulted in the following uses for Parcel 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC-RC</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-GC</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>314,620</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-IND/OP</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>109,380</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the following medical services are likely to be provided:

- Acute-Care Hospital
- Medical Office Buildings
- Outpatient Clinics, including Urgent Care
- Free-standing Emergency Departments
- Ambulatory Surgery Centers
- Wellness related Clinics and Retail facilities
- Imaging center and mobile imaging and treatment
- Mobile Trailer Pad(s) for mobile prefabricated modular structures or temporary emergency management services

Each of the zoning categories identified above allows for “Laboratory-Medical,” “Health Care Facility,” “Medical Services – Major,” and “Medical Services – Minor.” The category of “Medical Services – Major” is further defined in the FPASP, and covers “services requiring in-patient hospitalization or other services that require acute medical attention.” These services will be provided in the Hospital complex identified on the Site Plan and consisting of 400,000 occupied square feet. “Medical Services – Minor” also is further defined in the FPASP, and covers “outpatient services, including but not limited to Lasik surgery offices, dentistry offices, same day clinics.” Services within this category will be provided in the Medical Office Buildings.

Land use for office is allowed in both the Folsom General Plan and the FPASP. The medical buildings fall under an office land use designation as General Commercial (GC). The maximum FAR is 0.5 in the
General Plan, while the FPASP maximum FAR for GC is 0.25. While permitting medical services land use, the FPASP did not envision a hospital building. The Folsom General Plan has a land use designation of Public and Quasi-Public Facility (PQP) which corresponds with the hospital building. PQP use is defined as supporting the needs of the community by providing health uses, and the FAR ranges from 0.2 up to a maximum of 1.0. The Folsom Ranch Medical Center provides significant public amenities and community benefit not only to the City of Folsom, but also to the surrounding region. In order to provide a full service hospital, a minimum FAR of .55 is requested for the project site to accommodate the grossing and support space anticipated for a full service hospital. This FAR increase will translate into appropriate building footprints with efficient program layouts and onsite surface parking with open areas for a positive contribution to the visual environment.
6 | DEVELOPMENT PARAMETERS

The Site Plan included with the PD Permit Application and these Guidelines identifies two Medical Office Buildings of approximately 130,000 occupied square feet; a Hospital complex consisting of 400,000 occupied square feet and a Central Plant building consisting of approximately 20,000 square feet.

The entire project site is 27.44 acres, with each building comprising the approximate acreage in square feet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Central Plant*</th>
<th>Occupied Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Medical Office Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Hospital (100 Beds)</td>
<td>15,000*</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Medical Office Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Hospital Expansion (100 Beds)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Hospital Expansion (100 Beds)</td>
<td>5,000*</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000*</td>
<td>530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Central Utility Plant areas are estimated and are not included in total development area

Occupied square footage defined:

Occupied square footage is the actual space occupied and defined as area from inside wall to wall dimensions. Healthcare space is a specialized use that has well defined and code dictated requirements that are unlike other building uses and types. This specialized use requires core elements to be typically much larger than other building types. A larger percentage of project square footage is specialized square footage that is not occupied or dedicated to specific program use. A few examples are as follows:

Circulation corridors are a specialized use difference in which healthcare has descriptive requirements. California Building Code (CBC) Section 1224.4.7 requires a min of 8’ minimum “Clear” width corridors throughout the hospital facility to allow gurney traffic, supply traffic, and staff movement without obstructions. Clear space is also required by CBC around beds to allow staff movement and patient access that ranges from 3’ minimum clear to the edge of beds to 5’-0” minimum clear at stretchers. Storage requirements are another key driver per CBC requirements, with examples being a minimum of 20 net square feet of general storage per bed, exclusive of other required specialized storage spaces based on Acute Care Services provided. Specialized storage is required in each department with various requirements, but a rough estimate would require storage space at over 200 sq ft per bed. These
examples are a handful of key drivers of spaces that are not occupied uses. Occupied square footage does not include common areas of a healthcare building such as restrooms, stairwells, mechanical shafts, storage rooms, utility rooms, mechanical rooms, electrical rooms, and shared hallways or corridors.

Hospital Planning Drivers
Hospitals have a high level of complexity that begins with the design of a circulation system that connects a vast network of program spaces. The key types of space are inpatient care units, outpatient care, diagnostic/treatment, administrative and support services and public spaces. These spaces are organized based on key functional relationships and factors:

- Efficient travel distances for patients, visitors, and staff
- Stacking of inpatient units that have limited connections with each other but need convenient access to diagnostic and treatment services
- Emergency needs to be adjacent to Diagnostic/Imaging but can also be linked to Surgery and ICU, which should be adjacent to each other
- Access to natural light and views with connection to outdoors
- Utility services benefit from having the shortest and most direct distribution
- High volume outpatient services at medical office buildings separated from hospital inpatient services

One concept for building organization is the stacking diagram. The example below shows the program volume spread across 6 floors by Vertical Stacking versus that same volume spread over three floors by No Vertical Stacking. Consolidating program over multiple levels instead of spreading program spaces over available building footprint results in excessive travel distances. Short travel distances are preferred and critical for patient, visitor, and staff flow, not to mention material flow. In addition to extended travel distances in the No Vertical Stacking, a larger footprint generates inefficiencies in adjacencies and loss of views and access to natural light. A taller more compact building massing is more efficient than a sprawling facility. As a result, our proposed hospital will be a taller volume in a more compact footprint on the Medical Center site.
Another planning principle for the Medical Center is to preserve as much open space as possible in order to highlight a wayfinding hierarchy of buildings, with the tallest building the hospital and its inpatient services, flanked by the smaller medical office buildings providing outpatient care. The proposed site plan supports this approach and is designed for direct and intuitive wayfinding for patients, visitors and staff. The larger hospital is the focal point and centered in the site, between two smaller medical office buildings. The diagnostic/treatment services of the hospital are connected via sidewalks to both medical office buildings and the hospital is equidistant from each.

These planning principles will guide the development of the medical center. While the medical office buildings are proposed to be a maximum of three levels, future programming studies will ultimately determine the number of levels and corresponding building height of the hospital. Variables influencing the design are required and new service needs, new technologies, anticipated volume, operational and staffing assumptions, and building system decisions. Hospital planning and development is complex, as hospitals have longer lifespans than other building types and more intensity of use. An open system of planning which can fine tune to variables supports the goal of a high quality hospital of the future. Design flexibility is a request in these planning documents.

**Building Heights**
- Medical Office Buildings; 3 story, Sixty (60) feet maximum*
- Hospital Building; 3-6 story, One Hundred and Twenty (120) feet maximum*
- Central Utility Plant; 1 story, Thirty-five (35) feet maximum*

*Building Heights exclude roof top mechanical screen walls. Maximum height of mechanical screen walls is 15’ above the finished roof.*
Building Setback Requirements (as indicated on the Exhibit C - Preliminary Site Plan)

- Front Setback (Alder Creek Parkway): 30 feet (18 foot landscape corridor and pedestrian access easement required)
- Rear Setback (US Highway 50 On Ramp): 25 feet (25 foot landscape easement required)
- Side Setback (East Bidwell): 20 feet (20 foot landscape and pedestrian easement required)
- Side Setback (McCarthy Way): 18 feet (18 foot landscape corridor and pedestrian access easement required)
- Interior Setbacks (building to building) - 60’ minimum unless buildings are connected (10 feet per story unless buildings are connected; 0 feet at connected buildings; all building setbacks to comply with California Building Code requirements)

Surface Parking Requirements

- Medical Office Buildings; three spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross area
- Hospital Building; two spaces per hospital bed
- Accessible handicapped parking spaces to be provided per Folsom Municipal Code
- Loading/Unloading spaces will be provided at Hospital, designed to Dignity Health’s just in time delivery program that will restrict loading traffic to off peak hours.
- Dimensions of parking spaces will meet Folsom Municipal Code requirements. Dimensions of ADA accessible car and van parking spaces shall comply with California Building Code requirements.
- Typical angled parking stalls measure 9’x19’. Typical drive isles measure 25’ wide.
- A continuous 6” high raised concrete curb shall be provided along all landscape areas abutting parking or drive areas.
- Landscape island spacing and distribution of shade trees shall comply with Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASp) and Community Design Guidelines.
- Minimize cross-slopes across entire site and especially in areas of concentrated traffic in order to maximize accessibility and pedestrian safety.

Bicycle Parking

For Office land use, Folsom Municipal Code requires 5 bicycle parking spaces per 25 required vehicle parking spaces plus one additional bicycle parking space for every 10 additional vehicle parking spaces required or portion thereof. The maximum number of bicycle parking spaces required is 20. 20 bike parking spaces are provided at the entrance of each Medical Office Building. In addition to the Municipal Code required bicycle parking spaces, the Medical Center will provide 16 spaces at the Hospital building.
- Bicycle parking facilities shall be installed in a manner which allows adequate spacing for access to the bicycle and the locking device when the facilities are occupied. General space allowances shall include a 2-foot width and a 6-foot length per bicycle and a 5-foot maneuvering space behind the bicycle. The facilities shall be located on a hard, dust free surface, preferably asphalt or concrete slab.
- Bicycle parking shall consist of at least a stationary bicycle rack, typically a concrete slab or vertical metal bar, where the bicyclist supplies a padlock and chain or cable to secure the bicycle to a stationary object.

**Sustainable Design**

Energy efficiency shall be addressed in building design, in compliance with the FPASP and California Building Codes. In addition, Dignity Health has developed its own renewable energy goals for its facilities since 2010. This commitment is reflected in targeting below code required energy efficiency in the design and construction of new acute care buildings.

In addition to sustainable design for buildings, the site will have a solar panel array for covered employee parking. Electric Vehicle Parking Spaces and Electric Vehicle Charging Stations per the California Green Code will be provided in close proximity to both medical office buildings and the Hospital building. Cool Paving will be provided at the site in specific locations.
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MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING (PHASE 1)
65,000 SF
(3 STORIES)

HOSPITAL (FUTURE)
400,000 SF
(6 STORIES)

MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING (FUTURE)
65,000 SF
(3 STORIES)

CENTRAL UTILITY PLANT
20,000 SF

AMBULANCE ENTRY
SERVICE ENTRY
ED WALK-IN ENTRY
MAIN ENTRY

McCARTHY WAY
HIGHWAY 50
EAST BIDWELL STREET
ALDER CREEK PARKWAY

Scale: 1" = 120' = 0"
7 | SITE DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

Site development guidelines will help to establish the type of experiences that visitors, employees, and patients will have within the Medical Center. Clarity in site planning can lay the groundwork for a medical facility that contributes to positive experiences and improved patient outcomes. This project aims to achieve the following site planning goals:

- This campus should define its place within the community. The outward sign to the community should clearly represent that this is a welcoming place for healing.
- Provide an environment that promotes patient safety, accessibility, and is easy to navigate for pedestrians, vehicles, and emergency vehicles.
- Create open spaces and safe, comfortable pedestrian pathways that provide outdoor places for family members and staff to have moments of respite throughout the day and evening.
- Clearly identify building entrances and primary pedestrian pathways.
- Integrate the project with the surrounding development to ensure that pathways and streets are coordinated.

Project Site Access

Three site access options were presented for consideration in the environmental analysis and project approval: (1) signalized intersection at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way; (2) roundabout at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way; and (3) unsignalized left turn at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way, with possible future main site access via a left turn from Alder Creek Parkway to Westwood Drive, followed by a left turn from Westwood Drive to Mercy Drive.

Dignity Health’s preferred access to the project site is via a left turn at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way. Left turn access into the Folsom Ranch Medical Center at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way is a priority for Dignity Health to facilitate non-emergency patient and visitor access as well as employee access. The proposed signal spacing (i.e., 700 feet) to facilitate this left turn movement would not meet the City’s minimum spacing standards. Traffic analysis indicated that a signal is not needed until, at the earliest, construction of the last medical building. Although the Traffic Impact Analysis completed for the Project did not identify significant environmental impacts, due to the early stages of development of Folsom Ranch, the City will only allow future consideration of the traffic signal after completion of an updated traffic analysis, with details identified in the Conditions of Approval and the Development Agreement Amendment.

Through continued work on the site design, Dignity Health also believes (based on technical analysis)
that a roundabout at the intersection of McCarthy Way and Mercy Drive will facilitate traffic movements within the greater Parcel 85A. This type of intersection will increase pedestrian and vehicle safety and reduce vehicle emissions. The roundabout would serve as the main gateway entrance to the Folsom Ranch Medical Center campus. The site plan includes this roundabout.

**Emergency vehicle access**

Emergency vehicle access is provided to the site from all project site driveways in either direction of traffic. From southbound East Bidwell, emergency vehicle only access will be provided into the driveway. A half signal at this location will be installed for southbound left turn movement by emergency vehicles-only.

**Wayfinding guidelines**

Wayfinding is an essential component in every aspect of healthcare environmental design. Healthcare facilities are large scale, complex environments. Visitors to the Medical Center have varied physical abilities and cognitive/emotional states, and often feel rushed. Comprehensive wayfinding design influences positive patient and visitor outcomes by reducing stress and minimizing visitor disorientation. Dignity Health’s signage program is a comprehensive design that begins with the patient or visitor leaving their home, and their arrival to their Medical Center destination.

Providing a safe passage to the Medical Center is a key element of providing a safe environment. During route navigation, visitors should be able to cognitively map out the Medical Center location and its coordinates, whether from Highway 50 or from streets of surrounding residential communities. Wayfinding via freestanding sign - pylon, then distant read skyline and skyline building signage will be repetitive in order to be effective for navigation. Key decision points occur at intersections and chokepoints. Building signage will occur frequently to provide reassurance to patients and visitors as they navigate, making reorientation seamless and easy. Continuous visual connection is desired for clear and intuitive wayfinding to the Medical Center. Further detail on the wayfinding signage program may be found in Section 11 Sign Criteria.

**Site Design Guidelines**

- Vehicular and pedestrian circulation and building placements, including the delineation of emergency, service, and public traffic flows, on the site shall generally conform with the approved Folsom Medical Center Preliminary Site Plan presented in this document as Exhibit A.
- Provisions for ADA access shall be designated consistent with Federal and State Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and California Building Code requirements. ADA accessible routes must be
provided from public sidewalks to building entrances.

Campus Edge Considerations

- Ensure patient safety by establishing simple wayfinding at the campus edge. Emergency, patient and visitor, and service traffic flows should be well planned and clearly identified with wayfinding signage.
- The campus edge design defines an institution’s place in the community. Landscaping should be considerate of the local environment and increase connections to nature. Use native, contextually appropriate plants at campus edges. See required landscaping materials in the FPASP or the Community Design Guidelines.

Pedestrian Regulations

- Safe pedestrian pathways, traffic slowing measures at building entries and around crosswalks.
- Pedestrian crosswalks and drives shall be defined through use of enhanced paving.
- Shade elements including canopies, trellises, and trees should be thoughtfully placed along pathways, building entrances, and areas for respite.

Patient and Visitor Experience

- Provide adequate screening at back of house functions to maintain a calming visitor experience.

Loading, Storage and Utility Locations

- Loading areas shall be provided on site and shall be design to Dignity Health’s loading and unloading operations requirements.
- Loading areas shall be thoughtfully planned and obscured from public view through the use of landscaping, earthwork, and/or screen walls.
- Material handling, storage of medical waste, above ground storage of water, fuel, bulk oxygen, medical gas bottles, and unsightly day to day processing of supplies should be thoughtfully planned and obscured from public view through the use of landscaping, earthwork, and/or screen walls.
- Freestanding screen walls, retaining walls and fences shall be designed to have consistent materials, styles and colors to complement the buildings on the campus.
- Per California Building Code, the hospital is required to have an onsite emergency generator for
standby power and onsite fuel storage to maintain generators for a minimum 72 hour duration. The generator location will be at the Central Utility Plant, distanced away from the hospital building.

**Site Furniture**

- Site furniture should be safe to use and ADA accessible.
- Shall have appropriate level of protection from vandalism (graffiti), theft, and weather resistance.
- Shall be easy to maintain.
- Shall be inviting to use and comfortable.
- Shall be complementary to the building designs.
- Shall be provided in adequate numbers to serve the expected use.
- Newspaper/Periodical Vending machines shall be limited in number. Shall be provided in obscured yet convenient locations.

**Future Building Pads**

- Rough graded building pads for later phases of the Medical Center should be treated with an un-irrigated hydro-seed application of annual grasses to minimize erosion.

**Mobile Prefabricated Modular Structures**

- Modular structures are proposed to the west of the Hospital, and will be screened from adjacent roadways with evergreen screening plantings.
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Heliport

This facility is proposing heliport access for emergency patient transport to the hospital for emergency care, or to transport patients to other hospitals where a higher level of emergency care is available. The heliport will be designed and constructed in the future phases of the hospital. The hospital heliport will be located on the west side of the project site, near the Hospital’s Emergency Department Ambulance Entrance. This location will be furthest away from surrounding residential development. The heliport will have a landing area of broom finish concrete and will have a connecting concrete pathway of minimum 8' width. Sufficient airspace will be provided for takeoff and landing. Regulations and permitting processes associated with the special use heliport must be in accordance with the California Department of Transportation Aviation Division (Caltrans/Aviation) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Sacramento County Department of Airports. Site planning will also need to accommodate the Final Approach and Takeoff Area (FATO) as established through a coordinated effort with the FAA and Caltrans. Final site plan design shall incorporate required lighting requirements for safe landing and departure of helicopters. Exhibit B depicts the conceptual standards of the heliport landing and takeoff design and placement on the site plan. Exhibit C depicts the proposed helicopter basis of design.

Exhibit B: Conceptual FATO Clearances diagram
Exhibit C: Helicopter Design Parameters

Site Circulation

Circulation is a key element in the planned development of the Medical Center, as it is located along US Highway 50 and at the northeast corner of two significant signature corridors in East Bidwell and Alder Creek Parkway.

A comprehensive public transit plan is one of the main FPASP planning principles. The transit corridor is along Alder Creek Parkway, with future transit bus stops at key locations in the Plan Area. Public transportation to the Medical Center in the form of a future on-site or site adjacent bus stop will be a lasting amenity for patients, visitors, and staff. The intent of the FPASP is to support a transit corridor connecting light rail stations and bus routes, and the expectation is that a bus network along Alder Creek Parkway will be provided as part of the FPASP proposed public transit plan. Future bus stops are shown eastbound and westbound on Alder Creek Parkway.

Water Supply and Infrastructure

The City entered a Water Supply Agreement with landowners to supply water to the Plan Area to meet a build-out demand estimated at 5,600-acre feet annually. Components of the water system
include extension of offsite water transmission mains, storage tanks, booster pump stations and distribution mains. A Hydraulic Analysis Technical Memorandum for both intermediate and buildout scenarios of impacts to the City of Folsom’s water infrastructure has been completed with review by the Environmental and Water Resources Department.

Utility studies for Folsom Ranch Medical Center have validated a required minimum water pressure of 80 psi at the Hospital. The Folsom Ranch Medical Center design needs for higher pressure water is the basis for the design consultant team’s recommendation and Dignity Health’s proposal to connect to Zone 4 of the Folsom Plan Area (FPA) rather than Zone 3. Exhibit E shows the proposed Folsom Water Plan adding Folsom Ranch Medical Center to Zone 4. This Zone 4 connection is the buildout scenario.

The hydraulic analysis results of the Zone 4 buildout scenario complies with the system performance criteria, and the City has agreed to the Zone 4 water connection of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center, also known as Parcel 1 of Parcel 85A. The Medical Center site would have two points of connection to Zone 4 infrastructure.

Timing for construction of the Zone 4 infrastructure presently is under review between the City and other owners in Folsom Ranch. Pending completion of Zone 4 infrastructure and in light of the fact that the higher psi is not needed for early phases of the Folsom Ranch Medical Center (i.e., the two medical office buildings), the City proposed that initial water needs of the project site could be fulfilled by the Zone 4 infrastructure, which is currently supplied by the existing Zone 5 tank. Based on the proposed phasing provided by the consultant team, the first needs will be fulfilled by the Zone 5 tank as an interim supply. This Zone 5 tank interim connection is the intermediate scenario. By the time the Phase 1 (100 Beds) hospital is constructed, the Zone 4 Tank will be in service to meet the projected water needs of the hospital.

The analysis conclusion is that the Zone 5 tank has interim capacity to serve identified Folsom Specific Plan Area sites, including the Project site, until the Zone 4 tank is designed and constructed. Upon completion of the Zone 4 tank, Zone 4 infrastructure will cut over from the Zone 5 tank to the Zone 4 tank. The analysis established that the Zone 4 Tank should be constructed at the end of 2024, when demand in the FPA Zones 4, 5 and 6 exceeds 1 MG. The analysis results of the intermediate scenario complies with the system performance criteria. The City has advised that this technical memorandum will be used to update any references to water infrastructure in the Specific Plan and that no Specific Plan Amendment is required as part of the entitlement package related to this issue.
The 2014 Folsom Plan Area Water System Master Plan accommodated the water demand of the Medical Center. (See attachment to Environmental Information Sheet). The Medical Center’s proposed square footage is designed to the available water supply, as well as the water supply allocated in the MAM.

Exhibit E: Folsom Water Plan with Folsom Ranch Medical Center added to Zone 4
Landscape Intent

Landscape design plays an essential role in supporting Folsom Ranch Medical Center’s overall site planning goals of safe and easy navigation, comfortable pedestrian circulation, and a positive user experience for patients, staff, and visitors. Gardens provide a restorative environment from mental and emotional fatigue. A Healing Garden will be a featured site amenity. Fragrant plants, cool and calming colors, naturalistic massings and foliage with soft texture and movement will be the showcase of this Garden. Additionally, the landscape design of this project can support the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan’s principles of well-integrated sites, walkable neighborhoods, and sustainable design. Pollinator friendly plants that attract bees, hummingbirds, and butterflies will provide a habitat that will sustain healthy communities of beneficial insects and pollinators. The outdoor space design is an important component of providing a healing environment. With these goals in mind, the intent of landscape design for this project is to create user-friendly, functional, intuitive, human-scaled spaces that provide shade, biodiversity, seasonal interest, seating areas, healing spaces, and the overall calming and therapeutic effect that living landscapes can offer.

This chapter addresses guidelines for:

- Hardscape Materials
- Irrigation System
- Landscape Planting
- Plant Palettes

Landscape design for the Folsom Ranch Medical Center shall adhere to the guidelines in this chapter, and shall meet all applicable requirements in the FPASP and Community Design Guidelines.
EXHIBIT F: OVERALL CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN
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EXHIBIT G: CONCEPTUAL PHASE 1 LANDSCAPE PLAN
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### TREE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREES</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE BLO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acer platanum 'Bloodgood' / Bloodgood Japanese Maple</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE RUB</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Acer rubrum 'October Glory' / Red Maple</td>
<td>24&quot; box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB TRE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arbutus unedo / Strawberry Tree Multi-Trunk</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR FRA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Carpinus betulus 'Franz Fontaine' / Hornbeam</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER WES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cercis occidentalis / Western Redbud Multi-trunk</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIN CAM</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora / Camphor Tree</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOE PAN</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Koelreuteria paniculata / Golden Rain Tree</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG TUS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lagerstroemia x 'Tuscarora' / Pink Grape Myrtle</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU SAR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Laurus x 'Saratoga' / Saratoga Laurel</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLE SHA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Olea europaea 'Swan Hill' / Fruitless Olive</td>
<td>24&quot; box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN CAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pinus brutia / Calabrian Pine</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIS KEI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pistacia chinensis 'Keith Dovey' / Chinese Pistache</td>
<td>24&quot; box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POD MAG</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Podocarpus macrophyllus / Yew Pine</td>
<td>24&quot; box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU VES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prunus cer. 'Krauter Vesuvius' / Purple Leaf Plum</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUE DOU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii / Blue Oak</td>
<td>24&quot; box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUE LOB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Quercus lobata / Valley Oak</td>
<td>36&quot; Box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUE HIS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Quercus wislizenii / Interior Live Oak</td>
<td>24&quot; box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THU EME</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thuja occidentalis 'Emerald' / Dwarf Arborvitae</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULM ALL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ulmus parvifolia 'Ailee' / Ailee Lacebark Elm</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEL VIL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Zelkova serrata 'Village Green' / Sawleaf Zelkova</td>
<td>15 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**EXHIBIT H: PROPOSED TREE SCHEDULE**

---
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**Hardscape Materials Guidelines**

The use of durable and simple materials helps to create a contemporary and cohesive user experience across the site. Pedestrian sidewalks and paths will be simple gray concrete flat-work. Enhanced areas of cast concrete pavers and/or integrally colored concrete shall be considered for building entries, pathway nodes, and therapeutic garden spaces to enhance the visitor experience and help self-navigation. A limited use of stabilized decomposed granite pavement in low-traffic areas should be considered to create secondary walking paths or patient relaxation areas. The overall intent of the materials selection should be towards creating calming, unfussy, easy-to-navigate pedestrian spaces.

**Irrigation System Guidelines**

The irrigation system shall be fully automatic and shall be designed for the most efficient use of water in the landscape while maintaining plant health. To that end, design and management of the irrigation system shall be in compliance with California's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) and the City of Folsom's current irrigation standards. Specific measures include:

- Internet-connected ‘Smart’ irrigation controller(s) with weather sensors that automatically adjust watering times based on seasonal evapotranspiration data.
- Flow sensor and master valve assembly to monitor water use and shut off system in case of leaks.
- In-line subsurface drip emitter lines to irrigate all shrub/ground cover plantings.
- At-grade bubblers (2 bubblers per tree) at all trees. Trees grouped on their own valves, separate from understory plantings.
- Irrigation hydrozones organized based on similar plant water requirements and solar exposure.

The entire system shall utilize ‘purple pipe’ components to support future conversion to a reclaimed water source that the City of Folsom may bring to Folsom Ranch.

**Landscape Planting Guidelines**

Landscape planting shall be designed with sustainability and ease of maintenance in mind, and should complement the overall architectural style of Folsom Ranch Medical Center, specifically:

- All plant material shall be California-adapted, long-lived, non-toxic, and non-invasive. California-native plant species should be incorporated where appropriate.
- All plant material shall have a Very Low Water Use, Low Water Use, or Medium Water Use rating according to the WUCOLS rating system.
• Plants shall be spaced with adequate room to grow to their full size without requiring shearing.

• Perennial plants may be used sparingly, in accent plantings at entries and therapeutic garden spaces. There shall be no annual color plantings.

• Mowed lawn shall be limited to small areas for patient/visitor use for therapeutic purposes, and shall not exceed 5% of the total landscaped area.

• Street trees on the frontages along East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway shall be consistent with the streetscape conditions described in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (March 2018; Figures 7.3 and 7.11)

• Evergreen screening trees shall be planted along the northwestern portion of the parcel that borders US Highway 50 right-of-way.

• Trees shall be interspersed throughout the parking lot areas such that in 15 years, 40% of the parking lots will be shaded at midday.

• Planting that will attract humming birds and butterflies is encouraged and can create unexpected positive distractions for patients and visitors.

Additionally, per Folsom Municipal Code Section 17.57.070, the following shall be applied to landscaping at all parking lots:

• Planted and irrigated landscape areas equal to at least 5 percent of the total parking area shall be provided to create the visual and physical separation necessary to reduce the traffic hazards between pedestrians and vehicles. All landscaping areas shall be designed so that plant materials are protected from vehicle damage or encroachment.

• Trees shall be interspersed throughout the parking area so that in 15 years, 40 percent of the parking lot will be in shade at high noon, assuming the sun directly overhead. The percentage of area required to be shaded shall be based on aboveground, uncovered parking area. Trees shall be minimum 15-gallon size at planting.

**Plant Palettes**

On the following pages are lists of suggested tree and understory plant species. Low water use perennials should be added to the planting design in high-impact areas such as building entries and therapeutic garden spaces. Other species beyond this list may be incorporated into the design if they support Folsom Ranch Medical Center’s overall design principles and adhere to the guidelines herein.
Tree Palette

**Common Name / Botanical Name**
- Red Maple / *Acer rubrum* 'October Glory'
- Strawberry Tree Multi-Trunk / *Arbutus unedo*
- Hornbeam / *Carpinus betulus* 'Franz Fontaine'
- Western Redbud Multi-trunk / *Cercis occidentalis*
- Camphor Tree / *Cinnamomum camphora*
- Golden Rain Tree / *Koelreuteria paniculata*
- Pink Crape Myrtle / *Lagerstroemia x Tuscarora*
- Saratoga Laurel / *Laurus x Saratoga*
- Fruitless Olive / *Olea europaea* 'Swan Hill'
- Calabrian Pine / *Pinus brutia*
- Chinese Pistache / *Pistacia chinensis* 'Keith Davey'
- Yew Pine / *Podocarpus macrophyllus*
- Purple Leaf Plum / *Prunus cer. Krauter Vesuvius*
- Blue Oak / *Quercus douglasii*
- Valley Oak / *Quercus lobata*
- Interior Live Oak / *Quercus wislizenii*
- Allee Lacebark Elm / *Ulmus parvifolia* 'Allee'
- Sawleaf Zelkova / *Zelkova serrata* 'Village Green'

Understory Palette

**Common Name / Botanical Name**

**Shrubs**
- Century Plant Agave / *Agave americana*
- Dwarf Bottle Brush / *Callistemon citrinus* 'Little John'
- Camellia / *Camellia spp.*
- Bush Anemone / *Carpenteria californica* 'Elizabeth'
- California Wild Lilac / *Ceanothus spp.*
- Rockrose / *Cistus spp.*
- Pineapple Guava / *Feijoa sellowiana*
- Flannel Bush / *Fremontodendron x California Glory*
- Veitch Jasmine / *Gardenia jasminoides* 'Veitchii'
- Noel Grevillea / *Grevillea* x 'Noellii'
- Chinese Fringeflower / *Loropetalum* *spp.*
- Red-Tip Photinia / *Photinia fraserii*
- California Coffeeberry / *Rhamnus c. 'Mound San Bruno'*
- Yedda Hawthorn / *Rhaphiolepis umb. 'Southern Moon'*
- Rosemary / *Rosmarinus* *spp.*
- Australian Bluebell / *Sollya heterophylla*
- Coast Rosemary / *Westringia fruticosa 'Wynabbie Gem'*

Ornamental Grasses and Grasslike Plants
- Feather Reed Grass / *Calamagrostis* *x a. 'Karl Foerster'*
- Berkeley Sedge / *Carex tumulicola*
- Prairie Fire Sedge / *Carex testacea 'Prairie Fire'*
- Flax Lily / *Dianella revoluta 'Clarity Blue'*
- Fortnight Lily / *Dietes vegeta*
- Blue Lyme Grass / *Leymus condensatus 'Canyon Prince'*
- Pink Muhly / *Muhlenbergia capillaris 'Regal Mist'*
- Deer Grass / *Muhlenbergia rigens*
- Red Bunny Tails Fountain Grass / *Pennisetum m. 'Red Bunny Tails'*
- New Zealand Flax / *Phormium* *spp.*

Groundcovers and Vines
- Groundcover Manzanita / *Arctostaphylos 'Emerald Carpet'*
- Bank Catclaw / *Acacia redolens 'Lowboy'*
- Rockrose / *Cistus salviifolius 'Prostratus'*
- Violet Trumpet Vine / *Clytostoma callistegioides*
- Cotoneaster / *Cotoneaster dammeri 'Lowfast'*
- Creeping Fig / *Ficus pumila*
- Creeping Mahonia / *Mahonia repens*
- Dwarf Heavenly Bamboo / *Nandina 'Firepower'*
- Creeping Rosemary / *Rosmarinus 'Huntington Carpet'*
- Creeping Snowberry / *Symphoricarpos mollis*
- Star Jasmine / *Trachelospermum jasminoides*
Healing Garden Trees and Plants

- Alpine Strawberry / *Fragaria vesca*
- Prairie Dropseed / *Sporobolus heterolepsi*
- Gardenia / *Gardenia jasminoides*
- Lavender / *Lavandula*
- Rosemary / *Salvia rosmarinus*
- Lilac / *Syringa*
- Heliotrope / *Heliotropium*
9 | ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES

Design Intent

The architecture that makes up the Folsom Ranch Medical Center will be a key contributor to positive patient experiences and improved outcomes. The aesthetic of the campus buildings should instill confidence in the exceptional level of care and dedication to professionalism that medical center patrons will experience during their stay at the hospital or medical office buildings. Building designs shall be clean, comfortable, and approachable. Buildings shall be well-proportioned, constructed of high-quality materials, and should demonstrate an attention to care and craftsmanship. Primary public entrances shall be easily identified and highly visible to assist in wayfinding. Building form shall distinguish main public entries versus emergency and staff entrances. Building design and landscaping should be well coordinated in order to leverage the healing aspects of natural environments. As good stewards of our environment and our communities, green building principles will be an emphasis of the architectural design.

Massing, Form, and Entrances

The combination of massing and form is a critical component of how buildings are perceived and experienced. Buildings on this campus should exhibit a sound understanding of massing including a base, middle, and top massing, the human scale, and the macro scale. Hierarchy and rhythm should be used to create building forms that are cohesive, balanced, and approachable.

Articulation and naturally cast shadow are important aspects of building facade design that can animate and bring visual interest to built structures. Articulation is expressed through the push and pull of building surfaces, combination of complementary materials, and thoughtful placement of reveals. Overhangs, awnings, architectural integrated shading devices, and recesses will create shadows and protect the building and occupants from heat gain.

Main entrances to buildings or key departments within the hospital are opportunities to create additional visual interest in the building forms. They should be clearly delineated such that visitors are not confused with wayfinding. In terms of hierarchy, the main entrance of the hospital should be distinct and most clearly defined.
Building Materials, Colors, and Textures

Appropriate selection of materials, colors, and textures will ensure that the medical campus fits within and strengthens the fabric of the larger Folsom community. Exterior finish materials and colors shall be selected according to the following criteria:

- The exterior building materials shall form a complimentary palette of textures and colors. Warm-tone, approachable materials and colors shall establish the primary palette. Natural stone of hewn, rough cut, flame honed or polished texture; integrally colored synthetic plaster, textured finish; pre-finished metal panels of composite or plate aluminum construction shall constitute the primary exterior wall finishes and accent materials.
- High quality, emphasis on natural materials that demonstrate professional craftsmanship.
- Vandal resistance.
- Contextual response to surrounding architecture.
- Long term durability and ease of maintenance.
- Primary roof material shall be of either single ply sheet roofing or built-up roofing. Standing-seam or glass panel roofing may be used at the building entry canopies and other features.
- Window frames shall be pre-finished (coated) aluminum window systems.
- Paving materials may include exposed aggregate concrete, integrally colored concrete, decorative colored and textured asphalt or cast concrete pavers. Pedestrian pathways within gardens may be stabilized decomposed granite.
- Highly reflective materials, such as mirror finish glazing will not be permitted. See additional design considerations section for bird friendly design guidelines.

Use of materials will further emphasize building entrances. Texture and durability are especially important at the human scale where visitors intimately experience the quality of finishes.

Roof equipment

All roof-mounted equipment, including satellite dish antennas, shall be completely screened from public view with parapets or screen walls of architecturally integrated colors and forms. Roof mounted mechanical equipment may not exceed the height of the screen walls.
Additional Design Considerations

Canopy elements providing shelter for drop-off and pick-up of patients should be architecturally integrated within the total building aesthetic. Canopies can be used to bring emphasis to building entrances and contribute to clarity in wayfinding. All roof-mounted equipment, including satellite dishes, antennas, and mechanical equipment shall be completely screened from public view with parapets or screen walls of architecturally integrated colors and forms. The south of Highway 50 area has grassland and oak savannah, and is likely used as a bird corridor. Bird friendly design strategies will be addressed in the exterior building and lighting design of the Hospital, where large expanses of curtainwall occur. In order to deter bird collisions, highly reflective glass, along with mirrored glass will not be permitted. Fly through conditions where glass provides a clear line of sight to birds will not be permitted. Planning for a bird friendly building may include using UV patterned glass, fritted glass, and low reflectance, opaque glass such as spandrel glass, window films, or solutions applied to interior glass, such as interior window shades, or a combination thereof. Landscaping adjacent to the curtainwall façade shall be low level. Another bird strike mitigation measure will be to specify exterior light fixtures that will shield the light source to minimize glass and light trespass and to facilitate better vision at night for birds.
10 | SITE & BUILDING LIGHTING

Appropriate site and building lighting is critical for establishing a welcoming and safe campus. As with building massing, lighting should address the visitors experience to the campus at both a macro and human scale. Building accent lighting should be used to complement the building forms and materials, and add further emphasis to significant elements such as building entrances. Site lighting should not be overly bright, but should illuminate parking areas, pedestrian pathways, areas of respite, and open plazas, so that these spaces are inviting and safe into the evening hours.

- Free standing parking lot lighting shall be the same throughout the parking areas. Height to be thirty (30) feet maximum.
- Luminance within parking and pedestrian areas shall comply with Folsom Municipal Code requirements.
- Lighting should be appropriately scaled to the building.
- Buildings can be lit with a combination of ground mounted up lighting, architecturally integrated down lighting, and building mounted sconce lighting.
- Color of the lighting should be white and warm, and at building entrances, lighting should flatter skin tones.
11 | SIGN CRITERIA

 Appropriately designed signage and environmental graphics provide a clear, comforting, and welcoming experience to visitors. The application of these signage guidelines is a key component in creating an initial impression which conveys the quality of care, professionalism, and promise of excellence provided at the Folsom Ranch Medical Center.

Sign Types

Exhibit J shows conceptual diagrams of the various primary exterior sign types that may occur on the Medical Center campus. As future brand components evolve, these sign types and graphics may also change. Dignity Health reserves the right to modify onsite signage based on corporate branding efforts, which may change the visual identity system in the future. Below are examples of brand types that may change:

EXAMPLE OF CORPORATE BRAND TYPE

EXAMPLE OF CORPORATE BRAND TYPE

Selection of sign types and placement of signs are dependent on the viewer distance from the sign, rate of motion of the viewer, and critical wayfinding decision points. Distant Read Pylon and Distant Read Skyline sign types are intended to be viewed from Highway 50. Skyline sign types are to reinforce the wayfinding sequence at connector streets. Monument signs are best placed at entry points to the campus. Monument Directional signs are viewed from a vehicle traveling at lower speed within the campus boundaries. Onsite digital informational signage is permitted within these established sign types.
EXHIBIT K: SIGN TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Sided Blade Sign</td>
<td>Post Mounted to Roof Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Directional</td>
<td>Post Mounted to Roof Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Post Directional</td>
<td>Post Mounted to Roof Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline</td>
<td>Post Mounted to Roof Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Post Mounted to Roof Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Type</td>
<td>Sign Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Marks campus entry points. Provides branding and wayfinding information at the campus edge and corners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porte Cochere</td>
<td>Identifies primary entrances to the facility. Used for branding and wayfinding purposes within the campus boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Sign -Pylon</td>
<td>Large scale branding and way-finding targeted toward vehicular traffic on adjacent busy streets and highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Mounted to Roof Canopy</td>
<td>Directional signage marking building entry points for Emergency, Ambulance and specialized services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline</td>
<td>Large scale branding and wayfinding targeted toward vehicular traffic on adjacent busy streets and highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant Read Skyline</td>
<td>Building mounted, monument scale branding signage specifically oriented for long approach viewing such as from a busy street or highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Directional</td>
<td>Provides branding and wayfinding information at the campus edge and within the campus boundaries. Provides specific wayfinding information for individual departments on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Post Directional</td>
<td>Provides branding and wayfinding information within the campus boundaries. Provides specific wayfinding information for individual departments on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Sided Blade Sign</td>
<td>Provides branding and wayfinding information within the campus boundaries for a singular campus department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appropriate scale of signs is dependent on the intended viewing distance.

**Site Pageantry**

Site pageantry may be incorporated with campus signage in order to call attention to events, holidays, and promotions. Pageantry consists of fabric or metal banners fixed to light poles and building facades throughout the campus. Pageantry should be of a consistent branded theme and should be concentrated along primary vehicular and pedestrian pathways.

**Religious Symbols**

Religious symbols in the form of crosses, crucifix, statues, etc. may be integrated within the landscaping and architecture.
Summary

As the project site is located adjacent to Highway 50, the site will have one freestanding freeway pylon sign. The sign area will not exceed 750 square feet. The height is proposed as 80 feet maximum from the nearest highway crown. It may include internal illumination behind the letters and or logos only. Freeway signage will provide visualization of the Medical Center from both east and westbound traffic along Highway 50. Maximum visualization is needed to provide patients and families with a safe wayfinding experience when in a heightened state of emergency or concern traveling at a high rate of speed.

Two Distant Read Skyline freeway signs are proposed in this development and will be located adjacent to and intended to be viewed either westbound or eastbound direction of Highway 50. As the project develops and evolves over phases, the design team will review key lines of sight to determine sign placement on the appropriate buildings per phase. Only one Distant Read Skyline sign will be installed to be visible from each direction of Highway 50 at one building at one time. The intent is to provide a hierarchy of signage, as the buildings are constructed over phases. Therefore the Distant Read Skyline signage will be relocated to the most prominent building as the project evolves.

Distant Read Skyline and Skyline building signs and one Freestanding Pylon sign are proposed for this development, as shown in Exhibit K. The sign locations as shown in Exhibit L are potential locations, with the exact location to be evaluated as project phases progress. As noted in the section below under "Proposed Variances," the design and precise location of Distant Read Skyline and Skyline building signs will be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Commission along with each building design submittal.
Distant Read Skyline at Hospital Building

Distant Read Skyline at Medical Office Building

Distant Read Skyline signage will be provided at either location A or B for each view. As the project develops and evolves over phases, the design team will review key lines of sight to determine actual distant read signage placement.
12 | PUBLIC REALM DESIGN ELEMENTS

In addition to on-site design considerations, the design of the public realm which borders this property must be understood and integrated into the project planning. Guidelines specific to the design of the public realm are included in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Design Guidelines. In particular, this site abuts a “Primary Gateway” and an “Enhanced Intersection.” These particular design elements announce arrival and help to establish the character of the larger plan area and are not calculated in overall sign area square footage for this project. Refer to the guideline document for specific design criteria pertaining to “Primary Gateways” and “Enhanced Intersections.”

Exhibit M indicates the proposed locations for major site signage for the project that is not affixed to a building wall, and therefore does not include Distant Read Skyline and Skyline Sign types.
DISTANT READ PYLON/ FREESTANDING SIGN

MONUMENT SIGN

WALL SIGNAGE NOT SHOWN

EXHIBIT M: CONCEPTUAL MAJOR SITE SIGNAGE PLAN
13 | PROPOSED VARIANCES

The proposed development has the following variances from the FPASP as outlined below. The proposed conditions are noted in bold text, with the corresponding Folsom Municipal Code or FPASP in italics:

- **Building height is proposed as 120’ maximum, exclusive of mechanical roof screens.** *Maximum building height in the FPASP General Commercial Development Standards Table A.11 is 50’ for SP-GC land use.* This variance is requested in order to maximize the site and building efficiency of the project use for a Hospital. Hospitals typically have higher floor to floor dimensions due to interstitial space requirements for mechanical, plumbing, electrical, low voltage and medical gas systems.

- **FAR is proposed as .55 maximum for the overall project site.** *FAR for SP-GC is 0.25 in the FPASP General Commercial Development Standards Table A.11.* This variance is requested in order to maximize the site and building efficiency of the project use for a Hospital. This FAR request supports the development of a Medical Center appropriately sized for the surrounding community needs. The hospital is sized to provide comprehensive services for the area.

- **Signage variances are proposed in this development for Freestanding Pylon, Distant Read Skyline, and Skyline signage.** Distant Read Skyline signage is intended to be viewed from vehicles on Highway 50 and will provide visualization of the Medical Center from both east and westbound freeway traffic. Maximum visualization is required in order to provide patients and families with a safe wayfinding experience as they negotiate traffic at high speeds on the freeway to their destination. Skyline signage at the building exterior wall is requested to orient drivers at Alder Creek Parkway and East Bidwell, as opposed to regional patients and visitors using Highway 50. The Medical Center Distant Read Skyline signage shall be limited to two (2) signs for the Project with a total sign area estimated at 2,000 square feet for the entire site. Placement of signage will be shown on building designs when presented to the Planning Commission for final design approval. For Folsom Ranch Medical Center, multiple wall signs are proposed to include Skyline, Porte Cochere, and Monument sign types. The proposed Skyline, Porte Cochere, and Monument signage is estimated at 1,750 square feet total for the entire site, including both medical office buildings and the hospital. *Folsom Municipal Code Section 17.59.040 Sign regulations state that the maximum sign area is one and a half square feet of signage for each 1 lineal foot of primary building frontage up to a maximum of 150 square feet. Freestanding Pylon, Distant Read Skyline, Skyline, Porte Cochere and Monument signage is proposed to have LED illumination.* *Folsom Municipal Code states that each hospital use is permitted 1 non illuminated wall sign with a maximum sign area of .5 square feet for each 1 lineal foot of primary building frontage up to a maximum sign area...*
of 50 square feet. **Two Distant Read Skyline freeway signs are proposed in this development and will be located adjacent to and intended to be viewed either westbound or eastbound direction of Highway 50. As the project develops and evolves over phases, the design team will review key lines of sight to determine sign placement on the appropriate buildings per phase. Only one Distant Read Skyline sign will be installed to be visible from each direction of Highway 50 at one building at one time. The intent is to provide a hierarchy of signage, as the buildings are constructed over phases. Therefore the Distant Read Skyline signage will be relocated to the most prominent building as the project evolves. Distant Read Skyline signage proposed on the building frontage facing the freeway is proposed to have a letter height of 120 inches. Folsom Municipal Code states that only one additional wall sign is permitted on the building frontage facing the freeway, and that the letter height maximum is 60 inches from a distance of more than 500 feet from the nearest freeway lane. A proposed Freestanding Pylon sign near the freeway will not exceed 750 square feet sign area. This Freestanding Pylon sign is proposed as eighty feet maximum from the crown of the adjacent highway. The additional height is offset by the fact that the site is 6 feet below grade and visibility of other signage may be obscured because the project site is behind the berm of the overpass. Folsom Municipal Code Section 17.59.040 Sign regulations indicate a maximum height of eighteen feet measured from the crown of the adjacent highway. Further detail regarding signage is provided in Sign Criteria, Section 10, of this guideline. These variances are requested in order to highlight the Dignity Health Medical Center as a proud member of the Folsom Ranch community and to accentuate wayfinding to the project site. Size estimates are provided for the Distant Read Skyline and Skyline signage due to the possible addition of future "centers of excellence" that would be highlighted for patient awareness. Both the final placement of signage and the precise size of signage (except for the Freestanding Pylon sign, the size of which is fixed) will be shown on building designs when presented to the Planning Commission for final design approval.

- **Variance proposed to apply Folsom Municipal Code for bicycle parking count calculations.** For Office land use, FPASP 2 spaces per 20 required vehicle parking spaces plus one additional bicycle parking space for every 10 additional vehicle parking spaces is required. Variance is requested due to most patients arriving with a family member in a vehicle. 20 bicycle parking spaces are provided at each medical office building. An additional 16 bicycle parking spaces will be provided at the Hospital.

- **Variance proposed to provide a maximum of 6 loading/unloading spaces to coordinate with Dignity Health's just in time delivery program.** FPASP Table A.14 requires 3 each for office and 3 for hospital for a total of 9 loading/unloading spaces. Variance is requested due to minimized
anticipated volumes and frequencies of truck traffic based on Dignity Health's just in time delivery program. High volumes of deliveries and constant truck traffic are discouraged, as they stress the Hospital system with the need for excessive storage areas. Truck traffic will be limited to off peak hours. 6 loading/unloading spaces, 10' wide x 35' long by 14' high per Folsom Municipal Code are provided at the hospital.
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Amendment No. 2 to First Amended and Restated Development Agreement Relative to Folsom South Specific Plan (Dignity Health)
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
RELATIVE TO FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
(DIGNITY HEALTH)
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO
FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED TIER 1 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
RELATIVE TO FOLSOM SOUTH SPECIFIC PLAN
(DIGNITY HEALTH)

This Amendment No. 2 to First Amended and Restated Development Agreement
("Amendment No. 2") is entered into this ___ day of __________, 2021, by and between
the City of Folsom ("City") and Dignity Health, a California nonprofit public benefit
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 and Amendment No. 1 to the Restated
Development Agreement, described below between the Predecessor in Interest to
Landowner and the City.

RECITALS

A. Restated Development Agreement and Amendments Thereto. The City
and Landowner’s predecessor in interest Eagle Commercial Partners, LLC (referred to
herein as the “Predecessor in Interest”) 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 0517 (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. On November 12,
2015, Eagle Commercial Partners, LLC and the City entered into Amendment No. 1 to
First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement Relative to the Folsom
South Specific Plan, recorded on January 29, 2016, in the Official Records of the
County Recorder of Sacramento County in Book 0160129, Page No. 0385
("Amendment No. 1"). The Restated Development Agreement and Amendment No. 1
are collectively referred to herein as the “Development Agreement.”

B. Conveyance of Property to Landowner and Assignment of Development
Agreement. Predecessor in Interest conveyed the Property to its affiliate, Enclave at
Folsom Ranch, LLC (“Predecessor Affiliate”) which in turn conveyed the Property
identified by legal description on Exhibit A-1 and depicted on Exhibit A-2 to Landowner
on June 5, 2020. Concurrently with such conveyance, Predecessor in Interest entered
into an Assignment and Assumption Agreement Relative to The Folsom South Specific
Plan Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement, pursuant to a form
approved and required by the City, recorded on June 5, 2020, in the Official Records of
the County Recorder of Sacramento County as Document Number 202006050658
(“Assignment and Assumption Agreement”). The Assignment and Assumption
Agreement transferred all rights, title, interest, burdens and obligations of the
Predecessor in Interest under the Development Agreement with respect to the Property to Landowner.

C. Prior City Determinations and Approvals Relative to the Property. The Property is identified as “Parcel 1” on a Parcel Map approved by the City Planning Commission on December 4, 2019 (PN 19-389). Parcel 1 is one of four parcels created by the subdivision of the property identified as Parcel 85a in the Specific Plan. The Final Parcel Map including Parcel 1 was approved by the City Council and thereafter filed for record on May 22, 2020 in Book 240, Page 13 of Parcel Maps, Sacramento County. Prior to approval of the subdivision of Parcel 85a, on March 17, 2020, the Community Development Director for the City issued approval of a Minor Administrative Modification (“MAM”) associated with Parcels 61, 77, 78, and 85A (PN 20-003). The MAM provided for the transfer of certain residential units and gross square footage within the four parcels and remains in effect. The Community Development Director thereafter issued a second letter on April 1, 2020, confirming that Table A-7 of the Specific Plan contained a clerical error regarding allowed land uses for General Commercial (GC) and Regional Commercial (RC) for several parcels, including Parcel 85A (hereafter the “Table A-7 Correction”). The allowed land uses in the Table A-7 Correction remain in effect.

D. Subsequent Entitlements. On [ ], the City Planning Commission, in a duly noticed and conducted public hearing, approved the Subsequent Entitlements for the Development of the Property as follows:

1. Planned Development Permit (including the Site Improvements and all Amendments to the Planned Development Permit submitted and considered as of the date of the hearing).

2. Planned Development Guidelines.


4. Site Plan, as depicted on Exhibit B (Except parcels marked “Future Multifamily Housing” and “Future Hotel.” Other than the Site Improvements, development on Parcels marked “Future Multifamily Housing” and “Future Hotel” (Parcels 2-4 on Exhibit A-2) are not part of the Subsequent Entitlements and shall not be vested).

The Planning Commission further recommended for approval by the City Council of this Amendment No. 2 to the Development Agreement.

E. Purpose of Amendment; Findings Related to Medical Center. Landowner is processing Subsequent Entitlements for the Development of the Property for comprehensive medical uses, specifically two medical office buildings, an acute care hospital and related structures (as further defined in Section 1.3 of this Amendment No. Amendment No. 2 to Restated DA -Dignity Health - Pg. 2

[SAC-214573] 60.765-3375345.4
2 and hereafter the “Medical Center”). Landowner has requested that the Subsequent Entitlements, including the Conditions of Approval related thereto, as approved by the City, be included in the definition of Entitlements as that term is used throughout the Development Agreement, pursuant to Section 1.5.3 of the Development Agreement. The City and Landowner also intend to amend certain provisions of the Development Agreement to allow for flexibility in the approval of and term for the Subsequent Entitlements, specifically in relation to the development of a Medical Center. The City Council has determined that flexibility is required for the Subsequent Entitlements because development of the Medical Center presents significant benefits to the City and the region and unique characteristics in the buildout of the Medical Center buildings and related structures, as follows:

1. Development of the Medical Center will occur over a long period of time, with a phased timeline for construction and potential adjustments to physical structures as medical delivery systems change over time;

2. The California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (“OSHPD”) is required to approve the hospital building design which may result in required changes to the design of the Medical Center buildings and related structures;

3. The Medical Center will generate significant employment and other economic benefits to the City;

4. The Medical Center will provide needed expansion of access to health care services for the City and other jurisdictions in the region;

5. A significant capital investment is required for the Medical Center buildings and related structures; and

6. The status of Landowner as a nonprofit public benefit corporation.

F. Property. The subject of this Amendment No. 2 is the Development of the Property, as defined in Section 1.3. Landowner owns the Property and represents that all persons holding legal or equitable interests in the Property shall be bound by this Amendment No. 2 and the Development Agreement.

G. Hearings. On ____________, 2021, 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. 2 and recommended that the City Council approve this Amendment No. 2 to the Development Agreement. On ____________, 2021, the City Council, in a duly noticed and conducted public hearing, conducted the first reading of Ordinance No. __________ and approved this Amendment No. 2, and thereafter conducted the second reading of Ordinance No. __________ at a duly
noticed regular meeting of the City Council on ____________, 2021 and adopted the Ordinance approving this Amendment No. 2.

H. Environmental Review. On ____________, 2021, the Planning Commission considered the Environmental Checklist and Addendum Dignity Health Folsom Ranch Medical Center (the "Addendum") to the Specific Plan EIR/EIS for Development of the Property consistent with the Specific Plan. An Initial Study prepared in support of the Addendum identified mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts to less than significant, and those mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project and the Subsequent Entitlements, as reflected by the findings adopted by the Planning Commission in connection with the approval of the Subsequent Entitlements and the City Council's consideration, adoption of findings, and approval of this Amendment No. 2.

I. No New Impacts Associated with Approval of Amendment. The City Council has determined that the adoption of this Amendment No. 2 involves no new impacts not considered in the Specific Plan EIR, the Previous Environmental Analyses listed in Section 1.2 of the Addendum, and the Addendum; therefore, no further environmental documents relating to the adoption of this Amendment No. 2 are required.

J. Consistency with General Plan and Specific Plan. Having duly examined and considered this Amendment No. 2, the City finds and declares that this Amendment No. 2 is consistent with the General Plan and the Specific Plan.

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 agree to hereby amend the Development Agreement as follows:

AMENDMENTS

1. Incorporation of Recitals. The Recitals above are true and correct and constitute enforceable provisions of this Amendment No. 2.

2. Definition and Section 1.5.3 – Subsequent Entitlements. The term "Subsequent Entitlements" in the Definitions Section of the Restated Development Agreement and also referenced in Section 1.5.3 of the Restated Development Agreement and later updated by Amendment No. 1 is amended to include the following:

   a. The MAM approved by the Community Development Director on March 17, 2020.

   b. The Table A-7 Correction issued by the Community Development Director on April 1, 2020.
c. The Planned Development Permit (including the Site Plan for Parcel 1 and all amendments to the Planned Development Permit and Planned Development Guidelines); the Conditional Use Permit; the Planned Development Guidelines and this Amendment No. 2 approved by the Planning Commission and the City Council on [insert date].

d. Landowner acknowledges and agrees that, in addition to design features described in the Planned Development Guidelines and approved by the Planning Commission as described in Recital D, supplementary design detail for individual buildings, related structures and the heliport will be presented to the City as required by the Specific Plan and the Folsom Municipal Code by Landowner for review and approval by the City. As this additional design detail is presented to the City, Landowner shall prepare Design Guidelines for the Medical Center for review and approval by the City, which may be updated as phases of Development of the Project continue. Upon approval of the Design Guidelines by the City (or sections thereof being amended and approved by the City from time to time), such Design Guidelines shall be a Subsequent Entitlement without the necessity of further amendment to this Amendment No. 2 or the Development Agreement.

3. **Section 1.3 – Definitions.** The following Definitions are added:

“Adopting Ordinance” means Ordinance No. _____, dated _____, approving this Amendment No. 2.

“Addendum” means the Environmental Checklist and Addendum, Dignity Health Folsom Ranch Medical Center, dated [insert date of document].

“Conditional Use Permit” means the Conditional Use Permit approved by the City pertaining to the Project.

“Design Guidelines” means the design guidelines for the Medical Center approved by the City, and thereafter to be applied by the City to guide and evaluate the design of the Medical Center.

“Effective Date” means the date which is thirty (30) calendar days after the date of the Ordinance approving this Amendment No. 2.

“Environmental Analysis” means the Addendum and the Previous Environmental Analyses listed in Section 1.2 of the Addendum.

“Landowner” means Dignity Health, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation.
“Planned Development Permit” and “Planned Development Guidelines” include the Planned Development Permit and Planned Development Guidelines approved by the Planning Commission pertaining to the Project.

“Medical Center” means the buildings and related structures, including but not limited to the hospital and two medical office buildings, in which health care, research, staff support and ancillary services are provided (including the heliport) both temporary or permanent buildings or structures, and whether considered supportive or ancillary that are identified on the Planned Development Permit and described in the Planned Development Guidelines and the Conditional Use Permit.

“Predecessor in Interest” shall mean the prior owner of the Property and party to the Restated Development Agreement and Amendment No. 1, i.e., Eagle Commercial Partners, LLC.

“Predecessor Affiliate” shall mean the affiliate of Predecessor in Interest, Enclave at Folsom Ranch, LLC.

“Project” means development of the Medical Center and Site Improvements included in the Planned Development Permit consistent with the Development Agreement and the Subsequent Entitlements.

“Property” means the land identified by legal description on Exhibit A-1 and depicted on Exhibit A-2.

“Site Improvements” means the grading, infrastructure and off-site improvements identified in the Planned Development Permit Guidelines.

“Square Footage” for purposes of the Medical Center shall mean “Occupied Square Footage,” as that term is defined and described in the Planned Development Permit and the Planned Development Guidelines, as distinct from building gross square footage.

“Subsequent Entitlements” shall have the amended definition set forth in paragraph 2, subsections (a)-(d), inclusive, of this Amendment No. 2.

“Technical Memorandum” shall mean the PA Parcel 85A Zone Supplemental Analysis dated April 28, 2021 prepared in conjunction with the Environmental Analysis that determined the appropriate water infrastructure connection for water services to the Property.

“Traffic Study” means the traffic analysis prepared and included in the Addendum titled Final Local Transportation Analysis & CEQA Impact Study, dated April 23, 2021 and the Local Transportation Analysis & CEQA Impact Study Errata dated April 29, 2021.
"Vested Rights" means the rights to Develop the Property consistent with the terms and provisions of the Restated Development Agreement, Amendment No. 1, this Amendment No. 2 and the provisions of the Subsequent Entitlements.

4. **Section 1.4.1 – Commencement, Extension, Expiration.** In light of the unique circumstances identified in Recital E of this Amendment No. 2, the Term of the Development Agreement and this Amendment No. 2 are extended to June 30, 2056, or until 530,000 occupied square feet has been built out, whichever is later. All other provisions of Section 1.4.1 of the Restated Development Agreement remain in full force and effect. Landowner may request an additional extension pursuant to Section 1.4.1 of the Restated Development Agreement.

5. **Section 1.6 – Changes to the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance** in Amendment No. 1 is hereby revised to read as follows: “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. Both Parties acknowledge that the Project is for medical uses and not residential housing. However, in light of the allowed uses under the Specific Plan, City has requested that Landowner acknowledge, and Landowner hereby acknowledges, that there is no vested right to use Second Dwelling Units as an 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. Landowner further acknowledges that the State adopted amendments to Section 65850 of the California Government Code (specifically Section 65850(g)), effective January 1, 2018, to allow for the implementation of inclusionary housing requirements in residential rental units, upon adoption of an ordinance by the City. The Landowner is not currently contemplating any residential rental projects within the Property; however, in the event the City amends its Inclusionary Housing Ordinance with respect to rental housing pursuant to Section 65850(g), Landowner (or a successor in interest) agrees that the Property shall be subject to said City Ordinance, as amended, should any residential rental project be proposed within the Property. Other than the elimination of the "granny flat" option and the possible future application of an inclusionary housing requirement on residential rental properties (upon the conditions stated herein), 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.”

6. **Section 2.1 – Permitted Uses.** The permitted uses of the Property, the density and intensity of use, the maximum height and size of proposed buildings and related structures, set backs, Square Footage (as defined in Section 1.3 and calculated based on Occupied Square Footage and not building gross square footage), heliport location and approach, all signage approved in the Subsequent Entitlements (inclusive of spiritual symbolism), provisions for reservation or dedication of land for public purposes and location of public utilities and public improvements shall be those set forth
in the Entitlements, the Subsequent Entitlements, the Development Agreement and this Amendment No. 2. The permitted uses of the Property shall also include the types of buildings and related structures within the definition of Medical Center and as identified in the Subsequent Entitlements that are ancillary to the development of the Medical Center or the provision of medical services, including but not limited to concrete pads, trailers and structures or facilities that may be necessary for emergency (e.g., pandemic) services (including, but not limited to, tents), as long as they are identified in the Site Plan attached hereto as Exhibit B. Any temporary structures that are not identified in the Site Plan shall be processed through City administrative processes, with recognition given to the expedited review that may be necessary for temporary structures to address emergency purposes (including but not limited to pandemics).

7. **Section 2.2 - Vested Rights.** The City agrees that, except as otherwise provided in and as may be amended in accordance with the Exceptions to Vested Rights set forth in Section 2.2.3 of the Restated Development Agreement, Amendment No. 1, and this Amendment No. 2, the City is granting, and grants herewith, Vested Rights to Development for the Term of this Amendment No. 2 in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth herein. The City acknowledges that the rights vested by the Restated Development Agreement, Amendment No. 1 and this Amendment No. 2 include the land uses, utility connections and water (subject to the provisions of Sections 4.6 of the Restated Agreement and Section 4.6.1 of this Amendment No. 2), approximate acreages and Site Plan for the Property as shown and described in Exhibits A-2 and B attached hereto. Nothing in this Amendment No. 2 shall impair or affect the rights of Landowner under a vesting tentative map or the City's rights to condition such maps. (Govt. Code Sec. 66498.1, et seq.)

Such uses shall be developed in accordance with the Subsequent Entitlements, as the Subsequent Entitlements are described in Section 1.5.3 of this Amendment No. 2 and as approved by the City on the Effective Date.

**Section 2.2.1 – Vested Provisions of the PFFP.** No changes.

**Section 2.2.2 - Vested Provisions of the Specific Plan.** In addition to the provisions of Section 2.2.2(A)-(C) of the Restated Development Agreement, as modified by Amendment No. 1, the following shall apply to the Property:

D. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2.2.2(C) of Amendment No. 1, the street width and roadway sections for McCarthy Way and Mercy Way as approved in the Planned Development Permit and the Planned Development Guidelines, as well as all internal road widths for the Medical Center shall be vested for the Term of this Amendment No. 2, except that the City reserves all rights to add turn lanes, deceleration tapers and other necessary traffic improvements to accommodate safe vehicular access to the Medical Center in the future that have been analyzed and approved

Amendment No. 2 to Restated DA -Dignity Health - Pg. 8
in the Traffic Study or in a technical traffic analysis approved by the Planning Commission or City Council in connection with another project (either public or private).

E. The Specific Plan identifies a route for Bus Rapid Transit ("BRT"), which as of the Effective Date would be constructed and operated by Sacramento Regional Transit ("Sac RT"). The route identified for BRT has been considered in the Traffic Study, and the Subsequent Entitlements, including the Conditions of Approval, take into account the location for BRT identified in the Specific Plan. If Sac RT proposes any modifications to the location of BRT or location of a bus stop on the Property, the City agrees to (a) notify Landowner, (b) work in good faith with Landowner on any modifications to the location of BRT or a bus stop that may impact the Medical Center, and (c) notify Sac RT that the Subsequent Entitlements are vested pursuant to the terms of this Amendment No. 2.

**Sections 2.2.3 – 2.2.8 Exceptions to Vested Rights.** No changes, except for the addition of Section 2.2.9 as an Exception to Vested Rights, as follows:

**Section 2.2.9 – Intersection Controls at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way.** The Planned Development Permit proposes a non-standard traffic signal (i.e., 700-feet signal spacing) at the left turn access to the Medical Center at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way as depicted on Exhibit C to this Amendment No. 2. The Environmental Analysis concluded, based on the Traffic Study, that no significant environmental impacts would result from 700-foot signal spacing proposed by Landowner for a traffic signal at this intersection, although this spacing does not meet City design standards and is not reflected in the Specific Plan. City acknowledges that Landowner proposes to install the proposed signal concurrent with development of Phase 4 (second addition of 100 beds) of Project development and no sooner (unless traffic conditions require earlier installation), and City requires an updated analysis prior to final approval of installation of the traffic signal to identify any impacts to the Specific Plan transportation system. Subject to the specific requirements of Condition of Approval No. [ ], Landowner will prepare a supplemental traffic study no later than one year before the proposed installation of the traffic signal for City review and evaluation. The supplemental traffic study shall evaluate the traffic impacts associated with the installation of a traffic signal at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way. If the supplemental traffic study concludes that there is no significant traffic operational impact, the traffic signal may be installed by Landowner pursuant to the Conditions of Approval and consistent with technical specifications as approved by the City Engineer. For purposes of this section, "traffic operational impact" shall mean and include an environmental impact under CEQA, a safety impact, an impact to BRT, or an impact that results in unacceptable delays to an adjacent street. If the Traffic Study identifies any significant traffic operational impacts that can be mitigated and the
Landowner desires to install the traffic signal, the City will identify the required mitigation and the Landowner shall install the traffic signal along with the required mitigation. In the event the supplemental traffic study identifies any significant traffic operational impact that cannot be mitigated, the City will advise the Landowner and the traffic signal shall not be installed, and the intersection configuration approved as part of the Subsequent Entitlements shall remain in place. Any other modifications proposed by Landowner shall be subject to appropriate environmental review, City approval, and compliance with applicable City standards. If City determines that the left turn access to the Medical Center at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way must be discontinued for any reason, City shall (a) advise Landowner of the City's intention to discontinue access, (b) provide Landowner with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the City's determination to discontinue access, including an appeal to the City Council, and (c) consider the impact on safe and efficient public access to the hospital and emergency services, including any evidence Landowner may provide to City with respect to increased driving times.

**Section 2.2.10 – Class 1 Bicycle Path.** Landowner acknowledges that it is responsible for rough grading and installation of the necessary retaining wall at its sole cost and expense to accommodate the Class 1 Bicycle Path on the northern portion of the Property as shown in Figure 7.32 of the Specific Plan, and that said work shall be completed prior to the issuance of a building permit on the second expansion of the hospital, identified as Phase 4 and is anticipated to occur in approximately 2034. The City agrees that the design of the Class 1 Bicycle Path shall impact no more than five (5) parking spaces, and further that Landowner shall be relieved of the aforementioned obligation should the City amend the Specific Plan to relocate the Class 1 Bicycle Path, or if the City shall not have identified funding for construction of said the Class 1 Bicycle Path across the Property and the connection to East Bidwell Street at the time of issuance of a building permit on the second expansion of the hospital for Phase 4. For purpose of this section, “identified funding” shall mean either: (1) the Class 1 Bicycle Path is incorporated into a subsequent project to widen the East Bidwell Overcrossing structure of US Highway 50 or (2) the submission or application for federal, state or other grants which, together with the City's available matching funds, would be sufficient to construct the Class 1 Bicycle Path across the Property and the connection to East Bidwell Street.

8. **Section 3.5 – EIR Mitigation Measures.** Notwithstanding any other provision in the Restated Development Agreement or Amendment No. 1, as amended hereby, as and when Landowner elects to Develop the Property, or any portion of the Property, Landowner shall be bound by, and shall perform, or cause to be performed, all mitigation measures contained in the Specific Plan EIR/EIS, the Addendum, the Backbone Infrastructure IS/MND, and any environmental mitigation measures referenced therein applicable to the Development of the Property. The City acknowledges that Landowner has entered into a contractual agreement with
Predecessor’s Affiliate, which requires that the Site Improvements and related mitigation measures identified in Exhibit D attached hereto shall be completed by the Predecessor’s Affiliate. Landowner acknowledges that the Site Improvements are Conditions of Approval and, as such, are incorporated into the Subsequent Entitlements and are required for completion pursuant to the timing identified in the Conditions of Approval.

9. **Additions to Development Agreement.** Landowner acknowledges and confirms the Additions to Restated Development Agreement provided for in Section 2 of Amendment No. 1. The following Sections are also added to the Development Agreement as follows:

a. **Section 3.9.2.1 - Phasing of In-Tract Improvements.** The City acknowledges that the Medical Center will be constructed in numerous phases, with the timing and order of phases to be at the discretion of Landowner. The required in-tract improvements for development of the Medical Center shall be phased along with the specific building phases that trigger the need for in-tract improvements, as provided for in the Conditions of Approval for the Subsequent Entitlements.

b. **Section 3.9.3 – Design Review.** Landowner has provided some information related to design of the Medical Center in the Planned Development Guidelines, but acknowledges that additional design review for the two medical office buildings and the hospital is required, and that Landowner shall submit to the City for review and approval by the Planning Commission the design of the buildings and related structures that comprise the medical office buildings and/or hospital prior to construction of any permanent building. The approved building design(s) may be phased, but each phase shall be incorporated into the Design Guidelines that govern the design of the Medical Center.

c. **Section 4.1.1 – City Cooperation in Connection with State OSHPD Approval of Hospital Building Design and Review by Other Agencies.** In addition to the requirements of good faith cooperation and other provisions of Section 4.1 of the Development Agreement, the City acknowledges that Landowner will be required to obtain approval of the design of the hospital building by State OSHPD and will also be required to obtain approvals for components of the Medical Center (including but not limited to the heliport) from Caltrans, Sacramento County and other federal, state or regional agencies. This approval may result in required changes to, among other things, building structure, fenestration, awnings, set backs, and other physical features of the hospital building and/or layout of the Project on the Property. The City shall evaluate and process any such modifications pursuant to the MAM procedure in the Specific Plan if such modification qualifies to be processed through the MAM procedure, but reserves the right to process any such changes required by such agencies through the Planning Commission and/or the City Council, with appropriate notification to the approval body of the mandatory requirements imposed by such agencies.
d. **Section 4.6.1 – Water Supply.** The City, through approval of the Subsequent Entitlements, has made a finding pursuant to Folsom Municipal Code section 17.38.100(D) of the “availability of necessary public facilities including, but not limited to, water, sewage and drainage and the adequacy of the provision which the development makes for the furnishing of such facilities.” While the City retains the ability pursuant to Section 4.6 of the Restated Development Agreement to “address water shortages on a citywide basis,” the City acknowledges Landowner’s reliance upon the finding of the availability of necessary water to serve the Medical Center, as confirmed in the Addendum for the Project. The City based this determination upon the technical analysis supporting the Addendum regarding water demand for the Project and the conclusion from this technical analysis that the increased water demand estimated at 126 acre feet per year for the Project would remain within the 5,600 acre-feet per year available for the Specific Plan. A graphic included in the Addendum depicting the water supply for the Project is attached hereto as Exhibit E. City acknowledges that the estimate of water supply for the Project is now included in the baseline analysis of water usage for the Specific Plan. The City further acknowledges that Landowner will provide essential medical services throughout the Medical Center and that, in the event of a water shortage, the City will take into account the water requirements for essential medical services in any future action that may be necessary to address water shortages. Any disruption in water supply imposed by the State or the City that prevents Landowner from constructing any portion of the Medical Center shall provide a basis for an extension to the Term of this Amendment No. 2 for the same period that such disruption in water supply exists, subject to approval by the City Council.

e. **Section 4.6.2 – Water Infrastructure.** The City, through approval of the Subsequent Entitlements and consideration of a Technical Memorandum titled “PA Parcel 85A Zone Supplemental Analysis” dated April 28, 2021, provided in support of the Addendum, has determined that the water infrastructure for the Medical Center will be provided through “Zone 4,” as that Zone is identified in Figure 12.1 of the Specific Plan, and the landowner shall pay all costs and expenses for piping, and tank size expansion from 2 million gallons to 2.6 million gallons, and construction to connect water from Zone 4 to the Medical Center. On a temporary basis, until the completion of the Zone 4 infrastructure, the water infrastructure for the Medical Center will be provided through Zone 5, as that Zone is identified in Figure 12.1 of the Specific Plan. Landowner bears all costs and expenses to connect water from Zone 5 to the Medical Center. Unless improvements or connections to Zone 4 are solely attributable to the hospital uses included in the Project, Landowner shall only be required to provide a fair-share contribution towards the construction of the Zone 4 infrastructure and may elect to participate in any special assessment/special tax funding mechanisms that are established by the City. Landowner shall coordinate with developers of other projects that also use Zone 4 infrastructure to determine the amounts of their respective fair share contribution toward Zone 4 infrastructure.
f. **Section 4.10 – Commencement of Construction and Term of Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit.** In light of the extended Term of this Amendment No. 2, the City agrees that the provisions of Folsom Municipal Code sections 17.38.110 and 17.60.060 related to expiration, revocation or abandonment of a Planned Development Permit or a Conditional Use Permit shall have no effect, and that the term of the Planned Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit are equal to the Term of this Amendment No. 2.

g. **Section 4.11 – Maintenance of Landscaping Frontage, Primary Gateway and Street Lights on Public Streets.** Subject to receipt of funding through a mutually agreeable financing mechanism, the City agrees to maintain the frontage landscaping improvements identified on Exhibit F and the streetlights on McCarthy Way and East Bidwell Street along frontage of the Property as identified on Exhibit F. Landowner acknowledges the identification of a “Primary Gateway” on Figure 2.2 of the Folsom Plan Area Community Design Guidelines and as further described in Section 2.2.1 of that document. City acknowledges that the installation of the Primary Gateway and maintenance of the Primary Gateway is included as an amenity in the Folsom Plan Area Community Design Guidelines and, as such, is not an individual obligation assigned to Landowner. City shall not require Landowner to bear more than a fair share of the cost of such design, installation and maintenance, and Landowner agrees to coordinate with developers of other projects in the Specific Plan to determine the amounts of their respective fair share contribution toward the design, installation and maintenance of the Primary Gateway. Notwithstanding the foregoing, City shall not be responsible for any costs to design, install, or maintain said Primary Gateway.

10. **Effect of Amendment.** This Amendment No. 2 amends, but does not replace or supersede, the Restated Development Agreement and Amendment No. 1. In the event of any conflict, the language of this Amendment No. 2 shall be controlling in all events or circumstances. Except as modified hereby, all other terms and provisions of the Restated Development Agreement and Amendment No. 1 shall remain in full force and effect.

11. **Section 7.8 – Notices.** All notices required by the Development Agreement or this Amendment No. 2 as such requirements relate to the Property or the Subsequent Entitlements, or the enabling legislation or the procedure adopted pursuant to Government Code section 65865 shall be as provided for in Section 7.5 of the Development Agreement, with the substitution for Landowner as follows:

CommonSpirit Health  
3200 N. Central Avenue, 23rd Floor  
Phoenix, AZ 85012  
Attention: System Senior Vice President, National Real Estate Services

With copies to:
CommonSpirit Health
3400 Data Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Attention: National Real Estate Services

And

CommonSpirit Health
3200 N. Central Avenue, 23rd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85012
Attention: Legal Team

12. **Form of Amendment – Execution in Counterparts.** This Amendment No. 2 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 Amendment No. 2 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 ____, 2021.

CITY:
CITY OF FOLSOM
a municipal corporation

Michael Kozlowski, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:
Elaine Andersen, City Manager

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Steven Wang, City Attorney

ATTEST:
Christa Freemantle, City Clerk
[Notary Pages to be Added]

LANDOWNER:
DIGNITY HEALTH
a California nonprofit public benefit corporation

By: ______________________
Its: ______________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Martha Clark Lofgren, Brewer Lofgren LLP
EXHIBIT LIST

A-1  Legal Description of the Property
A-2  Depiction of Parcel 1 on Map
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E    Project Water Supply
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EXHIBIT A-1

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Situated in the City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, State of California and more particularly described as follows:


APN: 072-3190-046 (portion)
EXHIBIT B - SITE PLAN

Legend Follows on Next Page

[SAC-214573]
EXHIBIT B
SITE PLAN, CONTINUED

PHASE LEGEND
- PHASE 1
- FUTURE PHASE

CIRCULATION PATHS
- FIRE ACCESS
- SERVICES / MATERIALS
- ED WALK-IN
- AMBULANCE
- VISITORS / PATIENT
- EMPLOYEES

PROJECT INFORMATION
FUTURE: Acute Care Hospital = 400,000 SQFT
Medical Office Building = 130,000 SQFT

FUTURE TOTAL SQFT: 530,000 SQFT (OCCUPIED)
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ACREAGE: 27.44 acres
OVERALL SITE ACREAGE: 31 acres
TOTAL INPATIENT BEDS: 300+ beds
PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT = 120' (6 LEVELS)
PROPOSED MAX FAR: .55

EXHIBIT B – SITE PLAN LEGEND
EXHIBIT D
SITE IMPROVEMENTS AND MITIGATION
MEASURES TO BE COMPLETED BY
PREDECESSOR’S AFFILIATE

1. Mass grading of Parcel 85A and adjacent roadways resulting in contour graded developable parcels and subgrade along roadway alignments.

2. Rough grading of a portion of Hydromodification Basin #8 (HMB#8) including the access road along the Savannah Parkway alignment and perimeter of the basin.

3. Rough Grading of a storm drain outfall swale from the western terminus of Alder Creek Parkway to the existing downstream waterway.

4. Excavation at a borrow site west of East Bidwell.

5. Roadway and Utility improvements along East Bidwell, Alder Creek Parkway, Westwood Drive, Placerville Road, McCarthy Drive and Mercy Way, including storm drain, sanitary sewer, potable and non-potable water, and dry utility infrastructure.

6. HMB#8 improvements including a paved access road to East Bidwell and basin outlet control structure and spillway.

[Reference to Mitigation Measures Pending]
EXHIBIT E
PROJECT WATER SUPPLY, INCLUDING PARCEL 1 OF PARCEL 85A

Folsom Plan Area
Folsom Ranch Medical Center
Potable Water Demand Chart

Water Supply Agreement - 5,600 AFY
EXHIBIT F

STREET LIGHTING AND LANDSCAPING FRONTAGE

△ 1 PRIMARY GATEWAY BY OTHERS (MAINTENANCE TO BE ADDRESSED BY OWNER'S GROUP)
- 4 MONUMENT SIGN (LANDOWNER RESPONSIBILITY)
- 12 STREET LIGHTING (MAINTENANCE TO BE ADDRESSED BY SEPARATE AGREEMENT)
- 12 FLOOD LIGHTING FOR SITE SIGNAGE (LANDOWNER RESPONSIBILITY)
- 32 LIGHT POLE / AREA LIGHT (LANDOWNER RESPONSIBILITY)

LANDSCAPE AREA = TBD (MAINTENANCE TO BE ADDRESSED BY SEPARATE AGREEMENT)

ENHANCED INTERSECTION (MAINTENANCE TO BE ADDRESSED BY SEPARATE AGREEMENT)

NOTE: PLANT TYPES AND QUANTITIES ARE SHOWN IN THE PD GUIDELINES
Attachment 17

Site Photographs
Attachment 18

City Memorandum Regarding Folsom Ranch Medical Center Site Access
Dated September 30, 2020
To: Pam Johns, Community Development Director
From: Dave Nugen, Public Works Director
Date: September 30, 2020
Subject: Dignity Health Project site access (Alder Creek/McCarthry signal)

Over the past few months our staff has had the opportunity to work with the Dignity team to evaluate their request for a traffic signal at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and the future McCarthy Way. While we appreciate the efforts that have been put forth to evaluate the signal, based on the limited information available at this time we remain extremely concerned with the addition of a signal at this location. Given the current level of development in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) a traffic signal at this location seems premature and could significantly limit our opportunities to operate our signal system in an efficient manner. While we are not completely foreclosed on the concept of a signal at this location, we would advise that either the signal could be conditionally approved based on a longer-term buildout of the FPASP, or that other forms of traffic control be considered and evaluated at this location, such as a roundabout.

Background

Our concerns are based on several factors, generally having to do with the timing of the signal with respect to development in the FPASP, deviating from normal traffic signal design standards, and the concessions that would have to be made in order to accommodate a signal at the requested location. The following bullet points are intended to summarize our concerns.

1. Timing of this development with respect to land use growth and backbone transportation infrastructure in FPASP
   - East Bidwell Street will carry the majority traffic originating in, or passing through the FPASP until the Empire Ranch interchange, Oak Avenue interchange, and Rowberry overcrossing are constructed; this condition will
likely exist for several years due to a lack of funding to complete those major capital projects

- The Capital Southeast Connector will be constructed as a four-lane expressway from Prairie City to East Bidwell by 2022; the remaining portion from East Bidwell to the El Dorado County line will not be a high funding priority for the foreseeable future, therefore East Bidwell Street will function as the de facto eastern end of the Connector for several years, adding more traffic to the corridor

- It is too early in the FPASP development to make such significant changes to the planned traffic signal system without a full understanding of how traffic will flow through this area until the FPASP approaches buildout conditions

- To date the traffic modeling prepared by the applicant's traffic consultant has focused on the immediate area surrounding Alder Creek/McCarthy; staff has not yet seen any detailed analysis of the project impacts on the surrounding transportation network, including the traffic signals along the East Bidwell corridor (including the freeway ramps and north of 50), and the Alder Creek corridor (from Empire Ranch Rd to Prairie City Rd)

2. Design Standards and Signal Operations

- Standard traffic signal spacing is one signal per every quarter mile (about 1,300 feet) to minimize the chances of one signal's operations (queueing, delay) negatively impacting an adjacent signals and intersections

- The Dignity proposal would result in signal spacing of only 600 feet on Alder Creek between Westwood and East Bidwell

- According to Community Development Department staff, they have been approached by the developers on the other side of East Bidwell who are also asking the City to consider sub-standard signal spacing, which would result in sub-standard signal spacing on both sides of the East Bidwell corridor

- Sub-standard signal spacing can be allowed in some cases, such as in the Central Business District or Historic District, but those areas will not be carrying the same volume of traffic that we can expect within a quarter mile of the freeway.

- The Shops project, located in the southeast corner of East Bidwell/Alder Creek has been approved with two, right-turn only driveways on Alder Creek Parkway, just east of East Bidwell Street. Staff is concerned that, if a signal is approved at Alder Creek/McCarthy, that traffic exiting those driveways (including gas
trucks from the approved gas station in the Shops), would attempt to cross several lanes of Alder Creek Parkway to make a u-turn at McCarthy in order to travel towards East Bidwell Street. Due to the inadequate signal spacing, this movement would be a potential safety concern. Staff would prefer that traffic performing this movement should do it at the Westwood/Alder Creek signal in order to have adequate room to safely cross the eastbound lanes in order to perform a u-turn movement.

- In order to accommodate the turn pocket length for the eastbound left at McCarthy, the applicant proposes to limit the westbound left at the East Bidwell intersection to 150 feet of storage, which is less than our preferred standard (250 to 300 feet); this increases the potential to have traffic queues extending out of that turn pocket and blocking through lane access. There is also the potential safety concern of traffic traveling at the posted speed limit on Alder Creek not having sufficient stopping distance entering the turn pocket depending on the length of the left turn queue (which hasn't been noted in any memos provided by the consultant).

- The consultant has suggested that the Alder Creek/McCarthy signal could work if it is synchronized/coordinated with the East Bidwell/Alder Creek signal. If this coordination is necessary in order to make the McCarthy signal work, then this may create an unacceptable concession for us to make as it may limit our abilities to coordinate or time other signals along the East Bidwell corridor.

- We are currently in the process of upgrading/modernizing our traffic signal controllers to create “Smart” corridors, and this equipment will be the standard for all new traffic signals in the FPASP; however we do not believe that “smart” signal technology alone will be able to manage the traffic congestion and delay that we are anticipating along the East Bidwell corridor.

3. Impacts to the future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system in the FPASP
- The master plan currently shows the BRT route along Alder Creek Parkway between Westwood and East Bidwell and it is assumed that there would be a bus stop in that segment.
- The cross sections in the adopted FPASP for both Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive include dedicated BRT lanes in the median, and therefore the bus stops would also be located in the median.
In order to accommodate the required left turn storage for a signal at Alder Creek/McCarthy, the eastbound BRT would have to be moved to the shoulder and the station out of the median; this would also impact the BRT operation to the west (where the BRT would have to transition out of the median) and to the east (where BRT would have to transition back into the median).

Sacramento Regional Transit is now the transit provider for the City of Folsom and at this time does not have this BRT system in their long-range transit plan, nor do they currently operate any BRT lines in their system so it is unclear what their concerns/applicable standards might be.

4. Public emergency access is already planned along East Bidwell Street and provides direct access to the proposed Emergency Department.
   - The applicant has stated that a signal at Alder Creek/McCarthy is necessary to facilitate emergency access but has not demonstrated why this is important when the proposed project already includes a driveway on East Bidwell between US50 and Alder Creek which enters the site in closer proximity to the Emergency Department. This driveway can be accessed by motorists approaching from any direction (pending design that has yet to be provided by the applicant).
   - If the site access was not allowed at Alder Creek/McCarthy, but instead at Alder Creek/Westwood (as is currently designed), the additional travel time into the hospital site would seem reasonable given that there are other emergency access options.

Conclusion:

Based on the limited analysis conducted to date, the Public Works Department is not prepared to support a traffic signal at the Alder Creek/McCarthy intersection at this time. It is our recommendation that the project should consider and evaluate the following access scenarios.

 Scenario 1 (Preferred): Alder Creek/McCarthy intersection should be designed to operate without traffic controls and would be limited to north/south right turns in/out only at this time, but could potentially also include east/west uncontrolled left turn lanes until such time that traffic conditions become unsafe or result in excessive delay.
a. The Alder Creek/McCarthy intersection can be re-evaluated for future traffic control only after the FPASP is at least 75% built out and if traffic conditions at that time warrant further consideration.

b. The City will work with the applicant on an extensive way-finding program to guide hospital traffic from US 50 to Alder Creek Parkway and on to Dignity Way using a combination of street banners, pavement markings and signage; this could also include re-naming streets such as Westwood Drive north of Alder Creek to aid in the wayfinding strategy.

c. The intersections of Westwood/Dignity and Dignity/McCarthy should be evaluated at roundabouts to facilitate access to the hospital while minimizing delay.

Scenario 2 (Alternative): Alder Creek/McCarthy intersection evaluated as a 2x1 roundabout.

a. A conceptual design should be required to demonstrate that a roundabout would not negatively impact geometry at adjacent signals and any potential right of way impacts.

b. Some analysis/design should be included to demonstrate how BRT line and stations could be accommodated within or adjacent to the roundabout.

c. As with scenario 1, the intersection of Dignity/McCarthy should be evaluated as a roundabout.

My staff and I remain committed to assisting your staff and the applicant in finding a mutually acceptable solution to this issue. If you have any questions, please let us know.

cc: S. Krahn, CDD
S. Johnson, CDD
S. Banks, CDD
M. Rackovan, PW
Z. Bosch, PW
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CommonSpirit Health
10901 Gold Center Drive, Suite 300
Rancho Cordova CA 95670

Traffic Scenarios Memorandum

Project: Folsom Ranch Medical Center
DGL No.: 18300.00

Dear Robert:

As part of the Dignity Health Folsom Ranch Medical Center master planning effort, three traffic scenarios for campus access were developed and analyzed for Alder Creek Parkway between East Bidwell Street and Westwood Drive. The following scenarios were modeled:

- Scenario 1 - Signalized left at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way
- Scenario 2 - Roundabout at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way
- Scenario 3 - Left turn at Westwood, with main entrance to campus at Mercy Dr; eastbound left turns from Alder Creek at McCarthy prohibited; right in/ right out only for McCarthy Way at Alder Creek

The consultant team has collaborated on this memorandum to summarize the analysis for each scenario so that the technical information can be utilized to brief leadership both at Dignity Health and the City of Folsom. The documentation for each scenario includes the following information:

- Summary of the traffic control components along with phasing considerations,

---

1 DKS Associates provided pre-application traffic analysis, with the concurrence of City staff. All model inputs (including baseline and future year AM/PM peak hour volume sets, intersection geometrics and signal timings, access characteristics, and operational outputs) are documented in the following technical memoranda: Cumulative Volumes and Trip Generation Memo (DKS, July 30, 2020); VISSIM Model Assumptions and Queue Results (DKS, August 26, 2020); Scenario Review and Key Discussion Points (DKS, September 11, 2020). All analysis inputs and outputs were reviewed and accepted by the City of Folsom and will be incorporated into the environmental analysis for the Planned Development Permit.
· Discussion of any potential operational concerns, including any specific points mentioned by City staff, and
· Review of turning analysis for trucks that will need to navigate a path from the adjacent fueling station.

Given that the City has also expressed concerns regarding current operations at closely spaced signals at other locations within Folsom, this memorandum also provides a short discussion contrasting the identified locations with the study segment of Alder Creek Parkway. Finally, the memorandum identifies observable thresholds of operation for each scenario that would indicate that a proposed traffic control is not operating as predicted. The analysis then identifies solutions for consideration that may ultimately be incorporated into terms of an Amendment to the Development Agreement.²

Summary of Conclusions

Left turn access into the Folsom Ranch Medical Center at the intersection of Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way is a priority for Dignity Health to facilitate non-emergency patient and visitor access as well as employee access. The proposed signal spacing (i.e., 700 feet) to facilitate this left turn movement does not meet the City’s minimum spacing standards. However, as required by the City, Dignity Health commissioned a Progression Study for pre-application site planning. This traffic analysis demonstrates that if the signals at East Bidwell/Alder Creek Parkway and Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way are coordinated, queuing will not occur beyond acceptable City thresholds. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) may also be accommodated successfully in the median lane, and also functions to an acceptable standard if located on right lanes.

In addition, and by way of comparison, the proposed 700-foot signal spacing is a farther distance than other traffic signal spacing noted in the City. For example, signals are 500 feet apart at the intersections of Broadstone Parkway/Marketplace/Cavitt Drive, two similar intersections located near another section of East Bidwell, with high-traffic commercial on one side and a high density multi-family project across the street.

By contrast, the City’s preferred option (i.e., signalized left turn at Alder Creek Parkway/Westwood Drive) will result in increased traffic delays during certain hours that barely meet City’s maximum delay limits. Traffic modeling indicates that afternoon and evening departures from the medical campus will be adversely affected, as traffic queues develop along McCarthy Way and extending up to Mercy Drive, blocking vehicles from entering or exiting the medical campus and adjacent multi-family and commercial parcels.

Roundabouts offer a possible alternative to facilitate and control left turn movements from Alder Creek Parkway into the medical campus. Early coordination with adjacent property owners and facilitated by

²Proposed language for a development agreement is deferred pending approval by Dignity Health leadership of the preferred option.
the City will be required to obtain right of way at no cost. Moreover, given the expense of installation of this traffic control measure, it should be considered permanent, with no financial exposure to Dignity Health if results become unsatisfactory in the future.

For each scenario discussed below, large truck movements from a nearby gas station at the intersection of East Bidwell and Alder Creek Parkway also have been considered in traffic modeling analysis. The analysis establishes that truck traffic can be accommodated, in part by prohibiting u-turns at the Alder Creek Parkway/McCarthy Way intersection. Any inconvenience to commercial vehicles is outweighed by the importance of direct access to the medical campus.

**Background – Phased Construction and Anticipated Traffic Control Installation Timeline**

The following analysis is provided in the context of the phased development for the Folsom Ranch Medical Campus. The anticipated phasing for the medical center is seven phases, as follows:

- **Phase 1** – Medical Office Building 2023
- **Phase 2** – Hospital (100 Beds) 2028
- **Phase 3** – Medical Office Building 2030
- **Phase 4** – Hospital Support Services (Radiology, Surgery, Pharmacy, Emergency, or Lab) 2031
- **Phase 5** – Hospital Expansion (100 Beds) 2034
- **Phase 6** – Hospital Support Services (Radiology, Surgery, Pharmacy, Emergency, or Lab) 2040
- **Phase 7** – Hospital Expansion (100 Beds) 2045

If approved by the City, the traffic signal installation is not likely to occur any sooner than Phase 5, in 2034, which is the second expansion of the hospital. Alternatively, a roundabout would be constructed within the first phase.

The existing site condition includes a median, which allows for an unprotected left turn. Under the City's preferred scenario (i.e., Scenario 3) this median presumably is removed, with no additional traffic controls added at Alder Creek Parkway/Westwood Drive. The analysis below identifies the operational flaws with this scenario.

This table summarizes the timing for improvements under the three scenarios:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>SCENARIO 1: SIGNAL</th>
<th>SCENARIO 2: ROUNDABOUT</th>
<th>SCENARIO 3: NO LEFT TURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 1 (2023)</td>
<td>Interconnect installed</td>
<td>Interconnect installed and existing left-turn concrete median removed to be replaced with full median</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 2 (2028)</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 3 (2030)</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 4 (2031)</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 5 (2034)</td>
<td>Signal Warrant met and signal with double eastbound left-turn pockets installed</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 6 (2040)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 7 (2045)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change (Ped signal installed if BRT implemented)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 1 - Signalized left at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way

This scenario includes the following components:

- McCarthy signal coordination with the signal at Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway
- Double left turn lanes at Alder Creek for the eastbound approach
- No left turns allowed to exit from the Enclave development to the south of McCarthy
- BRT, when implemented, will be left running along the median heading westbound and in the right lane with mixed traffic running eastbound

Potential Operating Concerns

- No operational or queueing concerns shown in full buildout model
- Spacing between signals (700 ft) is less than the City of Folsom standard (see Exhibit A-Standard Construction Specifications Design Standards)
- There are other locations in the City with similarly spaced signals; these locations have circulation issues that are unique to the land use and operations
City Identified Concerns and Responses

- Shortened left-turn lanes could result in queue spill-back and/or lane-starvation conditions

  **Response:**
  
  The proposed design does not include any shortened or competing left-turn lanes. In some instances, left turn lanes have been lengthened to accommodate worst-case queue lengths.

- Signal spacing is closer than minimum spacing required by City in Standard Construction Specifications Design Standards (i.e., spaced closer than 3% of mile, or 1,320 feet apart); see Exhibits A, B and C. (Relevant excerpts of the Design Standards are attached as Exhibits A, B and C at the end of this memorandum.)

  **Response:**
  
  o Pursuant to City guidelines, proposed signal spacing of less than 1,320 feet requires the development of a Progression Study to verify that satisfactory operating conditions can be achieved. A Progression Study was developed based on City-approved volume sets and state-of-the-art micro-simulation analysis tools. Progression Study findings determined that no queueing or operational issues would result from implementation of Scenario 1.

  o Precedents of similarly spaced signals that operate without queuing issues are found throughout the City. Counterexamples cited by the City – namely the In & Out Burger adjacent to Placerville Road should not be considered an appropriate analogy given the operational and design differences along Bidwell Street. Traffic consultants believe, based upon knowledge of City records, that none of the counterexamples cited by the City – including the In & Out Burger – had a Progression Study performed to determine the operational performance of the proposed signal spacing prior to approval/construction. Additional details and examples are provided in a following section of this document.
• Having BRT run eastward on the shoulder in mixed flow will cause design and operational issues further west and is not supported by the Specific Plan

Response:

- Implementation of the BRT will fall under SacRT and the design and operation will ultimately fall under their jurisdiction. The Progression Study demonstrated that a BRT service line can operate acceptably under Scenario 1 (i.e., with the proposed signal) as either a center lane running line or outside general purpose lane running service. SacRT has no fleet composition policy regarding left-door or right-door BRT bus vehicle types. As such, both center lane or outside general purpose lane BRT service can be considered as a viable option.

- The Specific Plan includes language supporting running the BRT in mixed flow both in general language for the Specific Plan transit in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Section 7 Circulation Signature Corridors 7.6. See Exhibit E. Figure 7.3 shows the median as a Future Transit Corridor with two lanes designated as Future Travel Lanes.

- If necessary, the bus queue jump proposed for Alder Creek at Bidwell could allow for the bus to shift from center running to shoulder running safely and efficiently.

- The City has had to “fix”, at their own cost, operational issues at other closely spaced signals.

  Dignity is evaluating, as part of the future Amendment to Development Agreement, to identify operational thresholds, that if met, will trigger design and operational changes to be paid for by Dignity.

Potential Impacts on Truck Turning Analysis at Westwood Drive

- Planned fuel station located on Alder Creek between Bidwell and McCarthy, at the southeast corner of Alder Creek and Bidwell

- Fuel trucks will have to turn onto Alder Creek and make a U-turn to return to the freeway

- U-turns would be prohibited at McCarthy

- One of the potential truck types would need additional room at the northwest corner of Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive (see following truck u-turn diagram)
Comparison to other closely spaced signalized intersections

The City has identified two other existing conditions where closely spaced signals have resulted in operational problems and queue spill-back. However, the surrounding land use and operations for both differ significantly from the study segment at Alder Creek. These characteristics are described in greater detail as follows:

**E Bidwell Street and Placerville Road (Existing):**

- Signals on Bidwell Street at Iron Point Road and Placerville Road are 500 ft apart
- Intersection at Placerville/Bidwell is the only entrance/exit for high-volume/turnover varied commercial land uses (In-N-Out Burger, Starbucks, and Chevron)
- The left-turn pockets for northbound Bidwell at Iron Point and southbound Bidwell at Placerville use the same center lane, meaning that the left-turn pocket at Iron Point was shortened to make room for the left-turn pocket at Placerville
- Vehicles must make a U-turn at Iron Point Rd to access the freeway ramp
- The reduced space for left- and u-turning vehicles at Iron Point Road was causing queue spill-back issues on Bidwell. The City recently restricted U-turns at Iron Point Rd causing 1-3 min detours to access the ramp
- *Side note:* There are four signals continuing along Bidwell for the Palladio shopping center and adjacent streets all spaced about 800 ft apart

**E Bidwell Street and Montrose Drive (Existing):**

- Signals on Bidwell Street at Montrose Drive and Blue Ravine Road are 800 ft apart
- Between the two signals there are five driveways for varied commercial land use allowing uncontrolled access to the segment
- Two of the driveways are served by midblock left turn lanes allowing vehicles to cross Bidwell traffic
- There are many opportunities for short queues to block traffic or access points

**Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way (Proposed as Scenario 1):**

- Signals on Alder Creek at Bidwell Street, McCarthy Way (proposed) and Westwood Drive (planned) are 700 ft apart
- There are two primary movements that would produce queues (eastbound left [AM] and southbound right [PM])
- Queues would be managed with coordination between Bidwell and McCarthy signals
- There are only two right-in/right-out driveways between Bidwell and McCarthy on Alder Creek and both have more convenient exit opportunities on Bidwell
- *Avoids u-turns for primary movements*
- Signalized intersection is to serve drivers heading towards one single shared destination of the Medical Center, rather than a commercial development with mixed destinations.

There are analogous examples located within the city of closely spaced signals that operate acceptably. One example is along Broadstone Parkway between Bidwell Street and Cavitt Drive.

**Broadstone Parkway and Marketplace; Broadstone Parkway and Cavitt Drive (Existing):**

- Signals on Broadstone Parkway at two intersections, in close proximity to another section of East Bidwell Street Broadstone Parkway/Marketplace and Bidwell Street/Cavitt Drive are 550 ft apart.
- There are dual left-turn lanes from Bidwell onto Broadstone Parkway and then from Broadstone Parkway into the shopping center.
- There is only one uncontrolled driveway along the segment.
- High density residential is located on one side of Broadstone Parkway.
- Significant commercial land use on the other side of Bidwell results in significant traffic crossing and turning onto Bidwell.

**Indications that the signalized intersection does not function as modeled**

If the signal at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way is not working as planned or modeled, the following conditions would be observed:

- Queueing in the eastbound left turn pocket on Alder Creek blocking through traffic (lane starvation) or extending to the intersection with East Bidwell (spill-back).
- Queueing in the southbound left-turn pocket on Bidwell extending to the eastbound US-50 ramps (less likely).
- To validate that this is a persistent (chronic) issue, lane starvation or queue spill-back conditions should be observed during regular operations for more than 15 minutes during a peak hour and repeated three days in a week.

**Proposed Mitigation**

A phased mitigation should be implemented before any capital changes are implemented:

1. Ensure that the signals are timed correctly and/or update the signal timing to ensure queues are being processed correctly.

2. If signal timing is unable to remove the persistent queues, convert signal into a pedestrian signal for crossing the eastern approach of Alder Creek Parkway and convert McCarthy Way into Right-In/Right-Out only stop-controlled approaches. Maintain a signal head that allows protected...
southbound right turns from McCarthy Way when the pedestrian signal has blocked traffic on Alder Creek Parkway.
Scenario 2 — Roundabout at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way

This scenario includes the following components:

- A roundabout with two lanes for east- and westbound directions and one lane for north- and southbound directions
- BRT, when implemented, will be left running along the median heading westbound prior to and after the roundabout and eastbound will be in the right lane with mixed traffic

Potential Operating Concerns

- No operational or queueing concerns shown under full buildout conditions
- Issues with fitting BRT through the roundabout and location of bus stop further from intersection
- Larger footprint and either encroachment on parcel northeast of intersection to fit or potential non-standard design
- Spill-back issues from the Enclave gate spilling into the roundabout (low probability)

City Identified Concerns and Responses

- Spill-back issues from the Enclave gated entry south of McCarthy Way
  - The Progression Study showed no significant queue spill-back issues from entering vehicles delayed at the Enclave gate under Scenario 2 (roundabout control)
  - Queuing characteristics at the Enclave gate would be similar under Scenario 1 (signal) or Scenario 2 (roundabout)
Field observations show the entryway for Enclave to be sufficiently wide and deep to store approximately five vehicles (125 feet of storage).

- It would be difficult to implement BRT through a roundabout
  - There are multiple examples of roundabouts on multilane roadways that operate BRT successfully and will design the roundabout to accommodate such transit operations (can be provided upon request).
  - Roundabout design may impact the existing right of way to the south of Alder Creek Parkway where construction is already occurring.

**Truck Turning Analysis at Westwood Drive**

- Planned fuel station located on Alder Creek between Bidwell and McCarthy.
- Fuel trucks will have to turn onto Alder Creek and make a U-turn to return to the freeway.
- If designed to permit it (larger footprint), the roundabout could provide a U-turn opportunity for fuel trucks at McCarthy.
- If the roundabout does not provide sufficient turn radii for a fuel truck to make a U-turn, one potential truck type would require additional right-of-way at the northwest corner of Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive (same as Scenario 1).

**Indications that the Roundabout does not function as modeled (none)**

- The roundabout provides the shortest queues of the analyzed segments, and no indications that it does not function as designed are anticipated.
- Installation of the roundabout would occur in Phase 1. The roundabout is the most costly traffic control measure to install and, as such, Dignity Health will request the City's concurrence in the installation as a permanent traffic control measure (i.e., no triggers will be indicated to require Dignity Health to potentially fund the removal of this traffic control measure).
- If there are queueing concerns with the roundabout, then the other scenarios would not provide any mitigation.

**Future Potential Mitigation (none)**

Given the footprint of the roundabout, reconstruction to convert to stop or signal control would be costly.

**Roundabout Features and Benefits**

- Roundabouts are safer, more efficient, less costly and reduce number of crashes where people are hurt or killed by 78-82% when compared to signalized intersections per the AASHTO Highway Safety Manual.
• Roundabouts reduce the number of vehicles that must stop. This reduces delays and increases capacity of intersection.

• Reduces vehicle emissions as it eliminates stop and go driving, which produces the heaviest vehicle emissions.

• Reduces long term operational and maintenance costs compared to a signalized intersection. No signals to power and maintain.

• Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan includes roundabouts (see Exhibit D - Excerpt from Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, 7.4 Traffic Calming Techniques)
Scenario 3 — No Left Turn at McCarthy

This scenario includes the following components:

- Physical medians at McCarthy blocking left-turn movements for all approaches
- Pedestrian Signal on the eastern approach of Alder Creek Parkway at McCarthy to allow safe pedestrian crossing and access to BRT stations
- Double left turn lanes for the eastbound approach of Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive
- BRT, when implemented, will be left running along the median heading westbound and in the right lane with mixed traffic running eastbound

Potential Operating Concerns

- Non-intuitive circulation resulting in wayfinding challenges for a driver population that can be under duress, older and/or unfamiliar with the area as typical for hospital visitors (See Exhibit E- Wayfinding Deficiencies)
- The resulting queue during the afternoon/evening extends up to Mercy Way along McCarthy Way
- The queue blocks vehicles from entering or exiting Dignity campus and adjacent parcels
- The average delay for vehicles on McCarthy Way is within the City’s standard, but at the cusp of failure (within 0.3 seconds)
- Allowing vehicles to turn into an auxiliary lane on Alder Creek could alleviate queuing on McCarthy Way, but would require those vehicles to merge across multiple lanes in a short distance if motorists wish to continue to the west (Alder Creek) or south (Bidwell), resulting in an undesirable weaving condition with through vehicles from Westwood turning right onto Bidwell
Wayfinding

Wayfinding is a significant design aspect of healthcare experience and a functional necessity. The hospital wayfinding system must accommodate exterior vehicular, exterior pedestrian and interior pedestrian experiences in concert. Wayfinding design begins with the question of how does a first time patient, who may have vision and hearing impairments, arrive at the hospital facility? Measures to minimize visitor disorientation are critical in order to support patients in need of and deserving consideration and compassion.

Examples of inefficient wayfinding systems:
- Multiple pathways to the same area can create confusion
- More signs do not improve wayfinding, as the best wayfinding solution is intuitive

These examples result in time and resource waste when staff spend time giving directions to visitors.

Wayfinding design principles:
- Clear sightlines to show what is ahead
- Limited navigation to not overwhelm users with choices
- Continuous visual connection
- Use landmarks to provide orientation
- Provide signs at decision points to assist in wayfinding decisions
- Comprehensive wayfinding design is the best approach

These design principles turn what could be a potentially frustrating ordeal into a smooth engaging journey. Successful wayfinding can alleviate visitor and patient stress and maximize staff efficiency.

Time is a limited resource and is a critical aspect of hospital operations, where a few minutes can mean the difference between life and death.

The direct access to the campus presented in Scenarios 1 and 2 are considerably superior over Scenario 3, where loss of visual connection presents significant wayfinding challenges and results in significant travel time delay.
Travel Time Comparison
Eldwell to Dignity Health Campus Mercy Entry

Scenario 1: Full traffic signal at Alder Creek/McCarthy
Travel Time (PM): 1:30 (min sec)

Scenario 3: No left at Alder Creek/McCarthy, Eastbound u-turn
or left at Westwood
Travel Time via u turn at Westwood (PM): 2:20 (+0.50) (min sec)
Travel Time via left at Westwood (PM): 2:35 (+1.15) (min sec)
Scenario 3 presents a wayfinding challenge to patients and visitors, as they lose visual connection to their destination as they drive past the campus along Alder Creek Parkway. This signage gap can trigger stress and confusion. From Alder Creek, a signature corridor, the driver then needs to negotiate one left turn at Placerville, a collector street. Passing McCarthy along Alder Creek, the driver has lost sight of the medical center. From Placerville Road, signage would be required to direct the driver to the medical center, as the view of the medical center is too far in the distance and obscured by the surrounding development, which is high density multifamily residential. Another left turn into Mercy is required to finally arrive at the destination.
Truck Turning Analysis at Westwood Drive

- Planned fuel station located on Alder Creek between Bidwell and McCarthy Way
- Fuel trucks will have to turn onto Alder Creek and make a U-turn to return to the freeway
- U-turns would be blocked by a median at McCarthy Way
- One of the potential truck types would need additional room (More than Scenario 1 or 2) at the northwest corner of Alder Creek Parkway and Westwood Drive (see following truck u-turn diagram). Scenario 3 has two left turn lanes at Alder Creek and the truck turn starts further north from the northwest corner. In Scenarios 1 and 2 there is only one left turn lane and a larger median at Westwood, which accommodates the truck turn starting further south from the northwest corner.

Indications that the Stop Control does not function as modeled

If the stop-control at Alder Creek Parkway and McCarthy Way operated as modeled, it would be observed as either:

- Queueing in the southbound approach on McCarthy Way extending to Mercy Drive, blocking driveways and operations at the intersection of McCarthy Way and Mercy Drive
To validate that this is a chronic issue, the queue blocking (land starvation) should be observed during regular operations for more than 15 minutes during a peak hour and repeated three days in a week.

**Mitigation**

Operations should be analyzed with peak hour counts, intersection modeling, and signal warrants before any capital changes are implemented. A phased mitigation should be implemented:

1. Maintain a pedestrian signal control for eastbound traffic and convert the intersection into a partial signal that stops westbound traffic on Alder Creek Parkway and allows protected southbound right turns to clear the queue if it extends halfway to Mercy Drive.

2. If the above remediation fails to clear the queue or causes queues on Alder Creek Parkway to extend to Westwood Drive, remove the median barrier and convert to the signalized intersection (i.e., Scenario 1).

**Conclusion**
Regards,
DEVENNEY GROUP LTD.

Joanie Paik

c  Martha Lofgren, Brewer Lofgren LLP
study for the project, and the analysis shall use the City’s projected modeled traffic volumes for the model’s horizon year.

3) The driveway is at least 400 feet downstream and 600 feet upstream of an intersection containing left-turn pockets.

D. Turning movements may be restricted for any driveway where deemed necessary by the City Engineer because of safety concerns.

12.10 SIGNALIZED DRIVEWAYS

The need for traffic signals at driveways shall be based on warrants contained in the latest, edition of the Caltrans Traffic Manual (see Section 13 of these Design Standards). Any such evaluation shall be performed by the consultant as a part of the traffic study for the project.

The City will typically deny a request for a new signal if spacing requirements cannot be met. Typical minimum spacing required between traffic signals is one-quarter (1/4) of a mile.

The City does not share in the cost of design and construction of traffic signals which solely serve private property (i.e., a "tee" intersection where the driveway is situated as the "stem" of the "tee"). The developer shall bear all costs of providing signalization at the private access point, including design and construction. In the case where a private access point comprises the fourth leg of an intersection where the other three legs are public streets, the developer shall ultimately be 100% financially responsible for the private leg (or approximately one-fourth the cost of signalizing the intersection). This obligation is in addition to sharing in the cost of the remaining signal via payment of the City's Major Road Mitigation Fee (if applicable).

12.11 MINIMUM REQUIRED THROAT DEPTH

Driveways shall meet the minimum required throat depth (MRTD) requirements (see Section 13.2 H). In the case of "drive-thru" facilities, attention is directed to the latter part of Section 13.2 H for minimum on-site storage distances for ingressing vehicles.

On-site parking shall not be permitted within the MRTD area. The MRTD requirement does not apply to single family residential or duplex land uses.

In cases where a traffic study is not required, or in cases where there is insufficient data available to calculate the MRTD in accordance with Section 13.2 H, Table 12-1 shall be used to determine minimum required throat depth for access points for a site. In cases where a traffic study will be provided, but the access points have not yet been determined for a site, Table 12-1 shall be used to estimate the MRTD during the site design process. In these cases, the final MRTD requirements shall be determined by the traffic study via the methodology in Section 13.2 H. The distances shown in Table 12-1 chart represent vehicle storage equivalents, which means the total required distance may be achieved by summing the throat depths for several access points if more than one access point is to serve the site. In these cases, the distance shown in Table 12-1 shall be prorated to each access point to the nearest 25 feet based on the estimated relative percent usage of each access point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF FACILITY</th>
<th>VEHICLE STORAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive-thru bank window</td>
<td>10 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-thru restaurant</td>
<td>10 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-thru pharmacy</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic car wash</td>
<td>10 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-service car wash</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-in theater</td>
<td>15% of parking capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1% of parking capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service station</td>
<td>4 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-thru liquor store</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-thru dry cleaners</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-storage mini warehouse</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Refuse to 3 spaces for savings and main institutions and credit unions.
2. Measured to pick-up window.
3. At the main-entrance to the hospital.
4. Measured to gate.

K. Traffic Signals/Stop Signs - The need for new traffic signals and stop signs shall be based on warrants contained in the latest edition of the State Traffic Manual.

If a new traffic signal is being proposed which is not already a part of the City’s Capital Improvement Program, and the signal installation would result in less than 1,320 feet between signals, then the study shall include a signal progression analysis. The section of roadway to be analyzed for signal progression shall be determined by the Public Works Department and will include all existing and possible future signalized intersections.

The progression pattern calculations shall use a cycle consistent with current signal timing policies of the City. A desirable bandwidth of 50% of the signal cycle shall be used where existing conditions allow. Where intersections have no signals presently, but are expected to have signals, typically a 60% mainline, 40% cross street cycle split should be assumed. Cycle split assumptions shall relate to volume assumptions in the capacity analysis of individual intersections, and, where computerized progression analysis techniques are used, they shall be of the type which utilize turning movement volume data and pedestrian clearance times in the development of time/space diagrams.

The green time allocated to the cross street will be considered no less than the time which is required for a pedestrian to clear the main street using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices standards.

Those intersections which would reduce the optimum bandwidth if a traffic signal were installed may be required to remain unsignalized and have turning movements limited by access design or median islands.
Exhibit C – Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan - March 2018, Section 7: Circulation
Section 7

Intersection and Mid-block Bulb-Outs

Intersection and mid-block bulb-outs may be used along roadways with high pedestrian activity to reduce the amount of time that pedestrians are exposed during roadway crossings. With the use of mid-block bulb-outs, on-street parking near intersections is eliminated to improve visibility. In addition to an increased feeling of safety for pedestrians, bulb-outs also serve as a way to decrease traffic speed, especially when vehicles attempt to turn. This measure should include accent paving and landscaping that does not impair driver sight lines. Parking is restricted along bulb-out areas and curbs shall be pointed red to indicate that no parking is allowed.

Special Pavement Markings and Textured Paving

Special pavement markings and textured paving serve as a visual reference for motorists of the likely presence of pedestrians and cyclists in the area. This measure may be used in conjunction with any combination of the other traffic calming measures.

Roundabouts/Traffic Circles

Roundabouts and traffic circles are an alternative form of traffic control that reduce traffic speed and the amount of stopping at intersections while providing neighborhood focal points. The use of traffic circles and roundabouts depends on several factors, such as the amount of traffic projected along a street segment, surrounding land uses, and whether the roundabout or traffic circle is a more efficient intersection control device than a stop sign or signalized intersection. If roundabouts or traffic circles are utilized, they shall be landscaped with drought tolerant low growing shrubs and grasses to provide a clear line of sight for pedestrians and motorists. Crosswalks must be located outside the roundabout or traffic circle to provide a pedestrian refuge island at the median location. Parking shall be prohibited within the roundabout or traffic circle.

7.5 Truck Management Plan

Sacramento County, the City of Folsom, the City of Rancho Cordova, El Dorado County CalTrans, the Capital Southeast Connector JPA, and the quarries south of the Plan Area worked together on a Truck Management Plan (TMP) to address the issues associated with quarry truck traffic. On December 6, 2011, the Folsom City Council voted to support the Truck Management Plan and to authorize the City Manager to execute the Truck Management Plan Agreement upon adoption of the TMP by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors. On December 14, 2011, the Quarry Truck Management Plan was approved by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors (Resolution No. 2011-0938). The city may redesign the Plan Area circulation network to accommodate future quarry truck traffic.
Exhibit E - Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan - March 2018, Section 7: Circulation, 7.6 Signature Corridors

Figure 7.2 - Alder Creek Parkway (Section A - 4 Lane Open Space Arterial)

Figure 7.3 - Alder Creek Parkway (Section B - 4 Lane Urban Arterial)
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Transportation Analysis and CEQA Impact Study
Dated April 23, 2021 and April 29, 2021
(documents found on the City’s website at
https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublishedocument/6155/637558120792530000)
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**LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arborist</td>
<td>ISA-certified arborist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCA</td>
<td>American Society of Consulting Arborists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRZ</td>
<td>Critical Root Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSH</td>
<td>Diameter at standard height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR/EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>Folsom Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP</td>
<td>Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILF</td>
<td>In-lieu fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Parcel 85A and Offsite Infrastructure Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPZ</td>
<td>Tree Protection Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 INTRODUCTION

ECORP Consulting, Inc. conducted an arborist survey for the Parcel 85A and Offsite Infrastructure Project (Project), located in the city of Folsom in Sacramento County, California. The purpose of this report is to quantify oak woodland canopy within the Project Area as defined and identified on Figure 10.2 in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) (Torrence Planning et al. 2011) and to identify, map, and assess the general condition of trees within the Project Area according to the Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 12.16, City of Folsom 2020a). In addition, this report presents a preliminary mitigation strategy for the Project which will be updated at a later time once final impacts to oak woodland are determined.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project is generally located south of U.S. Highway 50, east of East Bidwell and north of Alder Creek Parkway, in Sacramento County, California (Figure 1). Additional offsite infrastructure elements occur to the west of East Bidwell. The Project corresponds to Sections 8, 9, 16, and 17, Township 9 North, Range 8 East (Mount Diablo Base and Meridian) of the “Clarksville, California” and “Folsom, California” 7.5-minute quadrangles (U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] 1953, 1967, respectively). The approximate center of the Project site corresponds to Latitude 38.64032° and Longitude -121.11751° within the Lower American Watershed (Hydrologic Unit Code #18020111; Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] et. al. 2016).

The Project consists of a commercial development along with supporting offsite infrastructure. The Project site is predominantly undeveloped annual grassland with a small area of oak woodlands at the western edge of the offsite infrastructure component. A small portion of the Project area was previously impacted by implementation of other projects within Folsom Plan Area.

3.0 METHODS

3.1 Field Survey

Oak woodland for the entire Folsom Plan Area (FPA) was previously mapped and presented in the Conceptual Oak Tree Mitigation Plan (ECORP 2017). The oak woodland habitat was determined by locating stands of oak trees with more than 10-percent cover, then adding a 30-foot buffer to the outer edge of the tree canopy (ECORP 2017). Any oak trees not included within the oak woodland were determined to be individual or isolated oak trees.

---

1 Oak woodlands were identified using geographic information systems technology, rectified aerial photographs, and field observation.
Figure 1. Project Location and Vicinity

2019-025 Eagle Properties 85A
ECORP arborist Krissy Walker-Berry (International Society of Arboriculture Certification #WE-11308A), with ECORP biologist Gabrielle Attisani, conducted the field survey on March 26, 2021. The Project Area was walked during the field survey, and data were recorded using a submeter capable Global Positioning System unit. No individual oak trees (as defined in the FPASP) were identified onsite. As such, the survey focused on the oak woodland area within the Project. While the approved FPASP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE] and City of Folsom 2011) for the FPA does not require an arborist survey for trees within the oak woodland, at the request of the City, ECORP collected additional information on oak trees within the oak woodland. Oak tree locations within the oak woodland were previously surveyed and mapped by MacKay and Somps Civil Engineers and ECORP collected additional data on these specific individuals within the oak woodland.

All trees identified as Protected Trees (defined below) were surveyed. Trees excluded from the City of Folsom’s Master Tree List as “not recommended” or “excluded from protection” or “heritage trees not eligible for heritage status” were not counted. Therefore, additional trees are located along within the Project that were not surveyed as part of this effort (e.g., known willow trees occurring along East Bidwell). Trees that occur outside of the Project area (i.e., trunk location is not within the Project Area) were not included in this survey. However, it is expected that these trees will be surveyed at a future time prior to ground breaking to provide baseline data for future monitoring (see Section 5.2).

3.2 Definitions

Data collected included species, tree tag number, diameter at standard height (DSH), dripline radius, structure, and condition. The survey results are intended for general Project planning purposes only; therefore, these results should not be considered a detailed tree analysis (i.e., results do not include hazard assessment, tree health diagnosis, preservation or removal recommendations, or pruning advisement). The following definitions from the Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance were used to guide the methodology and data collection for this survey effort:

- **Critical Root Zone (CRZ):** A circle with a minimum radius of one foot for every one inch in trunk DSH. For Heritage trees, the CRZ shall be a circle with a minimum radius of 1.5 feet for every one inch in trunk DSH, unless reduced by the City Arborist.

- **Dripline Radius:** A perfect circle around the tree with the radius being equal to the longest branch of the tree.

- **Heritage Tree:** A tree on the City’s Master Tree List that is over 30 inches DSH or a Multi-trunked Tree on the Master Tree List having a combined DSH of 50 inches or more, except for trees listed as “Not Eligible for Heritage Status.”

- **Landmark Tree:** A tree or group of trees determined by the City Council to be a significant community benefit.
- **Master Tree List**: A list prepared by the City, as amended from time to time, identifying the species of trees that may be planted as replacement trees, as Parking Lot Shading Trees, or as Street Trees. The list also identifies tree species that are not recommended for planting within the Project or that should be excluded from protection.

- **Native Oak Tree**: Any tree over six inches DSH of the genus *Quercus* and species *lobata* (valley oak), *douglasii* (blue oak), *wislizenii* (interior live oak), *agrifolia* (coast live oak), or hybrids, thereof; or multi-trunked native oak trees having an aggregate diameter of 20 inches DSH or more.

- **Parking Lot Shading Tree**: Any tree planted in a parking lot in order to meet shade coverage requirement and as identified in the Zoning Code.

- **Protected Tree**: Native Oak Trees, Heritage Trees, Landmark Trees, and Regulated Trees.

- **Regulated Tree**: Trees required by the City’s Zoning Code (such as Parking Lot Shading Trees and Street Trees) or required as conditions of development project approval (such as landscape buffer or screening trees) or required by this Chapter as mitigation for the removal of a Protected Tree.

- **Street Tree**: A tree of an approved species, in accordance with the City Master Tree List, located within 12.5 feet of a street or sidewalk, measured from the back of the sidewalk or back of the curb if no sidewalk exists.

- **Tree Protection Zone (TPZ)**: The circumference of the outermost edge of the tree’s CRZ or Dripline Radius, whichever is greater, plus one foot.

The following additional terms define the collected data:

- **DSH**: The diameter of a tree measured at 4.5 feet above ground while standing on the high side of the tree. For a tree other than a Multi-trunked Tree that branches at or below 4.5 feet, DSH shall mean the diameter at the narrowest point between the grade and the lowest branching point. For Multi-trunked Trees (trees with multiple vertical trunks in contact at or near ground level), the DSH shall be the diameter of each stem added together in total. This report lists total aggregate diameter along with the total number of trunks that were measured and each trunk’s diameter.

- **Condition**: An estimate of the tree’s overall health. This includes evaluation of foliage, evidence of wound healing, evidence of fungal attack, density of insect galls, and the amount and condition of attached deadwood, as well as the obvious potential for structural failure of one or more major branches or trunks, the environment and condition of the root crown, symmetry of the canopy, and any noticeable effects of crowding caused by adjacent trees. Each tree’s condition was rated according to the American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA) rating system (Table 1).
Table 1. ASCA Tree Rating System (Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating Number</th>
<th>Rating Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No apparent problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous or non-correctable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extreme problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, where appropriate, notes were taken regarding any unusual features (e.g., large trunk cavities, obvious damage or disease, girdling by barbed wire).

4.0 RESULTS AND IMPACT ANALYSIS

4.1 Survey Results

Seventeen trees were inventoried in the oak woodland within the Project area. All 17 trees are native blue oak trees (Quercus douglasii). A map depicting the locations of the inventoried trees is included as Attachment A. Detailed tree survey data for each tree are included as Attachment B. Representative site photographs are included as Attachment C.

The Project Area includes 17 trees that meet the definition of Protected Trees as defined above. One of these trees, tag number 1600, can also be categorized as a Heritage Tree. Photographs of this particular tree are also included in Attachment C. Particular attention is being given to this tree and the potential for preservation; however, engineering constraints may preclude available preservation options.

A Tree Work Permit and Tree Removal Permit will need to be obtained from the City prior to any construction activities affecting a Protected Tree on this Project.

5.0 MITIGATION STRATEGY

Mitigation for tree impacts within the FPA follows the requirements of the FPASP EIR/EIS, rather than the current (City of Folsom 2020a) City Tree Preservation Ordinance. The following sections provide a general mitigation strategy that will be updated once final impacts are determined through the rough grading plan approval process.
5.1 Direct Impact/Removed Tree

Up to 17 trees may be removed within the oak woodland for Project implementation. Once the Project impacts have been determined, per the FPASP, there are three options for mitigation:

1. Preserve offsite oak woodland habitat. While this option is allowed, the City has previously requested that oak impacts for this project are mitigated onsite to the extent feasible. This is the preferred method of mitigation for this Project if the City supports this approach.

2. Use of the in-lieu fee (ILF) program. The total cost of the ILF program is $150 per DSH inch removed. It is expected that some portion of mitigation will utilize the ILF program if offsite preservation is not utilized.

3. Onsite plantings. As previously discussed with the City, this is their preferred method for mitigation. However, onsite planting is not feasible within the boundaries of this Project as there are no open space areas that can support plantings. In the event that offsite preservation is not utilized, the City initially agreed to a deferred planting plan to be implemented in conjunction with a future project or phase of a project within the FPA, where planting locations will be available. Per the EIR/EIS, planting options include the following:

   a. Option 1: 24-inch box oak tree; one of these replaces two DSH inches removed.
   b. Option 2: 15-gallon container oak tree; one of these replaces one DSH inch removed.
   c. Option 3: five-gallon container oak tree; one of these replaces 0.5 DSH inch removed.
   d. Option 4: A combination of the above options.

5.2 Indirect Impact/Preserved Trees

It is expected that there will be indirect impacts to trees as a result of this project. However, the exact trees have not been identified at this time. Indirect impacts include activities such as, but not limited to, grading, trenching, paving, soil disturbance, and pruning within the TPZ of the tree.

The City has established standards for the TPZs of all Protected Trees. These standards include the following:

- A pre-construction meeting between the Project Arborist, City Arborist, construction foreman/superintendent, and all applicable parties.

- High-visibility exclusionary fencing shall be shown on the Project plans and installed to protect the TPZ of all Protected Trees in proximity to the regulated activity. Unless the Project construction goes through the TPZ, the fencing shall encompass the entire TPZ.
Weatherproof warning signs shall be attached to the TPZ fencing.

Where construction access through the TPZ is necessary, the soil shall be protected via the installation of an access path. The access path shall be comprised minimally of one-inch minimum thickness plyboards laid over a four-inch layer of mulch. Additionally, trunk protection or high-visibility fencing shall be placed around the trunk.

Tree pruning will be completed by an experienced arborist, preferably prior to the start of construction.

The following must occur to protect the Protected Trees during the Project:

- If any follow-up pruning is discovered, tree pruning will be completed by an experienced contractor under the direct supervision of the Project Arborist.
- Any necessary root severance shall be performed with sharp, sterile hand tools. Roots that have been ripped, torn, or crushed shall be traced back to undamaged tissue and cut cleanly, resulting in a flat surface with the adjacent bark firmly attached.
- Roots exposed from grade cuts or trenching shall not be allowed to dry out. If roots will be exposed overnight or if directed by the Project Arborist, the cut faces shall be moistened and covered until backfilled.
- The following actions are prohibited within the TPZ of Protected Trees:
  - Parking of vehicles, equipment, or storage of material within the TPZ, unless otherwise approved by the City.
  - Breaking roots with a backhoe or crushing them with a grader.
  - Wounding or breaking tree trunks or branches through contact with vehicles or heavy equipment.
  - Contamination of soil by washing out equipment or conducting vehicle maintenance.

In addition to these standards of protection during construction, the FPASP and the Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance require monitoring of trees that are indirectly impacted by construction. The following measures are recommended to monitor indirect impacts:

- Prior to grading, an Arborist will tag and assess the trees that will be subject to indirect impacts.
Monitor the health of all Protected Trees potentially impacted by the construction activities throughout the duration of the development Project. Per discussion with the City Arborist, this means the Project Arborist will be present onsite at the following times: the first one to two days of work within the Project when in the vicinity of Protected Trees, all work under native oak tree canopies, during all tree pruning, and anytime a backhoe is being used under any TPZ. In addition, the Project Arborist will be on call for questions related to work under all trees when not onsite. Because the Arborist will not likely be needed each day, a minimum of one weekly site visit will be conducted to check on the status of the trees within the Project when work is being conducted in the vicinity of Protected Trees.

Prepare a certificate of compliance at the conclusion of the Project, attesting compliance with the standards outlined in the Maintenance Standards and the conditions of the tree permit (City of Folsom 2020b).

Monitor the health of all indirectly impacted Protected Trees annually, for a period of five years. If any monitored tree appears to be dead or dying within five years of Project implementation, the tree shall be replaced using the direct impact mitigation described above.

6.0 CONCLUSION

This Arborist Report and Mitigation Strategy is intended to support the Project's entitlement process. Exact impacts and mitigation are unknown at this time. It is expected that a Final Mitigation Plan will be prepared at a later time once final impacts have been determined and exact mitigation has been calculated. Other documents or information may be required to support the Final Mitigation Plan (but are not expected at this stage). These may be standalone plans or included within the Final Mitigation Plan (if feasible). These may include the following:

- Planting and Irrigation Plan
- Performance Standards and Monitoring Plan for Mitigation Plantings
- Indirect Monitoring Methodology Plan
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Map Features
- Parcel 85A Project - 90.6 ac.
- Oak Trees
  - Oak Woodland - 1.282 ac.
  - Tree Protection Zone (TPZ)
  - Blue Oak (17)

Sources: ESRI, USGS, NAWP (2020), Sacramento County (2018), HSCC

Attachment A. Tree Inventory
2019-026 Parcel 85A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECORP Tag #</th>
<th>MSCE #</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>DSH (Inches)</th>
<th>Dripline (Feet)</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Heritage?</th>
<th>CRZ* (feet)</th>
<th>TPZ* (feet)</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Some suckering, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Medium lean, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Large lean, suckering, cavities, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Codominant stems with included bark, suckering, broken branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Some suckering and dead branches, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Suckering and few dead branches but good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Few dead branches and suckering but good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Decent budding but all from suckers along branches, top of main trunk dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Codominant branching, suckering, and large dead branches, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Lots of suckering, large dead branches, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lots of suckering and some large dead branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Some suckering and dead branches, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lots of suckering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Codominant trunks, suckering, and some dead branches, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Codominant trunks and dead branches, good budding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lots of suckering and dead branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>Quercus douglasii</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>Large dead branches, low suckering, good budding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CRZ = Critical Root Zone

*TPZ = Tree Protection Zone
ATTACHMENT C

Representative Photographs
Photo 1: Tree 1585; March 26, 2021.

Photo 2: Tree 1587; March 26, 2021.

Photo 3: Tree 1589, 1590 and 1588 (left to right); March 26, 2021.

Photo 4: Tree 1595; March 26, 2021.
Photo 5: Tree 1600; May 6, 2021.

Photo 6: Tree 1600; May 6, 2021.
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Statement of Qualifications

Krissy Walker-Berry

Senior Biologist and Certified Arborist, ECORP Consulting, Inc.

Ms. Walker-Berry is a biologist and certified arborist with more than 13 years of professional experience in field surveys, biological monitoring, preserve management, permitting, permit compliance, and report preparation for biological resources in both northern and southern California. Her arborist experience includes maintaining her ISA-certified arborist status since 2015 and her Tree Risk Assessment Qualification since 2018, as well as conducting multiple tree inventories, creation of tree mitigation plans, and monitoring construction activities around protected trees and other vegetation. She is also experienced in conducting focused and general surveys for listed and sensitive plants, general surveys for nonnative plants, vegetation mapping and assessment, jurisdictional wetland delineations, nesting bird surveys, and biological construction monitoring.
Attachment 22

Environmental Checklist and Addendum for Folsom Ranch Medical Center
Dated April, 2020
(documents found on the City’s website at https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublishedocument/6137/637558099893530000)
Attachment 23

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Folsom Ranch Medical Center Project
Dated April, 2021
(documents found on the City’s website at https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublishedocument/6141/637558120754730000)
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision
File #: PN-20-254
Requests: Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
          Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
          Minor Administrative Modifications
Location: The proposed Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project is
         located in the Mangini West area of the Folsom Plan Area
         Specific Plan, east of East Bidwell Street south of Savannah
         Parkway and north of Mangini Parkway
Staff Contact: Kathy Pease, AICP, Contract Planner, 916-812-0749
             kpease@masfirm.com

Property Owner
Folsom Real Estate South and
West Scott Blvd., LLC
4370 Town Center Blvd, Suite 100
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Applicant
TCS Improvement Company, LLC
4370 Town Center Blvd, Suite 100
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion recommend approval
of the following entitlements, subject to the findings (Findings A-W) and conditions of
approval (Conditions 1-55) attached to this report:

- Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
- Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
- Minor Administrative Modification for Transfer of Development Rights (Unit Transfer)
- Minor Administrative Modification for Land Use Boundary Refinements

Project Summary: The proposed Project includes the following entitlements:

- A Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide the 173-acre
  Project site into fourteen large lots.
AGENDA ITEM NO. 2
Type: Public Hearing
Date: May 19, 2021

- A Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide a 52.3-acre portion of the Project site into 260 residential lots for single family detached units.

- A Minor Administrative Modification to transfer 25 allocated dwelling units among parcels within the Project to accommodate the residential unit count and densities of the Project.

- A Minor Administrative Modification to refine land uses edges for the purpose of maximizing development efficiencies, avoiding natural resources, and accommodating a Class I trail.

These proposed actions are described in detail and analyzed in this report.
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____________________________
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Community Development Director
A. Background: Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan

The proposed Project site is part of the approved Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP), a comprehensively planned community that proposes new development based “Smart Growth” and Transit Oriented Development principles.

The FPASP, approved in 2011, is a development plan for over 3,500 acres of previously undeveloped land located south of Highway 50, north of White Rock Road, east of Prairie City Road, and adjacent to the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line in the southeastern portion of the City.

The FPASP includes a mix of residential, commercial, employment and public uses, complemented by recreational amenities including a significant system of parks and open space, all within proximity to one another and interconnected by a network of “complete streets”, trails and bikeways. The Specific Plan is consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Principles and the requirements of SB 375 (Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act).

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Project site is in the central portion of the FPASP and is west of East Bidwell Street, south of Savannah Parkway, and north of Mangini Parkway. The Project site is designated in the FPASP with seven land use categories (FPASP Land Use Plan, Figure 1), including SP-P (Park), SP-PQP (schools) SP-SF (Single Family Residential), SP-MLD (Multi Family Low Density Residential), SP-SFHD (Single Family High Density) and SP-OS (Open Space).
FIGURE 1: FPASP LAND USE PLAN

- 11,461 DU
- 27,140 Population
- 6.6 du/ac Average Density
- 2.8m GSF Commercial

Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan
2011 / 2020 Entitlements
Revised: July, 2020
B. Physical Setting

The 173-acre Project site is located west of East Bidwell Street, south of Savannah Parkway and north of Mangini Parkway in the FPASP (Figure 2, Aerial Photo). The site features gently rolling terrain with native grasses and trees.

The Project is adjacent to the Creekstone at Folsom Ranch, Mangini Ranch Phases I and II, and Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch projects, currently under construction.

FIGURE 2: AERIAL PHOTO (2021)
APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL

The Applicant requests approval of related actions for a subdivision for 260 detached single-family residential lots on a 52-acre portion of a 173-acre Project site. The Project site is west of East Bidwell Street, south of Savannah Parkway, and north of Mangini Parkway. The Applicant requests the following entitlements:

A. Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (Creation of 14 Large Lots)
B. Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (Creation of 260 Residential Lots)
C. Minor Administrative Modification – Transfer of Development Rights
D. Minor Administrative Modification – Land Use Boundary Refinement

A. Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (LLVTSM)

The first component of the Applicant’s proposal is a Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (LLVTSM) to subdivide 173 acres west of East Bidwell Street between Savannah Parkway and Mangini Parkway. The LLVTSM will subdivide the 173-acre area into fourteen (14) large lots for future sale, lease, and financing. The proposed LLVTSM is shown in Figure 3 and in Attachment 7.

FIGURE 3: LARGE LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
The proposed large lot parcels correspond to land uses and parcels (villages) on the FPASP Land Use Plan (Figure 1) designated MLD, SFHD, SF, PQP (elementary and middle schools), P (neighborhood park), and open space. The parcels in the 173-acre LLVTSM are summarized in Table 1.

### Table 1: Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Specific Plan/ Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
<th>Net Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Single Family High Density Residential</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Single Family High Density Residential</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Single Family High Density Residential</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SP-MLD-PD</td>
<td>Multi Family Low Density Residential</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SP-OS</td>
<td>Open Space (Measure W)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SP-MLD-PD</td>
<td>Multi Family Low Density Residential</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SP-MLD-PD</td>
<td>Multi Family Low Density Residential</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Single Family High Density Residential</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SP-SF-PD</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SP-P</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SP-PQP</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SP-PQP</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SP-OS</td>
<td>Open Space (Measure W)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SP-OS</td>
<td>Open Space (Measure W)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-LC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Space/Landscape Corridor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Roadway</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>173.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (SLVTSM)**

A Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (SLVTSM) is proposed for the southeast portion of the 173-acre LLVTSM. The SLVTSM would further subdivide a 52.3-acre area into 260 single-family residential lots, three (3) open space parcels, eight (8) landscape lots, and one (1) paseo lot. The 260 single family lots would consist of 218 lots in the SFHD and 42 in the MLD zone. The proposed SLVTSM layout is shown in Figure 4 and Attachment 8.

The remaining 120.7-acre portion of the LLVTSM area would not be subdivided in the proposed SLVTSM. The parcels outside of the SLVTSM are those on the north and west side of the Project site and include LLVTSM Parcels 6 through 12 (middle school, elementary school, park, MLD, and SFHD parcels).
The proposed SLVTSM consists of four “villages” on the southeast portion of the LLVTSM. Villages 1, 2 and 3 are designated in the FPASP and zoned Single Family High Density (SP-SFHD), and Village 4 is Multi Family Low Density (SP-MLD). In Villages 1-3 (SFHD), the typical lot sizes would be 45’x100’ and 50’x100’ and the lot size in Village 4 (MLD) would be 45’x67’ (typical). Together, the four villages would accommodate 260 detached single family residential units.

FIGURE 4: SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
Table 2: Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village/Lot</th>
<th>Specific Plan/Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
<th>Net Acres</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Single Family High Density Residential</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Single Family High Density Residential</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Single Family High Density Residential</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SP-MLD-PD</td>
<td>Multi Family Low Density Residential</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SP-OS</td>
<td>Open Space (Measure W)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SP-OS</td>
<td>Open Space (Measure W)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SP-OS</td>
<td>Open Space (Measure W)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>SP-SFHD-PD</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>SP-MLD-PD</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Roadways</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to the SLVTSM would be from East Bidwell Street on the east, Mangini Parkway on the south, and the east-west Northern Connector Road (A Drive) on the north. Pedestrian access in and out of the subdivision will be provided at seven locations, including B Drive and D Drive, which would provide north-south access into the subdivision. The residential street pattern is a grid with one cul-de-sac. Subdivision streets would consist of local roadways with attached and detached sidewalks. Most of the local roadways consists of a two-lane street with attached sidewalks and parking on both sides of the street (44-foot right of way), as shown in Figure 5.
Project entrances and pedestrian-only access points located along the Class 1 multi-purpose trail along the open space corridor are shown in Figure 6, Pedestrian Circulation Plan. Figures 7 and 8 show the planned cross sections for East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway.

An open space/drainage corridor (Lot A) includes a Class I multi-purpose trail and traverses the Project site from East Bidwell Street to Mangini Parkway in the southeast corner of the Project area. The Class I trail is identified on the FPASP Trails exhibit. Trail connections are provided at Mangini Parkway and East Bidwell Street. A landscaped pedestrian paseo will connect J Drive to the Class I multi-purpose trail north of the open space corridor which offers connectivity to the larger trail network.
Sites for future planned elementary and middle schools are within the LLVTSM area and immediately adjacent to the west boundary of the SLVTSM. The proposed SLVTSM subdivision is designed with multiple opportunities for pedestrian access to the schools on the grid street pattern along the Northern Connector Road (Road A) and internal to the subdivision.
FIGURE 7: EAST BIDWELL STREET CROSS SECTION

FIGURE 8: MANGINI PARKWAY CROSS SECTION
C. Minor Administrative Modifications (MAMs)

The Project includes two Minor Administrative Modifications (MAMs). The first request is for approval of a MAM to transfer development rights to move 25 dwelling units among five parcels (parcels 155, 159, 165-A2, 165-B, and 166) within the Project boundary and FPASP, as shown on Figure 9 and Table 3. Four of the five parcels are within the Project boundary. Parcel 155 is immediately to the north of the Project boundary. The unit transfer supports the 260 units in the SLVTSM.

**FIGURE 9: UNIT TRANSFER FOR 25 DWELLING UNITS**

![Figure 9: Unit Transfer for 25 Dwelling Units](image)

**Table 3: Unit Transfer Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Parcel</th>
<th>Existing Unit Allocation</th>
<th>Unit Allocation After Transfer</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165-A2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165-B</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second MAM is for minor adjustments to the land use boundaries of six FPASP parcels. The adjustments to land use boundaries are requested to maximize development efficiencies, preserve natural resources, and accommodate a Class I trail. The largest change is to the north side of the open space adjacent to East Bidwell. Changes to the boundaries are shown on Figure 10 and summarized on Table 4.

Table 4: Land Use Boundary Refinement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Acres</th>
<th>Proposed Acres</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFHD</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHD</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQP</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 10: LAND USE BOUNDARY REFINEMENT
ATTACHMENT 3
ANALYSIS

The following sections provide an analysis of the Applicant’s proposal. Staff’s analysis addresses the following:

A. Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
B. Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
C. Minor Administrative Modifications
D. Traffic/Access/Circulation
E. Noise Impacts
F. Conformance with Relevant Folsom General Plan Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Objectives and Policies

A. Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map

The proposed Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (LLVTSM) would subdivide a 173-acre area west of East Bidwell Street between Savannah Parkway and Mangini Parkway into fourteen (14) large lots for future sale, lease, and financing. The proposed LLVTSM is shown in Figure 3 and Attachment 6.

The large lot parcels correspond to land uses and parcels (villages) on the FPASP Land Use Plan (Figure 1) designated MLD, SFHD, SF, PQP (elementary and middle schools), P (neighborhood park), and open space.

All created parcels would be served by public roadways and utilities can be extended to each of the parcels. Staff has determined that the proposed LLVTSM complies with all City and State Subdivision Map Act requirements.

B. Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map

A Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (SLVTSM) would further subdivide a 52.3-acre portion of the 173-acre LLVTSM into 260 single-family residential lots (218 SFHD and 42 MLD) three (3) open space parcels, eight (8) landscape lots, and one (1) paseo lot. The proposed SLVTSM layout is shown in Figure 4 and Attachment 7.
Figure 11 depicts the relationship between the 173-acre LLVTSM area (dashed black line) and the 53.2-acre SLVTSM area (dashed red line).

**FIGURE 11: LARGE LOT AND SMALL LOT MAPS**

The proposed SLVTSM consists of four villages on the southeast portion of the LLVTSM. Villages 1, 2 and 3 are designated in the FPASP and zoned Single Family High Density (SP-SFHD), and Village 4 is Multi Family Low Density (SP-MLD). In Villages 1-3 (SFHD), the typical lot sizes would be 45’x100’ and 50’x100’, consistent with the FPASP Development Standards. Typical Village 4 (MLD) lot sizes would be 45’x67’, consistent with the FPASP Development Standards. Together, the four villages would accommodate 260 detached single family residential units.

The proposed subdivision conforms to the development standards established by the FPASP for both the SP-SFHD and SP-MLD land use categories including minimum lot size, maximum lot coverage, and setbacks, as shown in Tables 4 and 5. Villages 1, 2, 3 conform to the SP-SFHD standards and Village 4 to the SP-MLD standards. No deviations from the standards are proposed.
Table 4: SP-SFHD Single-Family High-Density Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porch Setback</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Primary Structure Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Garage Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>5 Feet/5 Feet</td>
<td>5 Feet/5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: SP-MLD Multi-Family Low Density Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porch Setback</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
<td>12.5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Primary Structure Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Garage Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>5 Feet/5 Feet</td>
<td>5 Feet/5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project will be required to dedicate public right-of-way for the internal public streets (Condition 8). Conditions 8, 26, 28 and 30 require the Applicant to coordinate with and dedicate public utility easements for underground facilities (i.e., SMUD, Pacific Gas and Electric, cable television, telephone) on properties adjacent to the public streets.

Staff has determined that the proposed SLVTSM complies with all City and State Subdivision Map Act requirements.

C. Minor Administrative Modifications

The Project includes two Minor Administrative Modifications (MAMs). The first request is for approval of a MAM to transfer development rights to move 25 dwelling units among five parcels (parcels 155, 159, 165-A2, 165-B, and 166) within the Project boundary and FPASP, as shown on Figure 9 and Table 3.

The unit transfer supports the 260 units in the SLVTSM. The transferring and receiving parcels are located within the FPASP and, after the transfer, they would remain within the General Plan and specific plan density ranges. The transferring and receiving parcels are owned and controlled by the Applicant.

The second MAM is for minor adjustments to the land use boundaries of six FPASP
parcels. The adjustments to the land use boundaries are requested to maximize development efficiencies, preserve natural resources, and accommodate a Class I trail.

As shown in Figure 10, a minor boundary change is proposed along the north edge of the open space corridor adjacent to East Bidwell Street. This boundary change is minor and open space acreage would remain the same.

The FPASP provides for Minor Administrative Modifications,

“... that are consistent with and do not substantially change its overall intent, such as minor adjustments to the land use locations and parcel boundaries shown in Figure 4.1 – Land Use and Figure 4.4 – Plan Area Parcels and the land use acreages shown in Table 4.1 – Land Use Summary.” [FPASP Section 13.3].

Minor administrative modifications can be approved at a staff level, provided the following criteria are met:

- The proposed modification is within the Plan Area.
- The modification does not reduce the size of the proposed town center.
- The modification retains compliance with City Charter Article 7.08, previously known as Measure W.
- The General Plan land use pattern remains consistent with the intent and spirit of the FPASP.
- The proposed changes do not substantially alter the backbone infrastructure network.
- The proposed modification offers equal or superior improvements to development capacity or standards.
- The proposed modification does not increase environmental impacts beyond those identified in the EIR/EIS.

Based on staff’s review, both request for MAMs meet the requirements. As a result, staff is able to approve the proposed Minor Administrative Modifications for the unit transfers as well as the boundary adjustments.

D. Traffic/Access/Circulation

Primary access to the SLVSTM portion of the Project would be from East Bidwell Street on the east, Mangini Parkway on the south, and the east-west Northern Connector Road (A Drive) on the north. The Northern Connector Road would be a new street that will connect to East Bidwell Street to the east. B and D Drives will provide north-south
access from the North Connector Road south into the subdivision. Residential streets in a grid pattern would serve residential neighborhoods.

Subdivision streets consist of two-lane public streets with attached and detached sidewalks and parking on both sides of the street. If separated sidewalks are proposed, Condition 35 requires a Homeowners Association (HOA) maintain the landscape strips between the separated sidewalk and curb, to maintain consistent landscape maintenance. If a HOA is not provided with the future development, Condition 35 requires that the SLVTSM be revised to use a street section with attached sidewalks.

Sidewalks will provide pedestrian circulation on residential streets. A multi-purpose Class I trail in the open space/drainage corridor (Lot A) will extend from Mangini Parkway to East Bidwell Street and connected to the FPASP trail system. A landscaped pedestrian paseo will connect J Drive to the Class I trail north of the open space corridor, which provides connectivity to the trail network.

The FPASP established a series of plans and policies for the circulation system within the entire Plan Area. The FPASP circulation system was designed with a sustainable community focus on the movement of people and provides mobility alternatives such as walking, cycling, carpooling, and viable forms of public transportation in addition to vehicular circulation. The circulation plan evaluated regional travel, both in terms of connectivity and capacity and local internal connections and access. The circulation plan also addressed the concerns of regional traffic, including parallel capacity to U.S. Highway 50, and connectivity with surrounding jurisdictions while considering community-wide connectivity, alternative modes of travel, and the provision of complete streets.

The 2011 Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement included not only a detailed analysis of traffic-related impacts within the Plan Area, but also an evaluation of traffic-related impacts on the surrounding communities. There are fifty-five (55) traffic-related mitigation measures associated with development of the FPASP which are included as conditions of approval for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project. Many of these mitigation measures are expected to reduce traffic impacts to East Bidwell Street. Included among the mitigation measures are requirements to; fund and construct roadway improvements within the Plan Area, pay a fair-share contribution for construction of improvements north of U.S. Highway 50, participate in the City’s Transportation System Management Fee Program, and Participate in the U.S. Highway 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association. The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project is subject to all traffic-related mitigation measures required by the 2011 FPASP EIR/EIS (Condition No. 53-25 to 53-79).
Kimley Horn prepared an Access Evaluation (May 4, 2021, Attachment 12) to evaluate access and circulation-related impacts associated with the proposed Project. The evaluation was based, in part, on the Toll Brothers Regency at Folsom Ranch Transportation Impact Study (November 20, 2019) that studied the East Bidwell Street corridor.

The Access Evaluation assumed the following traffic controls and movements for the Project roadways:

- Traffic signal at Mangini Parkway and East Bidwell Street
- Side street stop-controlled intersections
  - Northern Connector Road at D Drive
  - Northern Connector Road at B Drive
  - Northern Connector Road at East Bidwell Street
  - Mangini Parkway at B Drive
  - East Bidwell Street at E Drive
- Emergency vehicle access at Mangini Parkway and E Drive
- Right in/right out turn movements from East Bidwell Street to E Drive
- Future at grade pedestrian crossing on East Bidwell Street at Class I trail adjacent to open space (between Northern Connector Road and Mangini Parkway)

The Access Evaluation reviewed a future potential at-grade pedestrian crossing on East Bidwell Street along the project’s frontage. This crossing would serve the proposed Class I trail and would be located between the Northern Access Road and the Village 4 E Drive intersections. Because it would be at-grade, the crossing would require pedestrian actuation, striping, and signage and extensive traffic signal appurtenances to ensure safe and orderly operations when pedestrians cross. A future traffic operations analysis would be required to simulate the East Bidwell Street corridor traffic operations under the condition with this at-grade crossing. The City considers this a future improvement that will be evaluated more comprehensively in the future.

The Access Evaluation concluded that the Project would result in adequate circulation with the following conditions (Condition 52) of the SLVTM:

1. The Project shall construct two-way vehicle circulation along the surrounding roadways, namely the Northern Connector Road (A Drive), D Drive, and C Drive (see Exhibit 1 of Traffic and Circulation Analysis dated May 4, 2021). The Project shall provide these two-way roadway facilities to allow for adequate circulation directly related to the Project.
2. The access on the north end of E Drive at East Bidwell Street shall be an emergency vehicle access (EVA). Turn movements at E Drive at East Bidwell Street shall be restricted to right-turns in and out of Village 4 at East Bidwell Street.

3. A full access, side street stop-controlled intersection shall be constructed at E Drive and Mangini Parkway.

4. The northbound East Bidwell Street left-turn to the Northern Connector Road shall be constructed with at least 315-feet (255-foot deceleration plus 60-foot bay taper).

5. A southbound deceleration taper/flare or lane (subject to City specification) shall be constructed at the East Bidwell Street intersection with the Northern Connector Road.

6. The B Drive intersection with the Northern Connector Road is anticipated to operate adequately with side street stop controlled and without dedicated turn pockets. Adequate sight distance shall be provided and maintained.

E. Noise Impacts

Based on the proximity of the Project site to Mangini Parkway and East Bidwell Street, an environmental noise analysis was prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants dated April 23, 2021 (Attachment 10). The noise analysis evaluated noise impacts to the Project associated with traffic on adjacent roadways. Noise levels were compared to applicable City of Folsom noise standards for acceptable noise exposure on the Project site. Noise generated by the Project, including construction activities, operational noise, and on-site circulation was evaluated.

Two aspects of noise impacts were evaluated relative to the proposed subdivision, noise directed at the proposed project, and noise caused by the proposed project. As noted previously, the predominant existing noise sources in the project vicinity that cause an impact to the project site are from vehicles traveling on Mangini Parkway, East Bidwell Street, and the Connector Roadway (A Street) as well as background noises from existing and future adjacent nearby uses. Potential noise impacts that might result from the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project are construction-related activities and operational activities. Construction-related noise would have a short-term effect, while operational noise would continue throughout the lifetime of the Project.

The Noise Element of the City of Folsom General Plan regulates noise emissions from public roadway traffic on new development of residential or other noise sensitive land uses. The Noise Element states that noise from traffic on public roadways shall not
exceed 60 dB DNL exterior noise CNEL for outdoor use areas and 45 CNEL for interior areas. Future traffic noise levels at the outdoor activity areas of the single-family residential lots proposed near East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway, and the Northern Connector (A Drive) are predicted to exceed the General Plan exterior noise level standard.

To achieve compliance with the General Plan exterior noise standards, the Noise Analysis recommends the placement of several barriers (sound walls) on East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway and the Connector Roadway (Road A), as shown in red, purple and green on Figure 11. Red and purple denotes a 6-foot soundwall, and green an 8-foot tall soundwall. The yellow highlighting on Figure 11 indicates locations where residential units should include window upgrades and air conditioning on the second floors so that windows can remain closed at the owner’s discretion. The Noise Analysis recommendations are included as Condition No 36 of the SLVTM.

**FIGURE 12: RECOMMENDED SOUNDWALL LOCATIONS**

Construction of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision would temporarily increase noise levels in the project vicinity during the construction period. 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. 55-21 is included to reflect these requirements.

F. Water Supply

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Project is consistent with Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and Folsom Plan Area EIR/EIS. Accordingly, the proposed project’s water demand can be accommodated by the City’s existing water supply allocated to serve the Folsom Plan Area.

G. Conformance with Relevant General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Objectives and Policies

The Applicant prepared a detailed analysis of the Project’s consistency with all the policies in the FPASP (Attachment 8). Staff concurs with the Applicant’s analysis that the Project is consistent with the policies of the FPASP.

The following is a summary analysis of the Project’s consistency with the Folsom General Plan and key policies of the FPASP.

GP and SP OBJECTIVE H-1 (Housing)
To provide an adequate supply of suitable sites for the development of a range of housing types to meet the housing needs of all segments of the population.

GP and SP POLICY H-1.1
The City shall ensure that sufficient land is designated and zoned in a range of residential densities to accommodate the City’s regional share of housing.

Analysis: The City provides residential lands at a variety of residential densities as specified in the General Plan and in the Folsom Municipal Code. The FPASP includes specialized zoning (Specific Plan Designations) that are customized to the Plan Area as adopted in 2011 and as amended over time. The FPASP provides residential lands in a range of densities.

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project SLVTSM is consistent with the density range for the MLD (7 to 12 units per acre) and SFHD (4 to 7 dwelling units
per acre) designations.

SP POLICY 4.1
Create pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods using a grid system of streets where feasible, sidewalks, bike paths and trails. Residential neighborhoods shall be linked, where appropriate, to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel.

Analysis: The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project proposes traditional single-family neighborhoods with a grid system of local streets provided with sidewalks on both sides of the street. Biking and walking will be accommodated within the Project on sidewalks, Class I trails, and within the pedestrian paseo. A Class I trail will be provided within the open space corridor traversing the southeast portion of the Project. On-street Class II and Class III bicycle lanes will also connect nearby neighborhoods, parks, schools, with Class I bicycle trails.

SP POLICY 4.4
Provide a variety of housing opportunities for residents to participate in the homeownership market.

Analysis: The FPASP provides home ownership opportunities within the SF (Single-Family), SFHD (Single-Family High Density), and MLD (Multi-Family Low Density) land use designated areas. Residential development in the MLD (Multi-Family Low Density), MMD (Multi-Family Medium Density), MHD (Multi-Family High Density) and MU (Mixed-Use) land use categories may provide ‘for rent’ opportunities; however, home ownership may also be accommodated in ‘for sale’ condos, townhomes, etc. at the time of development.

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project is consistent with this policy in that it will provide detached single family home ownership opportunities within the MLD and SFHD designations. The Project provides additional housing supply in the City of Folsom, proximate to schools, park, trails, commercial services and other amenities that serve residents.

SP POLICY 4.6
As established by the FPASP, the total number of dwelling units for the Plan Area shall not exceed 11,461. The number of units within individual land use parcels may vary, so long as the number of units falls within the allowable density range for a particular land use designation.

Analysis: There have been several Specific Plan Amendments approved by the City Council which have increased residentially zoned land and a decreased commercially zoned land in the FPASP. As a result, the number of residential units within the Plan Area increased from 10,210 to 11,461. The various Specific Plan Amendment EIRs and Addenda analyzed impacts from the conversion of the commercial lands to residential lands; impacts and associated mitigations
measures can be found in the individual project-specific environmental documents. The increase in population was analyzed and can be accommodated in the excess capacity of the school sites provided in the Plan Area.

The proposed Project does not result in any change in total dwelling units in the FPASP. The Project proposes a MAM to transfer residential units among parcels within the Project boundary, but the overall unit allocation will remain the same. The reallocation of units to these parcels will not exceed the allowable density for the parcels.

SP OBJECTIVE 7.1 (Circulation)
Consistent with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 and the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375), create a safe and efficient circulation system for all modes of travel.

SP POLICY 7.1
The roadway network in the Plan Area shall be organized in a grid-like pattern of streets and blocks, except where topography and natural features make it infeasible, for the majority of the Plan Area in order to create neighborhoods that encourage walking, biking, public transit, and other alternative modes of transportation.

Analysis: Consistent with the requirements of the California Complete Streets Act, the FPASP identified and planned for hierarchy of connect “complete streets” to ensure that pedestrian, bike, bus, and automobile modes are travel are designed to have direct and continuous connections throughout the Plan Area. Every option, from regional connector roadways to arterial and local streets, has been carefully planned and designed. Recent California legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (AB 32 and SB 375) has resulted in an increased market demand for public transit and housing located closer to service needs and employment centers. In response to these changes, the FPASP includes a regional transit corridor that will provide public transportation links between the major commercial, public, and multi-family residential land uses in the Plan Area.

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project has been designed with multiple modes of transportation options (vehicles, bicycle, walking, access to transit and a Class I trail) and an internal street in a grid pattern consistent with the approved FPASP circulation plan.

SP POLICY 4.9 (PARKS)
Subdivisions of 200 dwellings units or more not immediately adjacent to a neighborhood or community park are encouraged to develop one or more local parks as needed to provide convenient resident access to children’s plan areas, picnic areas and unprogrammed open turf area. If provided, these local parks shall be maintained by a
landscape and lighting district or homeowner’s association and shall not receive or provide substitute park land dedication credit for parks required by the FPASP.

**Analysis:** The Project is generally consistent with this policy. The LLVTSM provides a 10.6-acre Neighborhood Park (Lot 10, Parcel 164). Condition 8 requires the Applicant to dedicate the park site to the City. The Project further subdivides the parcels into 260 residential lots with the SLVTSM. While Villages 1 through 4 in the SLVTSM are not immediately adjacent to a neighborhood or community park, the Project provides pedestrian connections to the park via the trail system.

**H. Design Review**

The project proposes includes a LLVTSM and SLVTSM to subdivide the property and no specific development is proposed at this time. Future development proposals will require Design Review to evaluate consistency with development standards and architectural guidelines. Because the area is within the Mangini Ranch portion of the FPASP, the development in the Project is subject to the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines (Attachment 11). The Central District Design Guidelines are complementary to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Design Guidelines.

The purpose of the Central District Design Guidelines is to ensure development:

- Creates a community that encourages interaction and evokes a “pride of place” where people want to live.
- Encourage linkages and connectivity through land use adjacencies, trails, and open space.
- Create a variety of walkable neighborhoods.
- Encourage physical, social, and economic diversity.
- Integrate environmentally responsible practices.

The proposed subdivision maps and Minor Administrative Modifications are consistent with these goals.

**I. Inclusionary Housing**

The Applicant proposes to comply with Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 17.104 (Inclusionary Housing) by paying in-lieu fees per Municipal Code Section 17.104.060(G). (See the Applicant’s Inclusionary Housing letter, included as Attachment 16 to this staff report). Homes within the subdivision will be sold at market prices. Fees paid by the applicant will help provide affordable housing elsewhere in the city. The applicant is required to enter into an Inclusionary Housing Agreement with the City. The Final Inclusionary Housing Plan is subject to approval by the City Council. In addition, the Inclusionary Housing Agreement, which will be approved by the City Attorney, must be
executed prior to recordation of the Final Map for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision project. Condition No. 43 is included to reflect these requirements.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides that residential Projects which are consistent with an approved Specific Plan for which an EIR was prepared are exempt from a requirement to prepare additional environmental analysis. CEQA Guidelines section 15182(c) provides specific criteria to determine whether this exemption applies:

\[(c) \text{ Residential Projects Implementing Specific Plans.}\]

\[(1) \text{ Eligibility. Where a public agency has prepared an EIR on a specific plan after January 1, 1980, a residential Project undertaken pursuant to and in conformity to that specific plan is exempt from CEQA if the Project meets the requirements of this section. Residential Projects covered by this section include but are not limited to land subdivisions, zoning changes, and residential planned unit developments. [CEQA Guidelines section 15182]}\]

The Applicant has prepared an analysis (Attachment 11) which determined that the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project qualifies for the exemption provided in CEQA Guidelines 15182(c), since it is consistent with the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.

The analysis also includes a review of the impacts and mitigation measures addressed in the EIR for the FPASP, which concluded that the Project will not result in any impacts not already identified, and that mitigation measures in the EIR will be sufficient to address Project impacts. None of the events described in CEQA Guidelines 15162 which would require preparation of a subsequent EIR (substantial changes to the Project, substantial changes in the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken, or new information of substantial performance) have occurred, as detailed in the CEQA Exemption Analysis (Attachment 11).

The City has reviewed the analysis and concurs that the Project is exempt from additional environmental review as provided in CEQA Guidelines 15182(c).

RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Move to recommend that the City Council:

- Approve the CEQA Exemption for the proposed Project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15182(c).
• Approve the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map creating fourteen (14) large lot parcels.

• Approve the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map creating 260 single-family residential lots, three (3) open space parcels, eight (8) lettered landscape lots, and one (1) paseo lot.

• Approve a Minor Administrative Modification to transfer 25 allocated dwelling units among parcels within the Project.

• Approve a Minor Administrative Modification to refine land use boundaries for the purpose of maximizing development efficiencies, avoiding natural resources, and accommodating a Class I trail.

These approvals are subject to the proposed findings below (Findings A-W) and the recommended conditions of approval for the Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (Conditions 1-11) and the conditions for the Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (Conditions 1-55) attached to this report.

**GENERAL FINDINGS**

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

B. THE PROJECT IS GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AS AMENDED.

**CEQA FINDINGS**

C. THE CITY, AS LEAD AGENCY, PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

D. THE CITY HAS DETERMINED THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS UNDERTAKEN TO IMPLEMENT AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

E. THE CITY HAS DETERMINED THAT THE IMPACTS OF THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT ARE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED BY THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND ASSOCIATED MITIGATION MEASURES AND THAT THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION
65457 AND CEQA GUIDELINES 15182(c).

F. NONE OF THE EVENTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 21166 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE OR SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES HAVE OCCURRED.

G. THIS PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM CEQA IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 AND SECTION 15182 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

LARGE LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FINDINGS

H. THE PROPOSED LARGE LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP IS CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY’S SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT IN THAT THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WILL ENSURE THAT THE PROJECT IS DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CITY STANDARDS.

I. THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION, TOGETHER WITH THE PROVISIONS FOR ITS DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENT, IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN (AS AMENDED), THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN (AS AMENDED), AND ALL APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE.

J. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED.

K. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED DENSITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

L. AS CONDITIONED, THE DESIGN OF THE LARGE LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OR SUBSTANTIALLY AND AVOIDABLY INJURY FISH OR WILDLIFE OR THEIR HABITAT.

M. AS CONDITIONED, THE DESIGN OF THE LARGE LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SERIOUS PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY PROBLEMS.

N. THE DESIGN OF THE LARGE LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH EASEMENTS FOR ACCESS THROUGH OR USE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION.

O. SUBJECT TO SECTION 66474.4 OF THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT, THE LAND
IS NOT SUBJECT TO A CONTRACT ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA LAND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1965 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 51200 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE).

P. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND FOLSOM PLAN AREA EIR/EIS. ACCORDINGLY, THE PROPOSED PROJECT’S WATER DEMAND CAN BE ACCOMODATED BY THE CITY’S EXISTING WATER SUPPLY ALLOCATED TO SERVE THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA.

SMALL LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FINDINGS

Q. THE PROPOSED SMALL LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP IS CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY’S SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT IN THAT THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WILL ENSURE THAT THE PROJECT IS DEVELOPED IN COMPLIANCE WITH CITY STANDARDS.

R. THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION, TOGETHER WITH THE PROVISIONS FOR ITS DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENT, IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN (AS AMENDED), THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN (AS AMENDED), AND ALL APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE.

S. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED.

T. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED DENSITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

U. AS CONDITIONED, THE DESIGN OF THE SMALL LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OR SUBSTANTIALLY AND AVOIDABLY INJURY FISH OR WILDLIFE OR THEIR HABITAT.

V. AS CONDITIONED, THE DESIGN OF THE SMALL LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SERIOUS PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY PROBLEMS.

W. THE DESIGN OF THE SMALL LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND THE TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH EASEMENTS FOR ACCESS THROUGH OR USE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION.
X. SUBJECT TO SECTION 66474.4 OF THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT, THE LAND IS NOT SUBJECT TO A CONTRACT ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA LAND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1965 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 51200 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE).

Y. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN AND FOLSOM PLAN AREA EIR/EIS. ACCORDING TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT’S WATER DEMAND CAN BE ACCOMODATED BY THE CITY’S EXISTING WATER SUPPLY AlLOCATED TO SERVE THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA.
Attachment 4

Conditions of Approval
Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
### PN 20-254 Mangini Ranch Phase 3 LLVTSM Conditions

<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>1.</td>
<td><strong>90 Day Protest Period</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CD (E) (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The conditions of project approval set forth herein include certain fees, dedication requirements, reservation requirements, and other exactions. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020(d), these conditions constitute written notice of the amount of such fees, and a description of the dedications, reservations, and other exactions. The Applicant is hereby notified that the 90-day protest period, commencing from the date of approval of the project, has begun. If the Applicant fails to file a protest regarding any of the fees, dedication requirements, reservation requirements or other exaction contained in this notice, complying with all the requirements of Government Code Section 66020, the Applicant will be legally barred from later challenging such exactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2                   | **Final Map**               | M             | CD (E) (P)              |
|                    | The Applicant shall submit final maps to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:  

| 3.                 | **Development Rights**      | M             | CD (E) (P)              |
|                    | The approval of this vesting large lot tentative subdivision map and the recording of any vesting large lot final map does not convey any right to develop. Processing and approval of a small lot tentative subdivision map or maps and/or planned development |
permit applications shall be required prior to grading (with the exception of the School site on Lots 11 and 12 which may be graded), construction or development of any of the parcels created by this vesting large lot tentative subdivision map. As a condition of the small lot tentative subdivision map or maps and/or design review approval, the City shall identify improvements necessary to develop the subject parcel. These improvements may include on and off-site roadways, water, sewer, storm drainage, landscaping, sound-walls, and other similar improvements.

<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><strong>Street Names</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Applicant shall select street names from the City’s approved list or subsequently approved by the Planning Commission and shall be used for the large lot final map.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CD (E) (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Public Right of Way Dedication</strong>&lt;br&gt;As provided for in the Amended and Restated Development Agreement and the First Amendment thereto, the Owner/Applicant shall dedicate all public rights-of-way (Savannah Parkway, East Bidwell Street, and Mangini Parkway, etc.) and corresponding public utility easements such that public access is provided to each and every lot as shown on the latest version of the Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CD (E) (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>FMC Compliance</strong>&lt;br&gt;The final map shall comply with the Folsom Municipal Code.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Single Phase</strong>&lt;br&gt;The final map shall be recorded in one phase.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CD(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Parks and Recreation</strong>&lt;br&gt;The following measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Parks and Recreation Department:</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Owner/Applicant will dedicate the proposed neighborhood park site NP-4 (Lot 10) 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 land with development constraints (per FMC Chapter 16.32.040 Paragraph G). Any deficiency in the proposed parkland dedication per the FMC shall require modification to Tentative and Final Subdivision Maps to provide an 11.4-acre (net) park site to the satisfaction of the Parks and Recreation Director.

2. Preparation of an NP-4 conceptual site diagram utilizing programmed elements from the Parks and Rec Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Parks and Recreation Director.

3. Rough grading of the NP-4 Park parcel consistent with the conceptual site diagram.

4. Applicant shall provide to the City an “As Built” topographic survey in an electronic file compatible with AutoCAD upon completion of the rough grading.

5. All subdivision utilities shall be brought into the park site by the Applicant at a location coordinated with Parks and Recreation staff and approved by the Parks and Recreation Director.

9. **Schools**
   The Owner/Applicant will ensure the proposed 12.9-acre Elementary School site (Lot 11) is dedicated to the satisfaction of the School District, consistent with the provisions of the Amended Restated Development Agreement for the Folsom Plan area.

10. **Schools**
    The Owner/Applicant will ensure the proposed 24.1-acre Middle School site (Lot 12) is dedicated to the satisfaction of the School District, consistent with the provisions of the Amended Restated Development Agreement for the Folsom Plan area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Development Agreement for the Folsom Plan area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11. | **Validity**  
Pursuant to Government Code Section 66452.6, this approval shall be valid for a minimum term equal to the remaining term of the Development Agreement for the project, or for a period of thirty-six months, whichever is longer, but in no event for a shorter period than the maximum period of time permitted by the Subdivision Map Act. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5

Conditions of Approval
Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MANGINI RANCH PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION (PN 20-254)

### NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF EAST BIDWELL STREET AND SAVANNAH PARKWAY
### SMALL LOT VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP AND MINOR ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition of Approval</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map</td>
<td>Approval of the Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map is subject to the approval of the Proposed Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, dated May 10, 2021.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Design Review</td>
<td>At the time specific development is proposed the Applicant shall apply for Design Review.</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Final Development Plans</td>
<td>The Owner/Applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:</td>
<td>G, I, M, B</td>
<td>CD (P) E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, dated May 10, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, dated May 10, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Preliminary Utility Plan, dated May 10, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Access and Circulation Analysis, dated May 4, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Environmental Noise Analysis, dated May, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Maps are approved for the development of a 260-unit single-family residential subdivision (Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision). Implementation of the Project shall be consistent with the above referenced items and these conditions of approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Plan Submittal</td>
<td>All civil engineering, improvement, and landscape and irrigation 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.</td>
<td>G, I</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Validity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FMC Compliance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This approval of the Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map shall be valid for a period of twenty-four (24) months pursuant to Section 16.16.110A of the Folsom Municipal Code and the Subdivision Map Act. The term of the approved Inclusionary Housing Agreement shall track the term of the Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, as may be extended from time to time pursuant to Section 16.16.110.A and 16.16.120 of the Folsom Municipal Code and the Subdivision Map Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Small Lot Final Map shall comply with the Folsom Municipal Code and the Subdivision Map Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Indemnity for City**
The Owner/Applicant shall protect, 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, which claim, action or proceeding is brought within the time period provided therefore in Government Code Section 66499.37 or other applicable statutes of limitation. The City will promptly notify the Owner/Applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the City should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the Owner/Applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City or its agents, officers, and employees, pursuant to this condition. 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. The Owner/Applicant’s obligations under this condition shall apply regardless of whether a Final Map is ultimately recorded with respect to this Project.

11. **Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map**
The Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision map is expressly conditioned upon compliance with all environmental mitigation measures identified in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan EIR/EIS as amended by the Revised Proposed Water Supply Facility Alternative (November 2012), the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Backbone Infrastructure Mitigated Negative Declaration (December 2014), and the Westland Eagle Specific Plan Amendment (September 2015).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARDA and Amendments</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CD (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The Owner/Applicant shall comply with all provisions of Amendments No. 1 and 2 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement and any approved amendments thereafter by and between the City and the Owner/Applicant of the Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mitigation Monitoring</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Owner/Applicant shall 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 Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan FEIR/EIS 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 in the mitigation measure column. Applicant shall fund on a Time and Materials basis all mitigation monitoring (e.g., staff and consultant time).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The Owner/Applicant acknowledges that the State adopted amendments to Section 65850 of the California Government Code (specifically Section 65850(9)), effective January 1, 2018, to allow for the implementation of inclusionary housing requirements in residential rental units, upon adoption of an ordinance by the City. The Landowner is not currently contemplating any residential rental Projects within the Subject Property; however, in the event the City amends its Inclusionary Housing Ordinance with respect to rental housing pursuant to Section 65850(9), Landowner (or successor in interest) agrees that the Subject Property shall be subject to said City Ordinance, as amended, should any residential rental Project be proposed within the Subject Property.</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICE/SECURITY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15.</th>
<th>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 considered:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A security guard on-duty at all times at the site or a six-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| G, I, B | PD |

### DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS

| 16. | **Taxes and Fees**  
The Owner/Applicant shall pay all applicable taxes, fees and charges for the Project at the rate and amount required by the Public Facilities Financing Plan and Amendments No. 1 and No. 2 to the Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement. |
| --- | --- |

| M | CD (P)(E) |

| 17. | **Assessments**  
If applicable, the Owner/Applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees. |
| --- | --- |

| M | CD (E) |
| 18. | **FPASP Development Impact Fees**  
The Owner/Applicant shall be subject to all Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Area development impact fees in place at the time of approval or subsequently adopted consistent with the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP), Development Agreement and amendments thereto, unless exempt by previous agreement. The Owner/Applicant shall be subject to all applicable Folsom Plan Area plan-wide development impact fees in effect at such time that a building permit is issued. These fees may include, but are not limited to, the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Fee, Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee (SPIF), Solid Waste Fee, Corporation Yard Fee, Transportation Management Fee, Transit Fee, Highway 50 Interchange Fee, General Park Equipment Fee, Housing Trust Fee, etc.  

Any protest to such for all fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions imposed on this Project will begin on the date of final approval (July 1, 2020), or otherwise shall be governed by the terms of Amendments No. 1 and 2 to ARDA. The fees shall be calculated at the fee rate set forth in the PFFP and the ARDA. | B | CD (P), PW, PK |
| 19. | **Legal Counsel**  
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 City shall provide notice to the Owner/Applicant of the outside counsel selected, the scope of work and hourly rates, and the Owner/Applicant shall reimburse the City for all outside legal fees and costs incurred and documented by the City for such services. The Owner/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 Owner/Applicant shall be responsible for reimbursement to the City for the services regardless of whether a deposit is required. | OG | CD (P)(E) |
### Consultant Services

If the City utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the Project, the City shall provide notice to the Owner/Applicant of the outside consultant selected, the scope of work and hourly rates, and the Owner/Applicant shall reimburse the City for actual costs incurred and documented in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for City personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the Grading Plan, Final Map, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.

| 20. | **Consultant Services**
|     | If the City utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the Project, the City shall provide notice to the Owner/Applicant of the outside consultant selected, the scope of work and hourly rates, and the Owner/Applicant shall reimburse the City for actual costs incurred and documented in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for City personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the Grading Plan, Final Map, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable. |

### GRADING PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

| 21. | **Mine Shaft Remediation**
|     | 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 prior to approval of grading plans. |

|     | **G** | **CD (E)** |
|     | **G, I, M, B** | **CD (P)(E)** |
22. **Prepare Traffic Control Plan.**
Prior to construction, a Traffic Control Plan for roadways and intersections affected by construction shall be prepared by the Owner/Applicant. The Traffic Control Plan prepared by the Owner/Applicant shall, at minimum, include the following measures:

- Maintaining the maximum amount of travel lane capacity during non-construction periods, possible, and advanced notice to drivers through the provision of construction signage.
- Maintaining alternate one-way traffic flow past the lay down area and site access when feasible.
- Heavy trucks and other construction transport vehicles shall avoid the busiest commute hours (7 a.m. to 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays).
- A minimum 72-hour advance notice of access restrictions for residents, businesses, and local emergency response agencies. This shall include the identification of alternative routes and detours to enable the avoidance of the immediate construction zone.
- A phone number and City contact for inquiries about the schedule of the construction throughout the construction period. This information will be posted in a local newspaper, via the City’s web site, or at City Hall and will be updated on a monthly basis.

23. **State and Federal Permits**
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 prior to approval of any grading or improvement plan.

24. **Landslide /Slope Failure**
The Owner/Applicant shall retain an appropriately licensed engineer during grading activities to identify existing landslides and potential slope failure hazards. The said engineer shall be notified a minimum of two days prior to any site clearing or grading to facilitate meetings with the grading contractor in the field.
## IMPROVEMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Plans</strong>&lt;br&gt;The improvement plans for the required public and private subdivision improvements necessary to serve any and all phases of development shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department prior to approval of a Final Map.</td>
<td>M CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td><strong>Standard Construction Specifications and Details</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 latest edition of the City of Folsom <em>Standard Construction Specifications and Details</em> and the <em>Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards</em>.</td>
<td>I CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td><strong>Water and Sewer Infrastructure</strong>&lt;br&gt;All City-owned water and sewer infrastructure shall be placed within the street right of way. In the event that a City-maintained public water or sewer main needs to be placed in an area other than the public right of way, such as through an open space corridor, landscaped area, etc., the following criteria shall be met;&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;- The Owner/Applicant shall provide public sewer and water main easements.&lt;br&gt;- An access road shall be designed and constructed to allow for the operations, maintenance and replacement of the public water or sewer line by the City along the entire water and/or sewer line alignment.&lt;br&gt;- In no case shall a City-maintained public water or public sewer line be placed on private residential property.</td>
<td>I CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SMUD Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Structural setbacks less than 14-feet shall require the Applicant to conduct a pre-engineering meeting with all utilities to ensure property clearances are maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Any necessary future SMUD facilities located on the Applicant’s property shall require a dedicated SMUD easement. This will be determined prior to SMUD performing work on the Applicant's property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In the event the Applicant requires the relocation or removal of existing SMUD facilities on or adjacent to the subject property, the Applicant shall coordinate with SMUD. The Applicant shall be responsible for the cost of relocation or removal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SMUD reserves the right to use any portion of its easements on or adjacent to the subject property that it reasonably needs and shall not be responsible for any damages to the developed property within said easement that unreasonably interferes with those needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Applicant shall not place any building foundations within 5-feet of any SMUD trench to maintain adequate trench integrity. The Applicant shall verify specific clearance requirements for other utilities (e.g., Gas, Telephone, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>In the event the City requires an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication (IOD) for future roadway improvements, the Applicant shall dedicate a 12.5-foot public utility easement (PUE) for overhead and/or underground facilities and appurtenances adjacent to the City’s IOD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Applicant shall comply with SMUD siting requirements (e.g., panel size/location, clearances from SMUD equipment, transformer location, service conductors).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#### Lighting Plan

The Owner/Applicant of all Project phases shall submit a lighting plan for the Project to the Community Development Department. The lighting plan shall be consistent with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines:

- Shield or screen lighting fixtures to direct the light downward and prevent light spill on adjacent properties;
- Place and shield or screen flood and area lighting needed for construction activities, nighttime sporting activities, and/or security so as not to disturb adjacent residential areas and passing motorists;
- For public lighting in residential neighborhoods, prohibit the use of light fixtures that are of unusually high intensity or that blink or flash;
- Use appropriate building materials (such as low-glare glass, low-glare building glaze or finish, neutral, earth toned colored paint and roofing materials), shielded or screened lighting, and appropriate signage in the office/commercial areas to prevent light and glare from adversely affecting motorists on nearby roadways; and
- Design exterior on-site lighting as an integral part of the building and landscaping design in the Specific Plan Area. Lighting fixtures shall be architecturally consistent with the overall site design. Lights used on signage should be directed to light only the sign face with no off-site glare.

#### Utility Coordination

The Owner/Applicant shall coordinate the planning, development and completion of this Project with the various utility agencies (i.e., SMUD, PG&E, etc.). The Owner/Applicant shall provide the City with written confirmation of public utility service prior to approval of the final map.

#### Replacing Hazardous Facilities

The Owner/Applicant shall be responsible for replacing any and all damaged or hazardous public sidewalk, curb and gutter, and/or bicycle trail facilities along the site frontage and/or boundaries, including pre-existing conditions and construction damage, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.
### 32. Future Utility Lines
All future utility lines lower than 69 KV that are to be built within the Project shall be placed underground within and along the perimeter of the Project at the developer’s cost. The Owner/Applicant shall dedicate to SMUD all necessary underground easements for the electrical facilities that will be necessary to service development of the Project.

### 33. Water Meter Fixed Network System
The Owner/Applicant shall pay for, furnish and install all infrastructure associated with the water meter fixed network system for any City-owned and maintained water meter within the Project.

### 34. Class I Multi-purpose trail
Dedicate land for the Class I multi-purpose trail subject to the satisfaction of the City within Lot A.

#### Class II Bike Lanes
All Class II bike lanes (East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway) shall be striped, and the legends painted to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. No parking shall be permitted within the Class II bike lanes.

### 35. Separated Sidewalks
A Homeowner’s Association shall maintain the landscape between the separated sidewalk and curb on residential streets. In the event a Homeowners Association is not provided, the residential street section shall be modified to a section that includes attached sidewalks.
Based on the Environmental Noise Assessment (the “Traffic Noise Assessment, Mangini Ranch Phase 3”) prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants on May 10, 2021 and included in the staff report as Attachment no. 13, the following measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department:

1. To comply with the General Plan 60 and 65 dB DNL exterior noise level standards for single- and multi-family residential uses (respectively), traffic noise barriers ranging from 6 to 8 feet in height relative to backyard elevation would be required. The heights and locations of the noise barriers are illustrated on Figure 2. Barrier insertion loss calculation worksheets are provided as Appendix C. The traffic noise barriers could take the form of masonry wall, earthen berm, or a combination of the two. Other materials may be acceptable but should be reviewed by an acoustical consultant prior to use.

2. To ensure compliance with the General Plan 45 dB DNL interior noise level standard with a factor of safety, it is recommended that all upper-floor bedroom window assemblies of residences constructed on the lots identified on Figure 2 from which the adjacent roadways would be visible be upgraded to a minimum STC rating of 32.

3. Air conditioning shall be provided for all residences that back up to East Bidwell Street, Road A and Mangini Parkway (Village 1 lots 21-30, Village 3 lots 12 ad 33-36, and Village 4 lots 1 and 24 -42) of the development so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control interior noise. These conclusions are based on the traffic assumptions cited in Appendix B, the project site plans and grading plans (dated May 10, 2021), and on noise reduction data for standard construction.
37. **Master Plan Updates**
The Owner/Applicant shall provide sanitary sewer, water and storm drainage improvements with corresponding easements, as necessary, in accordance with these studies and the latest edition of the City of Folsom *Standard Construction Specifications and Details*, and the *Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards*.

The storm drainage design shall provide for no net increase in run-off under post-development conditions.

| G, I | CD(E), EWR, PW |

38. **Best Management Practices**
The storm drain 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.

In addition to compliance with City ordinances, the Owner/Applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that comply with the General Construction Stormwater Permit from the Central Valley RWQCB, to reduce water quality effects during construction. Detailed information about the SWPPP and BMPs are provided in Chapter 3A.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality.”

| G, I | CD (E) |

39. **Litter Control**
During Construction, 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 official start of the rainy season (October 15).

| OG | CD (E) |
### FIRE DEPT REQUIREMENTS

| 40. | **All-Weather Access and Fire Hydrants**<br>The Owner/Applicant shall provide all-weather access and fire hydrants before combustible materials are allowed on any Project site or other approved alternative method as approved by the Fire Department. All-weather emergency access roads and fire hydrants (tested and flushed) shall be provided before combustible material or vertical construction is allowed on any Project site or other approved alternative method as approved by the Fire Department. (All-weather access is defined as six inches of compacted aggregate base from May 1 to September 30 and two inches asphalt concrete over six inches aggregate base from October 1 to April 30). The buildings 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 Department. | G, I, M, B | CD (P), FD |

- **Residential Fire-Flow with Automatic Fire Sprinkler System:** The required fire-flow for the proposed subdivision is determined to be 500 gpm per minute for 30 minutes.
- All public streets shall meet City of Folsom Street Standards.
- The maximum length of any dead-end street shall not exceed 500 feet in accordance with the Folsom Fire Code (unless approved by the Fire Department).
- All-weather emergency access roads and fire hydrants (tested and flushed) shall be provided before combustible material storage or vertical construction is allowed. 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.
- The first Fire Station planned for the Folsom Plan Area may be required to be completed and operational at the time that the threshold of 1,500 occupied homes within the Folsom Plan Area is met.
41. **Landscaping Plans**

Final landscape plans and specifications shall be prepared by a registered landscape architect and approved by the City prior to the approval of the first building permit. Said plans shall include all on-site landscape specifications and details including a tree planting exhibit demonstrating sufficient diversity and appropriate species selection to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. The tree exhibit shall include all street trees, accent trees, parking lot shading trees, and mitigation trees proposed within the development. Said plans shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping.

Landscaping shall meet shade requirements as outlined in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan where applicable. 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 the 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, view protection, 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. The Owner/Applicant shall comply with city-wide landscape rules or regulations on water usage. The Owner/Applicant shall comply with any state or local rules and regulations relating to landscape water usage and landscaping requirements necessitated to mitigate for drought conditions on all landscaping in the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project.

In addition, the project shall comply with the following requirements:

1. At the time specific development is proposed, detailed landscape improvements along the Class 1 Trail (Lot A) shall be provided
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>subject to the satisfaction of the City including the placement of the trail, fencing, benches or other amenities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A pedestrian connection linking Road “F” to Mangini Parkway shall be provided in Lot B, at the time specific development is proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAP REQUIREMENTS

| 42. | **Subdivision Improvement Agreement**  
Prior to the approval of any Final Map, the Owner/Applicant shall enter into a subdivision improvement agreement with the City, identifying all required improvements, if any, to be constructed with each proposed phase of development. The Owner/Applicant shall provide security acceptable to the City, guaranteeing construction of the improvements. | M | CD (E) |
| 43. | **Inclusionary Housing Plan**  
Inclusionary Housing Plan shall be approved by the City Council. The Inclusionary Housing Agreement, which will be approved by the City Attorney, shall be executed prior to recordation of the Final Map for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project. | M | CD (P)(E) |
The Owner/Applicant shall disclose to the homebuyers in the Department of Real Estate Public Report and/or the CC&R’s the following items:

1) Future public schools are located in proximity to the proposed subdivision, and that the public parks may include facilities (basketball courts, a baseball field, softball fields, soccer fields, and playground equipment) that may generate noise impacts during various times, including but not limited to evening and nighttime hours. The Owner/Applicant shall also disclose that the existing public parks include nighttime sports lighting that may generate lighting impacts during evening and nighttime hours.

2) Future Fire and Police stations are located adjacent to the Project site and may include facilities and equipment that generate noise and light impacts during various times, including but not limited to evening and nighttime hours.

3) The soil in the subdivision may contain naturally occurring asbestos and naturally occurring arsenic.

4) The collecting, digging, or removal of any stone, artifact, or other prehistoric or historic object located in public or open space areas, and the disturbance of any archaeological site or historic property, is prohibited.

5) The Project site is located close to the Mather Airport flight path and overflight noise may be present at various times.

6) That all properties located within one mile of an on- or off-site area zoned or used for agricultural use (including livestock grazing) shall be accompanied by 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 [CD (P, PK)]
Sacramento concerning any such property within the County zoned for agricultural uses within one mile of the subject property being transferred.
### Public Utility Easements
The Owner/Applicant shall dedicate public utility easements for underground facilities on properties adjacent to the public and private streets. A minimum of twelve and one-half foot (12.5') wide Public Utility Easements for underground facilities (i.e., SMUD, Pacific Gas and Electric, cable television, telephone) shall be dedicated adjacent to all public and private street rights-of-way. The Owner/Applicant shall dedicate additional width to accommodate extraordinary facilities as determined by the City. The width of the public utility easements adjacent to public and private right of way may be reduced with prior approval from public utility companies.

### Backbone Infrastructure
As provided for in the ARDA and the Amendment No. 1 thereto, the Owner/Applicant shall provide fully executed grant deeds, legal descriptions, and plats for all necessary Infrastructure to serve the Project, including but not limited to lands, public rights of way, public utility easements, public water main easements, public sewer easements, irrevocable offers of dedication and temporary construction easements. All required easements as listed necessary for the Infrastructure shall be reviewed and approved by the City and recorded with the Sacramento County Recorder pursuant to the timing requirements set forth in Section 3.8 of the ARDA, and any amendments thereto.

### New Permanent Benchmarks
The Owner/Applicant shall provide and establish new permanent benchmarks on the (NAVD 88) datum in various locations within the subdivision or at any other locations in the vicinity of the Project/subdivision as directed by the City Engineer. The type and specifications for the permanent benchmarks shall be provided by the City. The new benchmarks shall be placed by the Owner/Applicant within 6 months from the date of approval of the vesting tentative subdivision map.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Centralized Mail Delivery Units</strong>&lt;br&gt;All Final Maps shall show easements or other mapped provisions for the placement of centralized mail delivery units. The Owner/Applicant shall provide a concrete base for the placement of any centralized mail delivery unit. Specifications and location of such base shall be determined pursuant to the applicable requirements of the U. S. Postal Service and the City of Folsom Community Development Department, with due consideration for street light location, traffic safety, security, and consumer convenience.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CD (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td><strong>Recorded Final Map</strong>&lt;br&gt;Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Owner/Applicant shall provide a digital copy of the recorded Final Map (in AutoCAD format) to the Community Development Department. The exception to this requirement is model homes. Building permits for model homes only may be issued prior to recording of the Final Map, subject to approval by the Community Development Department.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td><strong>Recorded Final Map</strong>&lt;br&gt;Prior to issuance of building permits, the Owner/Applicant shall provide the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District with a copy of the recorded Final Map.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P), FCUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td><strong>Credit Reimbursement Agreement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Prior to the recordation of the first Small-Lot Final Map, the Owner/Applicant and City shall enter into a credit and reimbursement agreement for constructed improvements that are included in the Folsom Plan Area’s Public Facilities Financing Plan.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CD (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRAFFIC/ACCESS/CIRCULATION/PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

|   | The following conditions of approval are related to roadway and traffic related improvements for the Mangini Phase 3 Subdivision Project: | B | CD E, PW, FD |
The Project shall construct two-way vehicle circulation along the surrounding roadways, namely the Northern Connector Road (A Drive) D Drive and C Drive (see Exhibit 1 of Traffic and Circulation Analysis dated May 4, 2021). The Project shall provide these two-way roadway facilities to allow for adequate circulation directly related to the Project.

- The access on the north end of E Drive at East Bidwell Street shall be an emergency vehicle access (EVA).
- A full access side street stop-controlled intersection shall be constructed at E Drive and Mangini Parkway.
- The northbound East Bidwell Street left-turn to the Northern Connector Road shall be constructed with at least 315-feet (255-foot deceleration plus 60-foot bay taper).
- A southbound deceleration taper/lane or lane (subject to City specification) shall be constructed at the East Bidwell Street intersection with the Northern Connector Road.
- The B Drive intersection with the Northern Connector Road is anticipated to operate adequately with side street stop controlled and without dedicated turn pockets. Adequate sight distance shall be provided and maintained.

I.B. CD, E, PW, FD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53.</th>
<th>Trash/Recycling Containers and Air Conditioner Screening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trash, recycling, and yard waste containers shall be placed behind the side yard fence so that they are not visible from the public right-of-way to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. In addition, air conditioning units shall also be placed behind the side yard fence or located in the rear yard so that they are not visible from the public right-of-way to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Number (Source)</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3A.1-4 (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Screen Construction Staging Areas.</strong> The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall locate staging and material storage areas as far away from sensitive biological resources and sensitive land uses (e.g., residential areas, schools, parks) as feasible. Staging and material storage areas shall be approved by the appropriate agency (identified below) before the approval of grading plans for all Project phases and shall be screened from adjacent occupied land uses in earlier development phases to the maximum extent practicable. Screens may include, but are not limited to, the use of such visual barriers such as berms or fences. The screen design shall be approved by the appropriate agency to further reduce visual effects to the extent possible. Mitigation for the off-site elements outside of the City of Folsom’s jurisdictional boundaries shall be developed by the Project Applicant(s) of each applicable Project phase in consultation with the affected oversight agency(ies) (i.e., El Dorado and/or Sacramento Counties, and Caltrans) to reduce to the extent feasible the visual effects of construction activities on adjacent Project land uses that have already been developed.</td>
<td>Before approval of grading plans and during construction for all Project phases.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-2</td>
<td>3A.1-5 (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish and Require Conformance to Lighting Standards and Prepare and Implement a Lighting Plan.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>To reduce impacts associated with light and glare, the City shall:</strong>&lt;br&gt;  ▶ Establish standards for on-site outdoor lighting to reduce high-intensity nighttime lighting and glare as part of the Folsom Specific Plan design guidelines/standards. Consideration shall be given to design features, namely directional shielding for street lighting, parking lot lighting, and other substantial light sources, that would reduce effects of nighttime lighting. In addition, consideration shall be given to the use of automatic shutoffs or motion sensors for lighting features to further reduce excess nighttime light.&lt;br&gt;  ▶ Use shielded or screened public lighting fixtures to prevent the light from shining off of the surface intended to be illuminated.&lt;br&gt;<strong>To reduce impacts associated with light and glare, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall:</strong>&lt;br&gt;  ▶ Shield or screen lighting fixtures to direct the light downward and prevent light spill on adjacent properties.&lt;br&gt;  ▶ Flood and area lighting needed for construction activities, nighttime sporting activities, and/or security shall be screened or aimed no higher than 45 degrees above straight down (half-way between straight down and straight to the side) when the source is visible from any off-site residential property or public roadway.&lt;br&gt;  ▶ For public lighting in residential neighborhoods, prohibit the use of light fixtures that are of unusually high intensity or brightness (e.g., harsh mercury vapor, low-pressure sodium, or fluorescent bulbs) or that blink or flash.&lt;br&gt;  ▶ Use appropriate building materials (such as low-glare glass, low-glare building glaze or finish, neutral, earth-toned colored paint and roofing materials), shielded or screened lighting, and appropriate signage in the office/commercial areas to prevent light and glare from adversely affecting motorists on nearby roadways.</td>
<td>Before approval of building permits.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Community Development Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AIR QUALITY

**55-3  3A.2-1a (FPASP EIR/EIS)**  
**Implement Measures to Control Air Pollutant Emissions Generated by Construction of On-Site Elements.**

To reduce short-term construction emissions, the Project Applicant(s) for any discretionary development application shall require their contractors to implement SMAQMD’s list of Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices, and Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices (list below) in effect at the time individual portions of the site undergo construction. In addition to SMAQMD-recommended

| Before the approval of all grading plans by the City and throughout Project construction, where applicable, for all Project phases. |

City of Folsom Community Development Department
measures, construction operations shall comply with all applicable SMAQMD rules and regulations.

**Basic Construction Emission Control Practices**

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.
- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes (as required by the state airborne toxics control measure [Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations]). Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.
Enhanced Fugitive PM Dust Control Practices – Soil Disturbance Areas
- Water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil. However, do not overwater to the extent that sediment flows off the site.
- Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- Plant vegetative ground cover (fast-germinating native grass seed) in disturbed areas as soon as possible. Water appropriately until vegetation is established.

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

Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices
- The Project shall provide a plan, for approval by the City of Folsom Community Development Department and SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower [hp] or more) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction Project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a Project wide fleet-average 20% NOX reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most current California Air Resources Board (CARB) standards.
Board (ARB) fleet average that exists at the time of construction. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. The Project Applicant(s) of each Project phase or its representative shall submit to the City of Folsom Community Development Department and SMAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 hp, that would be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction Project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and Projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the Project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of heavy-duty off-road equipment, the Project representative shall provide SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the Project manager and on-site foreman. SMAQMD’s Construction Mitigation Calculator can be used to identify an equipment fleet that achieves this reduction (SMAQMD 2007a). The Project shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the SPA do not exceed 40% opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and the City and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of noncompliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the Project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. SMAQMD staff and/or other officials may conduct periodic site
inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this mitigation measure shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulations.

- If at the time of construction, SMAQMD has adopted a regulation or new guidance applicable to construction emissions, compliance with the regulation or new guidance may completely or partially replace this mitigation if it is equal to or more effective than the mitigation contained herein, and if SMAQMD so permits.

| 55-4 | 3A.2-1b (FPASP EIR/EIS) | Pay Off-site Mitigation Fee to SMAQMD to Off-Set NOX Emissions Generated by Construction of On-Site Elements. Implementation of the Project or the other four other action alternatives would result in construction-generated NOX emissions that exceed the SMAQMD threshold of significance, even after implementation of the SMAQMD Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices (listed in Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a). Additionally, Mitigation Measure 3A.4-1 (Implement Additional Measures to Control Construction-Generated GHG Emissions, pages 3A.4-14 to 15) has the potential to both reduce and increase NOX emissions, depending on the types of alternative fuels and engine types employed. Therefore, the Project Applicant(s) shall pay SMAQMD an off-site mitigation fee for implementation of any of the five action alternatives for the purpose of reducing NOX emissions to a less-than-significant level (i.e., less than 85 lb/day). All NOX emission reductions and increases associated with GHG mitigation shall be added to or subtracted from the amount above the construction threshold to determine off-site mitigation fees, when possible. The specific fee amounts shall be calculated when the daily construction emissions can be more accurately determined: that is, if the City/USACE select and certify the EIR/EIS and approves the Proposed Project or one of the other four other action alternatives, the City and the Applicants must establish the phasing by which development would occur, and the Applicants must develop a detailed construction schedule. Calculation of fees associated with each Project development phase shall be conducted by the Project Applicant(s) in | Before the approval of all grading plans by the City and throughout Project construction for all Project phases. The City of Folsom Community Development Department shall not grant any grading permits to the respective Project Applicant(s) until the respective Project Applicant(s) have paid the appropriate off-site mitigation fee to SMAQMD. |
consultation with SMAQMD staff before the approval of grading plans by the City. The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall pay into SMAQMD’s off-site construction mitigation fund to further mitigate construction generated emissions of NOX that exceed SMAQMD’s daily emission threshold of 85 lb/day. The calculation of daily NOX emissions shall be based on the cost rate established by SMAQMD at the time the calculation and payment are made. At the time of writing this EIR/EIS the cost rate is $16,000 to reduce 1 ton of NOX plus a 5% administrative fee (SMAQMD 2008c). The determination of the final mitigation fee shall be conducted in coordination with SMAQMD before any ground disturbance occurs for any Project phase.

| 55-5 | 3A.2-1c (FPASP EIR/EIS) | Analyze and Disclose Projected PM10 Emission Concentrations at Nearby Sensitive Receptors Resulting from Construction of On-Site Elements. Prior to construction of each discretionary development entitlement of on-site land uses, the Project Applicant shall perform a Project-level CEQA analysis (e.g., supporting documentation for an exemption, negative declaration, or Project-specific EIR) that includes detailed dispersion modeling of construction-generated PM10 to disclose what PM10 concentrations would be at nearby sensitive receptors. The dispersion modeling shall be performed in accordance with applicable SMAQMD guidance that is in place at the time the analysis is performed. At the time of writing this EIR/EIS, SMAQMD’s most current and most detailed guidance for addressing construction generated PM10 emissions is found in its Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (SMAQMD 2009a). The Project-level analysis shall incorporate detailed parameters of the construction equipment and activities, including the year during which construction would be performed, as well as the proximity of potentially affected receptors, including receptors proposed by the Project that exist at the time the construction activity would occur. Before the approval of all grading plans by the City. | City of Folsom Community Development Department |
| 55-6 | 3A.2-2 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Implement All Measures Prescribed by the Air Quality Mitigation Plan to Reduce Operational Air Pollutant Emissions.**
To reduce operational emissions, the Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall implement all measures prescribed in the SMAQMD-approved Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Air Quality Mitigation Plan (AQMP) (Torrence Planning 2008), a copy of which is included in Appendix C2. The AQMP is intended to improve mobility, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and improve air quality as required by AB 32 and SB 375. The AQMP includes, among others, measures designed to provide bicycle parking at commercial land uses, an integrated pedestrian/bicycle path network, transit stops with shelters, a prohibition against the use the wood-burning fireplaces, energy star roofing materials, electric lawnmowers provided to Homeowners at no charge, and on-site transportation alternatives to passenger vehicles (including light rail) that provide connectivity with other local and regional alternative transportation networks. | Before issuance of subdivision maps or improvement plans. | City of Folsom Community Development Department |
| 55-7 | 3A.2-4a (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Develop and Implement a Plan to Reduce Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction-Generated Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions.**
The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall develop a plan to reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs generated by Project construction activity associated with buildout of the selected alternative. Each plan shall be developed by the Project Applicant(s) in consultation with SMAQMD. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval before the approval of any grading plans.
The plan may include such measures as scheduling activities when the residences are the least likely to be occupied, requiring equipment to be shut off when not in use, and prohibiting heavy trucks from idling. Applicable measures shall be included in all Project plans and specifications for all Project phases. | Before the approval of all grading plans by the City and throughout Project construction, where applicable, for all Project phases. | City of Folsom Community Development Department |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-8</td>
<td>3A.2-6</td>
<td><strong>Implement Measures to Control Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Operational Odorous Emissions.</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Project Applicant(s) for any discretionary development application shall implement the following measure:&lt;br&gt;» The deeds to all properties located within the plan 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.</td>
<td>Before the approval of building permits by the City and throughout Project construction, where applicable, for all Project phases. City of Folsom Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

| 55-9 | 3A.3-1a | **Design Stormwater Drainage Plans and Erosion and Sediment Control Plans to Avoid and Minimize Erosion and Runoff to All Wetlands and Other Waters That Are to Remain on the SPA and Use Low Impact Development Features.**<br>To minimize indirect effects on water quality and wetland hydrology, the Project Applicant(s) for any discretionary development application shall include stormwater drainage plans and erosion and sediment control plans in their improvement plans and shall submit these plans to the City Public Works Department for review and approval. For off-site elements within Sacramento County or El Dorado County jurisdiction (e.g., off-site detention basin and off-site roadway connections to El Dorado Hills), plans shall be submitted to the appropriate county planning department. Before approval of these improvement plans, the Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall obtain a NPDES MS4 Municipal Stormwater permit. | Before approval of improvement and drainage plans, and on an ongoing basis throughout and after Project construction, as required for all Project phases. City of Folsom Public Works Department |
Permit and Grading Permit, comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance and County drainage and stormwater 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 on-site. Detailed information about stormwater runoff standards and relevant City and County regulation is provided in Chapter 3A.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality.”

The Project Applicant(s) for any discretionary development entitlement shall implement stormwater quality treatment controls consistent with the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for Sacramento and South Placer Regions in effect at the time the application is submitted. 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 EPA to minimize impacts on water quality, hydrology, and stream geomorphology and is specified as a method for protecting water quality in the proposed specific plan. 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, as specified in the 404 permit.

In addition to compliance with City ordinances, the Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that
Comply with the General Construction Stormwater Permit from the Central Valley RWQCB, to reduce water quality effects during construction. Detailed information about the SWPPP and BMPs are provided in Chapter 3A.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality.” Each Project development shall result in no net change to peak flows into Alder Creek and associated tributaries, or to Buffalo Creek, Carson Creek, and Coyote Creek. The Project Applicant(s) shall establish a baseline of conditions for drainage on-site. The baseline-flow conditions shall be established for 2-, 5-, and 100-year storm events. These baseline conditions shall be used to develop monitoring standards for the stormwater system on the SPA. 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, which are described in Chapter 3A.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” are met and shall be designed as off-stream detention basins. Discharge sites into Alder Creek and associated tributaries, as well as tributaries to Carson Creek, 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 5 consecutive years without undertaking corrective measures to meet the performance standard.

See FEIR/FEIS Appendix S showing that the detention basin in the northeast corner of the SPA has been moved off stream.

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 in consultation with the affected oversight agency(ies) (i.e., El Dorado County for the roadway connections, Sacramento County for the detention basin west of Prairie City Road, and Caltrans for the U.S. 50 interchange improvements) such that the performance standards described in Chapter 3A.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” are met.
### 55-10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3A.3-2a (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th><strong>Avoid Direct Loss of Swainson’s Hawk and Other Raptor Nests.</strong></th>
<th>Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, before any ground disturbing activities, and during Project construction as applicable for all Project phases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To mitigate impacts on Swainson’s hawk and other raptors (including burrowing owl), the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys and to identify active nests on and within 0.5 mile of the Project and active burrows on the Project site. The surveys shall be conducted before the approval of grading and/or improvement plans (as applicable) and no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction for all Project phases. To the extent feasible, 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 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 consultation with DFG that reducing the buffer would not result in nest abandonment. DFG 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 DFG, 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 will be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest. 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 DFG. The mitigation plan may consist of installation of one-way doors 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 may be allowed.</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game and City of Folsom Community Development Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 50 feet of the burrow until young have fledged. Once it is confirmed that there are no owls inside burrows, these burrows may be collapsed.

Mitigation for the off-site elements outside of the City of Folsom’s jurisdictional boundaries must be developed by the Project Applicant(s) of each applicable Project phase in consultation with the affected oversight agency(ies) (i.e., El Dorado and/or Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans), such that the performance criteria set forth in DFG’s guidelines are determined to be met.

### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 55-11 | 3A.7-1a (FPASP EIR/EIS) Prepare Site-Specific Geotechnical Report per CBC Requirements and Implement Appropriate Recommendations. Before building permits are issued and construction activities begin any Project development phase, the Project Applicant(s) of each Project phase shall hire a licensed geotechnical engineer to prepare a final geotechnical subsurface investigation report for the on- and off-site facilities, which shall be submitted for review and approval to the appropriate City or county department (identified below). The final geotechnical engineering report shall address and make recommendations on the following:  
- Site preparation;  
- Soil bearing capacity;  
- Appropriate sources and types of fill;  
- Potential need for soil amendments;  
- Road, pavement, and parking areas;  
- Structural foundations, including retaining-wall design;  
- Grading practices;  
- Soil corrosion of concrete and steel;  
- Erosion/winterization;  
- Seismic ground shaking; |
| | Before issuance of building permits and ground-disturbing activities. |
| | City of Folsom Community Development Department |
Liquefaction; and
- Expansive/unstable soils.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-12</td>
<td>3A.7-1b (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Monitor Earthwork during Earthmoving Activities.</strong> All earthworks shall be monitored by a qualified geotechnical or soils engineer retained by the Project Applicant(s) of each Project phase. The geotechnical or soils engineer shall provide oversight during all excavation, placement of fill, and disposal of materials removed from and deposited on both on- and off-site construction areas. 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).</td>
<td>Before issuance of building permits and ground-disturbing activities.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-13</td>
<td>3A.7-3 (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Prepare and Implement the Appropriate Grading and Erosion Control Plan.</strong> Before grading permits are issued, the Project Applicant(s) of each Project phase that would be located within the City of Folsom shall</td>
<td>Before the start of construction activities.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
retain a California Registered Civil Engineer to prepare a grading and erosion control plan. The grading and erosion control plan shall be submitted to the City Public Works Department before issuance of grading permits for all new development. The plan shall be consistent with the City’s Grading Ordinance, the City’s Hillside Development Guidelines, and the state’s NPDES permit, and shall include the site-specific grading associated with development for all Project phases.

The plans referenced above shall include the location, implementation schedule, and maintenance schedule of all erosion and sediment control measures, a description of measures designed to control dust and stabilize the construction-site road and entrance, and a description of the location and methods of storage and disposal of construction materials. Erosion and sediment control measures could include the use of detention basins, berms, swales, wattles, and silt fencing, and covering or watering of stockpiled soils to reduce wind erosion. Stabilization on steep slopes could include construction of retaining walls and reseeding with vegetation after construction. Stabilization of construction entrances to minimize trackout (control dust) is commonly achieved by installing filter fabric and crushed rock to a depth of approximately 1 foot. The Project Applicant(s) shall ensure that the construction contractor is responsible for securing a source of transportation and deposition of excavated materials.

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).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.9-1 (discussed in Section 3A.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality – Land”) would also help reduce erosion-related impacts.

| 55-14 | 3A.7-5 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Divert Seasonal Water Flows Away from Building Foundations.** | Before and during earthmoving activities. | City of Folsom Community Development Department |
The Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall either install subdrains (which typically consist of perforated pipe and gravel, surrounded by nonwoven geotextile fabric), or take such other actions as recommended by the geotechnical or civil engineer for the Project that would serve to divert seasonal flows caused by surface infiltration, water seepage, and perched water during the winter months away from building foundations.

| 55-15  | 3A.7-10 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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.**
|        |                        | To minimize potential adverse impacts on previously unknown potentially unique, scientifically important paleontological resources, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases where construction would occur in the Ione and Mehrten Formations shall do the following:
|        |                        | ▶ Before the start of any earthmoving activities for any Project phase in the Ione or Mehrten Formations, the Project Applicant(s) shall retain a qualified paleontologist or archaeologist to train all construction personnel involved with earthmoving activities, including the site superintendent, regarding the possibility of encountering fossils, the appearance, and types of fossils likely to be seen during construction, and proper notification procedures should fossils be encountered.
|        |                        | ▶ If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, the construction crew shall immediately cease work in the vicinity of the find and notify the appropriate lead agency (identified below). The Project Applicant(s) shall retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the resource and prepare a recovery plan in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines (1996). The recovery plan may include, but is not limited to, a field survey, construction monitoring, sampling and data recovery procedures, museum storage coordination for any specimen recovered, and a report of findings.

**Recommendations**

| During earthmoving activities in the Ione and Mehrten Formations. | City of Folsom Community Development Department |
in the recovery plan that are determined by the lead agency to be necessary and feasible shall be implemented before construction activities can resume at the site where the paleontological resources were discovered.

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., Sacramento County).

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

55-16 3A.4-1 (FPASP EIR/EIS) **Implement Additional Measures to Control Construction-Generated GHG Emissions.**

To further reduce construction generated GHG emissions, the Project Applicant(s) any particular discretionary development application shall implement all feasible measures for reducing GHG emissions associated with construction that are recommended by SMAQMD at the time individual portions of the site undergo construction. Such measures may reduce GHG exhaust emissions from the use of on-site equipment, worker commute trips, and truck trips carrying materials and equipment to and from the SPA, as well as GHG emissions embodied in the materials selected for construction (e.g., concrete). Other measures may pertain to the materials used in construction. Prior to releasing each request for bid to contractors for the construction of each discretionary development entitlement, the Project Applicant(s) shall obtain the most current list of GHG reduction measures that are recommended by SMAQMD and stipulate that these measures be implemented in the respective request for bid as well as the subsequent construction contract with the selected primary contractor. The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application may submit to the City and SMAQMD a report that substantiates why specific measures are considered infeasible for construction of that particular development phase and/or at that point in time. The report, including the substantiation for not implementing particular GHG reduction measures, shall be approved by the City, in consultation before approval of small-lot final maps and building permits for all discretionary development Project, including all on- and off-site elements and implementation throughout Project construction.

City of Folsom Community Development Department
with SMAQMD prior to the release of a request for bid by the Project Applicant(s) for seeking a primary contractor to manage the construction of each development Project. By requiring that the list of feasible measures be established prior to the selection of a primary contractor, this measure requires that the ability of a contractor to effectively implement the selected GHG reduction measures be inherent to the selection process.

SMAQMD’s recommended measures for reducing construction-related GHG emissions at the time of writing this EIR/EIS are listed below and the Project Applicant(s) shall, at a minimum, be required to implement the following:

- Improve fuel efficiency from construction equipment:
  - reduce unnecessary idling (modify work practices, install auxiliary power for driver comfort);
  - perform equipment maintenance (inspections, detect failures early, corrections);
  - train equipment operators in proper use of equipment;
  - use the proper size of equipment for the job; and
  - use equipment with new technologies (repowered engines, electric drive trains).

- Use alternative fuels for electricity generators and welders at construction sites such as propane or solar or use electrical power.

- Use an ARB-approved low-carbon fuel, such as biodiesel or renewable diesel for construction equipment. (Emissions of oxides of nitrogen [NOX] emissions from the use of low carbon fuel must be reviewed and increases mitigated.) Additional information about low carbon fuels is available from ARB’s Low Carbon Fuel Standard Program (ARB 2009b).

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

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

| 55-17 | 3A.8-2 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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.**
The Project Applicant(s) for any discretionary development application shall conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (where an Phase I has not been conducted), and if necessary, Phase II Environmental Site Assessments, and/or other appropriate testing for all areas of the SPA and include, as

| Before and during earth moving activities | City of Folsom Community Development Department |
necessary, analysis of soil and/or groundwater samples for the potential contamination sites that have not yet been covered by previous investigations (as shown in Exhibit 3A.8-1) before construction activities begin in those areas. Recommendations in the Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments to address any contamination that is found shall be implemented before initiating ground-disturbing activities in these areas.

The Project Applicant(s) shall implement the following measures before ground-disturbing activities to reduce health hazards associated with potential exposure to hazardous substances:

- Prepare a plan that identifies any necessary remediation activities appropriate for proposed on- and off-site uses, including excavation and removal of on-site contaminated soils, redistribution of clean fill material in the SPA, and closure of any abandoned mine shafts. The plan shall include measures that ensure the safe transport, use, and disposal of contaminated soil and building debris removed from the site. In the event that contaminated groundwater is encountered during site excavation activities, the contractor shall report the contamination to the appropriate regulatory agencies, dewater the excavated area, and treat the contaminated groundwater to remove contaminants before discharge into the sanitary sewer system. The Project Applicant(s) shall be required to comply with the plan and applicable Federal, state, and local laws. The plan shall outline measures for specific handling and reporting procedures for hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous materials removed from the site at an appropriate off-site disposal facility.
  - Notify the appropriate Federal, state, and local agencies if evidence of previously undiscovered soil or groundwater contamination (e.g., stained soil, odorous groundwater) is encountered during construction activities. Any contaminated areas shall be remediated in accordance with recommendations made by the Sacramento County Environmental Management
Department, Central Valley RWQCB, DTSC, and/or other appropriate Federal, state, or local regulatory agencies.

- Obtain an assessment conducted by PG&E and SMUD pertaining to the contents of any existing pole-mounted transformers located in the SPA. The assessment shall determine whether existing on-site electrical transformers contain PCBs and whether there are any records of spills from such equipment. If equipment containing PCB is identified, the maintenance and/or disposal of the transformer shall be subject to the regulations of the Toxic Substances Control Act under the authority of the Sacramento County Environmental Health Department.

- 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., Sacramento County).

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55-18</th>
<th>3A.9-1 (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th>Acquire Appropriate Regulatory Permits and Prepare and Implement SWPPP and BMPs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant(s) of all Projects disturbing one or more acres (including phased construction of smaller areas which are part of a larger Project) shall obtain coverage under the SWRCB’s NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity (Order 2009-0009-DWQ), including preparation and submittal of a Project-specific SWPPP at the time the NOI is filed. The Project Applicant(s) shall also prepare and submit any other necessary erosion and sediment control and engineering plans and specifications for pollution prevention and control to Sacramento County, City of Folsom, El Dorado County (for the off-site roadways into El Dorado Hills under the Proposed Project Alternative). The SWPPP and other appropriate plans shall identify and specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |                        | - The use of an effective combination of robust erosion and sediment control BMPs and construction techniques accepted by the local jurisdictions for use in the Project area at the time of

Submittal of the State Construction General Permit NOI and SWPPP (where applicable) and development and submittal of any other locally required plans and specifications before the issuance of grading permits for all on-site Project phases and off-site elements and

City of Folsom Community Development Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>planning commission</th>
<th>Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision (PN 20-254)</th>
<th>May 19, 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>construction, that shall reduce the potential for runoff and the release, mobilization, and exposure of pollutants, including legacy sources of mercury from Project-related construction sites. These may include but would not be limited to temporary erosion control and soil stabilization measures, sedimentation ponds, inlet protection, perforated riser pipes, check dams, and silt fences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The implementation of approved local plans, non-stormwater management controls, permanent post-construction BMPs, and inspection and maintenance responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The pollutants that are likely to be used during construction that could be present in stormwater drainage and non-stormwater discharges, including fuels, lubricants, and other types of materials used for equipment operation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Spill prevention and contingency measures, including measures to prevent or clean up spills of hazardous waste and of hazardous materials used for equipment operation, and emergency procedures for responding to spills;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Personnel training requirements and procedures that shall be used to ensure that workers are aware of permit requirements and proper installation methods for BMPs specified in the SWPPP; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The appropriate personnel responsible for supervisory duties related to implementation of the SWPPP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Where applicable, BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be in place throughout all site work and construction/demolition activities and shall be used in all subsequent site development activities. BMPs may include, but are not limited to, such measures as those listed below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Implementing temporary erosion and sediment control measures in disturbed areas to minimize discharge of sediment into nearby drainage conveyances, in compliance with state and local standards in effect at the time of construction. These measures may include silt fences, staked straw bales or wattles,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation throughout Project construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Commission
Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision (PN 20-254)
May 19, 2021

- sediment/silt basins and traps, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary vegetation.
  - Establishing permanent vegetative cover to reduce erosion in areas disturbed by construction by slowing runoff velocities, trapping sediment, and enhancing filtration and transpiration.
  - Using drainage swales, ditches, and earth dikes to control erosion and runoff by conveying surface runoff down sloping land, intercepting and diverting runoff to a watercourse or channel, preventing sheet flow over sloped surfaces, preventing runoff accumulation at the base of a grade, and avoiding flood damage along roadways and facility infrastructure.

A copy of the approved SWPPP shall be maintained and available at all times on the construction site.

For those areas that would be disturbed as part of the U.S. 50 interchange improvements, Caltrans shall coordinate with the development and implementation of the overall Project SWPPP or develop and implement its own SWPPP specific to the interchange improvements, to ensure that water quality degradation would be avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable.

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before the approval of grading plans and building permits, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall submit final drainage plans to the City, and to El Dorado County for the off-site roadway connections into El Dorado Hills, demonstrating that off-site upstream runoff would be appropriately conveyed through the SPA, and that Project-related on-site runoff would be appropriately contained in detention basins or managed with through other methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before approval of grading plans and building permits of all Project phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Folsom Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
improvements (e.g., source controls, biotechnical stream stabilization) to reduce flooding and hydromodification impacts. The plans shall include, but not be limited to, the following items:

- An accurate calculation of pre-Project and post-Project runoff scenarios, obtained using appropriate engineering methods, that accurately evaluates potential changes to runoff, including increased surface runoff;
- Runoff calculations for the 10-year and 100-year (0.01 AEP) storm events (and other, smaller storm events as required) shall be performed and the trunk drainage pipeline sizes confirmed based on alignments and detention facility locations finalized in the design phase;
- A description of the proposed maintenance program for the on-site drainage system;
- Project-specific standards for installing drainage systems;
- City and El Dorado County flood control design requirements and measures designed to comply with them;
- Implementation of stormwater management BMPs that avoid increases in the erosive force of flows beyond a specific range of conditions needed to limit hydromodification and maintain current stream geomorphology. These BMPs will be designed and constructed in accordance with the forthcoming SSQP Hydromodification Management Plan (to be adopted by the RWQCB) and may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques to limit increases in stormwater runoff at the point of origination (these may include, but are not limited to: surface swales; replacement of conventional impervious surfaces with pervious surfaces [e.g., porous pavement]; impervious surfaces disconnection; and trees planted to intercept stormwater);
- Enlarged detention basins to minimize flow changes and changes to flow duration characteristics;
- Bioengineered stream stabilization to minimize bank erosion, utilizing vegetative and rock stabilization, and inset floodplain restoration features that provide for enhancement of riparian habitat and maintenance of natural hydrologic and channel to floodplain interactions;
- Minimize slope differences between any stormwater or detention facility outfall channel with the existing receiving channel gradient to reduce flow velocity; and
- Minimize to the extent possible detention basin, bridge embankment, and other encroachments into the channel and floodplain corridor, and utilize open bottom box culverts to allow sediment passage on smaller drainage courses.

The final drainage plan shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Folsom Community Development and Public Works Departments and El Dorado County Department of Transportation that 100-year (0.01 AEP) flood flows would be appropriately channeled and contained, such that the risk to people or damage to structures within or down gradient of the SPA would not occur, and that hydromodification would not be increased from pre-development levels such that existing stream geomorphology would be changed (the range of conditions should be calculated for each receiving water if feasible, or a conservative estimate should be used, e.g., an Ep of 1 ±10% or other as approved by the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership and/or City of Folsom Public Works Department).

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 El Dorado County.

| 55-20 | 3A.9-3 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Develop and Implement a BMP and Water Quality Maintenance Plan.** Before approval of the grading permits for any development Project requiring a subdivision map, a detailed BMP plan must be prepared before the issuance of the permits by the City of Folsom Community Development Department and Public Works Department. |
and water quality maintenance plan shall be prepared by a qualified engineer retained by the Project Applicant(s) the development Project. Drafts of the plan shall be submitted to the City of Folsom and El Dorado County for the off-site roadway connections into El Dorado Hills, for review and approval concurrently with development of tentative subdivision maps for all Project phases. The plan shall finalize the water quality improvements and further detail the structural and nonstructural BMPs proposed for the Project. The plan shall include the elements described below.

- A quantitative hydrologic and water quality analysis of proposed conditions incorporating the proposed drainage design features.
- Predevelopment and post development calculations demonstrating that the proposed water quality BMPs meet or exceed requirements established by the City of Folsom and including details regarding the size, geometry, and functional timing of storage and release pursuant to the “Stormwater Quality Design Manual for Sacramento and South Placer Regions” ([SSQP 2007b] per NPDES Permit No. CAS082597 WDR Order No. R5-2008-0142, page 46) and El Dorado County’s NPDES SWMP (County of El Dorado 2004).
- Source control programs to control water quality pollutants on the SPA, which may include but are limited to recycling, street sweeping, storm drain cleaning, household hazardous waste collection, waste minimization, prevention of spills and illegal dumping, and effective management of public trash collection areas.
- A pond management component for the proposed basins that shall include management and maintenance requirements for the design features and BMPs, and responsible parties for maintenance and funding.

grading permits for all Project phases and off-site elements and implementation throughout Project construction.
LID control measures shall be integrated into the BMP and water quality maintenance plan. These may include, but are not limited to:

- Surface swales;
- Replacement of conventional impervious surfaces with pervious surfaces (e.g., porous pavement);
- Impervious surfaces disconnection; and
- Trees planted to intercept stormwater.

New stormwater facilities shall be placed along the natural drainage courses within the SPA to the extent practicable so as to mimic the natural drainage patterns. The reduction in runoff as a result of the LID configurations shall be quantified based on the runoff reduction credit system methodology described in “Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions, Chapter 5 and Appendix D4” (SSQP 2007b) and proposed detention basins and other water quality BMPs shall be sized to handle these runoff volumes.

For those areas that would be disturbed as part of the U.S. 50 interchange improvements, it is anticipated that Caltrans would coordinate with the development and implementation of the overall Project SWPPP or develop and implement its own SWPPP specific to the interchange improvements, to ensure that water quality degradation would be avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable.

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 El Dorado County and Caltrans.

### NOISE AND VIBRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Code (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-21</td>
<td>3A.11-1</td>
<td><strong>Implement Noise-Reducing Construction Practices, Prepare and Implement a Noise Control Plan, and Monitor and Record Construction Noise near Sensitive Receptors.</strong></td>
<td>Before and during construction activities on the City of Folsom Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To reduce impacts associated with noise generated during Project related construction activities, the Project Applicant(s) and their primary contractors for engineering design and construction of all Project phases shall ensure that the following requirements are implemented at each work site in any year of Project construction to avoid and minimize construction noise effects on sensitive receptors. The Project Applicant(s) and primary construction contractor(s) shall employ noise-reducing construction practices. Measures that shall be used to limit noise shall include the measures listed below:

- Noise-generating construction operations shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.
- All construction equipment and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses.
- All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers’ recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.
- All motorized construction equipment shall be shut down when not in use to prevent idling.
- Individual operations and techniques shall be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete offsite instead of on-site).
- Noise-reducing enclosures shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., compressors and generators) as planned phases are built out and future noise sensitive receptors are located within close proximity to future construction activities.
- Written notification of construction activities shall be provided to all noise-sensitive receptors located within 850 feet of SPA and within El Dorado Hills.
construction activities. Notification shall include anticipated dates and hours during which construction activities are anticipated to occur and contact information, including a daytime telephone number, for the Project representative to be contacted in the event that noise levels are deemed excessive. Recommendations to assist noise-sensitive land uses in reducing interior noise levels (e.g., closing windows and doors) shall also be included in the notification.

- To the extent feasible, acoustic barriers (e.g., lead curtains, sound barriers) shall be constructed to reduce construction-generated noise levels at affected noise-sensitive land uses. The barriers shall be designed to obstruct the line of sight between the noise-sensitive land use and on-site construction equipment. When installed properly, acoustic barriers can reduce construction noise levels by approximately 8–10 dB (EPA 1971).

- When future noise sensitive uses are within close proximity to prolonged construction noise, noise-attenuating buffers such as structures, truck trailers, or soil piles shall be located between noise sources and future residences to shield sensitive receptors from construction noise.

- The primary contractor shall prepare and implement a construction noise management plan. This plan shall identify specific measures to ensure compliance with the noise control measures specified above. The noise control plan shall be submitted to the City of Folsom before any noise-generating construction activity begins. Construction shall not commence until the construction noise management plan is approved by the City of Folsom. Mitigation for the two off-site roadway connections into El Dorado County must be coordinated by the Project Applicant(s) of the applicable Project phase with El Dorado County, since the roadway extensions are outside of the City of Folsom’s jurisdictional boundaries.
### PUBLIC SERVICES

| 55-22 | 3A.14-1 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Prepare and Implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan.**  
The Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall prepare and implement traffic control plans for construction activities that may affect road rights-of-way. The traffic control plans must follow any applicable standards of the agency responsible for the affected roadway and must be approved and signed by a professional engineer. Measures typically used in traffic control plans include advertising of planned lane closures, warning signage, a flag person to direct traffic flows when needed, and methods to ensure continued access by emergency vehicles. During Project construction, access to existing land uses shall be maintained at all times, with detours used as necessary during road closures. Traffic control plans shall be submitted to the appropriate City or County department or the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for review and approval before the approval of all Project plans or permits, for all Project phases where implementation may cause impacts on traffic. 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 and Caltrans). | Before the approval of all relevant plans and/or permits and during construction of all Project phases. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 55-23 | 3A.14-2 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Incorporate California Fire Code; City of Folsom Fire Code Requirements; and EDHFD Requirements, if Necessary, into Project Design and Submit Project Design to the City of Folsom Fire Department for Review and Approval.**  
To reduce impacts related to the provision of new fire services, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall do the following, as described below.  
1. Incorporate into Project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code, Folsom Fire Code (City of Folsom Municipal Code Title 8, Chapter 8.36), and other applicable requirements based on the City of Folsom Fire Department fire prevention standards. | Before issuance of building permits and issuance of occupancy permits or final inspections for all Project phases. | City of Folsom Fire Department, City of Folsom Community Development Department |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improvement plans showing the incorporation automatic sprinkler systems, the availability of adequate fire flow, and the locations of hydrants shall be submitted to the City of Folsom Fire Department for review and approval. In addition, approved plans showing access design shall be provided to the City of Folsom Fire Department as described by Zoning Code Section 17.57.080 (“Vehicular Access Requirements”). These plans shall describe access-road length, dimensions, and finished surfaces for firefighting equipment. The installation of security gates across a fire apparatus access road shall be approved by the City of Folsom Fire Department. The design and operation of gates and barricades shall be in accordance with the Sacramento County Emergency Access Gates and Barriers Standard, as required by the City of Folsom Fire Code.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Submit a Fire Systems New Buildings, Additions, and Alterations Document Submittal List to the City of Folsom Community Development Department Building Division for review and approval before the issuance of building permits. In addition to the above measures, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall incorporate the provisions described below for the portion of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, if it is determined through City/El Dorado County negotiations that EDHFD would serve the 178-acre portion of the SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Incorporate into Project designs applicable requirements based on the EDHFD fire prevention standards. For commercial development, improvement plans showing roadways, land splits, buildings, fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, and other commercial building improvements shall be submitted to the EDHFD for review and approval. For residential development, improvement plans showing property lines and adjacent streets or roads; total acreage or square footage of the parcel; the footprint of all structures; driveway plan views describing width, length, turnouts, turnarounds, radiuses, and surfaces; and driveway profile views showing the percent grade from the access road to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
structure and vertical clearance shall be submitted to the EDHFD for review and approval.
4. Submit a Fire Prevention Plan Checklist to the EDHFD for review and approval before the issuance of building permits. In addition, residential development requiring automation fire sprinklers shall submit sprinkler design sheet(s) and hydraulic calculations from a California State Licensed C-16 Contractor.

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

5. Incorporate Fire Flow Requirements into Project Designs.

The Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall incorporate into their Project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code, Folsom Fire Code, and/or EDHFD for those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area and shall verify to City of Folsom Fire Department that adequate water flow is available, prior to approval of improvement plans and issuance of occupancy permits or final inspections for all Project phases.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-24</td>
<td>The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure that the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented and when fair share.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-26</td>
<td>3A.15-1b (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td>The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements at the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 2). To ensure that the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection (Intersection 2).</td>
<td>A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented and when fair share funding should be paid.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-27</td>
<td>3A.15-1c (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td>The Applicant Shall Fund and Construct Improvements to the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 28). To ensure that the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, a traffic signal must be installed.</td>
<td>A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-28</td>
<td>3A.15-1e (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td>Fund and Construct Improvements to the Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Intersection 41). To ensure that the Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one dedicated left turn lane and two through lanes, and the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two through lanes and one dedicated right-turn lane. The Applicant shall fund and construct these improvements.</td>
<td>A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Plan Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-29</td>
<td>3A.15-1f (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Fund and Construct Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road Intersection (Intersection 44).</strong> To ensure that the Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, control all movements with a stop sign. The Applicant shall fund and construct these improvements.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-30</td>
<td>3A.15-1h (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 2).</strong> To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, this intersection must be grade separated including “jug handle” ramps. No at grade improvement is feasible. Grade separating and extended (south) Hazel Avenue with improvements to the U.S. 50/Hazel Avenue interchange is a mitigation measure for the approved Easton-Glenbrough Specific Plan development Project. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 2).</td>
<td>Sacramento County Public Works Department and Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-31</td>
<td>3A.15-1i (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>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).</strong> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. The currently County proposed White Rock Road widening Project will widen and realign White Rock Road from the Rancho Cordova City limit to the El Dorado County line (this analysis assumes that the Proposed Project and build alternatives will</td>
<td>Sacramento County Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before Project build out. Design of the White Rock Road widening to four lanes, from Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road, with Intersection improvements has begun, and because this
| 55-32 | **3A.15-1j**<br>(FPASPEIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive (Roadway Segment 10).** <br>To ensure that Hazel Avenue operates at an acceptable LOS between Curragh Downs Drive and Gold Country Boulevard, Hazel Avenue must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is part of the County adopted Hazel Avenue widening Project. | Before Project build out. Construction of phase two of the Hazel Avenue widening, from Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive, is expected to be completed by year 2013, before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is complete. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding. | Sacramento County Public Works Department |
| 55-33 | 3A.15-1l  
(FPASP  
EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the White Rock Road/Windfield Way Intersection (El Dorado County Intersection 3).**  
To ensure that the White Rock Road/Windfield Way intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the intersection must be signalized, and separate northbound left and right turn lanes must be striped. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the White Rock Road/Windfield Way intersection (El Dorado County Intersection 3). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | El Dorado County Department of Transportation |
| 55-34 | 3A.15-1o  
(FPASP  
EIR/EIS) | **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). Congestion on eastbound U.S. 50 is causing vehicles to use Folsom Boulevard as an alternate parallel route until they reach U.S. 50, where they must get back on the freeway due to the lack of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 10). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision | City of Folsom Public Works Department and Sacramento County Department of Transportation |
of a parallel route. It is preferred to alleviate the congestion on U.S. 50 than to upgrade the intersection at the end of this reliever route. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection (Caltrans Intersection 4). To ensure that the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, auxiliary lanes should be added to eastbound U.S. 50 from Hazel Avenue to east of Folsom Boulevard. This was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project.

map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.

| 55-35 | 3A.15-1p (FPASP EIR/EIS) | Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/ State Route 16 Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 12). To ensure that the Grant Line Road/State Route 16 intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. Protected left-turn signal phasing must be provided on the northbound and southbound approaches. Improvements to the Grant Line Road/State Route 16 intersection are contained within the County Development Fee Program and are scheduled for Measure A funding. Improvements to this intersection must be implemented by Caltrans, Sacramento County, and the City of Rancho Cordova. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Grant Line Road/State Route 16 intersection (Caltrans Intersection 12). |
| 55-36 | 3A.15-1q (FPASP EIR/EIS) | Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1). To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard, a bus-carpool

Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. Before Project build out. Construction of the Sacramento 50 Bus-Carpool

Sacramento County
Department of Transportation and the City of Rancho Cordova Department of Public Works

Caltrans

| 360 |
| Page  | 55-37 | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 3).**
To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program.

The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to

| Action | 3A.15-1r (FPASP EIR/EIS) | Lane and Community Enhancements Project is expected to be completed by year 2013, before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is complete.
Construction of the Sacramento 50 Bus-Carpool Lane and Community Enhancements Project has started since the writing of the Draft EIS/EIR.

City of Folsom Public Works Department and Sacramento County Department of Transportation | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-38</td>
<td>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). To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 4).</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Public Works Department and Sacramento County Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-39</td>
<td>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). To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to Westbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 16).</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Public Works Department and Sacramento County Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-40</td>
<td>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 18). To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to Westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 18).</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova Department of Public Works and Sacramento County Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project and included in the proposed Rancho Cordova Parkway interchange Project. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 18).

| 55-41 | 3A.15-1w (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound/Folsom Boulevard Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 4).** To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Folsom Boulevard merge, an auxiliary lane from the Folsom Boulevard merge to the Prairie City Road diverge must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Folsom Boulevard Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 4). |
| 55-42 | 3A.15-1x (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road Diverge (Freeway Diverge 5).** To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road off-ramp diverge, an auxiliary lane from the Folsom Boulevard merge must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | City of Folsom Public Works Department and Sacramento County Department of Transportation |
| 55-43 | 3A.15-1y (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road Direct Merge (Freeway Merge 6).**  
To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road onramp direct merge, an auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road diverge (Freeway Diverge 5). | Improvement should be built. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
| 55-44 | 3A.15-1z (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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).**  
To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp weave, an improvement acceptable to Caltrans should be implemented to eliminate the unacceptable weaving conditions. Such an improvement may involve a “braided ramp”.  
The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp weave (Freeway Weave 8). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
| 55-45 | 3A.15-1aa (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound/Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Merge (Freeway Merge 9).** | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision (PN 20-254)

#### May 19, 2021

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Oak Avenue Parkway loop merge, an auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/ Oak Avenue Parkway loop merge (Freeway Merge 9).

| 55-46 | 3A.15-1dd (FPASP EIR/EIS) | Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound/Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 23). To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Empire Ranch Road loop on ramp should start the westbound auxiliary lane that ends at the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp. The slip on ramp from southbound Empire Ranch Road would merge into this extended auxiliary lane. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Empire Ranch Road loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 23). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |

<p>| 55-47 | 3A.15-1ee (FPASP EIR/EIS) | Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound/Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 29). To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Oak Avenue Parkway loop on ramp should start the westbound auxiliary lane that ends at the Prairie City Road off ramp. The slip-on ramp from southbound Oak Avenue Parkway would merge into this extended auxiliary lane. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-48</td>
<td>3A.15-1ff</td>
<td>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound/Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 32). To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road loop ramp merge, an auxiliary lane to the Folsom Boulevard off ramp diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 32).</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-49</td>
<td>3A.15-1gg</td>
<td>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound/Prairie City Road Direct Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 33). To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road direct ramp merge, an auxiliary lane to the Folsom Boulevard off ramp diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Prairie City Road direct ramp merge (Freeway Merge 33).</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-50</td>
<td>3A.15-1hh</td>
<td>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound/Folsom Boulevard Diverge (Freeway Diverge 34). To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Folsom Boulevard Diverge, an auxiliary lane from the Prairie City Road loop ramp merge must be constructed. Improvements to</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 55-51 | 3A.15-1ii (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound/Hazel Avenue Direct Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 38).**

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue direct ramp merge, an auxiliary lane to the Sunrise Boulevard off ramp diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Hazel Avenue direct ramp merge (Freeway Merge 38). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | Sacramento County Department of Transportation and City of Rancho Cordova Department of Public Works |
| 55-52 | 3A.15-2a (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Develop Commercial Support Services and Mixed-use Development Concurrent with Housing Development and Develop and Provide Options for Alternative Transportation Modes.**

The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application including commercial or mixed-use development along with residential uses shall develop commercial and mixed-use development concurrent with housing development, to the extent feasible in light of market realities and other considerations, to internalize vehicle trips. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Public Works Department. To further minimize impacts from the increased demand on area roadways and intersections, the Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application involving schools or commercial centers shall develop and implement safe and secure bicycle parking to promote | Before approval of improvement plans for all Project phases any particular discretionary development application that includes residential and commercial or mixed-use development. As a condition of Project approval and/or as a condition of the | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
alternative transportation uses and reduce the volume of single-occupancy vehicles using area roadways and intersections. The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall participate in capital improvements and operating funds for transit service to increase the percent of travel by transit. The Project’s fair-share participation and the associated timing of the improvements and service shall be identified in the Project conditions of approval and/or the Project’s development agreement. Improvements and service shall be coordinated, as necessary, with Folsom Stage Lines and Sacramento RT.

| 55-53 | 3A.15-2b (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in the City’s Transportation System Management Fee Program.** The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall pay an appropriate amount into the City’s existing Transportation System Management Fee Program to reduce the number of single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections. | Concurrent with construction for all Project phases. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
| 55-54 | 3A.15-2c (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association.** The Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall join and participate with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association to reduce the number of single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections. | Concurrent with construction for all Project phases. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
| 55-55 | 3A.15-3 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Pay Full Cost of Identified Improvements that Are Not Funded by the City’s Fee Program.** In accordance with Measure W, the Project Applicant(s) for any particular discretionary development application shall provide fair-share contributions to the City’s transportation impact fee program to fully fund improvements only required because of the Specific Plan. | As a condition of Project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all Project phases. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
| 55-56 | 3A.15-4a (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 2).** Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be | | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
| 55-57 | 3A.15-4b (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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).**

To ensure that the Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound (East Bidwell Street) approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, four through lanes and a right-turn lane, and the westbound (East Bidwell Street) approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left turn lanes, four through lanes, and a right-turn lane. It is against the City of Folsom policy to have eight lane roads because of the impacts to non-motorized traffic and adjacent development; therefore, this improvement is infeasible. | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |

| 55-58 | 3A.15-4c (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the East Bidwell Street/College Street Intersection (Folsom Intersection 7).**

To ensure that the East Bidwell Street/College Street intersection operates at acceptable LOS C or better, the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one left-through lane, and two dedicated right-turn lanes. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the East Bidwell Street/Nesmith Court intersection (Folsom Intersection 7). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | City of Folsom Public Works Department |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>3A.15-4d</td>
<td><strong>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).</strong>&lt;br&gt;To ensure that the East Bidwell Street /Iron Point Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, four through lanes and a right-turn lane, and the southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, four through lanes and a right-turn lane. It is against the City of Folsom policy to have eight lane roads because of the impacts to non-motorized traffic and adjacent development; therefore, this improvement is infeasible.</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>3A.15-4e</td>
<td><strong>The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Serpa Way/ Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 23).</strong>&lt;br&gt;To improve LOS at the Serpa Way/ Iron Point Road intersection, the northbound approaches must be restriped to consist of one left-turn lane, one shared left-through lanes, and one right-turn lane. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Serpa Way/Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 23).</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-61</td>
<td>3A.15-4f</td>
<td><strong>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).</strong>&lt;br&gt;To ensure that the Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road intersection operates at a LOS D or better, all of the following improvements are required: The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane. The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and a through-right lane. The northbound approach must be</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and a right-turn lane. The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and a right-turn lane. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road Intersection Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. (Folsom Intersection 24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55-62</th>
<th>3A.15-4g (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th><strong>The Applicant Shall Fund and Construct Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Folsom Intersection 33).</strong></th>
<th>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</th>
<th>City of Folsom Public Works Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To ensure that the Oak Avenue Parkway/Easton Valley Parkway intersection operates at an acceptable LOS the southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes. The Applicant shall fund and construct these improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55-63</th>
<th>3A.15-4i (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th><strong>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 3).</strong></th>
<th>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</th>
<th>Sacramento County Department of Transportation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To ensure that the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS E or better this intersection should be replaced by some type of grade separated intersection or interchange. Improvements to this intersection are identified in the Sacramento County’s Proposed General Plan. Implementation of these improvements would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection by providing acceptable operation. Intersection improvements must be implemented by Sacramento County. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based
| 55-64 | 3A.15-4j (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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).**

To improve operation on Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is proposed in the Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova General Plans; however, it is not in the 2035 MTP. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Sacramento County Roadway Segments 5-7). The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Project on this roadway segment. | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | Sacramento County Department of Transportation. |
| 55-65 | 3A.15-4k (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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).**

To improve operation on Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway, this roadway segment could be widened to six lanes. This improvement is proposed in the Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova General Plans; however, it is not in the 2035 MTP. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 8). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | Sacramento County Department of Transportation. |
| 55-66 | 3A.15-4I (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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 Segments 12-13).**

To improve operation on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps, this roadway segment could be widened to eight lanes. This improvement is inconsistent with Sacramento County’s general plan because the county’s policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes. Analysis shown later indicates that improvements at the impacted intersection in this segment can be mitigated (see Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4q). Improvements to impacted intersections on this segment will improve operations on this roadway segment and, therefore; mitigate this segment impact. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Sacramento County Roadway Segments 12-13). | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | Sacramento County Department of Transportation. |
| 55-67 | 3A.15-4m (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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).**

To improve operation on White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is included in the 2035 MTP but is not included in the Sacramento County General Plan. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County. The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Project on this roadway segment. However, because of other development in the region that would substantially increase traffic levels, this roadway segment would continue to operate at an | Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | Sacramento County Department of Transportation. |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unacceptable LOS F even with the capacity improvements identified to mitigate Folsom South of U.S. 50 impacts. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 22).</td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
<td>Sacramento County Department of Transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-68</td>
<td>3A.15-4n (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>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).</strong> To improve operation on White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-69</td>
<td>3A.15-4o (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the White Rock Road/Carson Crossing Road Intersection (El Dorado County 1).</strong> To ensure that the White Rock Road/Carson Crossing Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound right turn lane must be converted into a separate free right turn lane, or double right. Improvements to this intersection must be implemented by El Dorado County. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the White Rock Road/Carson Crossing Road Intersection (El Dorado County 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>File</td>
<td>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-70</td>
<td>3A.15-4p (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td>To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one dedicated left turn lane, one shared left through lane and three dedicated right-turn lanes. Improvements to this intersection must be implemented by Caltrans and Sacramento County. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento County Department of Transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-71</td>
<td>3A.15-4q (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound US 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that Eastbound US 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard, an additional eastbound lane could be constructed. This improvement is not consistent with the Concept Facility in Caltrans State Route 50 Corridor System Management Plan; therefore, it is not likely to be implemented by Caltrans by 2030. Construction of the Capitol South East Connector, including widening White Rock Road and Grant Line Road to six lanes with limited access, could divert some traffic from U.S. 50 and partially mitigate the Project’s impact. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento County Department of Transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-72</td>
<td>3A.15-4r (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td><strong>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound US 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 3).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that Eastbound US 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue, an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento County Department of Transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
additional eastbound lane could be constructed. This improvement is not consistent with the Concept Facility in Caltrans State Route 50 Corridor System Management Plan; therefore, it is not likely to be implemented by Caltrans by 2030. Construction of the Capitol South East Connector, including widening White Rock Road and Grant Line Road to six lanes with limited access, could divert some traffic off of U.S. 50 and partially mitigate the Project's impact. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55-73</th>
<th>3A.15-4s (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound US 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 5).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that Eastbound US 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road, the eastbound auxiliary lane should be converted to a mixed flow lane that extends to and drops at the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp (see mitigation measure 3A.15-4t). Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. This improvement is not consistent with the Concept Facility in Caltrans State Route 50 Corridor System Management Plan; therefore, it is not likely to be implemented by Caltrans by 2030. Construction of the Capitol South East Connector, including widening White Rock Road and Grant Line Road to six lanes with limited access, could divert some traffic off of U.S. 50 and partially mitigate the Project's impact. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55-74</th>
<th>3A.15-4t (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound US 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (Freeway Segment 6).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
To ensure that Eastbound US 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway, the northbound Prairie City Road slip on ramp should merge with the eastbound auxiliary lane that extends to and drops at the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp (see Mitigation Measures 3A.15-4u, v and w), and the southbound Prairie City Road flyover on ramp should be braided over the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp and start an extended full auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (Freeway Segment 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55-75</th>
<th>3A.15-4u (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th><strong>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).</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that Eastbound US 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Prairie City Road slip on ramp should start the eastbound auxiliary lane that extends to and drops at the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp (see mitigation measure 3A.15-4u, w and x), and the southbound Prairie City Road flyover on ramp should be braided over the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp and start an extended full auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road slip ramp merge (Freeway Merge 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sacramento County Department of Transportation.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55-76</th>
<th>3A.15-4v (FPASP EIR/EIS)</th>
<th><strong>Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sacramento County Department of Transportation.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 55-77 | 3A.15-4w (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 8).**

To ensure that Eastbound US 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the southbound Oak Avenue Parkway loop on ramp should merge with the eastbound auxiliary lane that starts at the southbound Prairie City Road braided flyover on ramp and ends at the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp (see mitigation measure 3A.15-4u, v and w). Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 8).

Before Project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built.

Sacramento County Department of Transportation. |
| 55-79 | 3A.15-4y (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 35).**

To ensure that Westbound US 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Prairie City Road loop on ramp should start the westbound auxiliary lane that continues beyond the Folsom Boulevard off ramp. The slip-on ramp from southbound Prairie City Road slip ramp would merge into this extended auxiliary lane. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The Applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by Applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 35). | performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which Project phase the improvement should be built. | Sacramento County Department of Transportation. |

| 55-80 | 3A.16-1 (FPASP EIR/EIS) | **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.**

Before the approval of the final map and issuance of building permits for all Project phases, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall submit proof to the City of Folsom that an adequate wastewater conveyance system either has been constructed or is ensured through payment of the City’s facilities augmentation fee | Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any Project phases. | City of Folsom Community Development Department and City of Folsom Public Works Department |
as described under the Folsom Municipal Code Title 3, Chapter 3.40, “Facilities Augmentation Fee – Folsom South Area Facilities Plan,” or other sureties to the City’s satisfaction. Both on-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure and off-site force main sufficient to provide adequate service to the Project shall be in place for the amount of development identified in the tentative map before approval of the final map and issuance of building permits for all Project phases, or their financing shall be ensured to the satisfaction of the City.

| 55-81 | 3A.16-3  
(FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Demonstrate Adequate SRWTP Wastewater Treatment Capacity.**  
The Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall demonstrate adequate capacity at the SRWTP for new wastewater flows generated by the Project. This shall involve preparing a tentative map–level study and paying connection and capacity fees as identified by SRCSD. Approval of the final map and issuance of building permits for all Project phases shall not be granted until the City verifies adequate SRWTP capacity is available for the amount of development identified in the tentative map. | Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any Project phases.  
City of Folsom Community Development Department and City of Folsom Public Works Department |

| 55-82 | 3A.18-1  
(FPASP EIR/EIS) | **Submit Proof of Surface Water Supply Availability.**  
a. Prior to approval of any small-lot tentative subdivision map subject to Government Code Section 66473.7 (SB 221), the City shall comply with that statute. Prior to approval of any small-lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential Project not subject to that statute, the City need not comply with Section 66473.7, or formally consult with any public water system that would provide water to the affected area; nevertheless, the City shall make a factual showing or impose conditions similar to those required by Section 66473.7 to ensure an adequate water supply for development authorized by the map.  
b. Prior to recordation of each final subdivision map, or prior to City approval of any similar Project-specific discretionary approval or entitlement required for nonresidential uses, the Project Applicant(s) of that Project phase or activity shall demonstrate the availability of a reliable and sufficient water supply from a public | Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any Project phases.  
City of Folsom Community Development Department and City of Folsom Public Works Department |
water system for the amount of development that would be authorized by the final subdivision map or Project-specific discretionary nonresidential approval or entitlement. Such a demonstration shall consist of information showing that both existing sources are available or needed supplies and improvements will be in place prior to occupancy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any Project phases.</th>
<th>City of Folsom Community Development Department and City of Folsom Public Works Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-83</td>
<td>3A.18-2a (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td>Submit Proof of Adequate Off-Site Water Conveyance Facilities and Implement Off-Site Infrastructure Service System or Ensure That Adequate Financing Is Secured. Before the approval of the final subdivision map and issuance of building permits for all Project phases, the Project Applicant(s) of any particular discretionary development application shall submit proof to the City of Folsom that an adequate off-site water conveyance system either has been constructed or is ensured or other sureties to the City’s satisfaction. The off-site water conveyance infrastructure sufficient to provide adequate service to the Project shall be in place for the amount of development identified in the tentative map before approval of the final subdivision map and issuance of building permits for all Project phases, or their financing shall be ensured to the satisfaction of the City. A certificate of occupancy shall not be issued for any building within the SPA until the water conveyance infrastructure sufficient to serve such building has been constructed and is in place.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Community Development Department and City of Folsom Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-84</td>
<td>3A.18-2b (FPASP EIR/EIS)</td>
<td>Demonstrate Adequate Off-Site Water Treatment Capacity (if the Off-Site Water Treatment Plant Option is Selected). Before approval of final maps and issuance of building permits for any Project phases.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Community Development Department and City of Folsom Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-85</td>
<td>Conduct Environmental Awareness Training for Construction Employees.</td>
<td>Prior to 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 onsite biological resources, including special-status wildlife habitats; potential nests of special-status birds; and roosting habitat for special-status bats. The biologist shall also 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 prior to 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.</td>
<td>Before approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground disturbing activities, including grubbing or clearing, for any Project phase.</td>
<td>City of Folsom Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-86</td>
<td>Preconstruction Nesting Bird Survey.</td>
<td>The Project Applicant shall conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey of all areas associated with construction activities on the Project site within</td>
<td>Before approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground disturbing activities, including grubbing or clearing, for any Project phase.</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game, and City of Folsom Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Planning Commission
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision (PN 20-254)
### May 19, 2021

| 55-87 | 3A.5-1a (Westland/Eagle SPA) | **Comply with the Programmatic Agreement.**
The PA for the Project is incorporated by reference. The 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. This document is incorporated by reference. The PA is available for public inspection and review at the California Office of Historic Preservation 1725 23rd Street Sacramento, CA 95816. | **During all construction phases** | City of Folsom Community Development Department; U.S. Army Corp of Engineers; |
| 55-88 | 3A.5-2 (Westland/Eagle SPA) | **Conduct Construction Personnel Education, Conduct On-Site Monitoring If Required, Stop Work if Cultural Resources are Discovered, Assess the Significance of the Find, and Perform Treatment or Avoidance as Required.** To reduce potential impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall do the following:
- Before the start of ground-disturbing activities, the Project Applicant(s) of all Project phases shall retain a qualified archaeologist to conduct training for construction workers as necessary based 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 | **Before approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground disturbing activities, including grubbing or clearing, for any Project phase.** | City of Folsom Community Development Department; U.S. Army Corp of Engineers; |
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
The 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.

If 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. The Construction Manager, or archaeological monitor, if present, shall notify the USACE within 24 hours of the discovery.

- The USACE shall notify the State Historic Preservation Officer (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 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.

| 55-89 | 3A.5-3 (Westland/Eagle SPA) | **Suspend Ground-Disturbing Activities if Human Remains are Encountered and Comply with California Health and Safety Code Procedures.** | During all ground disturbing activities, for any Project phase. | Sacramento County Coroner; Native American Heritage Commission; City of Folsom |
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 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 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 a Most Likely Descendant 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 Most Likely Descendant has taken place. The Most Likely Descendant 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 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 reinternment 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 a Most Likely Descendant or if the Most Likely Descendant 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 Most Likely Descendant 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.
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Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
dated May 10, 2021
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Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
dated May 10, 2021
1. Lot dimensions and acreages are approximate and subject to change.

2. Typical lot size is measured from back of sidewalk. On irregular shaped lots, lot size is measured from center of travel lane.

3. Lot lines and lot areas may be adjusted at the time of the Final Map(s) provided no additional variances are required.

4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66456.1, the subdivider may file multiple Final Maps and approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

5. Lot lines and lot areas may be adjusted at the time of the Final Map(s) provided no additional variances are required.

6. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

7. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

8. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66499.1, the subdivider may file multiple Final Maps based upon the Tentative Map. The filing of a Final Map as a portion of the Tentative Map could result in a city-wide or county-wide application for final map approval.

9. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

10. Typical lot size is measured from center of travel lane. On irregular shaped lots, lot size is measured from center of travel lane.

11. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

12. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

13. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

14. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

15. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.

16. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66499.20.2, the land shown hereon may be approved Specific Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Folsom.
Attachment 9

Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan
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dated May 10, 2021
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dated May 10, 2021
CITY OF FOLSOM
CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis
for Mangini Ranch Phase 3

1. Application No: 20-254

2. Project Title: Mangini Ranch Phase 3

3. Lead Agency Name and Address:
   City of Folsom
   50 Natoma Street
   Folsom, CA 95630

4. Contact Person and Phone Number:
   Scott Johnson, AICP, Planning Manager
   Community Development Department
   (916) 355-7222

5. Project Location:
   173.0 acres located north of Mangini Parkway, south of Savannah Parkway, and west of East Bidwell Street. APN: 072-0060-100 & 072-0060-077 (173.0 acres, Folsom Real Estate South, LLC, and West Scott Boulevard, LLC.)

6. Project Applicant's/Sponsor's Name and Address:
   TCS Improvement Company, LLC
   4370 Town Center Blvd., #100
   El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

7. General Plan Designation: SFHD, MLD, SF, OS, P, PQP

8. Zoning: SP-SFHD-PD, SP-MLD-MD, SP-SF-PD, SP-OS, SP-P, SP-PQP

9. Other public agencies whose approval may be required or agencies that may rely on this document for implementing project:
   California Department of Fish and Wildlife (for Section 1602 agreement)
   Capital Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority
   Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
   Folsom-Cordova Unified School District
   Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
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**Mangini Ranch Phase 3**
CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

May 2021
I. INTRODUCTION

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 development proposal (project or Project) is located in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) area. As discussed later in this document, the project is consistent with the FPASP.

As a project that is consistent with an existing Specific Plan, the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 development is eligible for the exemption from review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") provided in Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182, subdivision (c), as well as the streamlining provisions in Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183.

Because the Project is exempt from CEQA, the City is not required to provide the following CEQA analysis. Nonetheless, the City provides the following checklist exploring considerations raised by sections 15182 and 15183 to disclose the City’s evidence and reasoning for determining the project’s consistency with the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (“FPASP”) and eligibility for the claimed CEQA exemption.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project proposes to further subdivide the 173-acre property (FPASP Parcels 73, 155, 159, 161, 163, 165A-1, 165A-2, 165B, and 166) into fourteen large lots through a large lot vesting tentative subdivision map (LLVTSM) for future sale, lease, and financing, consistent with the land use designations in the FPASP. Additionally, the Project includes a small lot vesting tentative subdivision map (SLVTSM) to further subdivide a 52.3-acre portion of the site into 260 residential lots for future development consistent with the land use designations in the FPASP. Lot sizes included are MLD-45’x67’, SFHD-45’x100’, and SFHD-50’x100’. The SLVTSM also includes three open space parcels, eight landscape lots, and one paseo lot.

The SLVTSM area also includes an open space corridor, extending from Mangini Parkway to East Bidwell Street, with a Class I multi-purpose trail located on the north side of the drainage corridor, consistent with the trail identified on the FPASP Trails Exhibit. Trail connections are provided at Mangini Parkway and East Bidwell Road, as well as internally from the project site via a pedestrian paseo. The pedestrian paseo is located to promote pedestrian accessibility where dictated by trail grading constraints. Offsite grading is proposed in the grading plan for the SLVTSM for large lot 11 and portions of large lot 12.
The requested land use entitlements for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project are:

1. A Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map;
2. A Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map;
3. A Minor Administrative Modification – Minor Land Use Boundary Refinements; and

A Minor Administrative Modification (MAM) is requested to refine the boundaries of the open space (OS) and residential (MHD and SFHD) (project site) parcels to meet City standards for roadway design, maximize development efficiencies, preserve natural resources, and accommodate public trails. There is no change in overall total Measure W open space with the proposed minor modification.

A Minor Administrative Amendment – Transfer of Development Rights is requested to move 25 dwelling units among five parcels (parcels 155, 159, 165-A2, 165-B, and 166) within the project boundary and the FPAS. No change to the overall FPASP unit allocation, total population, will occur. The proposed project does not affect the overall amount of non-residential development in the FPASP.

Infrastructure to serve the Project is proximate and available to the site.

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project is located within the Folsom Ranch Central District and is designed to comply with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines (approved 2015, amended 2018). No deviations from the FPASP Appendix A: Development Standards are sought with this application.

B. PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site consists of 173.0 acres and nine existing parcels in the FPASP plan area within the proposed Mangini Ranch Phase 3 development area, south of U.S. Highway 50 and west of East Bidwell Street. The project site is known as Mangini Ranch Phase 3. The site is located south of Savannah Parkway and north of Mangini Parkway.

East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway, and the Northern Connector (‘A’ Drive) provide direct access to the site. Public street access would be provided at proposed ‘B’ Drive, ‘E’ Drive, and ‘F’ Drive. ‘B’ Drive would be a crushed rock road that provides access to the entire development.

---

Drive is centrally located on the site and connects to ‘A’ Drive and Mangini Parkway. ‘E’ Drive is in the southeastern corner of the site and connects to East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway. ‘F’ drive is in the southwestern corner of the site and connects to Mangini Parkway. Adjacent to the project are the Mangini Ranch Phase 1, Creekstone and Toll Brothers subdivisions at Folsom Ranch, which are under construction.

The FPASP is a 3,513.4-acre comprehensively planned community that creates new development patterns based on the principles of smart growth and transit-oriented development. The Specific Plan zoning for the SLVTSM site is Single-Family High Density (SP-SFHD) and Multi-Family Low Density (SP-MLD).

See the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Project Narrative for exhibits of the proposed project and surrounding land uses.

C. **EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS**

Currently, the 173.0-acre project site is undeveloped. There are native tree species located within the bounds of the LLVTSM, however no trees are located within the bounds of the SLVTSM therefore no trees are proposed for removal with this application.

D. **CONSISTENCY WITH THE FPASP**

The Project is consistent with and aims to fulfill the specific policies and objectives in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. An analysis of the proposed project’s consistency with the FPASP is provided in Exhibit 3, the Applicant’s FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis.

1. **Land Use Designation and Unit Types**

The application intends to develop Mangini Ranch Phase 3 (as shown and described in the Project Narrative) as a Single-Family High Density and Multi-Family Low Density (SFHD and MLD) Residential site, consistent with the FPASP.

Lots 11 and 12 (PQP) are shown on the preliminary grading/infrastructure exhibits due to the planned mass grading of lot 11 and portions of lot 12. There are existing oak trees on a portion of lot 12, but the existing oak trees will be unimpacted by the grading, as shown on the offsite grading plan. Lot 5 (OS) will include a Class I trail along the northern boundary of the OS parcel. The boundary between the OS parcel and the development parcels is proposing a Minor Administrative Modification (MAM) (described above) to refine the boundaries between the development parcels and the open space parcel.
The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project proposes to create 260 residential lots. The FPASP defines the SFHD residential designation to allow a variety of “attached and detached housing options” including single-family and two-family dwellings, as well as “second dwelling units.” (FPASP, pp. 4-13 through 4-14.) Further, the SFHD density range in the FPASP is 4 to 7 dwelling units per gross acre. (FPASP, p. 4-14.) The FPASP defines the MLD residential designation as “one of the most flexible residential land use designations in the Plan Area[,]” which includes “single family dwellings (small lot detached, zero-lot-line and patio homes), two family dwellings and multi-family dwellings.” (FPASP, p. 4-14.) The density range for MLD is 7 to 12 dwelling units per gross acre. (FPASP, p. 4-14.) Therefore, land which is designated SP-SFHD and SP-MLD can be developed as residential lots in conformance with the FPASP. Moreover, the proposed density in Mangini Ranch Phase 3 (5.9 to 6.3 dwelling units per acre on the SP-SFHD parcels and 7.5 dwelling units per acre on the SP-MLD parcel) is consistent with the applicable density ranges in the FPASP.

The residential lots proposed by the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project are permitted uses as shown on Table 4.3 of the FPASP. (See also FPASP DEIR, Table 3A.10-4.)

In summary, the proposed land use and the density of residential use proposed for Mangini Ranch Phase 3 are consistent with the FPASP.

2. Circulation

Primary access to the SLVSTM portion of the Project would be from East Bidwell Street on the east, Mangini Parkway on the south, and the east-west Northern Connector Road (A Drive) on the north. The Northern Connector Road would be a new street that will connect to East Bidwell Street to the east. B and D Drives will provide north-south access from the North Connector Road south into the subdivision. Multiple access points to the Project are provided at East Bidwell Road (east side) and Mangini Parkway (south side). Improvements to East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway have been/are being constructed by other FPASP approved projects. City standard residential streets are proposed for this subdivision, with detached and attached pedestrian sidewalks and on-street parking. Class III bike routes are provided on all residential streets.

Access to the FPASP trails system is provided in three locations. Public trail heads located at the intersection of the open space at East Bidwell Road and Mangini Parkway. A pedestrian-activated traffic signal may be installed in the future, at the trail head located at East Bidwell Road, as shown on the Bikeways Plan in the FPASP. A Class I trail undercrossing is planned at the trail head at Mangini Parkway. Trail access is also provided in Village 1 on the Lot L Paseo near the intersection of ‘J’ Drive and ‘L’ Drive.

The proposed project it consistent with roadway and transit master plans for the FPASP.

3. Water, Sewer, and Storm Drainage Infrastructure
Water infrastructure

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project is being served by Zone 3 water from East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway. The project is located within the Zone 3 pressure zone. Water mains are provided within the perimeter streets, including East Bidwell Street and Street A, and along the project frontage to serve the site.

Sewer infrastructure

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project will be served by the sewer infrastructure within East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway through the internal street network.

Storm drainage infrastructure

The Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project site stormwater system will connect to existing infrastructure in East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway, and, at ultimate buildout, surface water runoff from the Project generally flows to the southwest area into a planned detention basin located adjacent Mangini Parkway.

The proposed project is consistent with planned infrastructure for the FPASP.

III. EXEMPTION AND STREAMLINING ANALYSIS

A. Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan

The City adopted the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan on June 28, 2011 (Resolution No. 8863).

The City of Folsom and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers prepared a joint environmental impact report/environmental impact statement ("EIR/EIS" or "EIR") for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project ("FPASP"). (See FPASP EIR/EIS, SCH #2008092051). The Draft EIR/EIS (DEIR) was released on June 28, 2010. The City certified the Final EIR/EIS (FEIR) on June 14, 2011 (Resolution No. 8860). For each impact category requiring environmental analysis, the EIR provided two separate analyses: one for the “Land” component of the FPASP project, and a second for the “Water” component. (FPASP DEIR, p. 1-1 to 1-2.) The analysis in this document is largely focused on and cites to the “Land” sections of the FPASP EIR.

On December 7, 2012, the City certified 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, (4) New Water Conveyance Facilities. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-1 to 3-4.) 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. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21166; Guidelines, § 15162.) The analysis in portions of the FPASP EIR’s “Water” sections that have not been superseded by the Water Addendum are still applicable.

The FPASP includes the Westland Eagle development, which is located in the central portion of the FPASP flanking Scott Road and Easton Valley Parkway. Since approval of the FPASP, the Westland Eagle development was transferred to new owners: Westland Capital Partners, Eagle Commercial Partners (applicant), and Eagle Office Properties. The new owners subsequently evaluated the approved land use plan and determined that many of the assumptions underlying the type and distribution of retail commercial and residential land uses in this area needed to be reevaluated to respond to current and future market conditions for retail commercial and residential development. Accordingly, the applicants proposed an amendment to the FPASP that would significantly reduce the area of commercial retail land use in the Westland Eagle plan area and increase the number of allowed residential dwelling units. The City adopted an amendment to the FPASP for the Westland Eagle Properties in June 2015 (Westland/Eagle SPA) that reduced the amount of commercial, industrial/office park and mixed-use acreage from 451.8 acres to 302.3 acres and the potential building area from approximately 4.5 million square feet to approximately 3.4 million square feet. The Westland/Eagle SPA also increased the number of proposed residential dwelling units from 9,895 to 10,817.

B. Documents Incorporated by Reference

The analysis in this document incorporates by reference the following environmental documents that have been certified by the Folsom City Council:

i. Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project EIR/EIS and Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, certified by the Folsom City Council on June 14, 2011, a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday).

ii. CEQA Addendum for the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan Project- Revised Proposed Off-site Water Facility Alternative prepared November, 2012, (“Water Addendum”), certified by the Folsom City Council on December 11, 2012, a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday);

iii. South of Highway 50 Backbone Infrastructure Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Backbone Infrastructure MND), dated December 9, 2014, adopted by the City
Council on February 24, 2015, a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday).

iv. CEQA Addendum and Environmental Checklist for the Westland Eagle Specific Plan Amendment, dated June 2015, (“Westland Eagle Addendum”), a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday).

Each of the environmental documents listed above includes mitigation measures imposed on the FPASP and activities authorized therein and in subsequent projects to mitigate plan-level environmental impacts, which are, therefore, applicable to the proposed project. The mitigation measures are referenced specifically throughout this document and are incorporated by reference in the environmental analysis. The Applicant will be required to agree, as part of the conditions of approval for the proposed project, to comply with each of those mitigation measures.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3, subdivision (c), the City will make a finding at a public hearing that the feasible mitigation measures specified in the FPASP EIR will be undertaken.

Moreover, for those mitigation measures with a financial component that apply plan-wide, the approved Public Facilities Financing Plan and Amended and Restated Development Agreement bind the Applicant to a fair share contribution for funding those mitigation measures.

The May 22, 2014, Record of Decision (ROD) for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project—City of Folsom Backbone Infrastructure (Exhibit 2) by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is also incorporated by reference.

All impacts from both on-site and off-site features of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project have been analyzed and addressed in the CEQA analysis and other regulatory permits required for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project and/or the Backbone Infrastructure project.

C. Introduction to CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Provisions

The City finds that the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 development proposal is consistent with the FPASP and therefore exempt from CEQA under Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182, subdivision (c), as a residential project undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with a specific plan.

The City also finds that the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project is eligible for streamlined CEQA review provided in Public Resources Code section 21083.3, and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 for projects consistent with a community plan, general plan, or zoning. Because the Project is exempt from
CEQA, the City is not required to provide the following streamlined CEQA analysis. Nonetheless, the City provides the following checklist exploring considerations raised by sections 15182 and 15183 because the checklist provides a convenient vehicle for disclosing the City’s substantial evidence and reasoning underlying its consistency determination.

As mentioned above, the City prepared an addendum to the FPASP EIR in December 2012 for purposes of analyzing an alternative water supply for the FPASP. Although this Water Addendum was prepared and adopted by the City after the certification of the FPASP EIR/EIS, it would not change any of the analysis under Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 because it gave the Plan Area a more feasible and reliable water supply.

The City has prepared site-specific studies pursuant to the requirements set forth in the mitigation measures and conditions of approval adopted for the FPASP under the FPASP EIR and Water Addendum for subsequent development projects. (See Exhibits 4 [Noise Assessment] and 5 [Access Evaluation Memo].) These studies support the conclusion that the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 development proposal would not have any new significant or substantially more severe impacts (CEQA Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (CEQA Guidelines, § 15183).

1. Exemption provided by Government Code, § 65457, and CEQA Guidelines, § 15182, subdivision (c)

Government Code section 65457, and CEQA Guidelines section 15182, subdivision (c), exempt residential projects that are undertaken pursuant to a specific plan for which an EIR was previously prepared if the projects are in conformity with that specific plan and the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 (relating to the preparation of a supplemental EIR) are not present. (Gov. Code, § 65457, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15182, subd. (c), 15162, subd. (a).)

The Applicant’s FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis attached as Exhibit 3 supports the determination that the Project is undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with the FPASP.

2. Streamlining provided by Public Resources Code, § 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines, § 15183

Public Resources Code section 21083.3 provides a streamlined CEQA process where a subdivision map application is made for a parcel for which prior environmental review of a zoning or planning approval was adopted. If the proposed development is consistent with that zoning or plan, any further environmental review of the development shall be limited to effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior EIR or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior EIR. Effects are not to be considered peculiar to the parcel or the project if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the city, which were found to
substantially mitigate that effect when applied to future projects.

CEQA Guidelines section 15183 provides further detail and guidance for the implementation of the exemption set forth in Public Resources Code section 21083.3.

D. Environmental Checklist Review

The row titles of the checklist include the full range of environmental topics, as presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

The column titles of the checklist have been modified from the Appendix G presentation to assess the Project’s qualifications for streamlining provided by Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15183, as well as to evaluate whether the conditions described in Guidelines section 15162 are present.

Pursuant to Guidelines section 15162, one of the purposes 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 a different environmental impact significance conclusion. If the situations described in Guidelines section 15162 are not present, then the exemption provided by Government Code section 65457 and Guidelines section 15182 can be applied to the Project. Therefore, the checklist does the following: a) identifies the earlier analyses and states where they are available for review; b) discusses whether proposed changes to the previously-analyzed program, including new site specific operations, would involve new or substantially more severe significant impacts; c) discusses whether new circumstances surrounding the previously-analyzed program would involve new or substantially more severe significant impacts; d) discusses any substantially important new information requiring new analysis; and e) describes the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project. (Guidelines, § 15162, subd. (a).)

The checklist serves a second purpose. Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and its parallel Guidelines provision, section 15183, provide for streamlined environmental review for projects consistent with the development densities established by existing zoning, general plan, or community plan policies for which an EIR was certified. Such projects require no further environmental review except as might be necessary to address effects that (a) are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in the prior EIR, (c) are potentially significant off-site impacts or cumulative impacts not discussed in the prior EIR, or (d) were previously identified significant effects but are more severe than previously assumed in light of substantial new information not known when the prior EIR was certified. If an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the project, has been addressed as a significant impact in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.
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 since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the prior environmental documents approved for the zoning action, general plan, or community plan. The environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist since the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the conclusion of the FPASP EIR.

The purpose of each column of the checklist is described below.

1. **Where Impact Was Analyzed**
   This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the environmental documents for the zoning action, general plan, or community plan where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

2. **Do Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?**
   Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the proposed project will result in new significant impacts not disclosed in the prior EIR or negative declaration or that the proposed project will result in substantial increases the severity of a previously identified significant impact. A yes answer is only required if such new or worsened significant impacts will require “major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration.” If a “yes” answer is given, additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be needed.

3. **Any New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?**
   Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether changed circumstances affecting the proposed project will result in new significant impacts not disclosed in the prior EIR or negative declaration or will result in substantial increases the severity of a previously identified significant impact. A yes answer is only required if such new or worsened significant impacts will require “major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration.” If a “yes” answer is given, additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be needed.

4. **Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?**
   Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information “of substantial importance” is available requiring an update to the analysis of a previous EIR to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigations remain valid. Any such information is only relevant if it “was not known and could not have been known with reasonable diligence at the time of the previous EIR.” To be relevant in this context, such new information must show one or more of the following:

   (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR
or negative declaration;
(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 measure or alternative; 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.

This category of new information may apply to any new regulations, enacted after certification of the
prior EIR or adoption of the prior negative declaration, which might change the nature of analysis of
impacts or the specifications of a mitigation measure. If the new information shows the existence of
new significant effects or significant effects that are substantially more severe than were previously
disclosed, then new mitigation measures should be considered. If the new information shows that
previously rejected mitigation measures or alternatives are now feasible, such measures or
alternatives should be considered anew. If the new information shows the existence of mitigation
measures or alternatives that are (i) considerably different from those included in the prior EIR, (ii)
able to substantially reduce one or more significant effects, and (iii) unacceptable to the project
proponents, then such mitigation measures or alternatives should also be considered.

5. Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which
The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR
On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which the
Project is Consistent?

Pursuant to Section 15183, subdivision (b)(1), of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether
there are project-specific significant effects that are peculiar to the project or its site. Although neither
section 21083.3 nor section 15183 defines the term “effects on the environment which are peculiar to
the parcel or to the project,” a definition can be gleaned from what is now the leading case
Mart Stores*). In that case, the court upheld the respondent city’s decision to adopt an ordinance
banning discount “superstores.” The city appropriately found that the adoption of the ordinance was
wholly exempt from CEQA review under CEQA Guidelines section 15183 as a zoning action
consistent with the general plan, where there were no project-specific impacts – of any kind –
associated with the ordinance that were peculiar to the project. The court concluded that “a physical
change in the environment will be peculiar to [a project] if that physical change belongs exclusively
and especially to the [project] or it is characteristic of only the [project].” (*Id.* at p. 294.) As noted by the
court, this definition “illustrate[s] how difficult it will be for a zoning amendment or other land use
regulation that does not have a physical component to have a sufficiently close connection to a
physical change to allow the physical change to be regarded as ‘peculiar to’ the zoning amendment or
other land use regulation.” (*Ibid.*)
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A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has effects peculiar to the project relative to the environmental category that were not discussed in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

6. Are There Effects Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?

Sections 21083.3 and 15183 include a separate, though complementary, means of defining the term “effects on the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project.” Subdivision (f) of section 15183 provides as follows:

An effect of a project on the environment shall not be considered peculiar to the project or the parcel for the purposes of this section if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the city or county with a finding that the development policies or standards will substantially mitigate that environmental effect when applied to future projects, unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect. The finding shall be based on substantial evidence which need not include an EIR.

This language explains that an agency can dispense with CEQA compliance for environmental impacts that will be “substantially mitigated” by the uniform application of “development policies or standards” adopted as part of, or in connection with, previous plan-level or zoning-level decisions, or otherwise – unless “substantial new information” shows that the standards or policies will not be effective in “substantially mitigating” the effects in question. Section 15183, subdivision (f), goes on to add the following considerations regarding the kinds of policies and standards at issue:

Such development policies or standards need not apply throughout the entire city or county but can apply only within the zoning district in which the project is located, or within the area subject to the community plan on which the lead agency is relying. Moreover, such policies or standards need not be part of the general plan or any community plan but can be found within another pertinent planning document such as a zoning ordinance. Where a city or county, in previously adopting uniformly applied development policies or standards for imposition on future projects, failed to make a finding as to whether such policies or standards would substantially mitigate the effects of future projects, the decision-making body of the city or county, prior to approving such a future project pursuant to this section, may hold a public hearing for the purpose of considering whether, as applied to the project, such standards or policies would substantially mitigate the effects of the project. Such a public hearing need only be held if the city or county decides to apply the standards or policies as permitted in this section.
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Subdivision (g) provides concrete examples of “uniformly applied development policies or standards”:
(1) parking ordinances; (2) public access requirements; (3) grading ordinances; (4) hillside development ordinances; (5) flood plain ordinances; (6) habitat protection or conservation ordinances; (7) view protection ordinances.

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has effects peculiar to the project relative to the environmental category that were not discussed in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan and that cannot be mitigated through application of uniformly applied development policies or standards that have been previously adopted by the agency. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

7. Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?

Pursuant to Section 15183, subdivision (b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there are any effects that were not analyzed as significant effects in the prior EIR for the zoning action, general plan, or community plan with which the project is consistent.

This provision indicates that, if the prior EIR for a general plan, community plan, or zoning action failed to analyze a potentially significant effect then such effects must be addressed in the site-specific CEQA analysis.

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has effects relative to the environmental category that were not analyzed as significant effects in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

8. Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts and Cumulative Impacts That Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan, Or Zoning Action?

Pursuant to Section 15183, subdivision (b)(3), of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there are any potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action with which the project is consistent.

Subdivision (j) of CEQA Guidelines section 15183 makes it clear that, where the prior EIR has adequately discussed potentially significant offsite or cumulative impacts, the project-specific analysis need not revisit such impacts:

This section does not affect any requirement to analyze potentially significant offsite or cumulative impacts.
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impacts if those impacts were not adequately discussed in the prior EIR. If a significant offsite or cumulative impact was adequately discussed in the prior EIR, then this section may be used as a basis for excluding further analysis of that offsite or cumulative impact.

This provision indicates that, if the prior EIR for a general plan, community plan, or zoning action failed to analyze the “potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts of the [new site-specific] project,” then such effects must be addressed in the site-specific CEQA analysis. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.3, subd. (c); see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15183, subd. (j)).

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has potentially significant off-site impacts or cumulative impacts relative to the environmental category that were not discussed in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

9. Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?

Pursuant to Section (b)(4) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there are previously identified significant effects that are now determined to be more severe than previously assumed based on substantial information not known at the time the EIR for the zoning action, general plan or community plan was certified.

This provision indicates that, if substantial new information has arisen since preparation of the prior EIR for a general plan, community plan, or zoning action with respect to an effect that the prior EIR identified as significant, and the new information indicates that the adverse impact will be more severe, then such effects must be addressed in the site-specific CEQA analysis.

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has significant impacts relative to the environmental category that were previously identified in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan but, as a result of new information not previously known, are now determined to be more severe than previously assumed. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.


Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3, this column indicates whether the prior environmental document and/or the findings adopted by the lead agency decision-making body provides 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 Review concludes that the impact does not occur with this project and therefore no mitigations are needed.
Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 21083.3 further limits the partial exemption for projects consistent with general plans, community plans, and zoning by providing that:

[All public agencies with authority to mitigate the significant effects shall undertake or require the undertaking of any feasible mitigation measures specified in the prior [EIR] relevant to a significant effect which the project will have on the environment or, if not, then the provisions of this section shall have no application to that effect. The lead agency shall make a finding, at a public hearing, as to whether those mitigation measures will be undertaken.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.3, subd. (c).) Accordingly, to avoid having to address a previously identified significant effect in a site-specific CEQA document, a lead agency must “undertake or require the undertaking of any feasible mitigation measures specified in the prior [EIR] relevant to a significant effect which the project will have on the environment.” (Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.3, subd. (c).) Thus, the mere fact that a prior EIR has analyzed certain significant cumulative or off-site effects does not mean that site-specific CEQA analysis can proceed as though such effects do not exist. Rather, to take advantage of the streamlining provisions of section 21083.3, a lead agency must commit itself to carry out all relevant feasible mitigation measures adopted in connection with the general plan, community plan, or zoning action for which the prior EIR was prepared. This commitment must be expressed as a finding adopted at a public hearing. (See Gentry v. City of Murrieta (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 1359, 1408 [court rejected respondent city’s argument that it had complied with this requirement because it made a finding at the time of project approval “that the Project complied with all ‘applicable’ laws”; such a finding “was not the equivalent of a finding that the mitigation measures in the [pertinent] Plan EIR were actually being undertaken”].)
### E. Checklist and Discussion

#### 1. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aesthetics. Would the Project:</td>
<td>FPAPS Draft EIR pp. 3A.1-1 to -34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.1-24 to -25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.1-1</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>pp. 3A.1-26 to -27</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No feasible MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.1-27 to -30</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.1-1 3A.7-4 3A.1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would</td>
<td>pp. 3A.1-31 to -33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Issue Area</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.</td>
<td>MM 3A.1-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</td>
<td>MM 3A.1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</td>
<td>MM 3A.1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</td>
<td>MM 3B.1-2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?</td>
<td>MM 3B.1-2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?</td>
<td>MM 3B.1-3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?</td>
<td>MM 3B.1-3b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?</td>
<td>Prior Environmental Document’s Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Aesthetics. Would the Project: **FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.1-1 to -34**

adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Discussion:
The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following aesthetic and visual impacts to less than significant levels: Impact 3A.1-1 (Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista); Impact 3A.1-2 (Damage to Scenic Resources Within a Designated Scenic Corridor); Impact 3A.1-4 (Temporary, Short-Term Degradation of Visual Character for Developed Project Land Uses During Construction); Impact 3A.1-6 (New Skyglow Effects); and impacts from the off-site improvements constructed in areas under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties (Impacts 3A.1-4 and 3A.1-5). (FEIR, pp. 1-15 to 1-19; DEIR, p. 3A.1-34.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to aesthetic resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.1-2a, MM 3B.1-2b, MM 3B.1-3a, and MM 3B.1-3b. (Water Addendum, p. 3-5.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to aesthetic resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.1-1, MM 3A.1-4, MM 3A.1-5. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.1-4.3.)

See Exhibit 1 (the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines) for more discussion of the architectural design guidelines and landscape design guidelines that apply to the Project. (Exh. 1, pp. 15-94.) See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with landscaping policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to aesthetic and visual impacts. (Exh. 3, p. 31.)

Mitigation Measures:
- MM 3A.1-1
- MM 3A.1-4
- MM 3A.1-5
- MM 3A.7-4
- MM 3B.1-2a
- MM 3B.1-2b
- MM 3B.1-3a
- MM 3B.1-3b

Conclusion:
With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe aesthetic impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15163).
### 2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Agriculture. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>p. 3A.10-29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.10-41 to -43</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No feasible MM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature,</td>
<td>p. 3A.10-29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture.</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that there were no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the two agriculture impacts to less than significant levels. Impacts 3A.10-3 (Cancellation of Existing On-Site Williamson Act Contracts) and 3.10-4 (Potential Conflict with Existing Off-Site Williamson Act Contracts) remain significant and unavoidable. (FEIR, pp. 1-123 to 1-124; DEIR, pp. 3A.10-41 to -43.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to agricultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.10-5. (Water Addendum, p. 3-12.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to agricultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.4-4.5.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with open space policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to agriculture and forest resources impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 4-5, 14-16.)

### Mitigation Measures:
- MM 3B.10-5

### Conclusion:

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe agriculture and forest resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
### 3. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Air Quality. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASD Draft EIR pp. 3A.2-1 to -63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.2-23 to -59</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.2-1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Air Quality. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.2-1 to -63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 3A.2-59 to -63</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.2-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
3. Air Quality. Would the project: | FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.2-1 to -63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following air quality impacts to less than significant levels: temporary short-term construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors (Impact 3A.2-1, for PM10 concentrations); long-term operation-related, regional emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors (Impact 3A.2-2); exposure to TACs (Impact 3A.2-4); and exposure to odorous emissions from construction activity (Impact 3A.2-6, for construction diesel odors and for corporation yard odors); and exposure to odorous emissions from operation of the proposed corporation yard (Impact 3A.2-6). (FEIR, pp. 1-22 to 1-34; DEIR, p. 3A.2-63.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to air quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.2-1a, MM 3B.2-1b, MM 3B.2-1c, MM 3B.2-3a, MM 3B.2-3b. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-5 to 3-6.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to air quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.2-1a, MM 3A.2-1b, MM 3A.2-1c, MM 3A.2-2, MM 3A.2-4a, MM 3A.2-4b, MM 3A.2-5, MM 3A.2-6. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.6-4.17.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with energy efficiency quality policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to air quality impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 27-28.)

The land use mix in the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project is consistent with the FPASP, and the mitigation measures in the MMRP for the FPASP EIR are applicable to and will be implemented for the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 development.

Mitigation Measures:
- MM 3A.2-1a
- MM 3A.2-1b
- MM 3A.2-1c
- MM 3A.2-1d
- MM 3A.2-1e
- MM 3A.2-1f
- MM 3A.2-1g
- MM 3A.2-1h
- MM 3A.2-2
- MM 3A.2-4a
- MM 3A.2-4b
- MM 3A.2-5
- MM 3A.2-6
- MM 3B.2-1a
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### Environmental Issue Area

|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### 3. Air Quality.  
**Would the project:**

- MM 3B.2-1b
- MM 3B.2-1c
- MM 3B.2-3a
- MM 3B.2-3b

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe air quality impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

4. Biological Resources. Would the project:

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

  - pp. 3A.3-50 to -72

  | | | | | | | | | | | |
  | | | | | | | | | | MM 3A.3-1a |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-1b |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2a |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2b |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2c |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2d |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2g |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2h |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-3 |

- Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans,

  - pp. 3A.3-72 to -75

  | | | | | | | | | | |
  | | | | | | | | | | MM 3A.3-1a |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-1b |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2a |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2b |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2c |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2d |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2g |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-2h |
  | | | | | | | | | | 3A.3-3 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Biological Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.3-28 to -50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife</td>
<td>pp. 3A.3-88 to -93</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Biological Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.3-75 to -88 (oak woodland and trees)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.3-5</td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.3-93 to -94</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Biological Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td>FYASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discussion:

The FYASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following biological resources impacts to less than significant levels: impacts on jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands (Impact 3A.3-1); cumulative impacts on aquatic resources, oak woodlands, nesting and foraging habitat for raptors, including Swainson’s hawk, and potential habitat for special-status plant species (Impact 3A.3-2); impacts on blue oak woodlands and on trees protected under Folsom Municipal Code and County Tree Preservation Ordinance (Impact 3A.3-5); as well as the impacts of off-site improvements which would be located in the jurisdiction of El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Caltrans. (FEIR, pp. 1-38 to 1-63; DEIR, p. 3A.3-94.)

The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FYASP project would have the same or less impacts to biological resources when compared to the FYASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.3-1a, MM 3B.3-1b, MM 3B.3-1c, MM 3A.3-1a, and MM 3B.3-2. (Water Addendum, p. 3-7.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to biological resources when compared to the FYASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures that include updated versions of some mitigation measures in the FYASP EIR as well as new mitigation measures: MM 3A.3-1a, MM 3A.3-1b, MM 3A.3-2c, MM 3A.3-2d, MM 3A.3-2e, MM 3A.3-2f, MM 3A.3-2g, MM 3A.3-2h, MM 3A.3-4a, MM 3A.3-4b, MM 3A.3-5, MM 4.4-1, MM 4.4-2, MM 4.4-3, MM 4.4-4, MM 4.4-5, MM 4.4-6, and MM 4.4-7. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.18-4.30.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with wetlands and wildlife policies in the FYASP that may be relevant to biological resources impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 20-23.)

The South Sacramento HCP, which is referenced in the FYASP EIR has been approved and adopted. But the South Sacramento HCP is not relevant to the Project because the City did not choose to participate in the South Sacramento HCP and the project site is outside of the boundaries of the South Sacramento HCP plan area. (See South Sacramento HCP, available at https://www.southerncscp.com/sshtc-chapters---final.html [last visited April 15, 2021].)

#### Mitigation Measures:

- MM 3A.3-1a
- MM 3A.3-1b
- MM 3A.3-2a
- MM 3A.3-2b
- MM 3A.3-2c
- MM 3A.3-2d
- MM 3A.3-2e
- MM 3A.3-2f
- MM 3A.3-2g
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MM 3A.3-2h
- MM 3A.3-3
- MM 3A.3-4a
- MM 3A.3-4b
- MM 3A.3-5
- MM 3B.3-1a
- MM 3B.3-1b
- MM 3B.3-1c
- MM 3A.3-1a
- MM 3B.3-2
- MM 4.4-1
- MM 4.4-2
- MM 4.4-3
- MM 4.4-4
- MM 4.4-5
- MM 4.4-6
- MM 4.4-7

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe biological resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
### 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.5-1 to -25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.5-17 to -23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside the formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.5-23 to -24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural Resources. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.5-1 to -25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following cultural resources impacts to less than significant levels: impacts on identified and previously undiscovered cultural resources (Impacts 3A.5-1 and 3A.5-2); and impacts from off-site improvements constructed in areas under the jurisdiction of El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Caltrans (Impacts 3A.5-1 through 3A.5-3). (FEIR, pp. 1-81 to 1-86; DEIR, p. 3A.5-25.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to cultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3A.5-1a, MM 3A.5-1b, MM 3A.5-2, MM 3A.5-3. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-8 to 3-9.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to cultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR, some of which have been updated in the Westland Eagle Addendum: MM 3A.7-10, MM 3A.5-1a, MM 3A.5-1b, MM 3A.5-2, MM 3A.5-3. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.31-4.39.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with cultural resources policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to cultural resources impacts. (Exh. 3, p. 24.)

#### Mitigation Measures:

- MM 3A.5-1a
- MM 3A.5-1b
- MM 3A.5-2
- MM 3A.5-3

#### Conclusion:

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe cultural resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
### 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 1. 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. 2. Strong seismic ground shaking? | pp. 3A.7-24 to -28 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | MM 3A.7-1a 3A.7-1b
### Environmental Issue Area

| Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts? | Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification? | Are These Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR? | Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted? | Are These Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR? | Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR? | Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact? | Prior Environmental Document’s Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Geology and Soils. Would the project: | FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | MM 3A.7-3 |
| 4. Landslides? | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | MM 3A.7-1a 3A.7-1b |
| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | MM 3A.7-1a 3A.7-4 3A.7-5 |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | MM 3A.7-1a 3A.7-1b |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 3A.7-35 to -36</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following geology impacts to less than significant levels: impacts from off-site elements under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans. (FEIR, pp. 1-89 to 1- 95; DEIR, p. 3A.7-40.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to geology and soils resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.7-1a, MM 3B.7-1b, MM 3B.7-4, MM 3B.7-5. (Water Addendum, p. 3-10.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to geology and soils when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.7-1a, MM 3A.7-1b, MM 3A.7-3, MM 3A.7-4, MM 3A.7-5. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.40-4.43.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with floodplain protection policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to geology and soils impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 25-27.)

Mitigation Measures:
- MM 3A.7-1a
- MM 3A.7-1b
- MM 3A.7-3
- MM 3A.7-4
- MM 3A.7-5
- MM 3B.7-1a
- MM 3B.7-1b
- MM 3B.7-4
- MM 3B.7-5

Conclusion:

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe geology and soils impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
7. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPAP Draft EIR pp. 3A.4-1 to -49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.4-13 to -30</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.2-1a 3A.2-1b 3A.4-1 3A.2-2 3A.4-2a 3A.4-2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.4-10 to -13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.4-1 to -49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

The FPASP EIR concluded that FPASP project’s incremental contributions to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from project-related construction (Impact 3A.4-1) and from long-term operation (Impact 3A.4-2) are cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable. (FEIR, pp. 1-70 to 1-79; DEIR, pp. 3A.4-23, 3A.4-30.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to GHG emissions and climate change when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.4-1a, MM 3B.4-1b. (Water Addendum, p. 3-8.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or fewer impacts to GHG emissions and climate change when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.4-1, MM 3A.4-2a, MM 3A.4-2b. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.44-4.52.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with air quality, low impact development, environmental quality, and energy efficiency policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to GHG emissions and climate change impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 27-28, 31-37.)

**Mitigation Measures:**

- MM 3A.2-1a
- MM 3A.2-1b
- MM 3A.4-1
- MM 3A.4-2
- MM 3A.4-2a
- MM 3A.4-2b
- MM 3B.4-1a
- MM 3B.4-1b

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe GHG emissions and climate change impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
### 8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>pp. 3A.8-19 to -20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.8-20 to -22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.8-2 3A.9-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.8-31 to -33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.8-22 to -28</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where</td>
<td>pp. 3A.8-18 to -19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project: 1. 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>pp. 3A.8-18 to -19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None require</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all hazards and hazardous materials impacts to less than significant levels, except for the impacts from off-site elements that fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties (Impacts 3A.8-2, 3A.8-3, 3A.8-5, 3A.8-7). (FEIR, pp. 1-99 to 1-108; DEIR, pp. 3A.8-35 to -36.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts. The DEIR also analyzes Impact 3A.8-7 related to mosquito and vector control. (See pp. 3A.8-33 to -35; MM 3A.8-7.)

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less hazards and hazardous materials impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.8-1a, MM 3B.8-1b, MM 3B.16-3a, MM 3B.16-3b, MM 3B.8-5a, MM 3B.8-5b. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-10 to 3-11.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced hazards and hazardous materials impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.8-2, MM 3A.8-5, MM 3A.8-7. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.53-4.57.)

### Mitigation Measures:

- MM 3A.8-2
- MM 3A.9-1
- MM 3A.8-6
- MM 3A.8-3a
- MM 3A.8-3b
- MM 3A.8-3c
- MM 3A.8-7
- MM 3B.8-1a
- MM 3B.8-1b
- MM 3B.16-3a
- MM 3B.16-3b
- MM 3B.8-5a
- MM 3B.8-5b

### Conclusion:

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe hazards and hazardous materials impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
## 9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>pp. 3A.9-24 to -28</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.9-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>pp. 3A.9-45 to -50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.9-24 to -28</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.9-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.9-28 to -37</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.9-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>FPASIP Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to -51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 3A.9-28-42</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also see generally Backbone Infrastructure MND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>See generally pp. 3A.9-1 to -51</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</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>p. 3A.9-45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which</td>
<td>p. 3A.9-45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project:</td>
<td>FPASIP Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to -51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 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>pp. 3A.9-43 to -44</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project: Would the Project:

- 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?
- Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to -51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all hydrology and water quality impacts to less than significant levels, except for the impacts from off-site elements that fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans (Impacts 3.10-1, 3.10-2, 3.10-3, 3.10-5). (FEIR, pp. 1-113 to 1-118; DEIR, p. 3A.9-51.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to hydrology and water quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.9-1a, MM 3B.9-1b, MM 3A.3-1a, MM 3A.3-1b, MM 3B.9-3a, MM 3B.9-3b. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-11 to 3-12.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to hydrology and water quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.9-1, MM 3A.9-2, MM 3A.9-3 MM 3A.9-4. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.58-4.62.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with water efficiency and low impact development policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to hydrology and water quality impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 30-31, 35.)

**Mitigation Measures:**

- MM 3A.9-1
- MM 3A.9-2
- MM 3A.9-3
- MM 3B.9-1
- MM 3B.9-1b
- MM 3A.3-1a
- MM 3A.3-1b
- MM 3B.9-3a
- MM 3B.9-3b

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe hydrology and water quality impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td><strong>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>p. 3A.10-29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.10-34 to -41</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Issue Area</td>
<td>Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</td>
<td>Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?</td>
<td>Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</td>
<td>Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which the Project is Consistent?</td>
<td>Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?</td>
<td>Are These Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?</td>
<td>Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?</td>
<td>Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Land Use and Planning, Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.3-93 to -94</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Contribute to the decay of an existing urban center?</td>
<td>Not relevant; also see Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project’s CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, pp. 361-363</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

#### 10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:

| FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49 |

##### Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that the following land use impacts were less than significant and no mitigation was required: Impacts 3A.10-1 (Consistency with Sacramento LAFCo Guidelines) and 3.10-2 (Consistency with the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint). (FEIR, pp. 1-123 to 1-124; DEIR, pp. 3A.10-36, 3A.10-39.) But impacts from off-site elements that fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans would be potentially significant and unavoidable. The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to land use when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.10-5. (Water Addendum, p. 3-12.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to land use when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.63-4.64.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with land use policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to land use impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 1-6.) The Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines (Exhibit 1) is a complementary document to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Guidelines.

The South Sacramento HCP, which is referenced in the FPASP EIR has been approved and adopted, but the South Sacramento HCP is not relevant to the Project because the City did not choose to participate in the South Sacramento HCP and the project site is outside of the boundaries of the South Sacramento HCP plan area. (See South Sacramento HCP, available at https://www.southsachcp.com/sshcp-chapters---final.html (last visited April 15, 2021.) In any event, the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project would not impede the implementation of the South Sacramento HCP.

**Mitigation Measures:**

- MM 3B.10-5

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe land use impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
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### 11. MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Mineral Resources. Would the Project:</strong></td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.7-36 to -38</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.7-9</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>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Mineral Resources. Would the Project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except one of the impacts to mineral resources to less than significant levels. Impact 3A.7-9 (Possible Loss of Mineral Resources-Kaolin Clay) remains significant and unavoidable. (FEIR, pp. 1-89 to 1-95; DEIR, pp. 3A.7-37 to -38.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to mineral resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR and that no mitigation measures were necessary to address the water supply and water facilities aspect of the FPASP project. (Water Addendum, p. 3-13.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to mineral resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, p. 4.65.)

**Mitigation Measures:**
- None required

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe mineral resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
## 12. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Noise. Would the project result in:</strong></td>
<td><strong>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to -52</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.11-50 to -51</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.11-33 to -35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</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>pp. 3A.11-36 to -48</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Noise. Would the project result in:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to -52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.11-27 to -35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</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>pp. 3A.11-27 and 3A.11-49</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Noise. Would the project result in:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to -52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 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>pp. 3A.11-27</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12. Noise. Would the project result in:  

Discussion:
The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following noise impacts to less than significant levels: temporary, short-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased equipment noise and groundborne noise and vibration from project construction (Impacts 3A.11-1, 3A.11-3); long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased operational traffic noise levels from project operation (Impact 3A.11-4); and impacts from off-site elements that are under the jurisdiction of El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Caltrans. (FEIR, pp. 1-127 to 1-132; DEIR, pp. 3A.11-51 to -52.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less noise impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.11-1a, MM 3B.11-1b, MM 3B.11-1c, MM 3B.11-1d, MM 3B.11-1e, and MM 3B.11-3. (Water Addendum, p. 3-14.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced noise impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR and one additional mitigation measure from the Westland Eagle Addendum: MM 3A.11-1, MM 3A.11-3, MM 3A.11-4, MM 3A.11-5, MM 4.12-1. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.66-4.74.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with noise policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to noise impacts. (Exh. 3, p. 29.)

Mitigation Measures:
- MM 3A.11-1
- MM 3A.11-3
- MM 3A.11-4
- MM 3A.11-5
- MM 3B.11-1a
- MM 3B.11-1b
- MM 3B.11-1c
- MM 3B.11-1d
- MM 3B.11-1e
- MM 3B.11-3
- MM 4.12-1

The May 10, 2021, Noise Study completed by Bollard Acoustical Consultants (attached as Exhibit 4) found that, consistent with the noise impact analysis in the FPASP EIR, a portion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Residential Development project site will be exposed to future traffic noise levels in excess of the City of Folsom’s 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. The impacts analyzed in the Noise Study are of the same type, scope, and scale as those impacts addressed in the FPASP EIR. In other words, the Noise Study did not find any new impacts, any effects that are peculiar to the project or project site, or any substantially more severe impacts than those analyzed in the FPASP EIR. The Noise Study provides recommendations to implement the FPASP EIR’s mitigation measures to achieve compliance with the City’s exterior and interior noise standards. These recommendations, which are listed below, are consistent with the mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR and simply add new details about noise barriers (e.g., required height and materials) and building materials required in the previously adopted mitigation measures.
**12. Noise. Would the project result in:**

- FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to -52

The following Noise Study recommendations implement the FPASP EIR’s mitigation measures will be required as conditions of approval:

- To comply with the General Plan 60 dB DNL exterior noise level standards, traffic noise barriers ranging from 6 to 8 feet in height relative to backyard elevation would be required. The traffic noise barriers could take the form of masonry wall, earthen berm, or a combination of the two. Other materials may be acceptable but should be reviewed by an acoustical consultant prior to use.
- To ensure compliance with the General Plan 45 dB DNL interior noise level standard with a factor of safety, it is recommended that all upper-floor bedroom window assemblies of residences constructed on the lots identified on Figure 2 of Exhibit 4, from which the adjacent roadways would be visible be upgraded to a minimum STC rating of 32.
- Air conditioning shall be provided for all medium-density residences of the development so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise. (Exh. 4, pp. 8-9; see Figure 2, Exh. 4, p. 3.)

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe noise impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
## 13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.13-1 to -16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>pp. 3A.13-11 to -15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>p. 3A.13-16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Population and Housing, Would the Project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.13-1 to -16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>p. 3A.13-16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:
The FPASP EIR concluded that all population, employment and housing impacts are less than significant and do not require mitigation. (FEIR, pp. 1-137 to 1-138; DEIR, p. 3A.13-16.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to population and housing when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR and, thus, no new mitigation was required. (Water Addendum, p. 3-15.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to population and housing when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.75-4.76.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with housing policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to population and housing impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 7-10.)

Mitigation Measures:
- None required

Conclusion:
With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe population and housing impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
## 14. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>FPASD Draft EIR pp. 3A.14-1 to -30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 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 the public services:</td>
<td>pp. 3A.14-12 to -13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.14-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.14-13 to -20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.14-2 3A.14-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Public Services.</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.14-1 to 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.14-20 to 23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.14-24 to 30</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.12-14 to -17 (in Parks and Recreation chapter, not the Public Services chapter)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
14. Public Services. | FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.14-1 to -30 | Discussion: The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all public services impacts to less than significant levels, except for impacts from off-site elements constructed in areas under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans (Impact 3A.14-1). (FEIR, pp. 1-138 to 1- 141; DEIR, p. 3A.14-30.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts. Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to public services when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR and, thus, no new mitigation was required. (Water Addendum, p. 3-16.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to public services when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.14-1, MM 3A.14-2, MM 3A.14-3. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.77-4.78.) See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with public services and utilities policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to public services impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 37-39.) Mitigation Measures:

- MM 3A.14-1
- MM 3A.14-2
- MM 3A.14-3

Conclusion: With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe public services impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15163).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</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>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Recreation.</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.12-1 to -17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

The FPASP EIR concluded that all parks and recreation impacts are less than significant and, thus, no mitigation was necessary. (FEIR, p. 1-136; DEIR, p. 3A.12-17.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to recreation when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measure: MM 3B.12-1. (Water Addendum, p. 3-15.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to recreation when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, p. 4.79.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with parks policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to recreation impacts. (Exhibit 3, pp. 16-17.)

**Mitigation Measures:**

- MM 3B.12-1

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe recreation impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
### 16. TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Transportation/ Traffic, Would the project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-67-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 relevant; no changes to air traffic would result from the Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></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>No significant traffic hazards were identified in the EIR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>3A.14-12 to -13 (in Public Services chapter, not Transportation chapter)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.14-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>Development will be required to follow City parking standards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>3A.15-27</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following traffic and transportation impacts to less than significant levels: Impacts 3A.15-1i, 3A.15-1j, 3A.15-1l, 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, 3A.15-1aa. (FEIR, pp. 1-142 to 1-175.) These impacts include intersection impacts, such as the intersections at Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street and East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road; and impacts at roadway segments, such as on eastbound U.S. 50, including the Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard segment, the Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue segment, and the Folsom Boulevard to Prairie City Road segment. (DEIR, pp. 3A.15-157.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less transportation and traffic impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.15-1a, MM 3B.15-1b. (Water Addendum, p. 3-16.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to transportation and traffic when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR listed below, as well as two new mitigation measures: MM 4.16-1, MM 4.16-2. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.80-4.90.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with circulation policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to traffic and transportation impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 3-4.)

The April 28, 2021, Access Evaluation Memo by Kimley-Horn (attached as Exhibit 5), which incorporates the November 20, 2019, Regency at Folsom Ranch Transportation Impact Study by T. Kear, focuses on the ingress and egress for the SLVTSM for Mangini Ranch Phase 3 (i.e., 260 residential lots), and determined that the Project would not result in any additional significant impacts. (Exh. 5, p. 5.) The Kimley-Horn Memo reached this conclusion, in part, based on improvements being constructed by other Projects including the East Bidwell Street intersection with Mangini Parkway, and the westward extension of Mangini Parkway by the adjacent, approved Toll Brothers development. (Exh. 5, p. 1, 4.) The memo also noted that signalization of the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway was analyzed and found necessary in the November 20, 2019, Regency at Folsom Ranch Transportation Impact Study. (Exh. 5, pp. 1, 4.) Thus, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant transportation and traffic impacts. (See Exh. 5, p. 5.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Transportation/ Traffic</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3A.15-1dd through MM 3A.15-11n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3A.15-2a through MM 3A.15-2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3A.15-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3A.15-4a through MM 3A.15-4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3A.15-4f through MM 3A.15-4g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3A.15-4i through MM 3A.15-4y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3B.15-1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3B.15-1b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 4.16-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 4.16-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe transportation/traffic impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
17. UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the Project:</td>
<td>FP/ASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.16-1 to -43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MM 3A.16-1 3A.16-3 3A.16-4 3A.16-5</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>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities,</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the Project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.16-1 to -43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Water Addendum, pp. 2-1 to 4-1. See generally DEIR, pp. 3A.18-7 to -53</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</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>Same as (a) above</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Same as (a) above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the Project:</td>
<td><strong>FPASP Draft EIR p. 3A.16-1 to -43</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.16-28 to -32</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>pp. 3A.16-28 to -32</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the Project:</td>
<td>FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.16-1 to -43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following utilities impacts to less than significant levels: impacts that result from increased demand for SRWTP facilities and that are related to air quality impacts identified in the 2020 Master Plan EIR (Impact 3A.16-3); and impacts associated with improvements to treatment plant facilities for which feasible mitigation may not be available to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level (Impacts 3A.16-4, 3A.16-5). (FEIR, pp. 1-177 to 1-182; DEIR, p. 3A.16-43.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.

In the Utilities and Service Systems chapter, the DEIR also addresses energy impacts, citing Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines. See Impact 3A.16-8 (Electricity Demand and Infrastructure, pp. 3A.16-33 to -36); Impact 3A.16-9 (Natural Gas, pp. 3A.16-36 to -39); Impact 3A.16-10 (Telecommunications, pp. 3A.16-39 to -40); Impact 3A.16-11 (Cable TV, pp. 3A.16-40 to -41); Impact 3A.16-12 (Increased Energy Demand, pp. 3A.16-41 to -43).

Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to utilities and service systems when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.16-3a, MM 3B.16-3b. (Water Addendum, p. 3-17.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to utilities and service systems when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.16-1, MM 3A.16-3, MM 3A.16-5, MM 3A.18-1, MM 3A.18-2, MM 3A.18-2b. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.91-4.95.)

See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 project’s consistency with utilities, water efficiency, and energy efficiency policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to utilities and service systems impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 31-35, 38-39.) All the permanent, offsite water and storm drainage infrastructure elements are consistent with and were included in pre-existing City plans – such as the Backbone Infrastructure Project – that have been considered in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum.

Mitigation Measures:
- MM 3A.16-1
- MM 3A.16-3
- MM 3A.16-4
- MM 3A.16-5
- MM 3B.16-3a
- MM 3B.16-3b

Conclusion:

With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Mangini Ranch Phase 3 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe utilities and service systems impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).
## 18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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…</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project’s CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, pp. 45-316
### 18. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project’s CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, pp. 316-345</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Mandatory Findings of Significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project’s CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, pp.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

The City finds that:

(a) impacts on the environment under a wide range of topics, including extensive detail regarding on-site biological resources and their habitats, were analyzed and disclosed in the FPASP EIR;

(b) cumulative impacts were analyzed for each impact topic throughout the FPASP EIR; and

(c) adverse impacts on humans were included and analyzed where relevant as part of the environmental impact analysis of all required topics under CEQA in the FPASP EIR (e.g., air quality, hazards, noise, etc.).

**Mitigation Measures:**

See those listed in sections E.1 (Aesthetics) to E.17 (Utilities) above.
F. Conclusion

As indicated above, the City finds that the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Project is exempt from CEQA under Government Code section 65457 and Guidelines section 15182, subdivision (c).

Though not required to do so, the City also makes the following additional findings to facilitate informed decision-making:

- Based on the preceding review, the City’s FPASP EIR and Water Addendum have adequately addressed the following issues, and no further environmental review is required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183: Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, and Recreation.

- The following site-specific impacts have been analyzed and determined to be less than significant: Land Use and Planning, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183, no further environmental analysis is required.

- The following site-specific issues reviewed in this document were within the scope of issues and impacts analyzed in the FPASP EIR, and site-specific analyses did not identify new significant impacts: Land Use and Planning, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic.
IV. REFERENCES

   a. Including Appendices and Attachments:
      • AQ/GHG Calculations
      • Transportation Impact Study
      • Cultural Resources Study
      • Biological Resources Technical Memo
      • Water, Sewer, Storm Drainage Memos
      • Tri-Colored Blackbird Memo
      • Urban Decay Analysis

Exhibit 1: Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines (Amended 2018)
Exhibit 2: ROD for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project—City of Folsom Backbone Infrastructure (May 22, 2014)
Exhibit 3: Applicant’s Policy Consistency Analysis (May 2021)
Exhibit 4: Traffic Noise Assessment by Bollard Acoustical Consultants (May 10, 2021)
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4 - Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Create pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods through the use of a grid system of streets where feasible, sidewalks, bike paths and trails. Residential neighborhoods shall be linked, where appropriate, to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The street and trail system is based on an efficient grid system that connects the project with nearby park, school, and open space with roadways, sidewalks, and trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Residential neighborhoods shall include neighborhood focal points such as schools, parks, and trails. Neighborhood parks shall be centrally located and easily accessible, where appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is part of a residential neighborhood, and connects to schools, trails, and parks via the roadway, sidewalk, and trail network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Residential neighborhoods that are directly adjacent to open space shall provide at least two defined points of pedestrian access into the open space area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Three defined points of access to adjacent open space is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Provide a variety of housing opportunities for residents to participate in the home-ownership market.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project contains housing types within the allowable density range of the SFHD and MLD zoning, which is the zoning for the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>All multi-family high density residential sites shall provide on-site recreational amenities for its residents, unless directly adjacent to a park site.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not involve multi-family high density residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>As established by the FPASP, the total number of dwelling units for the Plan Area is 11,461 and the total commercial square footage is 2,788,8441. 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 a particular 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 Report/Environmental Impact Statement (SCH#200092051) shall not be exceeded without requiring further CEQA compliance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project does not exceed the total number of dwelling units for the Plan Area and does not include commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6A</td>
<td>A maximum of 937 low, medium and high density residential dwelling units are allowed only in the three General Commercial (SP-GC) parcels and the Regional Commercial (SP-RC) parcel located at the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway. No more and no less than 377 high density residential dwelling units on a minimum of 15.7 acres shall be provided on these parcels. Other than the SP-RC and three SP-GC parcels specifically identified herein, this policy 4.6A shall not apply to any other Plan Area SP-RC or SP-GC parcels.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is not located at the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Transfer of dwelling units is permitted between residential parcels, or the residential component of SP-RC and SP-GC parcels, as long as 1) the maximum density within each land use designation is not exceeded, unless the land use designation is revised by a specific plan amendment, and 2) the total number of Plan Area dwelling units does not exceed 11,461.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed transfer of 21 development units from parcels 155 (-9 du) and 166 (-12 du) to parcels 159 (+9 du), 165A-2 (+1 du), and 165B (+11) will not exceed the maximum density (4-7 units per acre for Parcels 159, 165A-2 or 165B) permitted within those land use categories, nor will the overall FPASP dwelling unit maximum be exceeded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

May, 2021

Exhibit 3
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Each new residential development shall be designed with a system of local streets, collector streets, and access to an arterial road that protects the residents from through traffic.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project has a hierarchical street layout to provide an efficient circulation system consistent with the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Subdivisions of 200 dwellings units or more not immediately adjacent to a neighborhood or community park are encouraged to develop one or more local parks as needed to provide convenient resident access to children’s play areas, picnic areas and unprogrammed open turf area. If provided, these local parks shall be maintained by a landscape and lighting district or homeowner’s association and shall not receive or provide substitute park land dedication credit for parks required by the FPASP.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project includes 260 dwelling units. While not immediately adjacent to a neighborhood or community park, the Project does provide three points of access to the public trail system on adjacent open space, which connects to nearby parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commercial Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>The mixed-use town center should contain unique retail, entertainment and service-based establishments, as well as public gathering spaces.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not propose any mixed-use development. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>The mixed-use neighborhood center should contain retail and service-based establishments that are intended to serve the immediate area in which it is located.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not propose any mixed-use development. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Commercial and office areas should be accessible via public transit routes, where feasible.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not propose any commercial development. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>The Plan Area land use plan should include commercial, light industrial/office park and public/quasipublic land uses in order to create employment.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not propose any commercial development. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Policy No.</td>
<td>FPASP Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>The transfer of commercial intensity is permitted as provided in Section 13.3 - Administrative Procedures.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not propose any commercial development. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Thirty percent (30%) of the Plan Area shall be preserved and maintained as natural open space, consistent with Article 7.08.C of the Folsom City Charter.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project will not reduce the amount of preserved natural open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>The open space land use designation shall provide for the permanent protection of preserved wetlands.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project does not alter the protections provided by the open space land use designation in the FPASP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Land shall be reserved for parks as shown in Figure 4.3 – Specific Plan Land Use Designations and Table 4.2 – Land Use Summary. On future tentative subdivision maps or planned development applications, park sites shall be within 1/8 of a mile of the locations shown in Figure 4.3 – Specific Plan Land Use Designations. Park sites adjacent to school sites should remain adjacent to schools to provide for joint use opportunities with the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District. Park sites adjacent to open space shall remain adjacent to open space to provide staging areas and access points to the open space for the public.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No park sites are proposed, and no proposed park sites will be altered by the project. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Sufficient land shall be dedicated for parks to meet the City of Folsom requirement (General Plan Policy 35.8) of 5-acres of parks for every 1,000 residents.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project does not reduce the land to be dedicated for parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Parks shall be located throughout the Plan Area and linked to residential neighborhoods via sidewalks, bike paths and trails, where appropriate. During the review of tentative maps or planned development applications, the city shall verify that parks are provided in the appropriate locations and that they are accessible to resident via sidewalks, bike paths and trails.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nearby parks will be accessible by all residents in the project via sidewalks and public trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Elementary school sites shall be co-located with parks to encourage joint-use of parks where feasible.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose school or park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. Additionally, the LLVTSM is consistent with the planned school and co-located park policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Policy No.</td>
<td>FPASP Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.21</strong></td>
<td>Land shall be reserved for public services and facilities, as required by the City of Folsom. Public services and facilities sites shall be in the general locations as shown in Figure 4.3 – Specific Plan Land Use Designations.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The infrastructure needed to serve the Project area is consistent with the adopted Specific Plan and the updated infrastructure plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.22</strong></td>
<td>Land shall be reserved for schools as required by the City of Folsom and the Folsom Cordova Unified School District in accordance with state law. School sites shall be in the general locations shown in Figure 4.3 – Specific Plan Land Use Designations and have comparable acreages as established in Table 4.2 – Land Use Summary.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project would not alter the location of proposed school sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.23</strong></td>
<td>Elementary school sites shall be co-located with parks to encourage joint-use of parks.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose school or park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. Additionally, the LLVTSM is consistent with the planned school and co-located park policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.24</strong></td>
<td>All Public/Quasi-Public sites shown in Figure 4.3 – Specific Plan Land Use Designations may be relocated or abandoned as a minor administrative modification of the FPASP. The land use designation 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 dwelling units exceed 11,461 and the total commercial building area exceed 2,788,884 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#200809205) shall not be exceeded without requiring further CEQA compliance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project would not alter the location of proposed public/quasi-public sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5 - Housing Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Folsom General Plan Housing Element Policies Incorporated in the FPASP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-1.1</strong></td>
<td>The city shall ensure that sufficient land is designated and zoned in a range of residential densities to accommodate the city's regional share of housing.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The project proposes residential land uses that comply with the existing zoning and land use designation at the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-1.2</strong></td>
<td>The city shall endeavor to designate future sites for higher density housing near transit stops, commercial services, and schools where appropriate and feasible.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The project proposes residential land uses that comply with the existing zoning and land use designation at the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-1.3</strong></td>
<td>The city shall encourage home builders to develop their projects on multi-family designated land at the high end of the applicable density range.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The project proposes a density between 5.9 and 6.3 units per acre on the SFHD parcels and 7.5 units per acre on the MLD parcel, which is within the applicable range of 4-7 and 7-12 units per acre, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-1.4</strong></td>
<td>The City shall support and facilitate the development of second units on single-family designated and zoned parcels.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The project site is zoned SFHD and MLD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

| FPASP Policy No. | FPASP Policy Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Map Consistent | Remarks                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| H-1.6            | The city shall ensure that new development pays its fair share in financing public facilities and services and pursues financial assistance techniques to reduce the cost impact on the production of affordable housing.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | n/a            | This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The project will comply with all mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR and Addendums. See MMRP.                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| H-1.8            | The city shall strive to create additional opportunities for mixed-use and transit oriented development.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | n/a            | This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| H-3.1            | The city shall encourage residential projects affordable to a mix of household incomes and disperse affordable housing projects throughout the city to achieve a balance of housing in all neighborhoods and communities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | n/a            | This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The Project proposes residential development within the overall mix of household incomes.                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| H-3.2            | The city shall continue to use federal and state subsidies, as well as inclusionary housing in-lieu fees, affordable housing impact fees on non-residential development, and other fees collected into the Housing Trust Fund in a cost-efficient manner to meet the needs of lower-income households, including extremely low-income households.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | n/a            | This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The Project proposes residential development.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| H-3.3            | The city shall continue to make density bonuses available to affordable and senior housing projects, consistent with State law and Chapter 17.102 of the Folsom Municipal Code.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | n/a            | This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The Project does not seek a density bonus.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| H-3.4            | Where appropriate, the city shall use development agreements to assist housing developers in complying with city affordable housing goals.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | n/a            | This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The Project is subject to the Amended and Revised Development Agreement.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-3.5</td>
<td>The city shall make incentives available to property owners with existing development agreements to encourage the development of affordable housing.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The Project is subject to the Amended and Restated Development Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5.2</td>
<td>The city shall encourage housing for seniors and persons with disabilities to be located near public transportation, shopping, medical, and other essential services and facilities.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The project does not propose housing for seniors or persons with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5.4</td>
<td>The city shall encourage private efforts to remove physical barriers and improve accessibility for housing units and residential neighborhoods to meet the needs of person with disabilities.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The Project complies with the Folsom Ranch, Central District Design Guidelines and City standards for residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5.7</td>
<td>The city shall continue to provide zoning to accommodate future need for facilities to serve city residents in need of emergency shelter.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5.10</td>
<td>The city shall encourage developers to include spaces in proposed buildings or sites on which child care facilities could be developed or leased by a child care operator.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. The Project does not propose non-residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-6.2</td>
<td>The city shall assist in the enforcement of fair housing laws by providing information and referrals to organizations that can receive and investigate fair housing allegations, monitor compliance with fair housing laws, and refer possible violations to enforcing agencies.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7.1</td>
<td>The city shall continue to implement state energy-efficient standards to new residential development.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-7.2</td>
<td>The city shall include energy conservation guidelines as part of the development standards for the specific plan area.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7.3</td>
<td>The city shall reduce residential cooling needs associated with the urban heat island effect.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7.4</td>
<td>The city shall promote an increase in the energy efficiency of new and existing housing beyond minimum state requirements.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7.5</td>
<td>The city shall encourage the increased use of renewable energy.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7.6</td>
<td>The city shall encourage “smart growth” that accommodates higher density residential uses near transit, bicycle and pedestrian friendly areas of the city that encourage and facilitate the conservation of resources by reducing the need for automobile use.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. East Bidwell Street is part of the FPASP transit corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section 7 - Circulation

### Circulation Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 7.1</th>
<th>The roadway network in the Plan Area shall be organized in a grid-like pattern of streets and blocks, except where topography and natural features make it infeasible, for the majority of the Plan Area in order to create neighborhoods that encourage walking, biking, public transit and other alternative modes of transportation.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Topography and natural features make grid layout infeasible, but the proposed roadway connects future residents of the project to adjacent school, park, open space, and commercial uses. East Bidwell Street is part of the FPASP transit corridor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 7.2</td>
<td>Circulation within the Plan Area shall be ADA accessible and minimize barriers to access by pedestrians, the disabled, seniors and bicyclists. Physical barriers such as walls, berms, and landscaping that separate residential and nonresidential uses and impede bicycle or pedestrian access or circulation shall be minimized.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Project complies with the Folsom Ranch, Central District Design Guidelines and City standards for residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>The Plan Area shall apply for permanent membership in the 50 Corridor TMA. Funding to be provided by a Community Facilities District or other non-revocable funding mechanism.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not effect the Plan Area's permanent membership in the 50 Corridor TMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Submit a General Plan Amendment to the city to modify General Plan Policy 17.17 regarding Traffic Level of Service ‘C’. This level of service may not be achieved throughout the entire Plan Area at buildout.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The applicable Level of Service under the General Plan is 'D.' The streets are designed to meet traffic requirements and are consistent with the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roadway Classification Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A framework of arterial and collector roadways shall be developed that accommodate Plan Area traffic while accommodating through-traffic demands to adjoining city areas.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Project street layout is consistent with the Specific Plan. East Bidwell Street is part of the FPASP transit corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Major and minor arterials, collectors, and minor collectors shall be provided with sidewalks that safely separate pedestrians from vehicular traffic and class II bicycle lanes that encourage transportation choices within the Plan Area.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway have separated sidewalks from the street to enhance pedestrian design. Class III bike routes are provided on all residential streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Traffic calming measures shall be utilized, where appropriate, to minimize neighborhood cut-through traffic and excessive speeds in residential neighborhoods. Roundabouts and traffic circles shall be considered on low volume neighborhood streets as an alternative to four-way stops or where traffic signals will be required at project build-out. Traffic calming features included in the City of Folsom’s Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Guidelines (NTMP) may also be utilized in the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The street system has been designed to discourage traffic through the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Roadway improvements shall be constructed to coincide with the demands of new development, as required to satisfy city minimum level of service standards.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The streets are designed to meet traffic requirements and are consistent with the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Transit Policies**
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.8A             | Concurrent with development of the SP-RC and SP-GC parcels located at the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway, the following roadway improvements will be constructed:  
- Alder Creek Parkway from Prairie City Road to East Bidwell Street.  
- East Bidwell Street from White Rock Road to U.S. Highway 50.  
- Rowberry Road (including the over-crossing of U.S. Highway 50).  
The timing, extent of improvements and interim improvements shall be predicated on the extent and type of development proposed for the above referenced parcels | n/a | The project is not located at the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Alder Creek Parkway. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. |
| 7.9              | Public transportation opportunities to, from, and within the Plan Area shall be coordinated with the City Public Works Transit Division and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT). Regional and local fixed and circulator bus routes through the Plan Area shall be an integral part of the overall circulation network to guarantee public transportation service to major destinations for employment, shopping, public institutions, multi-family housing and other land uses likely to attract public transit use. | Yes | The project is consistent with the adopted Specific Plan, which addresses public transportation opportunities. |
| 7.10             | Consistent with the most recent update of the RT master plan and the Plan Area Master Transit Plan, a transit corridor shall be provided through the Plan Area for future regional ‘Hi-Bus’s service (refer to Figure 7.29 and the FPASP Transit Master Plan). Sufficient right-of-way shall be dedicated for the transit corridor as described in Section 7.3 and Figures 7.2, 7.3, 7.14 & 7.15. | Yes | The project is consistent with the adopted Specific Plan, which addresses public transportation opportunities. |
| 7.11             | Future transit bus stops and associated amenities shall be placed at key locations in the Plan Area according to the recommendation of the FPASP Transit Master Plan. | Yes | The project is consistent with the adopted Specific Plan, which addresses public transportation opportunities. |
| 7.12             | Provide interim park-and-ride facilities for public transit use as shown in the FPASP Transit Master Plan. | Yes | The project is consistent with the adopted Specific Plan, which addresses public transportation opportunities. |
# Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>The City of Folsom shall participate with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission in an update of the “Folsom El Dorado Corridor Transit Strategy Final Report dated December 2005. The update shall include the Plan Area and Sacramento County.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>The City of Folsom shall participate with the Sacramento Area Council of Government in a revision of the City of Folsom Short-Range Transit Plan Update Final Report, dated September 2005. The update shall include the Plan Area.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decision-making and planning processes. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) “A Guide to Transit Oriented Development (TOD)” shall be used as a design guideline for subsequent project level approvals for all projects along the Plan Area transit corridor.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The guideline was used in the preparation of the Specific Plan. The project is consistent with the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalks, Trails and Bikeway Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>A system of sidewalks, trails, and bikeways shall internally link all land uses and connect to all existing or planned external street and trail facilities contiguous with the Plan Area to provide safe routes of travel for pedestrians and bicyclists as depicted in Figure 7.32 and as indicated on the applicable roadway sections. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be designed in accordance with City design standards, including the latest version of the Bikeway Master Plan, the FPASP and the FPASP Community Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project includes sidewalks that are consistent with the adopted Specific Plan and City standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>Public accessibility to open space and scenic areas within the Plan Area shall be provided via roadway, sidewalks, trail and bikeway connections, where appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Access to nearby open space areas is provided via roadways, sidewalks, and trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>Traffic calming measures and signage shall be used to enhance the safety of sidewalk, trail and bikeway crossings of arterial and collector streets.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not propose any sidewalk, trail, or bikeway crossings. A pedestrian-activated traffic signal is planned at the trail head located at East Bidwell Road and a Class I trail undercrossing is planned at the trail head at Mangini Parkway, as shown on the Bikeways Plan in the FPASP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>Class I bike path and trail crossings of Alder Creek and intermittent drainages channels shall be minimized and located and designed to cause the least amount of disturbance to the creek environment.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Alder Creek is not located in this phase. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>Per state and federal programs, safe routes to schools shall be identified and signed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The nearest elementary and middle school sites are located within the LLVTSM for Town Center South. Streets are designed to promote walking and biking as alternative modes of daily travel and to provide safe routes to school. Signage shall be identified in the improvements plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>All Plan Area land uses shall be located within approximately 1/2 mile of a Class I bike path or a Class II bike lane.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is within 1/2 mile of East Bidwell Street, which will be developed with class II bike lanes as part of the planned Bicycle network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>Site design and building placement shall minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity. Physical barriers such as walls, berms, landscaping and slopes between residential and non-residential land uses that unnecessarily impede bicycle or pedestrian circulation shall be minimized. Clearly marked shaded paths shall be provided through commercial and mixed use parking lots.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The Project does not include commercial or mixed use development and complies with the Folsom Ranch, Central District Design Guidelines and City standards for residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>Adequate short and long term bicycle parking shall be provided for all Plan Area land uses (except for single-family and single-family high density residential uses) as specified in Table A.14.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project includes single-family high density residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 8 - Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Open Space areas shall be created throughout the entirety of the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Create a preserve open space zone that will include all of the preserved wetlands and required buffers that are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Create a passive open space zone that may contain limited recreation uses and facilities, storm water quality detention basins, water quality structures, wetland and tree mitigation areas and limited public utilities.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Where feasible, locate schools and parks adjacent or near to open space.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The nearest elementary and middle school sites are located within the LLVTSM for Town Center South. The LLVTSM is consistent with the planned school and co-located park policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Open space areas shall incorporate sensitive Plan Area natural resources, including oak woodlands, Alder Creek and its tributaries, hillside areas, cultural resources, and tributaries of Carson, Buffalo and Coyote Creeks within the boundaries of the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Policy No.</td>
<td>FPASP Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Open space improvements shall comply with City of Folsom General Plan Policy 27.1 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Natural parkways, thirty-feet (30') in width or larger, shall be considered part of the required thirty percent (30%) Plan Area natural open space provided the following minimum criteria is met: 8.7a: They include a paved path or trail. 8.7.b: They have the ability to be utilized for tree mitigation plantings or other appropriate mitigation measures and; 8.7.c: They are planted primarily with California central valley and foothills native plants as described in the most current edition of River-Friendly Landscape Guidelines.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No natural parkways are proposed in the project area. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Locate Class I bicycle paths and paved and unpaved trails throughout the open space.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Carefully site infrastructure, including roads, wastewater and water facilities, trailheads, equestrian trails and the like to minimize impact to the oak woodlands, Alder Creek and its tributaries, hillside areas, cultural resources and intermittent tributaries of Carson, Buffalo and Coyote Creeks within the boundaries of the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No cultural resources identified to be preserved, oak woodlands, or hillsides are present in the project. The project has been designed to avoid the wetland areas to the extent feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Provide the opportunity for educational programs that highlight the value of the various natural features of the Plan Area.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy directs the City in its decisionmaking. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>All open space improvements, including erosion control planting and landscaping, within the 200-year flood plain shall be designed to withstand inundation during a 200-year flood event.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant’s FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>All open space improvements, including erosion control planting and landscaping adjacent to Alder Creek and its tributaries shall be consistent with Section 10.2.6 - Alder Creek &amp; Floodplain Protection.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Alder Creek is not located in this phase. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>The FASP Open Space Management Plan shall describe the ownership, funding, and maintenance of open space areas.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The document submitted to the City contains this information. Therefore this policy does not apply to the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>The FPASP Community Design Guidelines shall include recommendations for the design of natural parkways and other passive open space recreation facilities, storm water quality detention basins, water quality structures, wetland and tree mitigation areas, and public utilities.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The document submitted to the City contains this information. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>All entitlements within the FPASP shall be reviewed to ensure that thirty percent (30%) of the Plan Area is maintained as natural open space to preserve oak woodlands and sensitive habitat areas.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project does not reduce the amount of open space in the Plan Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 9 - Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 9 - Parks</th>
<th></th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>To promote walking and cycling, community and neighborhood parks shall be connected to the pedestrian and bicycle network.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project’s sidewalks and bike routes are consistent with the connected pedestrian network in the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Park designs shall accommodate a variety of active and passive recreational facilities and activities that meet the needs of Plan Area residents of all ages, abilities and special interest groups, including the disabled.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Neighborhood parks shall feature active recreational uses as a priority and provide field lighting for nighttime sports uses and other activities as deemed appropriate by the City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Department.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>The sports facilities listed in Table 9.1 are suggested facilities for inclusion in community, neighborhood and local parks. The City may amend Table 9.1 as City needs change without amending the FPASP.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>All park master plans shall include a lighting plan and all park lighting fixtures shall be shielded and energy efficient.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Parks shall be designed and landscaped to provide shade, easy maintenance, water efficiency, and to accommodate a variety of recreational uses. Park improvements will comply with Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 13.26 Water Conservation and all applicable mitigations measures set forth in the FPASP EIR/EIS.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Park furniture and structures shall be selected based on durability, vandal resistance and long term maintenance, as approved by the City.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Public art is encouraged in parks where appropriate and feasible in compliance with the City’s Arts and Culture Master Plan.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Easements and designated open space shall not be credited as parkland acreage. These areas may be used for park activities, but not to satisfy Quimby park land dedication requirements.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>Placement of stand alone cell towers or antennae in parks in strongly discouraged. Cell towers or antennae are permitted to be located on sports field lighting poles with a use permit.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Cell towers are not proposed with this application. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>All parks shall be sited and designed with special attention to safety and visibility. Park designs shall follow the use restrictions as outlined in the Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 9.68: Use of Park Facilities. The Parks and Recreation Commission shall review all park master development plans and make recommendations to the City Council for approval.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>A Parks Master Plan shall be prepared for the Plan Area.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy affects the City and does not apply to individual developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>If the existing slope of a park site shown on Figure 9.1 exceeds five percent, the site shall be rough graded by owner/developer/builder dedicating the park land in accordance with grading plans approved by the City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Department. The cost to grade sites may be credited against park impact fees subject to city approval.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 10 - Resource Management & Sustainable Design

#### Wetland Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>Park land dedications are net areas in acres and exclude easements, wetlands, public rights-of-way and steep slopes or structures.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose park uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Delineated wetlands shall be preserved to the greatest extent possible within open space areas and corridors, or otherwise provided for in protected areas.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wetland permit has been issued for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Where preservation is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be carried out as specified in the FPASP EIR/EIS.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wetland permit has been issued for the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Water quality certification based on Section 401 of the Clean Water Act shall be obtained before issuance of the Section 404 permit.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A water quality certification was issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Construction, maintenance, and monitoring of compensation wetlands shall be in accordance with requirements of the USACE, pursuant to the issuance of a Section 404 permit. Compensation wetlands may consist of one of the following: 10.4a: Constructed wetlands within designated open space areas or corridors in the Plan Area; 10.4b: Wetland credits purchased from a mitigation bank; and /or; 10.4c: The purchase of land at an off-site location to preserve or construct mitigation wetlands. To ensure successful compensation wetlands, wetland feasibility studies shall be carried out in conjunction with request for permits from regulatory agencies prior to any construction.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wetland permit has been issued for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>As part of the Section 404 permitting process, the project applicants shall prepare a wetland mitigation and monitoring plan (MMP). The plan shall include detailed information on the habitats present within the preservation and mitigation areas, the long-term management and monitoring of these habitats, legal protection for the preservation and mitigation areas (e.g., conservation easement, declaration of restrictions), and funding mechanism information (e.g., endowment). The plan shall identify participation within mitigation banks.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wetland permit has been issued for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Maintenance and monitoring of all compensation wetlands, whether constructed or purchased, shall be carried out by an approved monitoring agency or organization, and shall be in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations. Monitoring shall continue for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation or until performance standards have been met, whichever is longer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wetland permit has been issued for the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.7</strong></td>
<td>Special status vernal pool invertebrates shall be protected as required by State and federal regulatory agencies. Where protection is not feasible, vernal pool invertebrates shall be mitigated per the wetland mitigation and monitoring plan.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No special status species were identified in the project area and any impacts to offsite areas are covered by the Biological Opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wildlife Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.8</strong></td>
<td>Tricolored blackbird nesting colony habitat, if any, shall be protected as required by State and federal regulatory agencies.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Project will comply with mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR, including conducting preconstruction surveys. See MMRP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.9</strong></td>
<td>A Swainson’s Hawk mitigation plan shall be prepared to avoid loss of nesting areas if applicable.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It is the applicant’s understanding that the City will soon approve a Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Plan. The project will comply with all relevant mitigation measures in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.10</strong></td>
<td>An incidental take permit shall be obtained to avoid impacts on the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB), unless delisting has occurred.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Project will comply with mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR. See MMRP. No Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB) were identified on the proposed project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.11</strong></td>
<td>Special-status bat roosts shall be protected as required by State and federal regulatory agencies.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Project will comply with mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR, including conducting preconstruction surveys. See MMRP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.12</strong></td>
<td>The Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District will provide year-round mosquito and vector control in accordance with state regulations and its Mosquito Management Plan.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This policy applies to the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oak Woodlands & Isolated Oak Tree Policies**
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>Preserve and protect in perpetuity approximately 399-acres of existing oak woodlands.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not have any oak woodlands or oak tree canopy to be preserved. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>The details of ownership, long term maintenance and monitoring of the preserved and mitigated oak woodlands and isolated oak tree canopy shall be specified in the FPASP Open Space Management Plan approved concurrently with the FPASP.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The document submitted to the City contains this information. Therefore this policy does not apply to the Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.15            | Oak trees included in residential and non-residential development parcel impacted oak woodlands are encouraged to be preserved wherever practical, provided preservation does not:  
  a) Cause a reduction in the number of lots or a significant reduction in the size of residential lots.  
  b) Require mass grading that eliminates level pads or requires specialized foundations.  
  c) Require the use of retaining wall or extended earthen slopes greater than 4 feet in height, as measured from the bottom of the footing to the top of the retaining wall.  
  d) Require the preservation of any trees certified by an arborist to be dead or in poor or hazardous or non-correctable condition or trees the pose a safety risk to the public.  
  e) Cost more to preserve the tree than to mitigate for its loss, based on the Isolated Oak Tree Mitigation requirements listed below. | n/a            | There are native tree species located within the bounds of the LLVTSM, however no trees are located within the bounds of the SLVTSM therefore no trees are proposed for removal with this application. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. |
| 10.16            | Isolated oak trees in residential and non-residential development parcels shall be rated according to the following national rating system developed by the American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA):                                                                 | n/a            | There are native tree species located within the bounds of the LLVTSM, however no trees are located within the bounds of the SLVTSM therefore no trees are proposed for removal with this application. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. |

**Table 10.1**  
ASCA Tree Rating System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating No.</th>
<th>Rating Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No apparent problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous or non-correctable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extreme problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>As part of any small lot tentative subdivision map application submittal, prepare and submit a site map, a tree preservation program and arborist’s report and both a canopy survey of oak trees in the development parcel as well as a survey of individual free standing oak trees. The surveys will show trees to be preserved and trees to be removed consistent with the requirements of FMC Chapter 12.16.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The SLVTSM does not have any oak woodlands or oak tree canopy to be preserved. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>For small lot tentative subdivision parcels that contain oak trees, a pre-application and conceptual project review is required to ensure that every reasonable and practical effort has been made by the applicant to preserve oak trees. At a minimum, the submittal shall consist of a completed application form, the site map, the tree preservation program, the arborist’s report, an aerial photograph of the project site, the oak tree surveys, and a conceptual site plan and grading plan showing road and lot layouts and oak trees to be preserved or removed.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The SLVTSM does not contain oak trees. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>Minor administrative modifications to the FPASP development standards, including but not limited to reduced parking requirements, reduced landscape requirement, reduced front and rear yard building setbacks, modified drainage requirements, increased building heights; and variations in lot area, width, depth and site coverage are permitted as part of the Design Review approval process in order to preserve additional oak trees within development parcels.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The SLVTSM does not have any oak woodlands or oak tree canopy to be preserved. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>When oak trees are proposed for preservation in a development parcel, ensure their protection during and after construction as outlined in FMC Chapter 12.16 – Tree Preservation. Once an individual residence or commercial building has received an occupancy permit, preserved trees on the property are subject to the requirements of FMC Chapter 12.16 – Tree Preservation.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The SLVTSM does not have any oak woodlands or oak tree canopy to be preserved. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Policy No.</td>
<td>FPASP Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>The following shall be prepared prior to extensive grading or excavation: 10.21a: Existing archeological reports relevant to the Plan Area shall be reviewed by a qualified archaeologist. 10.21b: Areas found to contain or likely to contain archaeological resources shall be 10.21c: An Archaeological Resources Report shall be prepared, as appropriate. 10.21d: Copies of all records shall be submitted to the appropriate information center in the California Historical Resource Information System (CHRIS).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed project has completed the archaeological surveys and reports described here and they have been submitted to the California Historical Resource Information System (CHRIS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>Publicly accessible trails and facilities in open space areas shall be located so as to ensure the integrity and preservation of historical and cultural resources as specified in the FPASP Community Design Guidelines and the Open Space Management Plan.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>Views toward cultural resources from publicly accessible trails and facilities shall be protected, where appropriate.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>There are no cultural resources that require displays on the project site. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>Interpretive displays near cultural resources shall be unobtrusive and compatible with the visual form of the resources.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>There are no cultural resources that require displays on the project site. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Quality Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>Natural drainage courses within the Plan Area along Alder, Carson, Coyote, and Buffalo Creeks and their tributaries shall be preserved as required by state and federal regulatory agencies and incorporated into the overall storm water drainage system.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed project is consistent with the drainage master plan, including the preservation measures for the referenced drainage features and waterways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>Trails located within open space corridors and areas shall be designed to include soil erosion control measures to minimize sedimentation of nearby creeks and maintain the natural state of drainage courses.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>Public recreational facilities (e.g., picnic areas and trails) located within open space corridors or areas shall be subject to urban storm water best management practices, as defined in Section 10.3 – Sustainable Design.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The SLVTSM includes an open space corridor with a Class 1 multi-purpose trial and will comply with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>Best management practices shall be incorporated into construction practices to minimize the transfer of water borne particulates and pollutants into the storm water drainage system in conformance with FMC Chapters 8.70 – Stormwater Management &amp; Discharge Control and 14.29 – Grading as well as current NPDES permit requirements and State Water Resources Control Board’s Construction General Permit requirements.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The described BMPs will be incorporated in the notes section for the final improvement plans for the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>All mitigation specified in the FPASP EIR/EIS shall be implemented.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures will be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Preference shall be given to biotechnical or non-structural alternatives, over alternatives involving revetments, bank regrading or installation of stream training structures.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project will include measures in improvement plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alder Creek & Floodplain Protection Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>Alder Creek shall be preserved in its natural state, to the extent feasible, to maintain the riparian and wetland habitat adjacent to the creek.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>All improvements and maintenance activity, including creek bank stabilization, adjacent to Alder Creek shall comply with the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits and the Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008 (SB 5).</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>Bank stabilization and other erosion control measure shall have a natural appearance, wherever feasible. The use of biotechnical stabilization methods is required within Alder Creek where it is technically suitable can be used instead of mechanical stabilization.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>New drainage outfalls within or near Alder Creek, or improvements to existing outfalls, shall be designed and constructed utilizing low impact development (LID) practices in conformance with the most current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination (NPDE) regulations. Consistent with these practices, storm water collection shall be decentralized, its quality improved and its peak flow contained in detention facilities that will slowly release it back into the creek drainage outfalls and improvements shall be unobtrusive and natural in appearance (refer to Section 12.6 - Stormwater).</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>All Plan Area development projects shall avoid encroaching on the Alder Creek 200-year flood plain to ensure that no adverse alterations to the creek or the floodplain occur where practical. However, in the event encroachment is unavoidable, construction shall comply with the FPASP EIR/EIS mitigation measures, and all relevant provisions of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan and FMC Chapter 14.23 – Flood Damage Prevention.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>Plan Area streets that cross Alder Creek may be grade-separated from the creek to allow uninterrupted passage of wildlife and trail users. Adequate vertical clearance shall be provided under all such street crossings to allow safe, visible bicycle, pedestrian and equestrian travel. Any streets that cross Alder Creek and are grade-separated shall follow the standards established in FMC Chapter 10.28 – Bridges.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>Emergency vehicle access along Alder Creek may be provided on Class I bike paths and/or separately designated emergency access roads (refer to Figure 7.29).</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>All lighting adjacent to Alder Creek shall be limited to bridges, underpasses, trailheads, public facilities and for other public safety purposes. Lighting fixtures shall be fully shielded and energy efficient.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>Class I bike paths and other paved and unpaved trails may be constructed near Alder Creek in the SP-OS2 passive open space zone consistent with the FPASP Community Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>Public access points shall be located in areas where they have the least impact to the Alder Creek environment and designed to avoid sensitive plant wildlife habitat areas.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>Re-vegetation and new planting along Alder Creek shall use California central valley and foothills native plants as described in the most current edition of River-Friendly Landscape Guidelines.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>Adhere to the recommendations and policies of the Alder Creek Watershed Management Action Plan where feasible.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The proposed project does not impact Alder Creek. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>An Operational Air Quality Mitigation Plan has been prepared and approved by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District based on the District’s CEQA guidelines dated July 2004. As required by LAFCO Resolution 1195 (dated 6 June 2001) the plan achieves a 35% reduction in potential emissions than could occur without a mitigation program.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed project will comply with all applicable air quality mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>The approved Operational Air Quality Mitigation measures shall be included as policies in the relevant sections of the FPASP.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed project will comply with all applicable air quality mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Policy No.</td>
<td>FPASP Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>Based on advisory recommendations included in Table 1-1 of the California Air Resources Board document entitled Air Quality and Land Use Handbook, avoid locating residential land uses within 500-feet of U.S. Highway 50.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Proposed residential land uses are more than 500-feet from U.S. Highway 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>Prohibit wood burning fireplaces in all residential construction.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consistent with the Specific Plan and the Air Quality Management Plan, Wood burning fireplaces are not included in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>Provide complimentary electric lawnmowers to each residential buyer in the SF, SFHD and the MLD land uses.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>Residential developments must be designed and/or located to reduce outdoor noise levels generated by traffic to less than 60 dB.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Project will comply with mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR, including noise reduction measures. See MMRP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>Noise from Aerojet propulsion system and routine component testing facilities affecting sensitive receptor areas shall be mitigated based on recommendations in the acoustical study.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project will not be impacted by the Aerojet facilities. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>The Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions in the Department of Real Estate Public Report shall disclose that the Plan Area is within the Mather Airport flight path and that over flight noise may be present at various times.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Avigation easements have been recorded on the property and disclosures will be provided in CC&amp;R's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>Landowner shall, prior to Tier 2 Development Agreement, record an easement over the property relating to noise caused by aircraft arriving or departing from Mather Airport.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Avigation easements have been recorded on the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Policy No.</td>
<td>FPASP Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.52</strong></td>
<td>Site specific development projects shall incorporate LID design strategies that include:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is consistent with the City's Backbone Infrastructure Master Plan, which includes stormwater requirements. The portion of the proposed project that includes site-specific development has incorporated LID design strategies as described in section 10.52 of the EIR for the FPASP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.52a:</td>
<td>Minimizing and reducing the impervious surface of site development by reducing the paved area of roadways, sidewalks, driveways, parking areas, and roof tops;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2b:</td>
<td>Breaking up large areas of impervious surface area and directing stormwater flows away from these areas to stabilized vegetated areas;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.52c:</td>
<td>Minimizing the impact of development on sensitive site features such as streams, floodplains, wetlands, woodlands, and significant on-site vegetation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.52d:</td>
<td>Maintaining natural drainage courses; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.52e:</td>
<td>Provide runoff storage dispersed uniformly throughout the site, using a variety of LID detention, retention, and runoff techniques that may include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Bioretention facilities and swales (shallow vegetated depressions engineered to collect, store, and infiltrate runoff); and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>Landscape buffers, parkways, parking medians, filter strips, vegetated curb extensions, and planter boxes (containing grass or other close-growing vegetation planted between polluting sources (such as a roadway or site development) and downstream receiving water bodies).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is designed to be consistent with the applicable design guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>The Plan Area landscape palette shall consist of California Central Valley and foothills native plant species as described in the most current edition of River-Friendly Landscape Guidelines and drought tolerant adaptive plant species except at neighborhood entry gateways and similar high visibility locations where ornamental plant species may be preferred.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not include any slopes greater than 25%. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>Open space areas adjacent to buildings and development parcels shall maintain a fuel modification and vegetation management area in order to provide the minimum fuel modification fire break as required by State and local laws and ordinances. Additionally, development parcels adjacent to open space areas may be required to provide emergency access through the property to the open space by means of gates, access roads or other means approved by the City of Folsom Fire Department. Ownership and maintenance of open space areas, including fuel modification requirements and fire hazard reduction measures are outlined in the FPASP Open Space Management Plan.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The FPASP Open Space Management Plan provides for fuel modification measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>Trees shall be interspersed throughout parking lots so that in fifteen (15) years, forty (40) percent of the parking lot will be in shade at high noon. At planting, trees shall be equivalent to a #15 container or larger.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not include any parking lots. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPASP Policy No.</td>
<td>FPASP Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>Conservation of energy resources will be encouraged through site and building development standards.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>Buildings shall incorporate site design measures that reduce heating and cooling needs by orienting buildings on the site to reduce heat loss and gain depending on the time of day and season of the year.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Design Review Approval is not being sought at this time. Where site conditions permit, the project incorporates site design measures that reduce heating and cooling needs through building orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>Solar access to homes shall be considered in the design of residential neighborhoods to optimize the opportunity for passive and active solar energy strategies.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Design Review Approval is not being sought at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>Multi-family and attached residential units shall be oriented toward southern exposures, where site conditions permit.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Design Review Approval is not being sought at this time. Additionally, the Project does not propose multi-family and attached residential units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>Buildings shall be designed to incorporate the use of high quality, energy efficient glazing to reduce heat loss and gain.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>Energy efficient appliances, windows, insulation, and other available technologies to reduce energy demands will be encouraged.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>Office park uses shall install automatic lighting and thermostat features.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not include office uses. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>Commercial and public buildings shall use energy efficient lighting with automatic controls to minimize energy use.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not include commercial or public buildings. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>Energy Star certified equipment and appliances shall be installed, to include: 10.65a - Residential appliances; heating and cooling systems; and roofing; and 10.65b - Nonresidential appliances and office equipment; heating, cooling, and lighting control systems; and roofing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>Commercial, residential, and public projects shall be designed to allow for the possible installation of alternative energy technologies including active solar, wind, or other emerging technologies, and shall comply with the following standards: 10.66a - Installation of solar technology on buildings such as rooftop photovoltaic cell arrays shall be installed in accordance with the State Fire Marshal safety regulations and guidelines. 10.66b - Standard rooftop mechanical equipment shall be located in such a manner so</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.66b</td>
<td>Standard rooftop mechanical equipment shall be located in such a manner so as not to preclude the installation of solar panels.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.66c</td>
<td>- Alternative energy mechanical equipment and accessories installed on the roof of a building, they shall be integrated with roofing materials and/or blend with the structure’s architectural form.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>Radiant solar heating or similar types of energy efficient technologies, shall be installed in all swimming pools.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose any publicly owned buildings. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>Electrical outlets shall be provided along the front and rear exterior walls of all single family homes to allow for the use of electric landscape maintenance tools.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose any publicly owned buildings. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>The city will strive to ensure that all new publicly owned buildings within the Plan Area will be designed, constructed and certified at LEED-NC certification levels.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project does not propose any publicly owned buildings. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Water Efficiency Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>The City of Folsom shall undertake all cost-effective operational and efficiency measures and consider the installation of onsite renewable energy technologies within appropriate portions of the Plan Area, including parks, landscape corridors and open space areas.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This is a City requirement, not a project-specific requirement. The City of Folsom has plans in place to undertake the described cost-effective operational and efficiency measures and consider the installation of onsite renewable energy technologies within appropriate portions of the Plan Area, including parks, landscape corridors and open space areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>All office, commercial, and residential land uses shall be required to install water conservation devices that are generally accepted and used in the building industry at the time of development, including low-flow plumbing fixtures and low-water-use appliances.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. Though Design review approval is not being sought at this time, the required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>A backbone “purple pipe” non-potable water system shall be designed and installed where feasible and practical to supply non-potable water to park sites, landscape corridors, natural parkways and other public landscaped spaces within the Plan Area.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Purple pipe has been incorporated into the Specific Plan for major collector roadway landscaping and funding is provided in the PFFP. Purple pipe infrastructure is not the applicant’s responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPAS Policy No.</td>
<td>FPAS Policy Description</td>
<td>Map Consistent</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>Water efficient irrigation systems, consistent with the requirements of the latest edition of the California Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, or similar ordinance adopted by the City of Folsom, shall be mandatory for all public agency projects and all private development projects with a landscape area equal to or greater than 2,500 square feet requiring a building or landscape permit, plan check or design review.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines. Water efficient irrigation systems will be employed for use in project-area landscaping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material Conservation &amp; Resource Efficiency Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>Use “Green” certified construction products whenever feasible.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Builders in the proposed project will be required to use “Green” certified construction products whenever feasible. The project will comply with all relevant requirements in the City Code and State Building Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>Prepare a construction waste management plan for individual construction projects.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prior to construction, a construction waste management plan will be prepared for individual construction projects within the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>A minimum of 50% of the non-hazardous construction waste generated at a construction site shall be recycled or salvaged for reuse.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The plan described in Section 10.75 will provide for a minimum of 50% of the non-hazardous construction waste generated at a construction site to be recycled or salvaged for reuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>Topsoil displaced during grading and construction shall be stockpiled for reuse in the Plan Area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Topsoil displaced during grading and construction of the proposed project shall be stockpiled for reuse in the Plan Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Quality Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>All HVAC and refrigeration equipment shall not contain chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>California outlawed the use of HFCs in 2018. The project is designed to comply with California law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant’s FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>All fire suppression systems and equipment shall not contain halons.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is designed to comply with the applicable Design Guidelines and standards. The required features will be verified during the building plan check process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>Provide accessible screened areas that are identified for the depositing, storage and collection of non-hazardous materials for recycling for commercial, industrial/office park, mixed-use, public-use and multi-family residential projects.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Same remark as in Section 10.79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>Particleboard, medium density fiberboard (MDF) and hardwood plywood shall comply with low formaldehyde emission standards.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Same remark as in Section 10.79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>Limit the use of volatile organic compounds (VOC) in all construction materials.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Same remark as in Section 10.79.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 11 - Public Services and Facilities

| 11.1             | Public schools will be constructed in the Plan Area in accordance with the City Charter and state law. | n/a | There are no public schools or public service facilities in the proposed SLVTSM. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. |
| 11.2             | All public service facilities shall participate in the City’s recycling program. | n/a | No public facilities are being proposed with this project. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. |
| 11.3             | Energy efficient technologies shall be incorporated in all Public Service buildings | n/a | No public facilities are being proposed with this project. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project. |
# Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Passive solar design and/or use of other types of solar technology shall be incorporated in all public service buildings.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No public facilities are being proposed with this project. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>The city shall strive to ensure that all public service buildings shall be built to silver LEED NC standards.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No public facilities are being proposed with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Utilize Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in the design of all public service buildings.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No public facilities are being proposed with this project. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>If the existing slope of a public facilities site shown on Figure 11.1 exceeds five percent, the site shall be rough graded by the owner/developer/builder dedicating the public facilities site in accordance with grading plans approved by the City of Folsom, subject to a credit and/or reimbursement agreement.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>There are no public schools or public service facilities in the proposed SLVTSM. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Plan Area landowners shall, prior to approval of the annexation by LAFCo and prior to any Tier 2 Development Agreement, whichever comes first, comply with the schools provision in Measure W (Folsom Charter Provision Section 7.08D) and incorporate feasible school impact mitigation requirements as provided in LAFCo Resolution No. 1196, Section 13.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project will comply with school district and charter requirements with respect to Measure W.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 12 - Utilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Consistent with the provisions of City Charter Article 7.08 (A), the FPASP shall &quot;identify and secure the source of water supply(is) to serve the Plan Area. This new water supply shall not cause a reduction in the water supplies designated to serve existing water users north of Highway 50 and the new water supply shall not be paid for by Folsom residents north of Highway 50.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This is a City requirement, not a project-specific requirement. The project is consistent with the FPASP and complies with the City's water supply agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.2</strong></td>
<td>Design and construct the necessary potable water, non-potable water for irrigation, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure require to serve the Plan Area. All infrastructure improvements shall follow the requirements established in the Water Master Plan, Wastewater Master Plan and the Storm Drainage Master Plan. Improvements will be based on phasing of development.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The policy affects the City and does not apply to individual developers. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.3</strong></td>
<td>Land shall be reserved for the construction of public utility facilities that are not planned within road rights-of-way, as required by the City of Folsom.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Land is being reserved for public utilities as described where needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.4</strong></td>
<td>Utilize Best Management Practices (BMPs) where feasible and appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BMPs will be utilized where feasible and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.5</strong></td>
<td>Urban runoff will be treated prior to discharging to a water of the state (i.e. creek, wetland) in accordance with the City's most current Municipal Stormwater Permit requirements for new development.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project complies with permit requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.6</strong></td>
<td>Employ Low Impact Development (LID) practices, as required by the City of Folsom, in conformance with the City's stormwater quality development standards.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is consistent with the Specific Plan requirements and the City requirements as they are updated from time to time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 13 - Implementation

#### Financing Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 13</th>
<th>Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.1</strong></td>
<td>The Plan Area shall fund its proportional share of regional backbone infrastructure costs and the full costs for primary and secondary backbone infrastructure.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project is consistent with Public Facilities Financing Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.2</strong></td>
<td>The Plan Area shall fund the its proportional share of the costs for Plan Area public facilities including the municipal center, police and fire department stations, the city corp yard and community, neighborhood and local parks.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project is consistent with Public Facilities Financing Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.3</strong></td>
<td>The City of Folsom shall apply for Sacramento Countywide Transportation Mitigation fee funding to help fund all eligible regional road backbone infrastructure.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This is a City requirement. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>A Plan Area fee will be created to fund backbone infrastructure and a proportional cost allocation system will be established for each of the Plan Area property owners.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The policy affects the City and does not apply to individual developers. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>City of Folsom impact and capital improvement fees shall be used to fund Plan Area backbone infrastructure and public facilities where allowed by law.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The policy affects the City and does not apply to individual developers. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>One or more Community Facilities Districts shall be created in the Plan Area to help finance backbone infrastructure and public facilities costs and other eligible improvements and/or fees.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The policy affects the City and does not apply to individual developers. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mangini Ranch Phase 3: Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPASP Policy No.</th>
<th>FPASP Policy Description</th>
<th>Map Consistent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phasing Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>Submit a conceptual backbone infrastructure phasing plan for the appropriate development area with the first tentative map or building permit submittal. Updating of the conceptual backbone infrastructure phasing plan shall be a requirement of subsequent tentative map or building permit applications for each development area.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The policy affects the City and does not apply to individual developers. Therefore the policy does not apply to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Create one or more Landscaping and Lighting Districts in the Plan Area for the maintenance and operation of public improvements and facilities and open space.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A Community Facilities District will be formed to implement policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May, 2021
Attachment 12

Access Circulation and Evaluation
dated April 28, 2021
Memorandum

To: Kris Steward
From: Matt Weir, P.E., T.E., PTOE, RSP1
Re: Access Evaluation
Mangini Ranch – Phase 3
Date: April 28, 2021

Per your request, we have prepared this access evaluation specific to Phase 3 of the above referenced project in Folsom. The assumptions upon which this evaluation was prepared were identified by the City of Folsom1 and the project team. The following is discussion of our evaluation, findings, and recommendations.

I. Land Use, Trip Generation, and Primary Access
   o 260 single-family detached residential units
      - Highest peak-hour volume2:
        160-trips IN (PM)
        142-trips OUT (AM)

A previously completed traffic study2 is understood to form the basis of the ultimate East Bidwell Street corridor. This prior effort is included by reference allowing this access evaluation to focus exclusively on ingress and egress for Phase 3. Accordingly, in addition to the assumptions summarized above, the following considerations were also incorporated as part of this evaluation:

   o Project Site’s Land Use
     Figure 13 (Enhanced SACSIM Representation of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (with 44 zones)) and Table 20 (Cumulative 2036 AM and PM Peak-hour Trip Generation by TAZ) of the prior traffic study3 contemplated the Specific Plan land uses for the project site (total of 770 single-family units) in the large Traffic Analysis Zone (#1840). This TAZ and the associated assumptions appear to have accounted for the Phase 3 project (260 single-family units). The project is understood to be consistent with the Specific Plan’s land use assumptions and was represented as such in the prior study.

   o East Bidwell St Access (E Bidwell St/Mangini Pkwy)
     Figure 36 (Mitigation 8 at Intersection 11) and Figure 40 (Portion of Mitigation 8 and 3 to be Implemented with Phase 1 of the Project) of the prior traffic study3 indicate full access with the implementation of traffic signal control. It is important to note that the prior traffic study concludes that the addition of that project (Regency at Folsom Ranch) triggers the need for this signalization. At the time of this memorandum, the subject intersection has been partially constructed to its ultimate width and traffic signal control is in place and operational. The construction of the west leg and its associated traffic signal modification to serve Regency at Folsom Ranch is anticipated to be completed in September 2021.

---

1 Telephone conferences with Steve Krahn, City of Folsom, December 9, 2020, and April 5, 2021.
II. Access Conditions and Trip Assignment

- **Phase 3 Project Only** (260 single-family detached residential units) *(see Exhibit 1)*
  1. “D” Dr @ Northern Connector Rd: full access, side-street stop control (SSSC)
  2. “B” Dr @ Northern Connector Rd: full access, S SSC
  3. “B” Drive @ Mangini Pkwy: full access, S SSC
  4. “E” Drive @ Mangini Pkwy: EVA only
  5. “E” Drive @ East Bidwell St: right-in/right-out, S SSC
  6. East Bidwell St via Northern Connector Rd: partial access, S SSC**
  7. East Bidwell St via Mangini Pkwy: full access, traffic signal controlled***

* EVA designation is per the current small lot tentative map (MacKay & Somps, March 3, 2021). This assumption is considered as part of this access evaluation.

** While this intersection is not anticipated to be signalized, the initial assumption is that left-turns out of this roadway will be restricted (northbound left-turns will be provided). This assumption will be partially tested by this access evaluation.

*** At the time of this memorandum, the adjacent Toll Brothers’ Regency at Folsom project is in the process of constructing Mangini Pkwy, including its connection to and signal modification with East Bidwell St. These improvements will be completed prior to the Phase 3 project’s occupancy.

Lastly it was necessary to approximate the peak-hour turning movements associated with Phase 3 along the Northern Connector Rd, Mangini Pkwy, and at East Bidwell St to allow for an evaluation and recommendation of treatments. These trips were developed as summarized below:

- **Global Trip Assignment**
  
  Per Figure 8 (Project Trip Distribution) of the prior traffic study\(^3\)
  
  - 84% of the trips originate from or are destined for points north
  - 16% trips originating from or destined for points assumed to access White Rock Rd (Capital SouthEast Connector) south of the project site

- **Approximate “Project Only” Peak-Hour Intersection Volumes\(^4\)**
  
  6. East Bidwell St via Northern Connector Rd
     
     **Ingress**
     
     - Southbound Right: 84% * 65% * 160 = 88 trips
     - Northbound Left: 16% * 35% * 160 = 9 trips
     - Northbound U-Turn: 16% * 15% * 160 = 4 trips

     **Egress**
     
     - Eastbound Right: 84% * 20% * 142 = 24 trips
     - Eastbound Right: 16% * 20% * 142 = 5 trips

  7. East Bidwell St via Mangini Pkwy
     
     **Ingress**
     
     - Southbound Right: 84% * 20% * 160 = 27 trips
     - Northbound Left: 16% * 50% * 160 = 13 trips

     **Egress**
     
     - Eastbound Left: 84% * 65% * 142 = 78 trips
     - Southbound U-Turn: 84% * 35% * 142 = 42 trips
     - Eastbound Right: 16% * 65% * 142 = 15 trips

---

\(^4\) Other adjacent projects will also contribute traffic to these two East Bidwell St. intersections. The effect of those developments’ traffic has been/will be analyzed separately, at the time those projects’ applications come forward. Other existing and proposed developments will also contribute traffic to these intersections.
III. Access Review

Based on our coordination with the City and project team, and review of the prior study\(^2\) and related project documentation, we offer the following recommendations for the conditions anticipated to result from the completion of the Phase 3 project:

- **Exterior Roadways**
  The construction of the Phase 3 project is understood to require the construction of two-way vehicle circulation along the surrounding roadways, namely the Northern Connector Road, “D” Drive, and “C” Drive (see Exhibit 1). Because, at the time of this evaluation, the developments located opposite the Phase 3 project are not imminent (to the north and the west), the Phase 3 project must provide these two-way facilities to allow for adequate circulation directly related to the project’s uses. The City has indicated that the full roadway, including Class II on-street bike lanes, are required to be constructed (excludes the opposite sidewalks and other frontage improvements).

- **Village 4 Access**
  As previously noted, the current small lot tentative map (MacKay & Somps, March 3, 2021) indicates that the southern “E” Drive connection to Mangini Parkway is an EVA only. As a result, the “E” Drive connection to East Bidwell Street is assumed to right-in/right-out only. This break in connectivity is also understood to have been proposed as a strategy to avoid “cut-through” traffic that might have otherwise viewed the “E” Drive route as a southbound shortcut to destinations to the west. It is important to note that the cut-through behavior that is the focus of this treatment is limited to southbound East Bidwell Street traffic. Traffic destined for northbound East Bidwell Street would not be able to use this route due to the absence of a left-turn at the “E” Drive intersection with East Bidwell Street (right-in/right-out only).
  - The proposed EVA location (at Mangini Parkway) has the effect of isolating Village 4 and concentrating all of the access to the right-in/right-out driveway at East Bidwell Street. As a result of this configuration, entering traffic originating from the south and exiting traffic destined for the north would be required to perform u-turns at the adjacent East Bidwell Street intersections (these movements are captured in the previously summarized intersection turning movements). Furthermore, concentrating all of the access to East Bidwell Street would require frequent interaction with the high volume/high speed arterial, including undesirable “weave” maneuvers as traffic positions for the southbound left-turn pocket at Mangini Parkway to perform a u-turn to travel northbound away from the project.
  - Although the Village 4 volumes are relatively low (representing only approximately 15-percent of the total project’s trips), the following access modifications are recommended (see Exhibit 1):
    - Relocate the EVA to the north end of “E” Drive and create a full access, SSSC intersection at the Mangini Parkway intersection with “E Drive”. This minor intersection would be anticipated to align with a future driveway opposite Mangini Parkway (Toll Brothers), would require a minimally sized eastbound left-turn pocket, would not be anticipated to conflict with the lanes or operations at the East Bidwell Street traffic signal, and would provide a meaningful improvement to Village 4’s circulation. In fact, if desired by the City, the creation of this intersection provides the opportunity to extend the eastbound left-turn pocket at the East Bidwell Street intersection to accept the outbound left-turns from Village 4. Otherwise, the subject eastbound left-turn lane at East Bidwell
Street is anticipated to be appropriately sized as currently reflected in the Mangini Parkway improvement plans (MacKay & Somps, December 17, 2020).

- As a result of these modifications, traffic associated with Village 4 would have a safer and more convenient primary access point along Mangini Parkway, in a location that appears to be consistent with future access plans for this segment.

- **East Bidwell Street Access**
  - **Northern Connector Road**
    As previously noted, the East Bidwell Street intersection with the Northern Connector Road is anticipated to restrict left-turns out. This is a common configuration supported by the City in which left-turns in are provided but the less safe outbound left-turns are eliminated. Traffic desiring to make this movement (outbound left-turn) would have to turn right and make a downstream u-turn at the Mangini Parkway signalized intersection. The volumes summarized above are relatively low, although it is acknowledged that future development will contribute to this intersection’s turning movements. As such, the northbound left-turn pocket should be sized adequately to accommodate both the near-term and ultimate traffic volumes. This pocket should be constructed to provide adequate deceleration distance. Incorporation of adequate deceleration distance will help to ensure safe operations by allowing these slowing vehicles to exit the #1 northbound East Bidwell Street through lane. Although queue storage is anticipated to be minimal, this left-turn pocket should total at least 315-feet (255-foot deceleration plus 60-foot bay taper), representing an assumed entry speed of 40-mph which includes a 10-mph speed reduction from the adjacent through lane ⁵. Lastly, it is important to note that, in the base access condition for Village 4, traffic originating from the south would be required to make a u-turn at this intersection (Northern Connector Road). This is an undesirable movement and one that would be eliminated with the suggested Village 4 access modifications noted above.

- As previously discussed, the southbound right-turn volumes at this intersection are estimated at 88 peak-hour trips during the PM peak-hour. Because this volume exceeds 50 peak-hour trips, the City will require a deceleration taper/flare or lane. As dictated by the City, this important deceleration facility should be constructed as part of this intersection.

- **Mangini Parkway**
  As previously noted, this intersection is currently signalized and is understood to be modified by the adjacent Toll Brothers project to complete the layout and modify the traffic signal to its ultimate operation. As such, because the intersection is understood to be constructed in a manner consistent with the prior study and the fact that the Phase 3 project is consistent with the underlying development assumptions, the intersection configuration is anticipated to be adequate and will accommodate the project.

- **Northern Connector Road/“B” Drive Access**
  The subject small lot tentative map (MacKay & Somps, March 3, 2021) depicts the Northern Connector Road as a two-lane facility with on-street parking. Because of the narrow cross-section and relatively low volumes anticipated, this intersection is

---

anticipated to operate with SSSC and without turn pockets along the Northern Connector Road approaches. This basic configuration and traffic control are anticipated to be adequate considering the mix of volumes and speeds. Adequate sight distance should be provided, and maintained, for vehicles exiting the Phase 3 project from “B” Drive.

- **Mangini Parkway/“B” Drive Access**
  This intersection is anticipated to be SSSC, with an eastbound left-turn lane along Mangini Parkway. This configuration should mimic the configuration being constructed for the adjacent Toll Brothers access in which the center lane of the three lane Mangini Parkway cross-section is used to form a minimally sized left-turn pocket. The dimensions of this pocket should match the Toll Brothers’ improvements. Adequate sight distance should be provided, and maintained, for vehicles existing the Phase 3 project from “B” Drive.

- **East Bidwell Street Pedestrian Activated Crossing**
  The City has indicated that a future potential at-grade pedestrian crossing is envisioned for East Bidwell Street along the project’ frontage (see Exhibit 1). This crossing would serve the proposed trail and would be located between the Northern Access Road and the Village 4 “E” Drive intersections. Because it would be at-grade, this crossing would require pedestrian actuation and extensive traffic signal appurtenances to ensure safe and orderly operations when pedestrian crossings are occurring. A future traffic operations analysis would be required to simulate the East Bidwell Street corridor traffic operations under the condition with this at-grade crossing. At this time, the City has expressed that this feature is a lower priority and that it will be considered more comprehensively at a later time.

### IV. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Based on the assessment documented above, the following is a summary of our findings and recommendations:

- Construction of the Phase 3 project requires the construction of two-way vehicle circulation along the surrounding roadways, namely the Northern Connector Road, “D” Drive, and “C” Drive (see Exhibit 1). The Phase 3 project must provide these two-way facilities to allow for adequate circulation directly related to the project’s uses.
- It is recommended to modify the Village 4 access by relocating the EVA to the north end of “E” Drive and creating a full access, SSSC intersection at Mangini Parkway. These modifications will improve the safety and convenience for Village 4 traffic.
- The northbound East Bidwell Street left-turn to the Northern Connector Road should be constructed with at least 315-feet (255-foot deceleration plus 60-foot bay taper).
- A southbound deceleration taper/flare or lane (subject to City specification) should be constructed at the East Bidwell Street intersection with the Northern Connector Road.
- The “B” Drive intersection with the Northern Connector Road is anticipated to operate adequately with SSSC and without dedicated turn pockets. Adequate sight distance should be provided and maintained.
- The “B” Drive intersection with Mangini Parkway is anticipated to operate adequately with SSSC and a minimally sized eastbound left-turn pocket (in a manner consistent with the adjacent Toll Brothers’ improvements).
- A future, potential pedestrian activated crossing of East Bidwell Street will be studied and considered more comprehensively by the City at a later time.

### Attachment:
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Introduction

The proposed Mangini Ranch Development is located within the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan. The specific component of the overall Mangini Ranch development analyzed in this study is the development of Phase 3 (project) which includes single-family residential lots. The Phase 3 component of the development (Villages 1-4) is located west of East Bidwell Street, between Mangini Parkway and (future) A Drive. The project area and site plan are shown on Figures 1 and 2, respectively.

Due to the potential for elevated East Bidwell Road, Mangini Parkway, and A Drive traffic noise levels at the development, Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. (BAC) was retained by the project applicant to prepare this noise assessment. Specifically, this assessment was prepared to determine whether traffic noise would cause noise levels at the development to exceed acceptable limits of the Folsom General Plan. This assessment also includes an evaluation of compliance with the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan EIR Noise Mitigation Measures.

Noise Fundamentals and Terminology

Noise is often described as unwanted sound. Sound is defined as any pressure variation in air that the human ear can detect. If the pressure variations occur frequently enough (at least 20 times per second), they can be heard, and thus are called sound. Measuring sound directly in terms of pressure would require a very large and awkward range of numbers. To avoid this, the decibel scale was devised. The decibel scale allows a million-fold increase in pressure to be expressed as 120 dB. Another useful aspect of the decibel scale is that changes in levels (dB) correspond closely to human perception of relative loudness. Appendix A contains definitions of Acoustical Terminology. Figure 3 shows common noise levels associated with various sources.

The perceived loudness of sounds is dependent upon many factors, including sound pressure level and frequency content. However, within the usual range of environmental noise levels, perception of loudness is relatively predictable, and can be approximated by weighing the frequency response of a sound level meter by means of the standardized A-weighing network. There is a strong correlation between A-weighted sound levels (expressed as dBA) and community response to noise. For this reason, the A-weighted sound level has become the standard tool of environmental noise assessment. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted levels in decibels.

Community noise is commonly described in terms of the “ambient” noise level, which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. A common statistical tool to measure the ambient noise level is the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) over a given time period (usually one hour). The Leq is the foundation of the Day-Night Average Level noise descriptor, Ldn or DNL, and shows very good correlation with community response to noise. The median noise level descriptor, denoted L50, represents the noise level which is
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Typical A-Weighted Sound Levels of Common Noise Sources

Decibel Scale (dBA)*

- 12-Gauge Shotgun 160
- Jet Takeoff 140
- Pneumatic Riveter 124
- Hammer Drill 114
- Rock Concert 105
- Tractor/Hand Drill 97
- City Traffic 78
- Air Conditioning Unit 60
- Electrical Transformer 45
- Conversation 65
- Floor Fan 50
- Refrigerator Hum 40
- Rustling Leaves 30
- Pin Falling 15

*Sources:
  - www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/noise/noisemeter.html
  - http://e-a-i.com/hearingconservation/beq_main.cfm
exceeded 50% of the hour. In other words, half of the hour ambient conditions are higher than the L50 and the other half are lower than the L50.

DNL is based upon the average noise level over a 24-hour day, with a +10-decibel weighting applied to noise occurring during nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) hours. The nighttime penalty is based upon the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposures as though they were twice as loud as daytime exposures. Because DNL represents a 24-hour average, it tends to disguise short-term variations in the noise environment. DNL-based noise standards are commonly used to assess noise impacts associated with traffic, railroad, and aircraft noise sources.

Criteria for Acceptable Noise Exposure

Folsom 2035 General Plan - Transportation Noise Sources

The Safety and Noise Element of the Folsom 2035 General Plan establishes exterior noise level standards for residential outdoor activity areas exposed to transportation noise sources (i.e., traffic). For single-family residential uses, such as those proposed in Phase 3 Villages 1-4, the General Plan applies an exterior noise level limit of 60 dB DNL at the outdoor activity areas (i.e., backyards). The intent of this criteria is to provide an acceptable exterior noise environment for outdoor activities.

The General Plan utilizes an interior noise level standard of 45 dB DNL or less within noise-sensitive project dwellings. The intent of this interior noise limit is to provide a suitable environment for indoor communication and sleep.

Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Noise Mitigation Measures

The noise mitigation measures shown below have been incorporated into the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan to mitigate identified environmental impacts. The noise-related mitigation measure which is applicable to the development of residential land uses within the Mangini Ranch development are reproduced below. Following the mitigation measure is a brief discussion as to the applicability of the measure to this project.

MM 3A.11-4 Implement Measures to Prevent Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increases in Noise from Project-Generated Operational Traffic on Off-Site and On-Site Roadways.

To meet applicable noise standards as set forth in the appropriate General Plan or Code (e.g., City of Folsom, County of Sacramento, and County of El Dorado) and to reduce increases in traffic-generated noise levels at noise-sensitive uses, the project applicant(s) of all project phases shall implement the following:

- Obtain the services of a consultant (such as a licensed engineer or licensed architect) to develop noise-attenuation measures for the proposed construction of on-site noise-sensitive land uses (i.e., residential dwellings and school classrooms) that will produce a
minimum composite Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating for buildings of 30 or greater, individually computed for the walls and the floor/ceiling construction of buildings, for the proposed construction of on-site noise-sensitive land uses (i.e., residential dwellings and school classrooms).

- Prior to submittal of tentative subdivision maps and improvement plans, the project applicant(s) shall conduct a site-specific acoustical analysis to determine predicted roadway noise impacts attributable to the project, taking into account site-specific conditions (e.g., site design, location of structures, building characteristics). The acoustical analysis shall evaluate stationary- and mobile-source noise attributable to the proposed use or uses and impacts on nearby noise-sensitive land uses, in accordance with adopted City noise standards. Feasible measures shall be identified to reduce project-related noise impacts. These measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

  - Limiting noise-generating operational activities associated with proposed commercial land uses, including truck deliveries;
  - Constructing exterior sound walls;
  - Constructing barrier walls and/or berms with vegetation;
  - Using “quiet pavement” (e.g., rubberized asphalt) construction methods on local roadways; and,
  - Using increased noise-attenuation measures in building construction (e.g., dual-pane, sound-rated windows; exterior wall insulation).

Pursuant to this mitigation measure, this report includes an analysis of traffic noise impacts at proposed residential lots within Phase 3 of the Mangini Ranch development resulting from traffic on East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway, and A Drive. As determined in the following assessment, portions of the development are predicted to be exposed to future traffic noise levels in excess of the applicable Folsom General Plan exterior and interior noise level criteria for single-family residential uses. As a result, this assessment prescribes specific noise control measures as required to achieve satisfaction with the General Plan’s exterior and interior noise level standards applicable to new residential developments.

Evaluation of Future Traffic Noise Levels at Phase 3 Residential Lots

Predicted Future Exterior Traffic Noise Levels

The FHWA Model was used with future traffic data to predict future traffic noise levels at the Phase 3 component of the Mangini Ranch development. Future traffic volumes for East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway were obtained from the Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan EIR. However, the Specific Plan’s traffic impact study does not include traffic modeling results for future A Drive. Due to the relatively minor nature of A Drive, it is reasonable to conclude that the projected future ADT on the roadway would be fewer than 5,000 vehicles per day. The day/night distribution and truck percentages for East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway, and A Drive
were derived from BAC file data for similar roadways. Estimated future traffic speed assumptions were based on posted speed limits and data for similar roadways. The FHWA Model inputs and predicted future traffic noise levels at the Phase 3 component of the development are shown in Appendix B and are summarized in Table 1.

### Table 1
Predicted Future Exterior Traffic Noise Levels at Mangini Ranch Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Predicted DNL (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Bidwell Street</td>
<td>Village 1</td>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village 4</td>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangini Parkway</td>
<td>Village 3</td>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village 4</td>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Drive</td>
<td>Village 1</td>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village 2</td>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A complete listing of FHWA Model inputs and results for the roadways are provided in Appendix B.
2. An offset of +3 dB was applied at upper-floor building facades due to reduced ground absorption of sound at elevated positions.

Source: Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. (2021)

**Analysis of Future Exterior Traffic Noise Level Exposure at Outdoor Activity Areas**

As indicated in Table 1, future traffic noise levels at the outdoor activity areas of the single-family residential lots proposed nearest to the East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway, and A Drive are predicted to exceed the applicable Folsom General Plan 60 dB DNL exterior noise level standard. As a result, further consideration of traffic noise mitigation measures would be warranted for portions of the development.

To achieve compliance with the General Plan's 60 dB DNL exterior noise level standard at the single-family residential lots of the development, it is recommended that traffic noise barriers be constructed at the heights and locations illustrated on Figure 2. Barrier insertion loss calculation worksheets are provided as Appendix C. As indicated in Appendix C, the construction of noise barriers ranging from 6 to 8 feet in height (relative to backyard lot elevation) would be required to comply with the General Plan 60 dB DNL exterior noise level criterion. The traffic noise barriers
could take the form of masonry wall, earthen berm, or a combination of the two. Other materials may be acceptable but should be reviewed by an acoustical consultant prior to use.

**Analysis of Future Interior Traffic Noise Level Exposure within Residences**

After construction of traffic noise barriers required to comply with the General Plan’s 60 dB DNL exterior noise level standard, future exterior traffic noise levels are predicted to range from 56 to 59 dB DNL at the first-floor facades of the single-family residences constructed nearest to East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway, and A Drive. Due to reduced ground absorption at elevated positions and lack of shielding by the recommended noise barriers, noise levels at the upper-floor facades of those residences are predicted to range from 66 to 71 dB DNL. To satisfy the Folsom General Plan 45 dB DNL interior noise level standard, minimum noise reductions of 14 dB and 26 dB would be required of the first- and upper-floor building facades (respectively) of the residences constructed adjacent to the roadways.

Standard residential construction (i.e., stucco siding, STC-27 windows, door weather-stripping, exterior wall insulation, composition plywood roof), typically results in an exterior to interior noise reduction of approximately 25 dB with windows closed and approximately 15 dB with windows open. This level of noise reduction would be adequate to reduce future East Bidwell Street, Mangini Parkway, and A Drive traffic noise levels to 45 dB DNL or less within the first-floors of all residences constructed within the Phase 3 development. However, upper-floor window construction upgrades would be warranted at a portion of residences constructed nearest to the roadways.

To ensure for satisfaction of the General Plan 45 dB DNL interior noise level standard including a factor of safety, it is recommended that all upper-floor window assemblies of residences constructed on the lots identified on Figure 2 with a view of the adjacent roadways be upgraded to a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 32. In addition, mechanical ventilation (air conditioning) should be provided for all residences of the development to allow the occupants to close doors and windows as desired for additional acoustical isolation.

**Conclusions**

Portions of the the Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Residential Development are predicted to be exposed to future traffic noise levels in excess of the applicable Folsom General Plan exterior and interior noise level criteria for single-family residential uses. To satisfy the General Plan exterior noise level standard, and to ensure for satisfaction of the General Plan interior noise level standard including a factor of safety, the following specific noise mitigation measures are recommended for this project:

1) To comply with the applicable General Plan 60 dB DNL exterior noise level standard, traffic noise barriers ranging from 6 to 8 feet in height relative to backyard elevation would be required. The heights and locations of the noise barriers are illustrated on Figure 2. Barrier insertion loss calculation worksheets are provided as Appendix C.
The traffic noise barriers could take the form of masonry wall, earthen berm, or a combination of the two. Other materials may be acceptable but should be reviewed by an acoustical consultant prior to use.

2) To ensure compliance with the General Plan 45 dB DNL interior noise level standard with a factor of safety, it is recommended that all upper-floor bedroom window assemblies of residences constructed on the lots identified on Figure 2 from which the adjacent roadways would be visible be upgraded to a minimum STC rating of 32.

3) Air conditioning shall be provided for all residences of the development so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise.

These conclusions are based on the traffic assumptions cited in Appendix B, the project site plans and grading plans (dated March 3, 2021), and on noise reduction data for standard residential dwellings and for typical STC rated window data. Deviations from the resources cited above, or the project site/grading plans, could cause future traffic noise levels to differ from those predicted in this assessment. In addition, Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. is not responsible for degradation in acoustic performance of the residential construction due to poor construction practices, failure to comply with applicable building code requirements, or for failure to adhere to the minimum building practices cited in this report.

This concludes BAC’s traffic noise assessment for the proposed Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Residential Development. Please contact BAC at (916) 663-0500 or dariog@bacnoise.com with any questions regarding this assessment.
### Appendix A  
**Acoustical Terminology**

**Acoustics**  
The science of sound.

**Ambient Noise**  
The distinctive acoustical characteristics of a given space consisting of all noise sources audible at that location. In many cases, the term ambient is used to describe an existing or pre-project condition such as the setting in an environmental noise study.

**Attenuation**  
The reduction of an acoustic signal.

**A-Weighting**  
A frequency-response adjustment of a sound level meter that conditions the output signal to approximate human response.

**Decibel or dB**  
Fundamental unit of sound. A Bell is defined as the logarithm of the ratio of the sound pressure squared over the reference pressure squared. A Decibel is one-tenth of a Bell.

**CNEL**  
Community Noise Equivalent Level. Defined as the 24-hour average noise level with noise occurring during evening hours (7 - 10 p.m.) weighted by a factor of three and nighttime hours weighted by a factor of 10 prior to averaging.

**Frequency**  
The measure of the rapidity of alterations of a periodic signal, expressed in cycles per second or hertz.

**IIC**  
Impact Insulation Class (IIC): A single-number representation of a floor/ceiling partition’s impact generated noise insulation performance. The field-measured version of this number is the FIIC.

**Ldn**  
Day/Night Average Sound Level. Similar to CNEL but with no evening weighting.

**Leq**  
Equivalent or energy-averaged sound level.

**Lmax**  
The highest root-mean-square (RMS) sound level measured over a given period of time.

**Loudness**  
A subjective term for the sensation of the magnitude of sound.

**Masking**  
The amount (or the process) by which the threshold of audibility is for one sound is raised by the presence of another (masking) sound.

**Noise**  
Unwanted sound.

**Peak Noise**  
The level corresponding to the highest (not RMS) sound pressure measured over a given period of time. This term is often confused with the "Maximum" level, which is the highest RMS level.

**RT60**  
The time it takes reverberant sound to decay by 60 dB once the source has been removed.

**STC**  
Sound Transmission Class (STC): A single-number representation of a partition’s noise insulation performance. This number is based on laboratory-measured, 16-band (1/3-octave) transmission loss (TL) data of the subject partition. The field-measured version of this number is the FSTC.
Appendix B-1
FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)
Noise Prediction Worksheet

Project Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Offset (dB)</th>
<th>Autos</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 1 Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 4 Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Noise Levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Offset (dB)</th>
<th>Autos</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 1 Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 4 Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Noise Contours (No Calibration Offset):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNL Contour (dB)</th>
<th>Distance from Centerline (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Future ADT obtained from the Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan EIR.
2. Distances scaled from the centerline of roadway to said locations using provided site plans.
3. A +3 dB offset was applied to upper-floor facades to account for reduced ground absorption of sound at elevated locations.
Appendix B-2
FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)
Noise Prediction Worksheet

Project Information:

Job Number: 2021-064
Project Name: Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3
Roadway Name: Mangini Parkway

Traffic Data:

Year: Future
Average Daily Traffic Volume: 10,900
Percent Daytime Traffic: 83
Percent Nighttime Traffic: 17
Percent Medium Trucks (2 axle): 2
Percent Heavy Trucks (3+ axle): 1
Assumed Vehicle Speed (mph): 40
Intervening Ground Type (hard/soft): Soft

Traffic Noise Levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Offset (dB)</th>
<th>Autos</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>Village 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>Village 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>Village 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>Village 4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest first-floor facades</td>
<td>Village 4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest upper-floor facades</td>
<td>Village 4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Noise Contours (No Calibration Offset):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNL Contour (dB)</th>
<th>Distance from Centerline (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Future ADT obtained from the Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan EIR.
2. Distances scaled from the centerline of roadway to said locations using provided site plans.
3. A +3 dB offset was applied to upper-floor facades to account for reduced ground absorption of sound at elevated locations.
Appendix B-3
FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)
Noise Prediction Worksheet

Project Information:

Job Number: 2021-064
Project Name: Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3
Roadway Name: A Drive

Traffic Data:

Year: Future
Average Daily Traffic Volume: 5,000
Percent Daytime Traffic: 83
Percent Nighttime Traffic: 17
Percent Medium Trucks (2 axle): 1
Percent Heavy Trucks (3+ axle): 1
Assumed Vehicle Speed (mph): 35
Intervening Ground Type (hard/soft): Soft

Traffic Noise Levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Offset (dB)</th>
<th>Autos</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village 1 Nearest</td>
<td>outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 1 Nearest</td>
<td>first-floor facades</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 1 Nearest upper-floor</td>
<td>facades</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 2 Nearest</td>
<td>outdoor activity areas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 2 Nearest</td>
<td>first-floor facades</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 2 Nearest upper-floor</td>
<td>facades</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Noise Contours (No Calibration Offset):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNL Contour (dB)</th>
<th>Distance from Centerline (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Future ADT was conservatively estimated to be 5,000 ADT based on type of roadway. Other inputs based on BAC file data for similar roadways.
2. Distances scaled from the centerline of roadway to said locations using provided site plans.
3. A +3 dB offset was applied to upper-floor facades to account for reduced ground absorption of sound at elevated locations.
### Project Information:

- **Job Number**: 2021-064
- **Project Name**: Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3
- **Roadway Name**: East Bidwell Street
- **Location**: Folsom, CA

### Noise Level Data:

- **Year**: Future
  - **Auto DNL, dB**: 67
  - **Medium Truck DNL, dB**: 57
  - **Heavy Truck DNL, dB**: 59

### Site Geometry:

- **Receiver Description**: Village 1 - Nearest outdoor activity areas
- **Centerline to Barrier Distance (C₁)**: 80
- **Barrier to Receiver Distance (C₂)**: 10
- **Automobile Elevation**: 394
- **Medium Truck Elevation**: 396
- **Heavy Truck Elevation**: 402
- **Pad/Ground Elevation at Receiver**: 394
- **Receiver Elevation**: 399
- **Base of Barrier Elevation**: 394
- **Starting Barrier Height**: 6

### Barrier Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Barrier Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Barrier Height (ft)</th>
<th>Autos DNL dB</th>
<th>Medium Trucks DNL dB</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks DNL dB</th>
<th>Total DNL dB</th>
<th>Autos?</th>
<th>Medium Trucks?</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Standard receiver elevation is five feet above grade/pad elevations at the receiver location(s).
Appendix C-2  
FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)  
Noise Barrier Effectiveness Prediction Worksheet

Project Information:  
Job Number: 2021-064  
Project Name: Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3  
Roadway Name: East Bidwell Street  
Location: Folsom, CA

Noise Level Data:  
Year: Future  
Auto DNL, dB: 67  
Medium Truck DNL, dB: 57  
Heavy Truck DNL, dB: 59

Site Geometry:  
Receiver Description: Village 4 - Nearest outdoor activity areas  
Centerline to Barrier Distance (C1): 80  
Barrier to Receiver Distance (C2): 10  
Automobile Elevation: 387  
Medium Truck Elevation: 389  
Heavy Truck Elevation: 395  
Pad/Ground Elevation at Receiver: 387  
Receiver Elevation: 392  
Base of Barrier Elevation: 387  
Starting Barrier Height 6

Barrier Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Barrier Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Barrier Height (ft)</th>
<th>Autos DNL (dB)</th>
<th>Medium Trucks DNL (dB)</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks DNL (dB)</th>
<th>Total DNL (dB)</th>
<th>Barrier Breaks Line of Sight to Autos?</th>
<th>Barrier Breaks Line of Sight to Medium Trucks?</th>
<th>Barrier Breaks Line of Sight to Heavy Trucks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
1. Standard receiver elevation is five feet above grade/pad elevations at the receiver location(s).
Appendix C-3
FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)
Noise Barrier Effectiveness Prediction Worksheet

Project Information:  
Job Number: 2021-064  
Project Name: Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3  
Roadway Name: Mangini Parkway  
Location: Folsom, CA

Noise Level Data:  
Year: Future  
Automobile DNL, dB: 63  
Medium Truck DNL, dB: 54  
Heavy Truck DNL, dB: 57

Site Geometry:  
Receiver Description: Village 3 - Nearest outdoor activity areas  
Centerline to Barrier Distance (C1): 60  
Barrier to Receiver Distance (C2): 10  
Automobile Elevation: 378  
Medium Truck Elevation: 380  
Heavy Truck Elevation: 386  
Pad/Ground Elevation at Receiver: 381  
Receiver Elevation: 386  
Base of Barrier Elevation: 381  
Starting Barrier Height 6

Barrier Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Barrier Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Barrier Height (ft)</th>
<th>DNL (dB) Autos medium Trucks</th>
<th>DNL (dB) Heavy Trucks</th>
<th>DNL (dB) Total</th>
<th>Barrier Breaks Line of Sight to…</th>
<th>Autos?</th>
<th>Medium Trucks?</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
1. Standard receiver elevation is five feet above grade/pad elevations at the receiver location(s).
### Appendix C-4

**FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)**

**Noise Barrier Effectiveness Prediction Worksheet**

#### Project Information:
- Job Number: 2021-064
- Project Name: Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3
- Roadway Name: Mangini Parkway
- Location: Folsom, CA

#### Noise Level Data:
- Year: Future
- Auto DNL, dB: 63
- Medium Truck DNL, dB: 54
- Heavy Truck DNL, dB: 57

#### Site Geometry:
- Receiver Description: Village 4 - Nearest outdoor activity areas
- Centerline to Barrier Distance \((C_1)\): 60
- Barrier to Receiver Distance \((C_2)\): 10
- Automobile Elevation: 382
- Medium Truck Elevation: 384
- Heavy Truck Elevation: 390
- Pad/Ground Elevation at Receiver: 384
- Receiver Elevation: 389
- Base of Barrier Elevation: 384
- Starting Barrier Height 6

#### Barrier Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Barrier Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Barrier Height (ft)</th>
<th>---------------</th>
<th>---------------</th>
<th>---------------</th>
<th>Barriers Breaks Line of Sight to...</th>
<th>Autos?</th>
<th>Medium Trucks?</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Standard receiver elevation is five feet above grade/pad elevations at the receiver location(s).
Appendix C-5
FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)
Noise Barrier Effectiveness Prediction Worksheet

**Project Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Roadway Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021-064</td>
<td>Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3</td>
<td>A Drive</td>
<td>Folsom, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year:** Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto DNL, dB</th>
<th>Medium Truck DNL, dB</th>
<th>Heavy Truck DNL, dB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noise Level Data:**

- Receiver Description: Village 1 - Nearest outdoor activity areas
- Centerline to Barrier Distance \((C_1)\): 30
- Barrier to Receiver Distance \((C_2)\): 10
- Automobile Elevation: 394
- Medium Truck Elevation: 396
- Heavy Truck Elevation: 402
- Pad/Ground Elevation at Receiver: 393
- Receiver Elevation: 398
- Base of Barrier Elevation: 393
- Starting Barrier Height: 6

**Site Geometry:**

**Barrier Effectiveness:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Barrier Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Barrier Height (ft)</th>
<th>DNL (dB)</th>
<th>Barrier Breaks Line of Sight to...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Autos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Medium Trucks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Heavy Trucks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Autos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Medium Trucks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Heavy Trucks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Autos?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Standard receiver elevation is five feet above grade/pad elevations at the receiver location(s).
Appendix C-6
FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108)
Noise Barrier Effectiveness Prediction Worksheet

Project Information:
Job Number: 2021-064
Project Name: Mangini Ranch Residential Development - Phase 3
Roadway Name: A Drive
Location: Folsom, CA

Noise Level Data:
Year: Future
- Auto DNL, dB: 62
- Medium Truck DNL, dB: 51
- Heavy Truck DNL, dB: 57

Site Geometry:
Receiver Description: Village 2 - Nearest outdoor activity areas
- Centerline to Barrier Distance (C1): 30
- Barrier to Receiver Distance (C2): 10
- Automobile Elevation: 388
- Medium Truck Elevation: 390
- Heavy Truck Elevation: 396
- Pad/Ground Elevation at Receiver: 388
- Receiver Elevation: 393
- Base of Barrier Elevation: 388
- Starting Barrier Height: 6

Barrier Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Barrier Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Barrier Height (ft)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>Medium Trucks</td>
<td>DNL (dB)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Autos?</td>
<td>Medium Trucks?</td>
<td>Heavy Trucks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Standard receiver elevation is five feet above grade/pad elevations at the receiver location(s).
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VISION + INTRODUCTION
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The Folsom Ranch, Central District Design Guidelines is a complementary document to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Guidelines. It is intended as an implementation tool for the residential development of Folsom Ranch, Central District, and provides the design framework for architecture, streetscene, and landscape to convey a master plan identity. These guidelines establish the pattern and intensity of development for Folsom Ranch, Central District to ensure a high-quality and aesthetically cohesive environment. While these guidelines establish the quality of architectural and landscape development for the master plan, they are not intended to prevent alternative designs and/or concepts that are compatible with the overall project theme.

As a regulatory tool, this guideline document will assist applicants in creating single-family residential neighborhoods that reflect the City’s rich history, reinforce the sense of community, and utilize sustainable best practices. This document also provides the framework for design review approval of Folsom Ranch, Central District residential projects.

This document is intended to be used by builders and developers when designing their Master Plot Plans. Any project that is submitted to the Folsom Ranch, Central District Architectural Review Committee and the City must be reviewed for consistency with these design guidelines. The Folsom Ranch, Central District Architectural Review Committee and the City will review all designs, plans, and construction to ensure compliance with this document. (Refer to Section Four.) The project must then obtain Planning Commission approval under a design review approval process.

Guiding Principles

The following guiding principles will guide the design of the Folsom Ranch, Central District to ensure quality development:

- Create a community that encourages interaction and evokes a “pride of place” where people want to live.
- Encourage linkages and connectivity through land use adjacencies, trails, and open space.
- Create a variety of walkable neighborhoods.
- Encourage physical, social, and economic diversity.
- Integrate environmentally responsible practices.

These Design Guidelines are interpretational and are, therefore, conceptual in nature. Any changes or deviations from these Design Guidelines can be discussed and negotiated with City staff. As a living document, the Guidelines can, over time, accommodate changes in lifestyles, consumer preferences, economic conditions, community desires, and the marketplace.

The architectural and landscape guidelines complement each other. Together they combine to form a distinctive master plan offering a high quality, sustainable environment, and a sense of identity.

Context

In 2011, the City of Folsom adopted The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) to guide development of approximately 3,500 acres of property south of U.S. Highway 50 (Plan Area) that was later annexed to the City of Folsom in early 2012 (refer to Figure 1.1 – Plan Area Location).
Folsom Ranch is strategically located in the center of the Plan Area and consists of approximately 1,700 acres of gently rolling terrain easily accessible from White Rock, Scott and Prairie City Roads as well as Highway 50 (refer to Figure 1.2). The property is home to much of the Plan Area oak woodlands as well as a 2.5 mile segment of Alder Creek and associated intermittent drainages and wetlands, which will be conserved in the extensive Folsom Ranch open space network.

As discussed in the FPASP, the Plan Area naturally divides into three distinct districts: the Southwest District, the Hillside District and the Central District, the majority of which is contained within the boundaries of Folsom Ranch (refer to Figure 1.3).
The Central District (primarily Folsom Ranch) will be the heart of the new community and its layout embodies the design principle of mixed compatible uses, developed in a compact pattern with access to alternative transportation modes. Consistent with the concept of interconnected streets, much of the road plan of Folsom Ranch, particularly in the Town Center, is based on a neo-traditional orthogonal system of “Complete Streets” featuring short blocks to slow traffic and provide multiple routes for pedestrian travel. Key design features of Folsom Ranch include the mixed-use Town Center, the regional transit corridor that traverses much of the Ranch, mixed-use neighborhood centers, community and neighborhood parks, schools, and an extensive open space system. Folsom Ranch offers a highly diversified mix of commercial, residential, public and quasi-public uses that will provide residents with multiple housing choices, job opportunities, and convenient access to schools and recreation.

When completed, Folsom Ranch will provide over 6,000 housing units, approximately 440,000 square feet of commercial space, three elementary schools and one combined middle/high school, a 26 acre community park, five neighborhood parks, a town center and entertainment district, and an extensive open space system with cycling and walking trails (refer to Table 1.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Area (Ac)</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>Bldg (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHD</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>205,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>234,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP-SCHOOLS</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 1,620 6,397 440,087
Major Roads 99
Total 1,719

Table 1.1 - Folsom Ranch Land Use Summary

Figure 1.3. - Folsom Ranch Boundary and Land Use Plan
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES
ARCHITECTURAL GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following residential guiding principles will guide the architecture to ensure quality development:

- Provide a varied and interesting streetscene.
- Focus of the home is the front elevation, not the garage.
- Provide a variety of garage placements.
- Provide detail on rear elevations where visible from the public streets.
- Choose appropriate massing and roof forms to define the architectural styles.
- Ensure that plans and styles provide a degree of individuality.
- Use architectural elements and details to reinforce individual architectural styles.

GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES

Edge Conditions

Rear elevations visible from open spaces and major roadways shall incorporate enhanced details used on the front elevation of the home. Rear elevations observable from open spaces and major roadways shall be visually aesthetically pleasing from surrounding viewpoints and adjacencies. Silhouettes and massing of homes along edges require design sensitivity. A row of homes with a single front or rear facing gable are prohibited. The following should be considered, and at least one element incorporated, in the design of the side and rear elevations along edge conditions:

- A balance of hip and gable roof forms;
- Single-story plan;
- Single-story elements on two-story homes;
- Offset massing or wall planes (on individual plans or between plans);
- Roof plane breaks (on individual plans or between plans);
- Detail elements on the front elevation shall be applied to the side and rear elevations along edge conditions.
Roof Forms

Rows of homes seen along major community roadways are perceived by their contrast against the skyline or background. The dominant impact is the shape of the building and roofline. To minimize the visual impact of repetitious flat planes, similar building silhouettes and similar ridge heights, discernibly different roof plans for each home plan shall be designed. Individual roof plans may be simple but, between different plans, should exhibit variety by using front to rear, side-to-side, gables, hipped roofs, and/or the introduction of single story elements.

The following roof design guidelines should also be considered:

• Provide a mix of gable and hip roofs along the streetscene.
• Design roofs for maximum solar exposure for the potential installation of solar features.
• Consider deep overhangs where appropriate to the style to provide additional shade and interior cooling.
• Offset roof planes, eave heights, and ridge lines.

Corner Buildings

Buildings located on corners often times function as neighborhood entries and highlight the architecture for the overall Folsom Ranch, Central District community. Buildings located on corners shall include one of the following:

• Front and side facade articulation using materials that wrap around the corner-side of the building;
• Awning on corner side;
• Home entry on corner side;
• Corner facing garage;
• A pop-out side hip, gable, or shed form roof;
• An added single-story element, such as a wrap-around porch or balcony;
• Recessed second- or third-story (up to 35’ max.); or
• Balcony on corner side.
Front Elevations

Front elevations shall be detailed to achieve a variety along the street scene. Each front elevation shall incorporate a Feature Window treatment (see Feature Window requirements on page 2-6). In addition, each front elevation shall incorporate one or more of the following techniques:

- Provide enhanced style-appropriate details on the front elevation.
- Offset the second story from the first level for a portion of the second story.
- Vary the wall plane by providing projections of elements such as bay windows, porches, and similar architectural features.
- Create recessed alcoves and/or bump-out portions of the building.
- Incorporate second-story balconies.
- Create interesting entries that integrate features such as porches, courtyards, large recessed entry alcoves, or projecting covered entries with columns.
- Use a minimum of two building materials or colors on the front elevation.

Multi-family Entries

Entries for multi-family homes should create an initial impression, locate and frame the doorway, act as a link between public and private spaces, and further identify individual unit entries.

- Wherever possible, orient the front door and principal access towards the roadway, paseo, or common open space.
- Incorporate appropriate roof elements, columns, Feature Windows and/or architectural forms in the entry statement to emphasize the building character and the location of individual doorways.

- If due to building configuration the front entry location is not immediately apparent, direct and draw the observer to it with added elements such as signs, lighting, and landscape.
Feature Windows

All front and visible edge elevations shall incorporate one Feature Window treatment that articulates the elevation. Feature Window options include:

- A window of unique size or shape;
- Picture window;
- A bay window projecting a minimum of 24 inches, or a 12 inch pop-out surround;
- A window with a substantial surround matching or contrasting the primary color of the home;
- A window recess a minimum of 2 inches;
- Decorative iron window grilles;
- Decorative window shelves or sill treatments;
- Grouped or ganged windows with complete trim surrounds or unifying head and/or sill trim:
  - A Juliet balcony with architectural style appropriate materials;
  - Window shutters; or
  - Trellis protruding a minimum of 12 inches from the wall plane of the window.

Windows

Windows on south-facing exposures should be designed, to the greatest extent possible, to maximize light and heat entering the home in the winter, and to minimize light and heat entering in the summer.

West-facing windows should be shaded where feasible to avoid prolonged sun exposure/overheating of the homes.

For additional window requirements addressing Sound Attenuation requirements refer to the Mangini Ranch Residential Development Environmental Noise Assessment document prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. on January 29, 2015.
Garage Door Treatments

Appropriate treatment of garage doors will further enhance the building elevation and decrease the utilitarian appearance of the garage door. Various garage door patterns, windows, and/or color schemes should be applied as appropriate to individual architectural styles, where feasible.

- Garage doors shall be consistent with the architecture of the building to reduce the overall visual mass of the garage.
- Garage doors shall be recessed 8 inches from the wall plane.
- All garage doors shall be automatic section roll-up doors.
- When appropriate, single garage doors are encouraged.
- Carriage-style garage doors of upgraded design are encouraged.

Street Facing Garages

All street facing garages should vary the garage door appearance along the streetscene. Below are options for the door variety:

- Vary the garage door pattern, windows, and/or color as appropriate to individual architectural styles.
- Use an attached overhead trellis installed beneath the garage roof fascia and/or above garage door header trim.
- Span the driveway with a gated element or overhead trellis.
- Provide a porte cochere.
- Street facing garages on corner lots at neighborhood entries shall be located on the side of the house furthest away from the corner.
Alley Treatments

The use of alleys should be elevated from purely functional, simple garage access to an enjoyable space that residents experience and utilize daily. Design of alleys shall address the functional and aesthetic features of the space to create a positive experience for the residents. At least one of the following shall be implemented along the alley:

- Building size and shape shall have stepped massing (recessed or cantilevered, i.e., stepping back upper floors or protruding forward upper floors) of at least one foot.
- Window trim, color, and appropriate details from the front elevation.
- Rear privacy walls and pedestrian gates designed and located for ease of unit access.
- Enhanced garage door patterns or finishes; garage door shall complement the design intent of the home and neighborhood.
- Provide sufficient planting areas between garages to soften the vertical architectural planes at alleys.

Building Forms

Building form, detail, and placement greatly influences how a structure is perceived based on how light strikes and frames the building. The effect of sunlight is a strong design consideration, as shadow and shade can lend a sense of substance and depth to a building. The following elements and considerations can be used to facilitate the dynamic of light and depth perception of the building.

Architectural Projections

Projections can create shadow and provide strong visual focal points. This can be used to emphasize design features such as entries, major windows, or outdoor spaces. Projections are encouraged on residential building forms. Projections may include, but are not limited to:

- Awnings (wood, metal, cloth)
- Balconies
- Shutters
- Eave overhangs
- Projecting second- or third-story elements
- Window/door surrounds
- Tower elements
- Trellis elements
- Recessed windows
- Porch elements
- Bay windows or dormers
- Shed roof elements

Offset Massing Forms

Front and street-facing elevations may have offset masses or wall planes (vertically or horizontally) to help break up the overall mass of a building.

- Offset forms are effective in creating a transition:
  - Vertically between stories, or
  - Horizontally between spaces, such as recessed entries.
- Offset massing features are appropriate for changes in materials and colors.
- Offsets should be incorporated as a functional element or detail enhancement.
- Over-complicated streetscenes and elevations should be avoided.
• Streetscenes should provide a mix of simple massing elevation with offset massing elements to compose an aesthetic and understandable streetscape.

**Floor Plan Plotting**

In each single-family detached neighborhood with a **minimum** of up to 80 homes, provide:

• Three floor plans.
• Four elevations for each floor plan using a minimum of **two** architectural styles. If only two styles are selected, elevations shall be significantly different in appearance.
• Four different color schemes for each floor plan.

In each single-family detached neighborhood with **more** than 80 homes, provide:

• Three floor plans.
• Four elevations for each floor plan using a minimum of **three** architectural styles. If only three styles per floor plan are selected, elevations shall be significantly different in appearance.
• Four different color schemes for each floor plan.

In each single-family detached neighborhood, street facing garages on corner lots at neighborhood entries shall be located on the side of the house furthest away from entry corner.
**Style Plotting**

To ensure that architectural variety occurs, similar elevations cannot be plotted adjacent to or immediately across the street from one another. No more than two of the same floor plan/elevations shall be plotted next to each other or directly across the street from one another. (Refer to Section Four for Design Review process.) The following describes the minimum criteria for style plotting:

- For a home on a selected lot, the same floor plan and elevation is not permitted on the lot most directly across from it and the one lot on either side of it.
- Identical floor plans may be plotted on adjacent lots, provided a different elevation style is selected for each floor plan.
- Identical floor plans may be plotted on lots across the street from each other provided a different elevation style is selected for each floor plan.

**Color Criteria**

To ensure variety of color schemes, like color schemes cannot be plotted adjacent to or immediately across the street from one another. Color and material sample boards shall be submitted for review along with the Master Plot Plan. (Refer to Section Four.)

A color scheme for a home on a selected lot may not be repeated (even if on a different floor plan) on the three lots most directly across from it and on the single lot to each side of it.

**Lower Height Elements**

Lower height elements are important to streetscape variety, especially for larger buildings or masses, as they articulate massing to avoid monotonous single planes. These elements also provide a transition from the higher story vertical planes to the horizontal planes of sidewalk and street, and help to transition between public and private spaces. Lower height elements are encouraged to establish pedestrian scale and add variety to the streetscape. Lower height elements may include, but are not limited to:

- Porches
- Entry features
- Interior living spaces
- Courtyards
- Bay windows
- Trellises
Section 2 - Architectural Design Guidelines

Balconies

Balconies break up large wall planes, offset floors, create visual interest to the facade, provide outdoor living opportunities, and adds human scale to a building. Scaled second- or third-story balconies can have as much impact on stepped massing and building articulation as a front porch or lower height elements. Balcony elements:

- May be covered or open, recessed into or projecting from the building mass.
- Shall be an integral element of, and in scale with, the building mass, where appropriate.
- Are discouraged from being plotted side-by-side at the same massing level (i.e. mirrored second-story balconies).

Roof Considerations

Composition and balance of roof forms are as definitive of a streetscape as the street trees, active architecture, or architectural character.

- Rooflines and pitches, ridgelines and ridge heights should create a balanced form to the architecture and elevation.
- Direction of ridgelines and/or ridge heights should vary along a streetscene.
- Roof overhangs (eaves and rakes) may be used as projections to define design vocabulary and create light and shade patterns.
- Hip, gable, shed, and conical roof forms may be used separately or together on the same roof or streetscene composition.
- Roof form and pitch shall be appropriate to the massing and design vocabulary of the home.
Outdoor Living Spaces

Outdoor living spaces, including porches, balconies, and courtyards, activate the streetscape and promote interaction among neighbors. Outdoor living spaces can also create indoor/outdoor environments opening up the home to enhance indoor environmental quality. Wherever possible, outdoor living space is encouraged.

Materials

The selection and use of materials has an important impact on the character of each neighborhood and the community as a whole. Wood is a natural material reflective of many architectural styles; however, maintenance concerns, a design for long-term architectural quality and new high-quality manufactured alternative wood materials make the use of real wood elements less desirable. Where “wood” is referred to in these guidelines, it can also be interpreted as simulated wood trim with style-appropriate wood texture. Additionally, some styles can be appropriately expressed without the wood elements, in which case stucco-wrapped, high-density foam trim (with style-appropriate stucco finish) is acceptable. Precast elements can also be satisfied by high-density foam or other similar materials in a style-appropriate finish.

- Brick, wood, and stone cladding shall appear as structural materials, not as applied veneers.
- Material changes should occur at logical break points.
- Columns, tower elements, and pilasters should be wrapped in its entirety.
- Materials and colors should be varied to add texture and depth to the overall character of the neighborhood.
- The use of flashy or non-traditional materials or colors that will not integrate with the overall character of the community is prohibited.
- Material breaks at garage corners shall have a return dimension equal to or greater than the width of the materials on the garage plane elevation.
- Use durable roofing and siding materials to reduce the need for replacement.
- Use local, recycled and/or rapidly renewable materials to conserve resources and reduce energy consumption associated with the manufacturing and transport of the materials. (Refer to Section Four for Design Review process.)
Section 2 - Architectural Design Guidelines

Exterior Structures
Exterior structures, including but not limited to, porches, patio covers, and trellises shall reflect the character, color, and materials of the building to which they are related.

- Columns and posts should project a substantial and durable image.
- Stairs should be compatible in type and material to the deck and landing.
- Railings shall be appropriately scaled, consistent with the design vernacular of the building, and constructed of durable materials.
- Exposed gutters and downspouts shall be colored to complement or match the fascia material or surface to which they are attached.

Accessory Structures
Accessory structures should conform to the design standards, setbacks, and height requirements of the primary structure. If visible from the front or side lot line, the visible elevation should be considered a front elevation and should meet the design criteria of the applicable architectural style.

Lighting
Appropriate lighting is essential in creating a welcoming evening atmosphere for the Folsom Ranch, Central District community. As a forward-thinking community, The Folsom Ranch, Central District will institute dark sky recommendations to mitigate light pollution, cut energy waste, and protect wildlife. All lighting shall be aesthetically pleasing and non-obtrusive, and meet the dark sky recommendations.

- All exterior lighting shall be limited to the minimum necessary for public safety.
- All exterior lighting shall be shielded to conceal the light source, lamp, or bulb. Fixtures with frosted or heavy seeded glass are permitted.
- Each residence shall have an exterior porch light at its entry that complements the architectural style of the building.
- Where feasible, lighting should be on a photocell or timer.
- Low voltage lighting shall be used whenever possible.

Address Numbers
To ensure public safety and ease of identifying residences by the Fire and Police Departments, address numbers shall be lighted or reflective and easily visible from the street.
RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

Folsom Ranch, Central District is envisioned as a sustainable, contemporary community where architectural massing, roof forms, detailing, walls, and landscape collaborate to reflect historic, regional, and climate-appropriate styles.

The design criteria established in this section encourages a minimum quality design and a level of style through the use of appropriate elements. Although the details are important elements that convey the style, the massing and roof forms are essential to establishing a recognizable style. The appropriate scale and proportion of architectural elements and the proper choice of details are all factors in achieving the architectural style.

ARCHITECTURAL THEME: CALIFORNIA HERITAGE

The styles selected for Folsom Ranch, Central District have been chosen from the traditional heritage of the California home styles, a majority of which have been influenced by the Spanish Mission and Mexican Rancho eras. Over the years, architectural styles in California became reinterpreted traditional styles that reflect the indoor-outdoor lifestyle choices available in the Mediterranean climate. These styles included the addition of western materials while retaining the decorative detailing of exposed wood work, wrought iron hardware, and shaped stucco of the original Spanish styles. Mixing of style attributes occurs in both directions, such as adapting Spanish detailing to colonial style form, or introducing colonial materials and details to the Hacienda form and function. The landscape and climate of California has also generated styles that acknowledge and blend with its unique setting. The Italian Villa is a prime example of a transplanted style developed in a climate zone similar to the climate found in California.

The following styles can be used within Folsom Ranch, Central District:

- Italian Villa
- Spanish Colonial
- Monterey
- Western Farmhouse
- European Cottage
- Craftsman
- Early California Ranch
- American Traditional

Additional architectural styles compatible with the intent of these guidelines may be added when it can be demonstrated to the Architectural Review Committee that they are regionally appropriate.

The following pages provide images and individual “style elements” that best illustrate and describe the key elements of each style. They are not all mandatory elements, nor are they a comprehensive list of possibilities. Photographs of historic and current interpretations of each style are provided to inspire and assist the designer in achieving strong, recognizable architectural style elevations. The degree of detailing and/or finish expressed in these guidelines should be relative to the size and type of building upon which they are applied.

These images are for concept and inspiration only and should not be exactly replicated.
**ITALIAN VILLA**

The Italian Villa was one of the most fashionable architectural styles in the United States in the 1860’s. Appearing on architect-designed landmarks in larger cities, the style was based on formal and rigidly symmetrical palaces of the Italian Renaissance.

Although residential adaptations generated less formality, traditional classical elements, such as the symmetrical facade, squared tower entry forms, arched windows, and bracketed eaves, persisted as the enduring traits of this style. When cast iron became a popular building material, it became a part of the Italianate vocabulary, embellishing homes with a variety of designs for balconies, porches, railings, and fences.

**Italian Villa Style Elements:**

- Eave and exaggerated overhangs.
- Wall materials typically consist of stucco with stone and precast accents.
- Decorative brackets below eaves may be added accents.
- Barrel tile or “S” tile roof
- The entry may be detailed with a precast surround feature.
- Stucco or precast columns with ornate cap and base trim are typical.
- Wrought iron elements, arched windows or elements, and quoins are frequently used as details.
SPANISH COLONIAL

This style evolved in California and the southwest as an adaptation of Mission Revival infused with additional elements and details from Latin America. The style attained widespread popularity after its use in the Panama-California Exposition of 1915.

Key features of this style were adapted to the California lifestyle. Plans were informally organized around a courtyard with the front elevation very simply articulated and detailed. The charm of this style lies in the directness, adaptability, and contrasts of materials and textures.

**Spanish Colonial Style Elements:**
- Plan form is typically rectangular or “L”-shaped.
- Roofs are typically of shallower pitch with “S” or barrel tiles and typical overhangs.
- Roof forms are typically comprised of a main front-to-back gable with front-facing gables.
- Wall materials are typically stucco.
- Decorative “wood” beams or trim are typical.
- Segmented or full-arch elements are typical in conjunction with windows, entry, or the porch.
- Round or half-round tile profiles are typical at front-facing gable ends.
- Arcades are sometimes utilized.
- Windows may be recessed, have projecting head or sill trim, or be flanked by plank-style shutters.
- Decorative wrought-iron accents, grille work, post or balcony railing may be used.
Monterey

The Monterey style is a combination of the original Spanish Colonial adobe construction methods with the basic two-story New England colonial house. Prior to this innovation in Monterey, all Spanish colonial houses were of single story construction.

First built in Monterey by Thomas Larkin in 1835, this style introduced two story residential construction and shingle roofs to California. This Monterey style and its single story counterpart eventually had a major influence on the development of modern architecture in the 1930's.

The style was popularized by the use of simple building forms. Roofs featured gables or hips with broad overhangs, often with exposed rafter tails. Shutters, balconies, verandas, and porches are integral to the Monterey character. Traditionally, the first and second stories had distinctly different cladding material; respectively siding above with stucco and brick veneer base below.

The introduction of siding and manufactured materials to the home building scene allowed for the evolution of the Monterey home from strictly Spanish Adobe construction to a hybrid of local form and contemporary materials. Siding, steeper pitched flat tile roofing, and the cantilevered balcony elements on the Monterey house define this native California style.

Monterey Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically a simple two-story box.
- Roofs are typically shallow to moderately pitched with flat concrete tile or equal; “S” tile or barrel tile are also appropriate.
- Roof forms are typically a front-to-back gable with typical overhangs.
- Wall materials are typically comprised of stucco, brick, or siding.
- Materials may contrast between first and second floors.
- A prominent second-story cantilevered balcony is typically the main feature of the elevation; two-story balconies with simple posts are also appropriate.
- Simple Colonial corbels and beams typically detail roof overhangs and cantilevers.
- Balcony or porch is typically detailed by simple columns without cap or base trim.
- Front entry is typically traditionally pedimented by a surround, porch, or portico.
- Windows are typically accented with window head or sill trim of colonial-style and louvered shutters.
- Corbel and post sometimes lean toward more “rustic” details and sometimes toward more “Colonial” details.
WESTERN FARMHOUSE

The Farmhouse represents a practical and picturesque country house. Its beginnings are traced to both Colonial styles from New England and the Midwest. As the American frontier moved westward, the American Farmhouse style evolved according to the availability of materials and technological advancements, such as balloon framing.

Predominant features of the style are large wrapping front porches with a variety of wood columns and railings. Two story massing, dormers, and symmetrical elevations occur most often on the New England Farmhouse variations. The asymmetrical, casual cottage look, with a more decorated appearance, is typical of the Western American Farmhouse. Roof ornamentation is a characteristic detail consisting of cupolas, weather vanes, and dovecotes.

Western Farmhouse Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically simple.
- Roofs are typically of steeper pitch with flat concrete tiles or equal.
- Roof forms are typically a gable roof with front-facing gables and typical overhangs.
- Roof accents sometimes include standing-seam metal or shed forms at porches.
- Wall materials may include stucco, horizontal siding, and brick.
- A front porch typically shelters the main entry with simple posts.
- Windows are typically trimmed in simple colonial-style; built-up head and sill trim is typical.
- Shaped porch columns typically have knee braces.
EUROPEAN COTTAGE

The European Cottage is a style that evolved out of medieval Tudor and Normandy architecture. This evolving character that eventually resulted in the English and French “Cottage” became extremely popular when the addition of stone and brick veneer details was developed in the 1920’s.

Although the cottage is looked upon as small and unpretentious, the style was quickly recognized as one of the most popular in America. Designs for the homes typically reflected the rural setting in which they evolved. Many established older neighborhoods across the United States contain homes with the charm and character of this unpretentious style.

Roof pitches for these homes are steeper than traditional homes, and are comprised of gables, hips, and half-hip forms. The primary material is stucco with heavy use of stone and brick at bases, chimneys, and entry elements. Some of the most recognizable features for this style are the accent details in gable ends, sculptured swooping walls at the front elevation, and tower or alcove elements at the entry.

European Cottage Style Elements:

- Rectangular plan form massing with some recessed second floor area is desirable.
- Main roof hip or gable with intersecting gable roofs is typical of this style.
- Steep roof pitches with swooping roof forms are encouraged.
- Roof appearance of flat concrete tile or equal is typical of the European Cottage style.
- Recessed entry alcoves are encouraged.
- Wall materials are typically comprised of stucco with brick and/or stone veneer.
- Bay windows, curved or round top accent windows, and vertical windows with mullions and simple 2x trim are utilized at front elevations and high visibility areas.
- Stone or brick accent details at the building base, entry, and chimney elements are typical.
- Horizontal siding accents and wrought iron or wood balconies and pot shelves are encouraged.
Craftsman Influenced by the English Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century and stylized by California architects like Bernard Maybeck in Berkeley and the Greene brothers in Pasadena, the style focused on exterior elements with tasteful and artful attention. Originating in California, Craftsman architecture relied on the simple house tradition, combining hip and gable roof forms with wide, livable porches, and broad overhanging eaves. The style was quickly spread across the state and across the country by pattern books, mail-order catalogs, and popular magazines.

Extensive built-in elements define this style, treating details such as windows and porches as if they were furniture. The horizontal nature is emphasized by exposed rafter tails and knee braces below broad overhanging eaves constructed in rustic-textured building materials. The overall effect was the creation of a natural, warm, and livable home of artful and expressive character. Substantial, tapered porch columns with stone piers lend a Greene character, while simpler double posts on square brick piers and larger knee braces indicate a direct Craftsman reference to the style of California architect Bernard Maybeck, who was greatly influenced by the English Arts and Crafts Movement of the late 19th Century.

Craftsman Style Elements:
- Plan form is typically a simple box.
- Roofs are typically of shallower pitch with flat concrete tiles (or equal) and exaggerated eaves.
- Roof forms are typically a side-to-side gable with cross gables.
- Roof pitch ranges from 3:12 to 5:12 typically with flat concrete tiles or equal.
- Wall materials may include stucco, horizontal siding, and stone.
- Siding accents at gable ends are typical.
- A front porch typically shelters the main entry.
- Exposed rafter tails are common under eaves.
- Porch column options are typical of the Craftsman style:
  - Battered tapered columns of stone, brick, or stucco
  - Battered columns resting on brick or stone piers (either or both elements are tapered)
  - Simpler porch supports of double square post resting on piers (brick, stone, or stucco); piers may be square or tapered.
- Windows are typically fully trimmed.
- Window accents commonly include dormers or ganged windows with continuous head or sill trim.
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**Early California Ranch**

A building form rather than an architectural style, the Ranch is primarily a one-story rambling home with strong horizontal lines and connections between indoor and outdoor spaces. The “U”- or “L”-shaped open floor plan focused on windows, doors, and living activities on the porch or courtyard. The horizontal plan form is what defines the Ranch.

The applied materials, style, and character applied to the Ranch have been mixed, interpreted, adapted, and modernized based on function, location, era, and popularity.

This single-story family oriented home became the American dream with the development of tract homes in the post-World War II era. Simple and affordable to build, the elevation of the Ranch was done in a variety of styles. Spanish styling with rusticated exposed wood beams, rafter tails under broad front porches, and elegantly simple recessed windows were just as appropriate on the Ranch as the clean lines of siding and floor to ceiling divided-light windows under broad overhanging laminate roofs.

Details and elements of the elevation of a Ranch should be chosen as a set identifying a cohesive style. Brick and stucco combinations with overly simple sill trim under wide windows with no other detailing suggests a Prairie feel, while all stucco, recessed windows, and exposed rusticated wood calls to mind a Hacienda ranch.

**California Ranch Style Elements:**

- Plan form is typically one-story with strong horizontal design.
- Roofs are typically shallow pitched with “S” tile, barrel tile, or flat concrete tile.
- Roof forms are typically gable or hip with exaggerated overhangs.
- Wall materials are commonly comprised of stucco, siding, or brick.
- A porch, terrace, or courtyard is typically the prominent feature of the elevation.
- Exposed rafter tails are typical.
- Porch is commonly detailed by simple posts or beams with simple cap or base trim.
- Front entry is typically traditionally pedimented by a surround, porch, or portico.
- Windows are typically broad and accented with window head and sill trim, shutters, or are recessed.
- A strong indoor/outdoor relationship joined by sliding or French doors, or bay windows is common.
American Traditional

The American Traditional style is a combination of the early English and Dutch house found on the Atlantic coast. Their origins were sampled from the Adam style and other classical styles. Details from these original styles are loosely combined in many examples.

Current interpretations have maintained the simple elegance of the early prototypes, but added many refinements and new design details. This style relies on its asymmetrical form and colonial details to differentiate it from the strict colonial styles.

Highly detailed entries having decorative pediments extended and supported by semi-engaged columns typically. Detailed doors with sidelights and symmetrically designed front facades. Cornices with dentils are an important feature and help identify this style.

American Traditional Style Elements:

- Plan form is typically asymmetric “L”-shaped.
- Roofs are typically of moderate to steeper pitch with flat concrete tile (or equal) roof and exaggerated boxed eaves.
- Roof forms are typically hip or gable with dominant forward facing gables.
- Front facade is typically one solid material which may include stucco, brick, or horizontal siding.
- The front entry is typically sheltered within a front porch with traditionally detailed columns and railings.
- A curved or round-top accent window is commonly used on the front elevation.
- Windows are typically fully trimmed with flanking louvered shutters.
- Gable ends are typically detailed by full or partial cornice, sometimes emphasized with dentils or decorative molding.
- Decorative or pedimented head and sill trim on windows is typical.
LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES
GUIDING LANDSCAPE DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Sustainable Landscape Design

Through thoughtful, sensitive design, Folsom Ranch, Central District can be designated to conserve valuable resources and create a noteworthy community within the City of Folsom. Sustainable landscape design links natural and built systems to achieve balanced environmental, social, and economic outcomes and improves quality of life, and the long-term health of communities and the environment. Sustainable landscape balances the needs of people and the environment to benefit both. Landscape Architects are encouraged to research alternative possibilities and incorporate them into the Model Home and community common area landscape design. The following is a list of various ‘sustainable’ features and practices to be used and/or considered for the Folsom Ranch, Central District Development at the improvement plan phase/level.

- To comply with AB 1881, Model Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance and conserve water, incorporate a water management system utilizing up-to-date best management practices that allows groundwater to recharge.

- Encourage the use of low toxic wood preservatives (no CCA), or naturally rot-resistant wood for landscaping (no pressure-treated wood in or on the ground.)

- Choose low water, drought tolerant, and/or native plants that match the micro climate, and soil conditions. (Refer to Plant Matrix herein)

- Select plants that are “non-invasive” according to the current California Invasive Plant Inventory, published by the California Invasive Plant Council.
• Design landscape and plant spacing to allow for plants to reach mature size. Using appropriate sizes and the thoughtful placing of plants prevents overgrowth and future thinning, reducing the amount of material sent to the landfill.

• Locate plants to ensure proper drainage and to reduce potential damage to buildings.

• Reuse soils from the site, if appropriate, as horticultural soils.

• Maintain and/or improve soil health through responsible management including nurturing soil with organic matter, reducing synthetic fertilizer use, and restoration to sustain protected and future ecosystems.

• Use integrated pest management to control or eliminate pesticide and toxic chemical use.

• Create and/or maintain wildlife habitat.

• Increase tree cover to provide shade in developed areas to reduce energy demand, mitigate solar heat gain into buildings, and to reduce the amount of heat absorbed by paved areas.

• Plant deciduous trees on the south side of buildings to allow for increased solar heat gain in winter months (thereby reducing energy needed for heating interiors) and shading in summer months (thereby reducing energy needed for cooling interiors).

• Minimize the use of large turf areas (except within parks, parkways (as permitted by AB1881 Water Use Analysis), or single family residential front yards) or inefficient small turf areas (those under 8'-0” in width) in landscaping by incorporating water-conserving groundcovers or perennial grasses, shrubs, and trees.

• Utilize weather and climate-smart irrigation controllers.

• Design irrigation zones to suit plant requirements and incorporate high-efficiency nozzles.

• Use sustainable materials in landscape construction and site furnishing selections including, but not limited to, recycled materials, environmentally preferable/responsible products, materials that can be recycled, certified “green” products, and locally available or locally manufactured products.

• Use nitrogen-fixing plants to reduce fertilizer use.

• Create natural looking design to reduce maintenance required.

• Water conservation (xeriscape, rain gardens, grouping plants with similar requirements).

• Control water runoff (bioswales, rain gardens, green roofs).

• Preserving Oak Woodlands and isolated Oak Trees. Refer to the Landscape Master Community Plant Matrix section.

Example of Drip Irrigation Before Mulch
COMMUNITY DESIGN THEME/ LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Landscaping plays an important role in establishing the visual identity and character of the Folsom Ranch, Central District Community. Consistency in theme and the application of major community-level design elements, such as enhanced entry with dynamic monumentation, upgraded hardscape and master landscape, arterial street parkways, thoughtful specifications of walls, fences and pilasters, adjacent community interface with improved edge conditions, and site-specific plant materials, is designed to be maintained throughout the Folsom Ranch, Central District development to communicate and enhance the community’s identity.

Folsom Ranch, Central District embraces the California Heritage theme. Careful thought has been given to integrate the structural and aesthetic elements of a balanced, cohesive community. To ensure that these design guidelines are implemented in a manner that will provide a sense of the City of Folsom’s character and ambiance, a central theme of California Heritage has been developed. This theme is appropriate to the community’s locale, and will tie the community together while enabling neighborhoods and mixed-use areas to further develop their individual character through their own unique elements.

Several identifying design and landscape elements will be incorporated throughout the community and will generally include:

- Timeless stone, steel, boulders, stucco, and heavy wood beams incorporated into monumentation, way-finding, and accessory structures.
- Natural landscaped areas blended with manicured landscaping.
• Low water, drought-tolerant and native tree and shrub materials, such as California Sycamores, Oaks, and Pine trees. In addition, plants rated low and very low water use per the WUCOLS rating system shall be used.

• Natural materials such as stone, wood, and boulders, complemented by an earth-tone color palette.

• Varied paving materials, including stone, concrete, wood, decomposed granite, and concrete pavers.

Folsom Ranch, Central District is a planned community that is inspired by the unique character of the City of Folsom and enhances its distinct identity. Like California itself, the design intent and architecture is an eclectic and colorful mix of various influences from across the United States. This community offers its residents an environment in which pedestrian connectivity, recreational activity, and social interaction are fostered. The residential neighborhoods within Folsom Ranch, Central District focus on these aspects by providing generous landscape setbacks, residences oriented to the street, widened pathways/trails, public gathering areas, and several community parks with recreational amenities.

Thematic elements are major project improvements that occur at the community or neighborhood level, and assist in establishing the overall design theme for the Folsom Ranch, Central District community. These major thematic elements will be reinforced within the following:

• Monumentation/ Signage
• Streetscape Landscape
• Enhanced Masonry Vertical Elements
• Enhanced Hardscape
• Enhanced Community Edge Conditions
• Open Space, Parks and Recreation Facilities
• Lighting/ Street Furniture Family

• Walls and Fences
• Landscaping/ Plant Palette

These thematic elements will commonly occur throughout the community and will unite Folsom Ranch, Central District under a common design vocabulary. General design guidelines and design criteria for the community theme elements are contained in the sections that follow.
COMMUNITY IDENTITY PLAN MONUMENTATION

Appropriate community, mixed-use areas and residential neighborhood thematic identification is important in establishing a new community and maintaining the overall Folsom Ranch, Central District theme, as well as providing a system for identifying community development and giving directional information to residents and visitors. A general conceptual Community Identity Signage/Monumentation Key Program has been provided herein.

Entry monument signage, through decorative typefaces and symbolic graphics, will inform the visitor that they are entering a planned community. Project and neighborhood signage will direct visitors who have entered the Folsom Ranch, Central District towards the distinct community components and amenities. Monument signage will be consistent with the character of the project, but flexible enough to respond to individual project contexts. Logos, type styles, color schemes, and architectural features should be consistent throughout the area being identified. Monument signs may vary in size and detail in a manner that reflects their relative importance within the signage hierarchy, but will incorporate all the materials proposed within the major community monumentation.

Materials:

- Dry Stacked Stone Pilasters and Walls or manufacturers stacked stone product application.
- Precast Concrete Pilaster Caps
- Precast Concrete Wall Caps
- Specimen Trees with complementary plant material selections
Major Project Entry

The Major Project Entry Monumentation will be the landmark of the new community and establish a unifying community identity while providing a strong statement of community, commitment, and quality.
Subdivision Entry Design, Geometry & Entry Options

Primary Neighborhood Entry Signage will be used to identify the various residential neighborhood entry points within the Folsom Ranch, Central District community. The entry signage monument incorporates design elements of stone, precast concrete capping, large focal trees with vertical accent trees supporting entry statement, groundcover/shrub planting, annual color and enhanced paving.

Masonry wall and pilasters are to be of a uniform or complimentary design of material and color throughout. Where possible, place one story homes or homes with one story roof element on lots adjacent to entry streets. Typically, these lots will need to be wider to accommodate one story.
Subdivision Entry Design & Geometry

Standard Condition
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Subdivision Entry Landscape Concept
Standard Condition
Subdivision Entry Options
Enhanced Condition

- Enhanced Entry Paving
- Monument Stone Clad Entry Monument with Subdivision or Project Logo plaque, each side
- Pavers located at Entries and at other breaks in wall plan
- Optional lower "Drop" Wall - 42" high max.
- Landscape Lot
- Vertical Backstop Trees
- Canopy Entry tree with vertical accents
- Stone Clad Subdivision Entry Monumentation Wall with Low Fillters - materials to match or complement other masonry features
- Vertical Backstop Trees
- Turf or Groundcover or Shrubs no more than 36" high, incorporate color/annuals at entry

Interior Residential Street
Arterial or Collector Street
Parkway
Parkway Trees
Skatewalk
Enhanced Pedestrian Crosswalk
35' 35' 36'
35' 35'
Subdivision Entry Options w/ Median
Enhanced Condition
Subdivision Entry Options w/ Gates

Enhanced Condition
STREETScape PLANS/ SECTIONS

Several streetscape applications are proposed within the Folsom Ranch, Central District development, as shown within this section, Streetscape Key Map for Phase One Development. As illustrated in the following exhibits, a hierarchy of streetscapes within Phase One is provided and distinctive landscape treatments are planned for each roadway. Landscape and hardscape treatments include elements such as landscaped medians, sidewalks, enhanced paving at pedestrian crossings and primary/secondary entries, bike trails, and parkway trees to enhance roadways. The main road will feature such landscape elements as signage, street furniture, and a predominant plant palette consisting of canopy trees on corner treatments and parkways, center medians where space allows, and vertical trees as backdrops within landscape lots. The use of enhanced paving is strongly encouraged. Some roadway improvements shall occur in phases. Street Sections ‘A’ through ‘C’ are for ultimate build-out. Streetscapes and Landscape Treatments for Phase One are provided as follows:

Street Section Keymap for Phase One
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C 90' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Street 'B'
(Future Improvements - By Others)
N.T.S.

D 56' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Street 'A'
N.T.S.
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D-1
Emergency Vehicle Access / Street 'A'

V
37' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Local Street
N.T.S.
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V-1
40' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Minor Collector
With Class II Bike Lanes
(No Parking)
N.T.S.

V-2
50' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Minor Collector - Attached Sidewalk
With Class II Bike Lanes
(No Parking)
N.T.S.
38' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Local Street
With Class II Bike Lanes
(No Parking)
N.T.S.

44' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Local Street - Attached Sidewalk
N.T.S.
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38' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Local Street - Attached Sidewalk
(at Creek Crossing)
(No Parking)
N.T.S.

52' RIGHT-OF-WAY
Divided Entry
(no parking)
N.T.S.
GRADING CRITERIA

The topography of the Folsom Ranch, Central District is generally gently sloping ground. Slope varies from less than 1% to 6% with a few exceptions of isolated steeper slopes along Alder Creek and its tributaries. Mass grading will be done in a comprehensive manner to create flat building pads to accommodate development while preserving certain natural features.

Grading will be conventional grading which consists of uniform slope gradients with angular slope intersections and pad configurations which are rectangular. Transitions zones from the development area to the natural drainage features will vary in slope steepness when there is sufficient land areas to accomplish the grade change. All single family building sites will drain to their public street frontage (Type A drainage).

Slopes between lots vary from less than 1 foot to several feet side to side and generally 1-4 feet between the rears of lots. In several instances the grade difference along the rear of the lots will be as much as approximately 8 feet. Grade differences between building sites will be accomplished with 2:1 slopes and in some instances retaining walls up to 6 feet in height. The slope will be achieved on the lower of the building sites. In all cases, level side yard area of a minimum of 4 feet will be maintained and in the rear yard a minimum of 15 feet level will be maintained. Setbacks will be established to accommodate such requirements.

The site will contain several storm detention and water quality basins. These features will be graded with generally modest side slopes to provide a safe transition from the edge or adjacent trail to the bottom. These basins will be separated from the development edge or Class 1 trails with bollards, post and cable, or open style fencing.
Slopes, Walls, and Transitions
Slopes, Walls, and Transitions
LID Measures

Various Low Impact Design (LID) strategies can be incorporated into the design of each of the individual developments within the Plan Area, if desired. However, the hydromodification and water quality facilities proposed in the SDMP are adequate in accommodate site development without the need to utilize site-based LID strategies.

Using small, economical landscape features, LID techniques work as a system to slow, filter, evaporate, and infiltrate surface runoff at the source. LID design calculations for a reduction in the required water quality and hydromodification volumes have not been incorporated for the Folsom Plan Area Storm Drainage Master Plan, but may be included in future drainage studies prepared for small lot tentative map approvals within the Plan Area.

LID strategies to address water quality fall under the two broad categories of Practices and Site Design. The most common concepts are summarized below:

Practices:

Basic LID strategy for handling runoff is to (1) reduce the volume of runoff and (2) decentralize flows. Common methods include:

- **Bio-retention cells** typically consist of grass buffers, sand beds, a ponding area for excess runoff storage, organic layers, planting soil, and vegetation.

- **Vegetated swales** function as alternatives to curb and gutter systems, usually along residential streets or highways. They use grasses or other vegetation to reduce runoff velocity and allow filtration, while high volume flows are channeled away safely to a larger water quality management facility.

- **Filter strips** can be designed as landscape features within parking lots or other areas, to collect flow from large impervious surfaces. They may direct water into vegetated areas or special sand filters that capture pollutants and gradually discharge water over a period of time.

- **Disconnected impervious areas** direct water flows collected from structures, driveways, or street sections, into separate localized detention cells instead of combining it in drain pipes with other runoff.

- **Cistern collection systems** can be designed to store rainwater for dry-period irrigation, rather than channeling it to streams. Smaller tanks that collect residential roof drainage are often called “rain barrels” and may be installed by individual homeowners. Some collection systems are designed to be installed directly under permeable paving areas, allowing maximum water storage capacity while eliminating the need for gravel beds.
Site Design:

- **Decreasing Impervious Surfaces** can be a simple strategy to address water quality and avoid problems from storm water runoff and water table depletion, by reducing surfaces that prevent natural filtration. Methods may include reducing roadway surfaces, permeable pavement surfacing, and vegetative roof systems.

- **Planning site layout and grading to natural land contours** can minimize grading costs and retain a greater percentage of the land’s natural hydrology. Contours which function as filtration basins can be retained or enhanced for water quality and quantity, and incorporated into the landscaping design.

- **Natural Resource Preservation and Xeriscapes** can be used to minimize the need for irrigation systems and enhance property values.

- **Clustering Homes** on slightly smaller lot areas can allow more preserved open space to be used for recreation, visual aesthetics, and wildlife habitat.

Specific LID strategies that could be used to fulfill the current and future requirements for storm water quality treatment and hydromodification may include the following potential LID measures:

Site Design Measures:

- Protect slopes, channels and other areas particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss.

- Maximize the protection of natural drainage features and vegetation.

- Minimize impervious areas and break up or disconnect the flow of runoff over impervious surfaces.

- Provide low maintenance landscaping that encourages retention and planting of native vegetation and minimizes the use of lawns, fertilizers, and pesticides.

- Provide vegetated open-channel conveyance systems discharge into and through stable vegetated areas.

- Install LID stormwater planters.

- Separate sidewalks from street curb and gutters.

- Install drought tolerant and storm water appropriate planting.
Source Control Measures

- Storm Drain Stenciling and Signage
- Outdoor Material Storage Area Design
- Outdoor Trash Storage Area Design
- Loading/Unloading Area Design
- Vehicle and Equipment Wash Area

Treatment Control Measures

- Bio-Swales
- Grass Swales
- Wet Pond
- Stormwater Planter
- Pervious Pavements
- Grass Filter Strips

The Storm Drainage Master Plan suggests a pragmatic approach be utilized in the selection of technically appropriate and aesthetically pleasing LID measures in accordance with the good engineering and planning practices. Specific LID measures should be selected on the basis of being both practical and cost effective.
LIGHTING GUIDELINES

The site furnishings and lighting will be used to enhance, unify and reinforce the character of the overall site design. The site furnishings and lighting shall be made of natural materials/elements that can be tied to the color and texture of the proposed monuments, walls/fences and architecture.

Lighting shall incorporate the following written guidelines and design imagery.

- All exterior light fixtures and fixture placement shall comply to the standards specified in the City’s design documents. Use of LED technology is required.
- Streets and intersections should be well lighted in accordance with the City standard illumination levels. Low-level lighting for pedestrian safety should be installed where appropriate. Intersections should have increased light levels for definition and to mitigate automobile/pedestrian conflicts.
- Accent lights should be installed at all primary entry monuments, secondary monuments, and park/trail monuments.
- Street lights shall conform to the overall project theme and City standards. Use of LED technology is required.
- All water features and landscaping should be subdued and indirect to prevent spill over onto adjacent lots and streets.
- The type and location of building lighting should preclude direct glare onto adjacent property, streets and skyward by the use and application of shields.
- Pedestrian scale fixtures are encouraged over “high mast” poles.
- Consistent lighting fixtures shall be used throughout Folsom Ranch, Central District to enhance community character.
- Light rays shall be confined on-site through orientation, the use of shading/directional controls, and/or landscape treatment.
- No tree to be planted within 20 feet of a light standard.

Proposed Light Standard Options from the City of Folsom (Heads to be selected per City of Folsom)
Street Furniture Guidelines

Site furnishings including, but not limited to, tables, benches, and trash receptacles will be metal and/or concrete. The wood shall be stained to maintain a natural appearance.

Materials: (Custom)
- Seat walls with stone.
- Concrete or brick wall capping.
- Varied paving materials, including stone, concrete, decomposed granite, and concrete pavers.
- Wood or metal overhead structures.

Materials: (Design Standards)
- Trash receptacles with metal slats.
- Metal picnic tables and benches.
- Mailboxes- powder coated steel, cluster box unit (CBU) with decorative lid.

Lighting within development areas adjacent to Open Space Districts shall comply with the following “dark sky” lighting regulations:

1. Flood lamp shielding and/or City-approved “dark sky” light fixtures/bulbs shall be used in developed areas to reduce the amount of stray lighting into natural resource areas.

2. Direct lighting rays shall be confined to the respective residential, resort, commercial, or common area lots upon which the exterior lights are to be installed so that adjacent Open Space Districts are protected from any significant light spillage, intrusion, and glare.

3. No skyward casting lighting shall be allowed in development areas adjacent to Open Space Districts.
WALL AND FENCE GUIDELINES

Maintaining quality and character of all aspects of the public realm is a key placemaking principle. The wall and fence design criteria is intended to provide variety and privacy for each lot while providing continuity and unity within the community.

Walls and fencing will be used throughout the community to complement the overall design theme, establish community identity, provide protection from roadway and other noise, and allow privacy and security in residential areas. The use of walls and fences can also serve to accentuate neighborhood features in addition to screening streets and adjacent uses.

The following types of walls (solid and opaque) and fences (open and largely transparent) have been selected for possible use within different areas of the project site. All wall and fence heights are measured from the highest grade elevation on either side of the wall or fence. An overall community wall program is provided to help unify and reinforce community character.

For wall heights exceeding those outlined herein based on Sound Attenuation requirements refer to the Mangini Ranch Residential Development Environmental Noise Assessment document prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. on January 29, 2015.

- Decorative walls and/or screen walls shall be integrated with the architecture of community building, as well as the overall landscape design.
- All community theme walls and fences shall be consistent in design.
- For most products, the community wall will be colored split face block with an enhanced brick cap.

- Pilasters will be stacked stone veneered with an enhanced brick cap. Pilasters will occur at changes in wall direction or change in materials visible to the public realm and as outlined on page 3-26.
- Higher-end estate product wall adjoining a public street or any wall publicly visible or adjacent to the public realm shall be slump face block, slurry coat and painted, with a decorative brick cap.
- Interior/ side yard or any wall not visible to the public realm shall be precision block with precision cap, or wood fencing based on builder's preference and product price point. Block color to match slump slurry wall paint color.
- View fencing of full height tubular steel and/or a low wall or concrete mow curb with tubular steel combination may be used. Pilasters may be incorporated into steel fencing.
- Vines and/or shrubs should be planted along community walls to soften the visual character. An extensive use of vines is encouraged.
- The maximum wall or fence height shall be six (6) feet within any required rear, or side setback area, and along the project perimeter unless a need for an 8'-0" high wall or higher is determined necessary to act as a sound wall and approved by the City. Wall/fence heights are measured from the base of the wall/fence to the top of the interior or exterior side, always providing a minimum six (6) feet barrier from either side. The maximum height of any wall should not exceed ten (10) feet (when in combination with a retaining wall) without a variance.
- Combination retaining wall and privacy walls at block ends may be used.
- Rear yard fencing adjacent to park areas or open space edges where residential pad is
• For residential side yard gates, vinyl gates are encouraged, color to match or complement adjacent wall/architecture.
• Gates should be provided in walls or fences to allow emergency access and to facilitate convenient pedestrian access to activity areas and adjacent uses.
• Walls should be eliminated or sited to provide additional setbacks areas at project entries to accommodate distinctive landscaping, ornamental gateways, signage and street furniture.
• Walls should be curved or angled at corner locations along street frontages to preserve sight lines.
• Be mindful of sight lines when laying out lots and perimeter walls.

elevated above park/open space shall be view fencing, where applicable, considering grade differentials, etc.
• Where appropriate, view fencing may be less than 6’ high to provide an enhanced view shed. In cases where pools or spas are located in rear yards, a minimum 5’-6” high perimeter fence is required. Continuous view fencing or block walls shall have pilasters located at corners, at change in wall/fencing materials, and significant redirections in the fence line.
• Wall sections greater than 50 feet in length should incorporate at least two of the following design features which are proportionate to the wall length:
  – A minimum 2 feet change in plane for at least 2 feet.
  – A minimum 18-inch change in height for at least 10 feet.
  – Use of pilasters at 50 feet maximum intervals and at changes in wall planes.
  – A minimum 4 feet high view fencing section for at least 10 feet.
• Solid walls or wood fencing shall be used for property line fencing and gate returns between housing lots and those areas in public view. Fence return located on the garage side of each home shall include a three foot (3’) wide minimum gate.
• All retaining walls, courtyard walls, gates and fences shall be compatible with the architecture of each neighborhood/village.
• Visible precision block walls or wood fencing is prohibited from the public realm.
• Walls shall be setback a minimum of 5 feet from all public sidewalks. Where feasible a 10 feet setback is preferred.
The following photos should not be construed as the exact wall and fence height, color and material, but should be used as preferred examples. The sketches and graphic representations contained within these Design Guidelines are for conceptual purposes and are provided as visual aids in understanding the basic intent of the Guidelines and to present examples of their potential implementation. The block/color specification can be substituted with a different manufacturer as long as colors and textures match.

Community Wall and Pilaster
Pilaster: Precision column block with stone veneer and enhanced brick cap
Wall: Split face block with brick cap
Block Color: Sandstone available through Angelus Block - 6x6x16
Brick: Jumbo Alamo Blend ‘A’ - available through Belden Brick
Grout: Light Khaki - available through Orco Blended Products
Stone: TNS Coso Junction Thin Veneer-available through Thompson Bldg.
Grout-CBP Light Smoke #145

High End Product - Community Wall and Pilaster
Pilaster: Precision column block with stone veneer and brick cap
Wall: Slump column block with slurry coat, paint, and brick cap
Block Color: Auburn available through Angelus Block - Slump 6x6x16 - Super Slump
Slurry Coat/ Sack: Sherwin Williams SW7513w Sanderling (La Habra Color Coat Match x-B1072)
Brick: Jumbo Alamo Blend ‘A’ - available through Belden Brick
Grout: Light Khaki - available through Orco Blended Products
Stone: TNS Coso Junction Thin Veneer-available through Thompson Bldg.
Grout-CBP Light Smoke #145
Community Prefabricated Tubular Steel Fence

Color: Sherwin Williams SW7020 Black Fox, Powdercoated
Precision Block Wall Option at Side Yard Conditions
(No Precision Block Wall shall be visible/exposed to the public realm.)
Color: Harvest, available through Angelus Block

Wood Fence Option at Side Yard Conditions
(No Wood Fence shall be visible/ exposed to the public realm)
Color: Mission Brown Cabot Semi-solid Stain or equivalent
LANDSCAPE MASTER COMMUNITY PLANT MATRIX

The plant list for this project was developed to reinforce the community theme and to create some seasonal change with a mixture of low water use, drought-tolerant, deciduous, and evergreen plants while maintaining a well-balanced landscape. Many plants on this list are considered low water using and drought-tolerant species and were chosen based on their specific growth characteristics, including flowering and foliage color, texture and form.

The following items should be considered in the community landscape design process:

- Consistent street tree themes should be related to the hierarchy of the street system.
- Extensive use of trees, vines and shrubs to soften community theme wall and fencing.
- Recognition of existing natural conditions and situations.
- Use of both “formal” and “informal” planting arrangements, depending upon the particular condition.
- “Layering” of the shrub understory to create depth, variety and interest.
- Refer to local codes for spacing distance from utilities, light poles, etc.
- Preserving Oak Woodlands and isolated Oak trees on Folsom Ranch is imperative, as the State of California passed the Oak Woodlands Conservation Act of 2001. Refer to section 10.2.3 of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan for further Oak mitigation requirements.
Placing within the community shall comply with the City of Folsom’s Design Standards:

1. All plant material shall be in accordance with the appropriate ordinances, resolutions, and specifications established by the City.

2. All plant material shall be in conformance with City-approved Streetscape/ Street Tree Master plans where applicable. The City retains the right to prohibit any plant material generally known to require excessive maintenance, because of factors such as, but not limited to, disease, pest control, troublesome root development, ultimate size, high water needs, overplanting, difficult growth habits, and invasive regeneration habits.

3. To help protect our Urban Forest from pests, disease, storm damage, and drought, plus to increase tree population diversity the following tables shall be utilized:
   - If 60 trees or less shall be planted for a project:
     - Not to exceed 30% Genus
     - Not to exceed 20% Species
     - Not to exceed 10% Cultivar
   - If over 60 trees shall be planted for a project:
     - Not to exceed 15% Genus
     - Not to exceed 10% Species
     - Not to exceed 5% Cultivar

4. The use of drought tolerant plant materials that are particularly compatible with our local environment is strongly encouraged to promote water conservation and reduce maintenance costs. Landscape irrigation shall be designed in accordance with the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance as required by AB 1881. Plans shall show Water Conservation Concept statement and all calculations and schedules required by the Ordinance. The Soils Analysis may be shown on the plans or submitted separately.

5. In addition to minimum setback requirements for certain species as shown on the “Folsom Master Tree List,” the following minimum distances shall be required:
   - Three feet from City maintenance limit line.
   - Four feet from utility installations including, but not limited to sewers, gas, water lines, meter vaults, catch basins, etc.
   - Ten feet from driveways.
   - Ten feet from fire hydrants.
   - Twenty feet from light standards.
   - Tree limbs must have a clearance of 14.5 feet over streets, 8 feet over bicycle trails, and 7 feet over pedestrian-traveled ways.
   - Minimum sizes of trees shall be #15, or as approved by the Director.
   - Ten feet from front of stop signs.
   -Five feet from infrastructure or 24”D x 20’W root barrier (23 inches below grade and 1 inch above grade) that is approved by the City.
LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION

NOTE

All landscaped areas will be permanently irrigated using an automatic, underground irrigation system or drip system. The irrigation system will be separated into several systems based on water requirements of each hydrozone. Hydrozone separations will be based on sun orientation and water requirements of the plant material.

Irrigation of required landscaped areas shall be by either automatic overhead high efficiency spray nozzle or drip irrigation and matched precipitation rate, low gallonage sprinkler heads, bubblers, and timing devices. Landscape areas less than 8’ wide shall be irrigated with drip irrigation. Timing devices shall include soil moisture sensors and rain sensing override devices. Sprinkler pop-up heights shall range from 6” in turf areas and 12” high in shrub/groundcover beds, where a drip system may not be applicable. The irrigation system shall be capable of operating automatically by incorporating an electric weather based and climate-smart irrigation controller or advanced solar technology components and low voltage electric remote control valves. Quick coupling valves, as required, shall be strategically located to provide supplemental water to plant material and for wash down purposes. All remote control and quick coupling valves shall be located and installed within the shrub beds wherever possible.

The irrigation system will be compliant with the City Water Efficient Ordinance and should conform to MWELO AB 1881. Irrigation water use will comply with water allotments defined in the Ordinance.

A backbone “purple pipe” non-potable water system shall be designed and installed to supply non-potable water to park sites, landscape corridors, natural parkways, and other public landscaped areas within the community.

UTILITY AND EQUIPMENT SCREENING

All utilities above/below ground and other equipment providing service to the Folsom Ranch, Central District residential neighborhoods shall be screened accordingly to prevent unsightly conditions that distract from the overall aesthetics.

- Above-ground utility equipment should be screened from view by the use of hedges, trees, or larger screening plant material and/or vines where feasible, subject to utility provider requirements or restrictions.
- Above-ground utility equipment, vents, and access doors to underground utilities shall be located with sufficient space to allow clearance between the screening for the utility equipment and any paved surface including streets, driveways, and walkways.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single-Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abies concolor</td>
<td>White Fir</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abies nordmanniana</td>
<td>Nordmann Fir</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia spp.*</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia baileyana</td>
<td>Bailey Acacia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia melanoxylon</td>
<td>Black Acacia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer macrophyllum***</td>
<td>Big Leaf Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer spp.</td>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer buerferianum</td>
<td>Trident Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer campestre</td>
<td>Hedge Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer macrophyllum</td>
<td>Big-leaf Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer negundo</td>
<td>California Box Elder</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer platanoides x truncatum</td>
<td>Crimson Sunset Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer rubrum ‘Bowhall’</td>
<td>Bowhall Red Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer rubrum ‘Columnare’</td>
<td>Columnare Red Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer rubrum ‘October Glory’</td>
<td>October Glory or Red Sunset Red Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer tataricum ginnala</td>
<td>Amur Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer truncatum</td>
<td>Shantung Maple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus californica***</td>
<td>California Buckeye</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus glabra</td>
<td>Ohio Buckeye</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum</td>
<td>Common Horsechestnut</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus x carnea ‘Briotii’</td>
<td>Red Horsechestnut</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albizia julibrissin</td>
<td>Silk Tree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnus cordata</td>
<td>Italian Alder</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnus glutinosa</td>
<td>European Alder</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnus rhombifolia</td>
<td>White Alder</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Botanical Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Common Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Project Entries</strong></th>
<th><strong>Signature Corridors</strong></th>
<th><strong>Folsom Street Tree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Single Family Detached</strong></th>
<th><strong>Multi-Family</strong></th>
<th><strong>Parks/Schools</strong></th>
<th><strong>Open Space</strong></th>
<th><strong>Commercial/Mixed Use</strong></th>
<th><strong>Drainage Basin</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amelanchier canadensis</td>
<td>Eastern Serviceberry</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelanchier laevis</td>
<td>Allegheny Serviceberry</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araucaria bidwillii</td>
<td>Bunya-Bunya</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus unedo</td>
<td>Strawberry Tree</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus unedo ‘Marina’</td>
<td>Marina Strawberry Tree</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauhinia lunariodes</td>
<td>Anacacho Orchid Tree</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauhinia macranthera</td>
<td>Chihuahuan Orchid Tree</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula nigra</td>
<td>River Birch</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula platyphylla japonica</td>
<td>Japanese White Birch</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesalpinia cacalaco ‘Smoothie’</td>
<td>Smoothie Thorless Cascalote</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callistemon viminalis</td>
<td>Weeping Bottlebrush</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calocedrus decurrens</td>
<td>Incense Cedar</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia reticulata</td>
<td>NCN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinus betulus ‘Fastigiata’</td>
<td>European Hornbeam</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>American Hornbeam</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carya illinoensis</td>
<td>Pecan</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carya ovata</td>
<td>Shagbark Hickory</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casanopsis cuspidata</td>
<td>Japanese Chinquapin</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casuarina stricta</td>
<td>She-Oak, Beechwood</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castanea dentata</td>
<td>American Chestnut</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castanea mollissima</td>
<td>Chinese Chestnut</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalpa speciosa</td>
<td>Western Catalpa</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus spp.</td>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus atlantica (‘Glauc’)</td>
<td>Atlas (Blue) Cedar</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>Deodar Cedar</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtis australis</td>
<td>European Hackberry</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtis occidentalis</td>
<td>Common Hackberry</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceratonia siliqua</td>
<td>Carob Tree</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercidium 'Desert Museum'*</td>
<td>Desert Museum Palo Verde</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercidium floridum*</td>
<td>Blue Palo Verde</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
### Botanical Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cercis canadensis</td>
<td>Eastern Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercis canadensis ‘Forest Pansy’</td>
<td>Forest Pansy Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercis occidentalis* ** ***</td>
<td>Western Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercis reniformis ‘Oklahoma’</td>
<td>Oklahoma Redbud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercis siliquastrum</td>
<td>Judas Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilopsis linearis*</td>
<td>Desert Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilopsis linearis ‘Art’s Seedless’</td>
<td>Art’s Seedless Desert Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilopsis linearis ‘Bubba’</td>
<td>Bubba Desert Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilopsis linearis ‘Lucretia Hamilton’</td>
<td>Lucretia Hamilton Desert Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilopsis linearis ‘Warren Jones’</td>
<td>Warren Jones Desert Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chionanthus retusus</td>
<td>Chinese Fringe Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitalpa tashkentensis ‘Pink Dawn’</td>
<td>Pink Dawn Chitalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>Camphor Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus spp.</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cladrastis kentukea</td>
<td>Yellow Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordyline australis</td>
<td>Dracaena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus spp.</td>
<td>Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus controversa</td>
<td>Giant Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus x ‘Eddie’s White Wonder’</td>
<td>Eddie’s White Wonder Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Eastern Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus kousa</td>
<td>Kousa Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinus obovatus</td>
<td>Smoke Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus laevigata ‘Paul’s Secret’</td>
<td>Paul’s Secret English Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus phaenopyrum</td>
<td>Washington Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptomeria japonica</td>
<td>Japanese Cryptomeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus spp.</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus arizonica</td>
<td>Arizona Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus sempervirens</td>
<td>Italian Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diospyros kaki</td>
<td>Fuyu Persimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diospyros virginiana</td>
<td>American Persimmon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species  
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only  
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebenopsis ebano</td>
<td>Texas Ebony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaeocarpus decipiens</td>
<td>Japanese Blueberry Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriobotrya deflexa</td>
<td>Bronze Loquat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriobotrya japonica</td>
<td>Loquat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus spp.**</td>
<td>Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus nicholii</td>
<td>Nichol’s Willow-leaved Peppermint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus polyanthemos</td>
<td>Silver Dollar Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</td>
<td>Red Ironbark Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucommia ulmoides</td>
<td>Hardy Rubber Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
<td>American Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagus sylvestica</td>
<td>European Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagus sylvestica ‘Atropunicea’</td>
<td>Copper Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagus sylvestica ‘Pendula’</td>
<td>Weeping European Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagus sylvestica ‘Purpurea Pendula’</td>
<td>Weeping Purple Beech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feijoa sellowiana</td>
<td>Pineapple Guava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficus carica</td>
<td>Common Fig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficus microcarpa nitida</td>
<td>Indian Laurel Fig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmiana simplex</td>
<td>Parasol Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus spp.</td>
<td>Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus Americana ‘Autumn Purple’</td>
<td>Autumn Purple White Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus angustifolia ‘Raywood’</td>
<td>Raywood Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus greggi</td>
<td>Little Leaf Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus latifolia</td>
<td>Oregon Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geijera parviflora</td>
<td>Australian Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginkgo biloba</td>
<td>Gingko, Maidenhair Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginkgo biloba ‘Autumn Gold’</td>
<td>Autumn Gold Maidenhair Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginkgo biloba ‘Princeton Sentry’</td>
<td>Princeton Sentry Maidenhair Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginkgo biloba ‘Saratoga’</td>
<td>Saratoga Maidenhair Tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos ‘Shademaster’</td>
<td>Shademaster Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleditsia tracanthos ‘Sunburst’</td>
<td>Sunburst Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grevillea robusta</td>
<td>Silk Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnocaludus dioica</td>
<td>Kentucky Coffee Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesia carolina</td>
<td>Carolina Silver Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heteromeles arbutifolia*</td>
<td>Toyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymenosporum flavum</td>
<td>Sweetshade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex x ‘Nellie R. Stevens’</td>
<td>Nellie Stevens Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex altaclarensis ‘Wilsonii’</td>
<td>Wilson Altaclara Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex aquifolium</td>
<td>English Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex cornuta ‘Burfordii’</td>
<td>Burford Chinese Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglans californica ‘Hindsii’***</td>
<td>California Black Walnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglans cinerea</td>
<td>Butternut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglans nigra</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglans regia</td>
<td>English Walnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus conferta</td>
<td>Shore Juniper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus californica</td>
<td>California Juniper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus occidentalis</td>
<td>Western Juniper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus osteosperma</td>
<td>Utah Juniper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus scopulorum ‘Blue Haven’</td>
<td>Blue Haven Juniper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus scopulorum ‘Skyrocket’</td>
<td>Skyrocket Juniper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koelreuteria bipinnata</td>
<td>Chinese Flame Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koelreuteria paniculata</td>
<td>Goldenrain Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia spp.</td>
<td>Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia hybrid ‘Arapaho’</td>
<td>Arapaho Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia hybrid ‘Muskogee’</td>
<td>Muskogee Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia hybrid ‘Natchez’</td>
<td>Natchez Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia hybrid ‘Tonto’</td>
<td>Tonto Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia hybrid ‘Tuscarora’</td>
<td>Tuscarora Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>Goshorn Street Tree</th>
<th>Shingle Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Used</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>Sweet Bay</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucaena retusa</td>
<td>Golden Ball Lead Tree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidambar spp.</td>
<td>Sweet Gum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Tree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithocarpus edulis</td>
<td>Japanese False Oak</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maackia amurensis</td>
<td>Amur Maakia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia spp.</td>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora ‘St. Mary’</td>
<td>St. Mary Southern Magnolia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia kobus</td>
<td>Kobus Magnolia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia x soulangeana</td>
<td>Saucer Magnolia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus spp.</td>
<td>Crabapple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus ‘Centurion’</td>
<td>Centurion Crabapple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus ‘Harvest Gold’</td>
<td>Harvest Gold Crabapple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus ioensis ‘Prariefire’</td>
<td>Prariefire Crabapple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus ‘Robinson’</td>
<td>Robinson Crabapple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus ‘Strawberry Parfait’</td>
<td>Strawberry Parfait Crabapple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maytenus boaria</td>
<td>Mayten Tree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca lanceolata</td>
<td>Black Tea Tree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca leucadendron</td>
<td>Paperbark</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca linariifolia</td>
<td>Flaxleaf Paperbark</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca quinquenervia</td>
<td>Broad-leaved Paperbark</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metasequoia glyptostroboides</td>
<td>Dawn Redwood</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morus alba</td>
<td>White Mulberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyssa sylvatica</td>
<td>Sour Gum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olea europaea Majestic Beauty TM</td>
<td>Majestic Beauty TM Olive</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olea europaea 'Swan Hill'**</td>
<td>Swan Hill Olive</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olneya tesota</td>
<td>Desert Ironwood</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmanthus fragrans</td>
<td>Sweet Olive</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostrya virginiana</td>
<td>American Hop-hornbeam</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinsonia aculeata*</td>
<td>Mexican Palo Verde</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinsonia floridum*</td>
<td>Blue Palo Verde</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinsonia x ‘Desert Museum’*</td>
<td>Mexican Palo Verde</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persea borbonia</td>
<td>Redbay</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persea thunbergii</td>
<td>Persea</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photinia serratifolia</td>
<td>Chinese Photinia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picea pungens</td>
<td>Colorado Spruce</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picea pungens glauca</td>
<td>Colorado Blue Spruce</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus brutia</td>
<td>Calabrian Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus canariensis</td>
<td>Canary Island Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus cembroi</td>
<td>Coulter Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus densiflora</td>
<td>Japanese Red Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus edulis</td>
<td>Pinon Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus eldarica</td>
<td>Afghan Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus flexilis</td>
<td>Limber Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus halepensis</td>
<td>Allepo Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus nigra</td>
<td>Austrian Black Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus parviflora</td>
<td>Japanese White Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian Stone Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus ponderosa</td>
<td>Ponderosa Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus sabinaiana***</td>
<td>Gray Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus sylvestris</td>
<td>Scotch Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus thunbergii</td>
<td>Japanese Black Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistacia chinensis</td>
<td>Chinese Pistache</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistacia chinensis ‘Keith Davies’</td>
<td>Keith Davies Chinese Pistache</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistacia chinensis ‘Red Push’</td>
<td>Red Push Chinese Pistache</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittosporum tenuifolium</td>
<td>Blackstem Pittosporum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus x acerifolia</td>
<td>London Planetree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species  
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only  
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platanus x acerifolia 'Bloodgood'</td>
<td>Bloodgood Planetree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus x acerifolia 'Columbia'</td>
<td>Columbia London Planetree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus x acerifolia 'Yarwood'</td>
<td>Yarwood London Planetree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
<td>American Sycamore</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus racemosa</td>
<td>California Sycamore</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podocarpus gracilior</td>
<td>Fern Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podocarpus henkelii</td>
<td>Long-leafed Yellowwood</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podocarpus macrophyllus</td>
<td>Yew Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podocarpus macrophyllus ‘Maki’</td>
<td>Shrubby Yew Pine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus canadensis</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus fremontii***</td>
<td>Fremont or Western Cottonwood</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus nigra ‘Italica’</td>
<td>Lombary Poplar</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosopis glandulosa ‘Maverick’</td>
<td>Maverick Texas Honey Mesquite</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosopis hybrid ‘Phoenix’</td>
<td>Phoenix Thornless Mesquite</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus spp.</td>
<td>Flowering Cherry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus caroliniana</td>
<td>Carolina Laurel Cherry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus cerasifera var.</td>
<td>Cherry Plum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus cerasifera ‘Krauter Vesuvius’</td>
<td>Purple Leaf Plum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus dulcis</td>
<td>Almond</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudotsuga menziesii</td>
<td>Douglas Fir</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pterostyrax hispida</td>
<td>Epaulette Tree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punica granatum</td>
<td>Pomegranate</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus calleryana ‘Capital’</td>
<td>Capital Pear</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus calleryana ‘Chanticleer’</td>
<td>Chanticleer Pear</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus calleryana ‘Redspire’</td>
<td>Redspire Pear</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus fauriei ‘Korean Sun’</td>
<td>Fauer Pear</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus kawakamii</td>
<td>Evergreen Pear</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus acutissima</td>
<td>Sawtooth Oak</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus bicolor</td>
<td>Swamp White Oak</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Used</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quercus castaneifolia</td>
<td>Chestnut-leafed Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus cerris</td>
<td>Turkey Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus chrysolepis</td>
<td>Golden Cup Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus coccinea</td>
<td>Scarlet Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus douglasii***</td>
<td>Blue Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus garryana</td>
<td>Oregon White Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus ilex</td>
<td>Holly Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus lobata</td>
<td>Valley Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus macrocarpa</td>
<td>Burr Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus x morehus</td>
<td>Oracle Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus muehlenbergii</td>
<td>Chinquapin Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus nuttallii</td>
<td>Nuttall Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus palustris</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus phellos</td>
<td>Willow Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus shumardii</td>
<td>Shumard Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus suber</td>
<td>Cork Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus virginiana</td>
<td>Southern Live Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus wislizeii</td>
<td>Interior Live Oak</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus lancea</td>
<td>African Sumac</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinia X ambigua 'Idahoensis'</td>
<td>Idaho Locust</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinia X ambigua 'Purple Robe'</td>
<td>Purple Robe Locust</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix babylonica</td>
<td>Weeping Willow</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix gooddingii***</td>
<td>Black Willow</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix laevigata***</td>
<td>Red Willow</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix lasiolepis***</td>
<td>Arroyo Willow</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapindus sebiferum</td>
<td>Chinese Tallow Tree</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciadopitys verticillata</td>
<td>Umbrella Pine</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophora spp.</td>
<td>Pagoda Tree</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophora japonica</td>
<td>Japanese Pagoda Tree</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
### Botanical Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Sokol Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophora scundiflora</td>
<td>Mescal Bean Tree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophora scundiflora ‘Silver Sierra’</td>
<td>Silver Sierra, Texas Mountain Laurel</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styrax japonicus</td>
<td>Japanese Snowbell</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styrax obassia</td>
<td>Fragrant Snowbell</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringa reticulata</td>
<td>Japanese Tree Lilac</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxodium distichum</td>
<td>Bald Cypress</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxodium mucronatum</td>
<td>Montezuma Cypress</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxus baccata</td>
<td>English Yew</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuja occidentalis</td>
<td>American Arborvitae</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuja plicata</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilia americana</td>
<td>American Linden, Basswood</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilia cordata</td>
<td>Little-leaf Linden</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilia tomentosa</td>
<td>Silver Linden</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toona sinensis</td>
<td>Toona</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus americana ‘Princeton’</td>
<td>American Elm (DED resistant)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus glabra ‘Camperdownii’</td>
<td>Camperdown Elm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus parvifolia var.</td>
<td>Chinese or Evergreen Elm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus parvifolia ‘Allee’</td>
<td>Chinese Lacebark Elm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus wilsonii ‘Prospector’</td>
<td>Prospector Elm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus x ‘Frontier’</td>
<td>Frontier Elm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbellularia californica***</td>
<td>California Bay</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitex agnus-castus</td>
<td>Chaste Tree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitex agnus-castus ‘Montrose Purple’</td>
<td>Montose Purple Chaste Tree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca spp.</td>
<td>Yucca</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelkova serrata</td>
<td>Sawleaf Zelkova</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelkova serrata ‘Village Green’</td>
<td>Village Green Zelkova</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziziphus jujube</td>
<td>Jujube, Chinese Date</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species

**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only

***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsum Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Used</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butia capitata</td>
<td>Pindo Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaerops humilis</td>
<td>Mediterranean Fan Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycas revoluta</td>
<td>Sago Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix canariensis</td>
<td>Canary Island Date Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix dactylifera*</td>
<td>Edible Date Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix reclinata</td>
<td>Senegal Date Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syagrus romanzoffianum</td>
<td>Queen Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachycarpus fortunei</td>
<td>Windmill Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washingtonia filifera</td>
<td>California Fan Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washingtonia robusta</td>
<td>Mexican Fan Palm</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHRUBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abelia X grandiflora</td>
<td>Glossy Abelia</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia spp.**</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acanthus mollis</td>
<td>Bear’s Breech</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achillea millefolium***</td>
<td>Yarrow</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer spp.</td>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agapanthus spp.</td>
<td>Lily of the Nile</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus unedo ‘Compacta’</td>
<td>Dwarf Strawberry Tree</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos spp.**</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armeria maritima</td>
<td>Sea Pink</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemisia spp.</td>
<td>Artemisia</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepia curassavica</td>
<td>Blood Flower Milkweed</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucuba japonica</td>
<td>Japanese Aucuba</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucuba japonica ‘Crotonifolia’</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucuba japonica ‘Variegata’</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea spp.</td>
<td>Azalea</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccharis ‘Centennial’**</td>
<td>Centennial Coyote Brush</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccharis pilularis var.</td>
<td>Coyote Bush</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambusa multiplex ‘Alphonse Karr’</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Sidewalk Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Used</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bambusa oldhamii</em></td>
<td>Clumping Giant Timber Bamboo</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Berberis spp.</em></td>
<td>Barberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Berberis thunbergii var.</em></td>
<td>Japanese Barberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buddleja davidii var.</em></td>
<td>Butterfly Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buxus spp.</em></td>
<td>Boxwood</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Caesalpinia gilliesii</em></td>
<td>Yellow Bird of Paradise</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calycanthus occidentalis</em>**</td>
<td>Spicebush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Camellia spp.</em></td>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cassia artemisiodes</em></td>
<td>Feathery Cassia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ceanothus spp.</em></td>
<td>Lilac</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cephalanthus occidentalis</em>**</td>
<td>Button Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cistus spp.</em></td>
<td>Rockrose</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coleonema spp.</em></td>
<td>Breath Of Heaven</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Convolvulus cneorum</em></td>
<td>Bush Morning Glory</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cordyline australis var.</em></td>
<td>Australian Dracaena</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cornus sericea</em>**</td>
<td>Red Twig Dogwood</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cotoneaster spp.</em></td>
<td>Cotoneaster</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dicksonia antarctica</em></td>
<td>Tasmanian Tree Fern</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dietes vegeta</em></td>
<td>Fortnight Lily</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dodonaea viscosa</em></td>
<td>Hopseed Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dodonaea viscosa</em> ‘Purpurea’</td>
<td>Purple-leafed Hopseed Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eleagnus pungens var.</em></td>
<td>Silverberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Encelia spp.</em></td>
<td>Brittlebush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Erigeron karvinskianus</em></td>
<td>Santa Barbara Daisy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eriogonum spp.</em></td>
<td>Buckwheat</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Euonymus spp.</em></td>
<td>Euonymus</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fatshedera lizei</em></td>
<td>Botanical Wonder</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fatsia japonica</em></td>
<td>Japanese Aralia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fremontodendron spp.</em></td>
<td>Flannel Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gardenia spp.</em></td>
<td>Gardenia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grevillea spp.</td>
<td>Grevillea</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grewia occidentalis</td>
<td>Lavender Starflower</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemerocallis spp.**</td>
<td>Daylily</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heteromeles arbutifolia*,***</td>
<td>Toyon</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus spp.</td>
<td>Hibicus</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrangea spp.</td>
<td>Hydrangea</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypericum spp.</td>
<td>St. Johnswort, Goldflower</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex spp.</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus spp.**</td>
<td>Juniper</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kniphofia uvaria</td>
<td>Red Hot Poker</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana spp.**</td>
<td>Lantana</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavandula spp.**</td>
<td>Lavender</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucophyllum spp.</td>
<td>Texas Ranger</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum japonicum</td>
<td>Japanese Privet</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum japonicum ‘Texanum’</td>
<td>Wax Leaf Privet</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>Glossy Privet, White Wax Tree</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liriope muscari</td>
<td>Big Blue Lily Turf</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobelia laxiflora</td>
<td>Red Mexican Lobelia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahonia spp.</td>
<td>Oregon Grape</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimulus aurantiacus*,***</td>
<td>Sticky Monkey Flower</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimulus bifidus</td>
<td>Santa Lucia Monkey Flower</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimulus puniceus</td>
<td>Red Monkey Flower</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myoporum laetum</td>
<td>Myoporum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrstus spp.</td>
<td>Myrtle</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandina domestica var.</td>
<td>Nandina, Heavenly Bamboo</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neprolepis cordifolia</td>
<td>Sword Fern</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolina bigelovii</td>
<td>Nolina</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmanthus fragrans</td>
<td>Sweet Olive</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteospernum spp.</td>
<td>Freeway Daisy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelargonium X hortorum</td>
<td>Garden Geranium</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species  
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only  
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Edgewood Street Tree</th>
<th>Single-Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penstemon spp.</td>
<td>Penstemon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phormium spp.**</td>
<td>Flax</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photinia x fraseri</td>
<td>Fraser’s Photinia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllostachys aurea</td>
<td>Golden Bamboo</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllostachys bambusoides</td>
<td>Giant Timber Bamboo</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittosporum spp.</td>
<td>Pittosporum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portulacaria afra</td>
<td>Elephant’s Food</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus caroliniana ‘Compacta’</td>
<td>Dwarf Carolina Laurel Cherry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyracantha spp.</td>
<td>Pyracantha</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnus californica var.*</td>
<td>California Coffeeberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhaphiolepis spp.</td>
<td>Indian Hawthorn</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus ovata</td>
<td>Sugar Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribes malvaceum***</td>
<td>Chaparral Currant</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribes spp.</td>
<td>Currant</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romneya coulteri*</td>
<td>Matilija Poppy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romneya ‘White Cloud’</td>
<td>White Cloud Matilija Poppy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa spp.</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa californica***</td>
<td>Wild Rose</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarinus spp.**</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia spp.**</td>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambucus mexicana ***</td>
<td>Mexican Elderberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santolina chamaecyparissus</td>
<td>Lavender Cotton</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stachys byzantina</td>
<td>Lamb’s Ears</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styx officinalis var. redivivus</td>
<td>Snowdrop Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphoricarpos spp.</td>
<td>Snowberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thymus spp. **</td>
<td>Thyme</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachelospermum asiaticum</td>
<td>Yellow Star Jasmine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachelospermum jasminoides</td>
<td>Star Jasmine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena spp.**</td>
<td>Verbena</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum spp.</td>
<td>Viburnum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westringia spp.</td>
<td>Coast Rosemary</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xylosma congestum</td>
<td>Xylosma, Glossy Xylosma</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca spp.**</td>
<td>Yucca</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUCCULENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agave spp.**</td>
<td>Agave</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloe spp.**</td>
<td>Aloe</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbine frutescens</td>
<td>Yellow Stalked Bulbine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbine frutescens 'Hallmark'</td>
<td>Orange Hallmark Bulbine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbine frutescens 'Yellow'</td>
<td>Yellow Bulbine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echeveria spp.</td>
<td>Hen and Chicks</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphorbia rigida</td>
<td>Blue Euphorbia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphorbia spp.</td>
<td>Euphorbia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferocactus wislizenii</td>
<td>Fish Hook Barrel Cactus</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperaloe parviflora</td>
<td>Red Yucca</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opuntia spp.</td>
<td>Prickly Pear</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portulacaria afrara*</td>
<td>Elephant's Food, Elephant Bush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedum spp.</td>
<td>Sedum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca spp.</td>
<td>Yucca</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUND COVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achillea spp.**</td>
<td>Yarrow</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajuga reptans var.</td>
<td>Carpet Bugle</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos spp.</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccharis pilularis***</td>
<td>Coyote Brush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergenia cordifolia</td>
<td>Heartleaf Bergenia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campanula poscharskyana</td>
<td>Serbian Bellflower</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus griseus var.</td>
<td>Carmel Creeper</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centranthus ruber</td>
<td>Jupiter's Beard</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerastium tomentosum</td>
<td>Snow-in-Summer</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclamen persicum</td>
<td>Cyclamen</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianthus spp.</td>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Waxed Used</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dichondra micrantha</td>
<td>Dichondra</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca californica 'Serpentine Blue'</td>
<td>California Fescue selection</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca glauca</td>
<td>Blue Fescue</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragaria chiloensis</td>
<td>Ornamental Strawberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragaria 'Pink Panda'</td>
<td>Pink Panda Ornamental Strawberry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazania hybrids</td>
<td>Hybrid Gazania</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazania spp.</td>
<td>Gazania</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geranium spp.</td>
<td>Cranesbill</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedera canarensis</td>
<td>Algerian Ivy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedera helix</td>
<td>English Ivy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuchera spp.**</td>
<td>Coral Bells</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypericum spp.</td>
<td>St. John’s Wort</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberis sempervirens</td>
<td>Evergreen Candytuft</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatiens wallerana</td>
<td>Impatiens</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperus spp.</td>
<td>Juniper</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana spp.</td>
<td>Lantana</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobelia erinus</td>
<td>Lobelia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonicera japonica ‘Halliana’</td>
<td>Hall’s Honeysuckle</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myoporum parvifolium</td>
<td>Ground Cover Myoporum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myoporum parvifolium ‘Putah Creek’</td>
<td>Putah Creek Myoporum</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandina domestica ‘Harbour Dwarf’</td>
<td>Dwarf Heavenly Bamboo</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophiopogon spp.</td>
<td>Mondo Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteospermum fruticosum var.</td>
<td>Trailing African Daisy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Ground Cover varieties</td>
<td>Ground Cover Rose</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santolina chamaecyparissus</td>
<td>Lavender Cotton</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaevola 'Mauve Clusters'</td>
<td>Fan Flower</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedum morganianum</td>
<td>Donkey Tail</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedum rubrotinctum</td>
<td>Pork and Beans</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soleirolia soleiroli</td>
<td>Baby's Tears</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thymus praecox arcticus</td>
<td>Creeping Thyme</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Foelsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single-Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Used</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thymus praecox ‘Purple Carpet’</td>
<td>Purple Carpet Creeping Thyme</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachelospermum asiaticum</td>
<td>Yellow Star Jasmine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca minor*</td>
<td>Dwarf Periwinkle</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca minor ‘Sterling Silver’</td>
<td>Sterling Silver Periwinkle</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zauschneria californica</td>
<td>California Fuchsia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinnia angustifolia</td>
<td>Zinnia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoysia tenuifolia*</td>
<td>Korean Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thymus praecox ‘Purple Carpet’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trachelospermum asiaticum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vinca minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vinca minor ‘Sterling Silver’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zauschneria californica</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zinnia angustifolia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoysia tenuifolia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thymus praecox ‘Purple Carpet’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trachelospermum asiaticum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vinca minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vinca minor ‘Sterling Silver’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zauschneria californica</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zinnia angustifolia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoysia tenuifolia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates drought-tolerant species  
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only  
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
## Section 3 - Landscape Design Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitis californica</td>
<td>California Wild Grape</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitis californica ‘Roger’s Red’</td>
<td>Roger’s Red California Grape</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisteria spp.</td>
<td>Wisteria</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRASSES/WILDFLOWER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Use</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bouteloua curtipendula*</td>
<td>Sideoats Grama Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouteloua gracilis*</td>
<td>Blue Grama Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex barbaraee***</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Sedge</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex elata*</td>
<td>Golden Variegated Sedge</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex spp.</td>
<td>Sedge</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorogalum pomeridianum***</td>
<td>Soap Root</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinisia heterophylla***</td>
<td>Chinese Houses</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichelostemma capitatum***</td>
<td>Bluedicks</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elymus glaucus***</td>
<td>Blue Wildrye</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilobium canum ***</td>
<td>California Fuchsia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschscholzia californica***</td>
<td>California Poppy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca californica***</td>
<td>California Fescue</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca glauca</td>
<td>Blue Fescue</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca mairei</td>
<td>Atlas Fescue</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca rubra</td>
<td>Red Fescue</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilia tricolor***</td>
<td>Bird’s Eyes</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helictotrichon sempervirens</td>
<td>Blue Oat Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus acutus</td>
<td>Spiny Rush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus balticus</td>
<td>Rush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus effuses***</td>
<td>Common Rush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus effusus pacificus ‘Quartz Creek’</td>
<td>Quartz Creek Soft Rush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasthenia californica***</td>
<td>Goldfields</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layia fremontii***</td>
<td>Tidy Tips</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leymus condensatus*</td>
<td>Wild Rye</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leymus condensatus ‘Canyon Prince’*</td>
<td>Canyon Prince Wild Rye</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leymus triticoidees***</td>
<td>Creeping Wild Rye</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species
**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only
***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
### Botanical Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Project Entries</th>
<th>Signature Corridors</th>
<th>Folsom Street Tree</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Parks/Schools</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Commercial/Mixed Used</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lupinus microcarpus ***</td>
<td>White-Whorled Lupine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupinus microcarpus var. densiflorus***</td>
<td>Golden Lupine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupinus nanus***</td>
<td>Sky Lupine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscanthus spp.</td>
<td>Miscanthus</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhlenber gia ssp.</td>
<td>Muhlenbergia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhlenbergia rigens***</td>
<td>Deergrass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassella lepida***</td>
<td>Foothill Needlegrass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasella pulch ra***</td>
<td>Purple Needlegrass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassella tenuissima</td>
<td>Mexican Feather Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolina bigelovii</td>
<td>Desert Bigelov Nolina</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophiopogon jabburan vittata</td>
<td>Snakebeard</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophiopogon japonicus</td>
<td>Mondo Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennisetum spp.</td>
<td>Fountain Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penstemon heterophyllus***</td>
<td>Foothill Penstemon</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlaris arundinacea ‘Picta’</td>
<td>Variegated Ribbon Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlaris arundinacea ‘Rosa e’</td>
<td>Ribbon Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus tabernaemontani</td>
<td>Soft-stem Bulrush</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisyrinchium bellum ***</td>
<td>Blue-Eyed Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago californica***</td>
<td>California Goldenrod</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporobol us airoides***</td>
<td>Alkali Sacaton</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporobol us wrightii</td>
<td>Giant Dropseed</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipa pulchra</td>
<td>Needle Grass</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triteleia laxa***</td>
<td>Ithuriel’s Spear</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoysia ‘De Anza’**</td>
<td>Turf Zoysia De Anza</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates drought-tolerant species

**Indicates that designer must select a low water or drought-tolerant variety only

***River-Friendly Landscaping List – Sacramento, CA
DESIGN PROCESS
INTRODUCTION

The Folsom Ranch, Central District Design Guidelines have been created to provide property owners, architects, home builders, and contractors with a set of parameters for the preparation of their drawings and specifications. Adherence to these Guidelines will assure builders that a consistent level of quality will be maintained. The Folsom Ranch, Central District Architectural Review Committee (or the “Committee”) and the City will review all designs, plans, and construction to ensure:

- Primary site design issues have been adequately considered,
- Excellence in architectural design,
- The unique landscape potential of the homesite is addressed,
- Compatibility and integration with surrounding land uses.

Architectural Review Committee

The Folsom Ranch, Central District is designed to be a unique community of homes for all income levels. The future community's Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R's) may not list specific design items necessary for plan approval. Rather, the authority to approve or disapprove individual building and landscaping plans is given to the Folsom Ranch, Central District Architectural Review Committee. The Committee does not seek to restrict individual creativity or preferences, but rather maintain within the overall community the aesthetic relationship between homes, natural amenities, and surrounding neighbors. As the community matures, these key relationships will become increasingly important, requiring coordination through the design process.

The Committee is composed of three members or more, as decided upon by the Project Master Developer, who are intricately involved in the development of the community. Additionally, an architect or other design professional, who is a non-owner, may serve on or act as a consultant to the Committee.

The Committee will use the Design Guidelines for the purpose of review, but may individually consider the merits of any design due to special conditions that, in the opinion of the Committee, provide benefits to the adjacent areas, the specific site, or to the community as a whole. Alternate materials/architectural styles that are deemed equivalent may be permitted, subject to Planning Commission approval.

Deviations to these standards may be considered for projects with special and unique design characteristics during the Folsom Ranch Design Review Committee process and the City’s development review process. This document is intended to encourage and direct a high level of design quality to the project site while permitting flexibility for creative expression and innovative design solutions.

Deviations can be classified as Minor Deviations and Major Deviations. Examples of Minor Deviations include, but are not limited to, setback or lot coverage changes, architectural styles, and architectural material substitutions. Examples of Major Deviations include, but are not limited to, land use changes or other changes not in substantial conformance with the approved final map. This document grants the Community Development Director the authority to determine whether a deviation should be considered Minor or Major. Review and approval of Minor Deviations shall be conducted by the Community Development Director, whereas Major Deviations shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.
Amendments to the Design Guidelines shall be reviewed and approved by planning staff or the Community Development Director.

The plans must identify the changes and/or modifications at the time of submittal plans to the ARC. With the ARC’s approval, the plans can then be submitted to the City for approval. Since all approvals by the City are subject to Design Approval by the Planning Commission (Planning Commission actions are appealable to the City Council), such approval shall ratify the Design Guidelines changes or modifications for the particular project seeking the changes or modifications. If changes to the Design Guidelines are proposed, then the changes shall be approved by the ARC first then the City of Folsom, in a manner subject to the City’s approval.

Architectural Review Committee approval is required for all development projects located in Folsom Ranch. For those projects that require discretionary approvals from the City of Folsom, such as tentative subdivision map, Planned Development Permit, Use Permit or other approvals granted by the Planning Commission and/or City Council, ARC approval is required prior to the submittal of the application to the City.

Prior to the commencement of any site work or construction activity, the builders or their respective agent must submit to the Committee an APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL of such work. Approval by the Committee must be received prior to the start of any clearing, grading, construction, or landscaping. The authority to approve or disapprove building and landscape plans is provided by the future CC&Rs for Folsom Ranch, Central District. Deviations from the Design Guidelines may be permitted on a case-by-case basis, subject to the Planning Commission approval under the design review approval process.

**Procedural Flow Chart**

The outline that follows represents the steps necessary to complete a residence in Folsom Ranch, Central District. It is important to note that any deviation from these procedures could cause unnecessary delays or additional costs.

1. **Pre-Design Submittal Meeting**
   
   Pre-Submittal Meeting: Design Concept.
   
   Highly recommended, but not required.

2. **Conceptual Design Review**
   
   - Two sets of Preliminary Plans showing:
     - Floor Plans
     - Elevations
     - Site Plans
     - Fencing Plans
     - Application Form
     - Review and Processing Fee / Deposit- Per Builder/Master Developer requirements
3. Final Design Review Approval
   - Two sets of:
     - Site Plan
     - Landscape Plan
     - Irrigation Plan
     - Fencing Plan
     - Floor Plans
     - Roof Plan
     - Building Elevations
     - Specifications and Schedule
     - Color and Material Selections

4. Construction Guidelines and Standards
   - Construction Schedule
   - Building Permit
   - Final Inspection

5. Submit to City Building Department
   City of Folsom
   Community Development Department
   Building Division
   50 Natoma Street
   Folsom, CA 95630

NOTE: Applicant to make himself familiar with the City of Folsom Design Review Process and Applications.

Design Review and Approval Process

The Design Guidelines outline the design intent, basic requirements, and processes to be followed by the Committee in reviewing and approving architectural, site, and landscaping plans. It is recommended that all interested parties familiarize themselves with the Design Guidelines prior to the commencement of any design work.

We encourage the utilization of professional designers and builders who have acquainted themselves with the Architectural Design Guidelines, the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, and County Codes and Regulations, and who have demonstrated an understanding of the quality and standards that will be required at Folsom Ranch, Central District. Licensed architects, engineers, and landscape architects shall prepare all plans and designs.

Pre-Design Submittal Meeting

Adherence to the Design Guidelines and all applicable government regulations is the sole responsibility of the builder. Before beginning the design process, the City of Folsom Planning Department should be contacted to clarify all regulatory questions, in addition to becoming familiar with the Specific Plan.

To establish the design concept, owners, builders, and/or architects should meet informally with a representative or representatives of the Committee to discuss and consider all approaches, ideas, designs, and to review any preliminary design sketches. An owner and/or builder may appoint a personal representative to attend meetings and process plans, but in general we encourage the owner and/or builder to be present at the conferences. The Committee will review, with the owner, builder or agent, their design approach to confirm the intent of the Design Guidelines and the appropriateness of the design concept. Although not mandatory, this step is strongly
**Conceptual Design Submittal**

The Pre-Design Conference should give the owner or builder and the owner's or builder's design team sufficient direction to prepare the Conceptual Design Submittal. This submittal should consist of exterior elevation drawings including material list and color palette, floor plan and site plan, showing existing and proposed grades, property lines, proposed fencing, and building setbacks.

The materials required for the ARC approval may be different than what is required to obtain approval from the City of a Planned Development Permit. The materials requested herein are considered to be the minimum required for ARC approval and if the City requires ARC approval of additional items not listed here, then the applicant shall provide those materials to the ARC for review. It is the intent that the City not accept applications unless the ARC has approved the planned project. Lastly, ARC approval does not convey any representations of approval by the City of Folsom.

The Conceptual Design Submittal package should contain two (2) sets of the following:

1. Floor plans drawn to scale.
2. Conceptual exterior elevations with enough detail to allow the committee to make an effective review of the plan.

**NOTE:** These items may be in sketch form and to scale, that is, drawings of a preliminary nature, and need not have all the dimensions and details. However, critical dimensions should be included.

3. A site plan, drawn to scale, showing:
   a. Property lines.
   b. Existing grades, trees, rock outcroppings, and any other significant resources.
   c. Home location, setbacks, and easements.
   d. Driveway and turn-around locations and dimensions, guest parking location (minimum of two guest spaces).
   e. Any decks, patios, and/or outdoor living space proposed show location and size.
   f. Fence and wall location.

4. The completed Application for Approval form.

Builder should submit the completed Application Form, along with the plans described above, to the Committee. The Committee will review the plans and contact the builder within thirty (30) calendar days. If needed, an informal meeting will be scheduled to review the Conceptual Design Submittal.

5. Reviews and Processing Fee.

To ensure a thorough review is provided to each builder and that the highest architectural and design standards are met, the Committee may, at their discretion, retain the services of architects, engineers, landscape architects, and/or inspectors. To cover the cost of the Committee and insure against damage to Folsom Ranch, Central District due to construction, builders are required to submit a fee/deposit for ARC services. A portion of the review fee will not be returned. The remaining balance will be held as a deposit until a construction inspection is completed. Upon inspection, if no damage occurred to neighboring property or any other property in Folsom Ranch, Central District as a result of your construction, the balance of the deposit minus the review fee will be returned. If the FRARC finds that damage has occurred, the cost for repairs will be taken out of the deposit. The cost for repair services will be based on a time and materials basis with a full accounting provided to the builder. Any unspent deposit will be returned to the builder. In the event that cost for damage repair exceeds...
the initial fee/deposit amount, an invoice will be provided to the builder. If the builder elects not to submit a preliminary plan for comments, the fee/deposit will be due upon the submittal of the Final Design Review application.

**Final Design Review and Approval**

After preliminary review and approval of the materials, colors, and design concept, the builder or builder's agent must submit a final set of working drawings (construction documents), a detailed site plan of the building(s), including grading and drainage plans, fencing plan, irrigation plan, and a landscape plan showing type, size, and quantity of material, for final design approval.

The Committee’s Final Design Review procedure is also structured for a thirty (30) day review period. Applicants must submit two (2) sets of final construction plans as further defined below, and two copies of the application.

Construction plans, i.e. final plans drawn to scale, shall include the following information:

1. **Grading Plan:** The grading plan shall be prepared to comply with Specific Plan guidelines. It may not be required for lots padded by the developer.
   a. Existing topography and the proposed finish grades. The grading plan must include all drainage information including swales, retention areas, berm and erosion control measures, and quantity of excavation, if required. This grading plan must be approved by the Committee before any earthwork begins.
   b. First floor and basement floor elevations must be shown with respect to the site grades.
   c. Indicate driveway widths, drainage culverts, pipe and headwalls, sidewalks, patios, fences and walls, air conditioning, and garage locations.
   d. Show rear deck size with stairs to the lower grade.
   e. Show any extreme site conditions including terrain, trees to be retained, and tree to be removed on the plan.
   f. Show all proposed structures.
   g. Show the lengths, designs, height, finish, and location of all walls (retaining and freestanding) and fences.

2. **Landscape and Irrigation Plan:**
   a. The irrigation plan must include the point of connection to the water source, pipe location and sizes, head and drip emitter locations, zone limits, controller, RP devices and back flow preventer locations.
   b. Landscape plans must show all trees, shrubs, ground cover, and lawn locations,
and be drawn to scale. Plans should include a plant schedule which lists all plants and specifies common and botanical name, height and width minimums, container size, quantity, quality, and typical spacing if applicable.

3. First Floor Plan:
   a. Indicate decks, patios, stoops, retaining walls, trash enclosures, air conditioning screening, front entry step sizes, materials and finishes, driveway areas, and all interior spaces of the first floor.

4. Second Floor Plan and/or Third Floor Plan, if proposed (Commercial or Multi-Family may have more floors - all floor plans are required for submittal):
   a. Indicate lower roof projections, roof overhangs, chimney locations, and all interior spaces.

5. Roof Plan:
   a. Indicate all roof areas and corresponding slopes and gutter and downspout locations.

6. Building Elevations:
   a. Building elevations should be drawn along with floor plans to match the site plan orientation.
   b. Articulate “all” elevations, including hidden elevations, with finishes, window types, trims, and fascia details. Show the proposed finished grades against elevations, garbage screens, air conditioning location, screens, decks, rear stairs, and the maximum height from the first floor to the uppermost roof peak.
   c. Provide samples or a materials board with the exterior color scheme and material selections. Include any brick, stone, siding, and roof tile samples.

7. Specifications and Schedule:
   a. Final construction specifications may be included on drawings or in book form.

8. Approval:
   a. If the Committee or applicant so desire, meetings between the builder and/or their agent and the Committee shall be held during the following week to review the Committee’s comments.
   b. When revisions of the items required to be modified are minor, all parties shall affix signatures on the comments sheet attesting to such and one (1) set of all documents will be returned to the builder marked “Approved as Submitted” or “Approved as Noted”. Plans needing to be extensively modified will be denied and will have to be resubmitted.
   c. Upon approval, the Committee will write a letter to the applicable lot owners, stating the final approval of the plans.
   d. The Committee will retain the final drawings until construction is completed and compliance with approval verified. If work has not started or a continuance not received by the owner or owner’s agent within three (3) years from approval, the approval will then automatically expire.

NOTE: Revisions required by the building department must be resubmitted for final review by the FRARC and construction may not proceed until approved.
Construction Guidelines and Standards

Upon final design approval from the Committee, the plans will be ready for building permit application and construction.

Along with the final design approval from the Committee, other requirements will include:

1. A construction schedule showing start and finish dates. The should be submitted when final plan approval is obtained.

2. The acquisition of a building permit from the City of Folsom.

3. Previously collected funds will be utilized to repair any damage caused by construction personnel or equipment to adjacent property or amenities, or used to clean the construction site if necessary. Checks shall be made payable to “The Folsom Ranch, Central District Community Association.”

4. All signage within the development shall be subject to the City of Folsom’s sign ordinances.

5. Construction of driveways shall be at the time of building permit for each individual lot. The Folsom Ranch, Central District Architectural Review Committee shall review the placement of individual homes and driveways within the project. Site improvement plans for each lot shall be prepared by a Civil Engineer registered to practice in the State of California, based on the Committee’s approved site plans and shall include slope stabilization and erosion control methods. Provisions for the disposal of excess fill material shall be incorporated into the individual lot grading and/or building permit(s) filed with the Building Department.

6. All builders are to maintain their construction sites in a neat and orderly fashion, and shall clean up and remove all debris. The builder and general contractors shall be responsible for the maintenance of such neatness and removal of debris by subcontractors employed on the construction site. Activities expressly prohibited by the Design Guidelines include dumping excess concrete mix on adjacent lots or parcels, and the dumping of waste materials, chemicals, oils, sewage, garbage, paints, insecticides, petroleum or other chemical products, etc., into storm drains and street gutters.

7. Contractors are responsible for providing on-site parking for their work crews’ vehicles.

8. Contractors are responsible for site cleanup.

9. Contractors are responsible for erosion control and must comply with plans as approved by the Folsom Ranch, Central District Architectural Review Committee (FRARC). The FRARC may include more restrictive measures than required by the County/City, if appropriate for this site.

Submittal Fees and Deposits

The Application for Approval, processing fee, damage deposit, and all other materials necessary for the Committee to approve a residence must be sent to:

The Folsom Ranch, Central District Community Association
Architectural Review Committee
3907 Park Drive, Suite 235
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
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Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision Project Booklet (Bound Separately)
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Mangini Ranch Phase 3 Inclusionary Housing Letter dated November 3, 2020
November 3, 2020

Mr. Scott Johnson
Planning Manager
Community Development Department
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

Re: Town Center South Tentative Map Compliance with Chapter 17.104-
Inclusionary Housing

Dear Mr. Johnson,

In accordance with Chapter 17.104 of the Folsom Municipal Code, TCS Improvement Company, LLC hereby elects to satisfy the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requirements for the proposed Small Lot Tentative Map (Town Center South) with the payment of the In-Lieu Fee as permitted in Section 17.104.060(G).

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

TCS Improvement Company, LLC
a California limited liability company

By: HBT Town Center, LLC,
a California limited liability company
Its: Manager

By: [Signature]
William B. Bunce, Member
Planning Commission Staff Report
50 Natoma Street, Council Chambers
Folsom, CA 95630

Project: 4803 White Pine Court Detached Garage Design Review
File #: PN-21-066
Request: Residential Design Review
Location: 4803 White Pine Court (APN 072-3720-068)
Staff Contact: Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner, 916-461-6209
jkinkade@folsom.ca.us

Property Owner/Applicant
Name: JMC Homes
Address: 1430 Blue Oaks Boulevard #190
Roseville, CA 95747

Recommendation: Conduct a public meeting and upon conclusion recommend approval of a Residential Design Review Application for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pine Court (PN 21-066) subject to the findings (Findings A-M) and conditions of approval (Conditions 1-11) attached to this report.

Project Summary: The proposed project involves a request for Residential Design Review approval for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pines Court, within White Rock Springs Ranch Villages 8-9. The property is zoned SP-SF (Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, Single-Family District).

Table of Contents:
1 - Description/Analysis
2 - Background
3 - Conditions of Approval
4 - Vicinity Map
5 - Floor Plan, Elevations and Site Plan, dated March 19, 2021
6 - Approved Colors and Materials Board for White Rock Springs Ranch Villages 8-9
7 - Example Color Elevation, dated April 22, 2021
Submitted,

PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director
APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL
The applicant, JMC Homes, is requesting residential design review approval for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pine Court. The residence approved on this parcel was part of the White Rock Springs Ranch Villages 8-9 master plan approved by the Planning Commission on June 17, 2021. During staff-level approvals of the individual lots, JMC Homes requested that Lot 68 (4803 White Pine Court) also include a detached garage to better utilize the unusual shape of the lot. The applicant is requesting a detached garage only for this specific lot. The garage, as illustrated in Attachments 5 and 6, would be 924 square feet in area, 14.5 feet tall and located 8 feet from the approved residence, 21 feet from the front property line, 20 feet from the rear property line and approximately 9 feet from the side property line. Design-wise, the structure is proposed to match the color, materials, garage door type and building accents of the main residence.

POLICY/RULE
Folsom Municipal Code (FMC), Section 17.06.030 requires that single-family residential master plans submit a Design Review Application for approval by the Planning Commission. Because detached garages were not included in the approved master plan for White Rock Springs Ranch Villages 8-9, Planning Commission approval is required for Design Review of the proposed structure. Section 17.06.080 of the FMC states that, In approving, conditionally approving, or denying an application for design review under this chapter, the community development director or the planning commission shall make the following findings:

1. Project compliance with the general plan and any applicable specific plans and zoning ordinances;

2. Conformance with any adopted city-wide design guidelines;

3. Conformance with any project-specific design guidelines and standards approved through the planned development permit process or similar review process;

4. Compatibility of building materials, textures and colors with surrounding development and consistency with the general design theme of the neighborhood.
### ANALYSIS

#### General Plan and Zoning Consistency

The General Plan land use designation for the project site is SF (Single-Family), and the zoning designation for the project site is SP-SF (Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan-Single-Family District). Single-family residences and detached garages are allowed by right in the Single-Family Specific Plan designation.

Table A.1 of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan describes the setback and height requirements for both the primary structure and accessory structures, including detached garages in the SP-SF Specific Plan designation. The Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan is silent on minimum separation of an accessory structure from the main residence. However, FMC Section 17.58.060(B) states that a garage or accessory building that is not attached to and made part of the main building shall not be closer than eight feet clear distance to main building.

The following table shows how the proposed project relates to the FMC and FPASP zoning requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garage Front Setback</td>
<td>20 feet, behind front plane of residence</td>
<td>21 feet, behind front plane of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Side Setback</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td>9 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Rear Setback</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Garage Height</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
<td>14.5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation from Residence</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above table, the proposed project meets all development standards.

#### Residential Design Review

The proposed project is subject to the White Rock Springs Ranch Design Guidelines, which were approved by the City Council in 2016. The Design Guidelines are a complementary document to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. The Design Guidelines, which are intended to act as an implementation tool for residential development specifically within the White Rock Springs Ranch and Carr Trust subdivisions, provide the design framework for architecture, street scene, and landscaping to convey a master plan identity. While these Design Guidelines establish the quality of architectural and landscape development for the master plan, they are not intended to prevent alternative designs and/or concepts that are compatible with the overall project theme.

The following are the relevant architectural principles intended to guide the design of the White Rock Springs Ranch and Carr Trust Subdivisions to ensure quality development:
• Focus of the home is the front elevation, not the garage
• Provide appropriate massing and roof forms to define the architectural styles
• Ensure that plans and styles provide a degree of individuality
• Use architectural elements and details to reinforce individual architectural styles
• Provide a variety of garage placements

In addition to the general architectural principles referenced previously, the Design Guidelines also provide specific direction regarding a number of architectural situations and features regarding garages. The following are examples of architectural situations and features that are relevant to the proposed project:

• Garage doors shall be consistent with the architecture of the building to reduce the overall visual mass of the garage.
• Where appropriate, single garage doors are encouraged.
• Carriage-style garage doors of upgraded design are encouraged.
• For street-facing garages, the guidelines recommend that one of the following options is utilized:
  o Vary the garage door pattern, windows, and/or color as appropriate to individual architectural styles;
  o use an attached overhead trellis installed beneath the garage roof fascia and/or above garage door header trim;
  o Span the driveway with a gated element or overhead trellis; or
  o Provide a porte cochere.

The proposed building materials are proposed to match the stucco, roofing, window sills and shutters, wainscoting and under-dormer accents of the main residence. The potential color schemes of the main residence were approved by the Planning Commission as part of the White Rock Springs Ranch Villages 8-9 Master Plans Design Review. The design and colors of these homes were deemed consistent with the materials and colors recommended by the Design Guidelines as part of that design review approval. An example color elevation is provided in Attachment 7 to show what the proposed garage would look like with one of the approved color schemes.

By moving the garage 2.5 feet behind the front plane of the residence and recessing the garage door 1.5 feet in back of the rest of the structure, the applicant has ensured that the focus of the lot is on the residence rather than the garage. The front elevation of the garage is broken up into a two-car garage door and windows for the shop, thereby further de-emphasizing the garage. The style of the garage door is consistent with that of the approved garage door for the residence. While the guidelines call for a variety of garage doors, they also call for consistency with the architecture of the building, so since the garage doors will be on the same lot, using the same type of garage door is appropriate in this case. Taking into consideration the aforementioned architectural
details, materials, and colors, staff has determined that the design of the proposed detached garage is consistent with the design principles established by the White Rock Springs Ranch Design Guidelines. As a result, staff forwards the following design recommendations to the Commission for consideration:

1. This approval is for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pine Court. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached site plan, floor plan and building elevations dated March 19, 2021 and colors on the elevations dated April 22, 2021.

2. The design, materials, and colors for the proposed detached garage shall be consistent with the submitted building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

3. The color scheme of the garage shall match that of the main residence on the lot.

These recommendations listed above are included in the conditions of approval presented for consideration by the Planning Commission (Condition No. 11).

PUBLIC NOTICING
A notice was posted on the project site five days prior to the Planning Commission meeting of May 19, 2021 that met the requirements of FMC Section 17.06.070.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
The City, as lead agency, previously certified an EIR/EIS for the FPASP. Subsequently, the City determined that the White Rock Springs Ranch Subdivision project is entirely consistent with the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) and therefore the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act as provided by Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182. Since that determination was made, none of the events described in Public Resources Code section 21166 or CEQA Guidelines section 15162 (e.g. substantial changes to the project) have occurred. Therefore, no environmental review is required in association with this application.

In addition, this project is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures). Subsection e specifically exempts garages from environmental review.

Based on staff’s analysis of this project, none of the exceptions in Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines apply to the use of the categorical exemptions in this case.

RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
Based on the analysis described above, staff recommends approval of the proposed
project.

Move to Approve a Residential Design Review Application for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pine Court as illustrated on Attachments 5 and 6 for the 4803 White Pine Court Detached Garage Design Review project (PN 21-066) subject to the findings (Findings A-M) and conditions of approval (Conditions 1-11) attached to this report.

GENERAL FINDINGS

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

B. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AND THE WHITE ROCK SPRINGS RANCH DESIGN GUIDELINES.

CEQA FINDINGS

C. THE CITY, AS LEAD AGENCY, PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

D. THE CITY PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED THAT THE WHITE ROCK SPRINGS RANCH SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN.

E. THE CITY PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED THAT THE WHITE ROCK SPRINGS RANCH SUBDIVISION PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65457 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15182.

F. NONE OF THE EVENTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 21166 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE OR SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES HAVE OCCURRED.

G. THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UNDER SECTION 15303 (NEW CONSTRUCTION OR CONVERSION OF SMALL STRUCTURES) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

H. THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF SUCCESSIVE PROJECTS OF THE SAME TYPE IN THE SAME PLACE, OVER TIME, IS NOT SIGNIFICANT IN THIS CASE.
I. NO UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST TO DISTINGUISH THE PROPOSED PROJECT FROM OTHERS IN THE EXEMPT CLASS.

J. NO ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR THIS APPLICATION.

DESIGN REVIEW FINDINGS

K. THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE FOLSOM PLAN AREA SPECIFIC PLAN, AND THE APPLICABLE ZONING ORDINANCES.

L. THE PROJECT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE WHITE ROCK SPRINGS RANCH DESIGN GUIDELINES.

M. THE BUILDING MATERIALS, TEXTURES, AND COLORS OF THE PROJECT WILL BE COMPATIBLE WITH SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT AND CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL DESIGN THEME OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
BACKGROUND

On March 22, 2016, the City Council approved a Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Project Design Guidelines, Inclusionary Housing Plan, and Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement for development of a 395-unit single-family residential subdivision (White Rock Springs Ranch Subdivision) on a 138.9-acre property located within the southeast portion of the Folsom Plan Area. The Large-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map subdivided the subject property into 10 single-family residential lots, 6 open space lots, a portion of a school site, and a portion of a neighborhood park site. The Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map subdivided the large-lot residential parcels into 395 single-family residential lots. Lastly, the White Rock Springs Ranch Design Guidelines were approved for the orderly development of the proposed single-family residential subdivision. The Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map associated with the project received an automatic three-year extension in 2018 as provided for by the State Subdivision Map Act.

On June 28, 2016, the City Council approved a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Project Design Guidelines, Inclusionary Housing Plan, and Amendment No. 1 to the First Amended and Restated Tier 1 Development Agreement for development of a 28-unit single-family residential subdivision (Carr Trust Property Subdivision) on a 14.67-acre property located within the southeast portion of the Folsom Plan Area. The General Plan Amendment changed the General Plan land use designations from MLD and OS to SFHD and OS. The Specific Plan Amendment changed the Specific Plan land use designations from SP-OS2 and SP-MLD to SP-OS2 and SP-SFHD-PD. The Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map subdivided one of the subject parcels into 28 single-family residential lots. Lastly, the Carr Trust at White Rock Springs Ranch Design Guidelines were approved for the orderly development of the proposed single-family residential subdivision. The Small-Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map associated with the project received an automatic three-year extension in 2018 as provided for by the State Subdivision Map Act.

On June 17, 2020, the Planning Commission approved a Residential Design Review Application submitted by JMC Homes for 86 single-family residential units situated within the previously approved White Rock Ranch Springs Villages 8 and 9. The aforementioned Design Review approval included ten (10) individual master plans with three (3) distinct California heritage-themed architectural styles (Craftsman, Spanish Colonial, and French Cottage) and fifteen (15) color and material alternatives.
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
SF (Single-Family)

SPECIFIC PLAN DESIGNATION
SP-SF (Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan, Single-Family District)

ADJACENT LAND USES/ZONING
North: White Pine Court with approved undeveloped residential land (SP-SF) beyond
East: Approved undeveloped residential land (SP-SF)
South: Landscape buffer with Sycamore Creek Way (SP-SF) beyond
West: Landscape buffer with Sycamore Creek Way (SP-SF) beyond

SITE CHARACTERISTICS
The project site is currently graded and improved and is pending construction of a single-family residence.

APPLICABLE CODES
FPASP (Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan)
White Rock Springs Ranch Design Guidelines
FMC 17.06, Design Review
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Conditions of Approval
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR 4803 WHITE PINE COURT DETACHED GARAGE DESIGN REVIEW (PN 21-066)

<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>1.</td>
<td>The applicant shall submit final site development plans to the Community Development Department that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below and attached to this staff report:</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Plan, dated March 19, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building Elevations, dated March 19, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Floor Plan, dated March 19, 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This project approval is for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pine Court as illustrated on Attachments 5 and 6 for the 4803 White Pine Court Detached Garage Design Review project (PN 21-066). Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above-referenced items as modified by these conditions of approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Building 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.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The project approvals granted under this staff report (Residential Design Review) shall remain in effect for two years from final date of approval (May 19, 2023). 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.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR 4803 WHITE PINE COURT DETACHED GARAGE DESIGN REVIEW (PN 21-066)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Condition/Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>When Required</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.                 | 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, NS     |

### DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND FEE REQUIREMENTS

| 5.                 | 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.                                                                 | B             | CD (P)(E)              |
| 6.                 | If applicable, the owner/applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees.                                                                                                           | B             | CD (E)                 |
| 7.                 | 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. | B             | CD (P)(E)              |
## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR 4803 WHITE PINE COURT DETACHED GARAGE DESIGN REVIEW (PN 21-066)

<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>8.</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 Final Map, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>CD (P)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</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, 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 will begin on the date of final approval (June 17, 2020). 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>10.</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>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHITECTURE/SITE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

11. The project shall comply with the following architecture and design requirements:

1. This approval is for a 924-square-foot detached garage located at 4803 White Pine Court. The applicant shall submit building plans that comply with this approval and the attached site plan, floor plan and building elevations dated March 19, 2021 and colors on the elevations dated April 22, 2021.

2. The design, materials, and colors for the proposed detached garage shall be consistent with the submitted building elevations, materials samples, and color scheme to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.

3. The color scheme of the garage shall match that of the main residence on the lot.

4. All mechanical equipment shall be ground-mounted and concealed from view of public streets, neighboring properties and nearby higher buildings. For lots abutting the open space areas, mechanical equipment shall be located out of view from open space areas.

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 (P) Community Development Department</td>
<td>I  Prior to approval of Improvement Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Planning Division</td>
<td>M  Prior to approval of Final Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Engineering Division</td>
<td>B  Prior to issuance of first Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Building Division</td>
<td>O  Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Fire Division</td>
<td>G  Prior to issuance of Grading Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW Public Works Department</td>
<td>DC  During construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Park and Recreation</td>
<td>OG  On-going requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 4

Vicinity Map
Attachment 5

Floor Plan, Elevations and Site Plan, dated March 19, 2021
Attachment 6

Approved Colors and Materials Board for White Rock Springs Ranch Villages 8-9
Attachment 7

Example Color Elevation, dated April 22, 2021