

Broadstone Villas

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared by:

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

With technical support from:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
11 Natoma Street, Suite 155
Folsom, CA 95630

October 2021

Volume 1 of 2

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND	1
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
3.1 Project Location	2
3.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses	2
3.3 Project Characteristics	2
3.3.1. Parking and Circulation	3
3.3.2. Utilities	4
3.3.3. Sustainability Features	4
3.3.4. Trash/Recycling	5
3.3.5. Fencing and Signage	5
3.3.6. Landscaping	5
3.4 Construction and Phasing	5
3.5 City Regulation of Urban Development	5
3.5.1. General Plan	5
3.5.2. Zoning Ordinance	6
3.5.3. Community Development Department Standard Construction Conditions	6
3.5.4. City of Folsom Municipal Code	7
4.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES	9
5.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS	9
6.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	9
6.1 City of Folsom General Plan	9
6.2 Tiering	9
6.3 Incorporation of the Folsom 2035 General Plan and Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan EIRs by Reference	10
7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	11
7.1 DETERMINATION	12
8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST	13
I. AESTHETICS	14
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES	17

III.	AIR QUALITY	19
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	28
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES	38
VI.	ENERGY	49
VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	52
VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	56
IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	63
X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	66
XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	72
XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES	74
XIII.	NOISE	75
XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING	84
XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES.....	86
XVI.	RECREATION.....	88
XVII.	TRANSPORTATION	90
XVIII.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	105
XIX.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	109
XX.	WILDFIRE.....	112
XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	114
9.0	MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.....	117
10.0	INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS	117
11.0	REFERENCES	118

LIST OF TABLES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Neighboring Land Uses	2
2	City of Folsom Municipal Code Regulating Construction and Development.....	8
3	Sacramento County – Attainment Status	20
4	Summary of Annual Air Quality Data for Folsom Area Air Quality Monitoring Stations	21
5	Construction Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions.....	25
6	Previous Studies Conducted within the Study Area	41
7	Previously Documented Resources within the Study Area	44
8	California Electricity Sources 2019.....	49
9	Global Warming Potentials and Atmospheric Lifetimes.....	57
10	City of Folsom Municipal Code Sections Regulating the Effects on Hydrology and Water Quality from Urban Development.....	68
11	Ambient Noise Measurement Results	76
12	Off-site Traffic Noise Levels	79
13	Project HVAC Noise.....	81
14	Study Intersections	91
15	US 50 Study Segments	92
16	Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections	93
17	Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections.....	94
18	Level of Service Criteria – Basic Freeway Segments	96
19	Level of Service Criteria – Freeway Ramp Merge/Diverge Areas	96
20	Existing 2021 Intersection Delay and LOS.....	98
21	Existing 2021 US 50 Segment Density and LOS.....	99
22	Project Trip Generation	99
23	Existing 2021 Intersection Delay and LOS, with and without Project.....	100
24	Existing 2021 US 50 Segment Density and LOS, with and without Project	100
25	EPAP 2026 Intersection Delay and LOS.....	101
26	EPAP 2026 US 50 Segment Density and LOS.....	101
27	EPAP 2026 Intersection Delay and LOS, with and without Project.....	102
28	EPAP 2026 US 50 Segment Density and LOS, with and without Project	102

LIST OF APPENDICES

A	Figures
B	Air Quality Modeling Results and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist
C	Biological Resource Database Queries
D	Cultural Resources Assessment Report
E	Geotechnical Engineering Study Update
F	Noise Analysis
G	Transportation Impact Study
H	Tribal Cultural Resources Correspondence
I	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
APN	Assessors Parcel Number
AWSC	All-Way Stop Control
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CARB	California Air Resources Control Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CH ₄	Methane
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	Decibels
dBA	A-weighted Decibel
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EBC	East Bidwell Corridor
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPAP	Existing plus Approved Project
EV	Electric Vehicle
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
GHG	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
GWh	Gigawatt hours
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
HVAC	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning
ISMND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
LID	Low Impact Design
LOS	Level of Service
LSAA	Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MHD	Multi-Family High Density

MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MRTD	Minimum Required Throat Depth
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
N ₂ O	Nitrous Oxide
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
O ₃	Ozone
PD	Planned Development
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric
PM	Particulate Matter
PRC	Public Resources Code
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
sf	Square foot/feet
SF ₆	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SSO	Sanitary Sewer Overflows
STC	Sound Transmission Class
SWITRS	Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resources
TIS	Transportation Impact Study
TNM	Traffic Noise Model
TWSC	Two-Way Stop Control
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WL	Watch List

This page intentionally left blank

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Elliott Home (Applicant) proposes to construct Broadstone Villas (proposed project), a 257-unit apartment community on an 18.44 ±-gross acre site located at 1565 Cavitt Drive on the eastern corner of East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway in the City of Folsom.

This Initial Study addresses the proposed project and whether it may cause significant effects on the environment. These potential environmental effects are further evaluated to determine whether they were examined in the Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report (EIR; 2018). In particular, consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) §21083.3, this Initial Study focuses on any effects on the environment which are specific to the proposed project, or to the parcels on which the project would be located, which were not analyzed as potentially significant effects in the General Plan EIR, or for which substantial new information shows that identified effects would be more significant than described in the previous EIRs. For additional information regarding the relationship between the proposed project and the previous EIRs, see Section 6 of this Initial Study.

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

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

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The proposed project is comprised of Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 072-0270-155-0000 and falls within the plan area for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan (SP 95-1). The Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area encompasses approximately 570 acres between East Bidwell Street and the Empire Ranch Specific Plan area and is bounded by Folsom Lake College to the north and U.S. Highway 50 to the south. An EIR for the Specific Plan was certified by the City Council in September 1994.

The Specific Plan establishes guidance and regulations for development within the plan area. The analysis contained in the EIRs prepared for the Specific Plan are incorporated into this Initial Study, as applicable. Additionally, the following technical reports, quantified analysis and/or surveys were used in preparation of this Initial Study and are incorporated by reference:

- Air Quality Modeling and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist performed by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (October 2021).
- Biological Resource Evaluation prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (September 2021).
- Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning (October 2021).
- Geotechnical Engineering Study Update prepared by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc (April 2021).

- Noise modeling performed by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (October 2021).
- Transportation Impact Study prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (September 2021).
- Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with Assembly Bill 52 and CEQA prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (October 2021).

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Project Location

The project site is located at 1565 Cavitt Drive, on the eastern corner of East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway, west of Cavitt Drive in the City of Folsom (City) in Sacramento County, California. The project site consists of APN 072-0270-155. The site has frontage along East Bidwell Street, Broadstone Parkway, and Cavitt Drive. The 18.49-acre project site is a part of a larger, estimated 37.20-acre parcel; the applicant proposes subdividing this parcel between the 18.49-acre site for this project and an estimated 18.69-acre parcel for future commercial development (development of the second parcel is not considered as part of this Initial Study). The site is located within Section 5, Township 9 North, Range 8 East (Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute "Folsom and Clarksville Quadrangle"). Refer to **Figure 1** for the project site and vicinity map and **Figure 2** for the site plan. Note: All figures are located in **Appendix A**. The property is owned by Elliott Homes.

3.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is currently undeveloped and rough graded. An existing Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) substation sits near the eastern boundary of the site along Cavitt Drive; this substation would be unchanged by the proposed project. East of Cavitt Drive is a residential subdivision (Village 3A of the Broadstone Unit 3 Specific Plan Area) and Handy Family Park. The site is also bordered to the east by the Talavera Apartments. North of the site is Broadstone Parkway and a commercial shopping center beyond. Along the west boundary, a railroad corridor with a bicycle trail separates the project site from East Bidwell Street; across East Bidwell Street is another commercial shopping center. South of the project site is vacant, rough graded land which may be developed into multifamily residential or mixed-use commercial development in the future.

Neighboring land uses are summarized in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Neighboring Land Uses

Direction	Land Use
North	Broadstone Parkway, commercial shopping center
East	Cavitt Drive, Handy Family Park, residential subdivision
South	Vacant, rough graded land
West	Railroad corridor, bicycle trail, East Bidwell Street, commercial shopping center

3.3 Project Characteristics

A total of 257 apartment units would be constructed and would include the following unit configurations: 1-bedroom and 1-bath; 2-bedroom and 2-bath; 2-bedroom and 2.5-bath; 3-bedroom

and 2.5-bath; and 3-bedroom and 3-bath. The units would be located within 33 three-story buildings. One standalone six-car garage would be constructed. Additionally, a one-story clubhouse would be constructed that would include approximately 6,063-square feet (sf) of amenity area and 1,104-sf of building support area. Residential areas would total approximately 285,229-sf. When additionally considering 89,770-sf of garage space, 3,327-sf of building support area, 28,510-sf of circulation areas (hallways, etc.), and 6,063-sf of amenity space provided by the clubhouse, the development would total approximately 412,889-sf. The overall density for the project would be approximately 19.63 dwelling units per acre.

Residential units would range from approximately 770- to 1,781-sf each. Each unit would be designed with a full kitchen, living space, at least one storage closet, and a washer and dryer included within the unit. Some of the second- and third-floor units would have balconies, and first floor units would have access to an area of deck space adjoining each unit. Maximum building height of the residential buildings, at the roofline, would be approximately 30-feet above grade, and the parapets would screen the building-attached mechanical equipment from view. All units would be market rate.

Community amenities would include an estimated 7,167-sf clubhouse (with 6,063-sf of amenity space and 1,104-sf of building support space) that would include a lobby, a quiet lounge, a lounge game room with a pool table and shuffle court, a kitchen, a work room, six restrooms, a pet room, a bike room, and a fitness center. Outside the clubhouse would be a large pool, spa, cabanas, outdoor kitchens, bocce ball, fire pits, and lounge areas. Additional outdoor amenities would include landscaped courtyards and walkways adjacent to the residential buildings, along with two dog parks with synthetic turf. Two leasing offices would be adjacent to the lobby within the clubhouse. Refer to **Figures 3A-3D** for artist rendering of the building facades.

3.3.1. Parking and Circulation

A road would be constructed along the southern boundary of the project site; this road would run roughly east-west and would provide access between Cavitt Drive and East Bidwell Street. One driveway would be constructed along the north side of this road to provide access to the project site. Both the new road and this driveway would have minimum inside turn radii of 25-feet and minimum outside turn radii of 50-feet and would be accessible to emergency vehicles. Additionally, a driveway accessing the project site would be constructed along the eastern edge of East Bidwell Street. This driveway would have minimum inside turn radii of 25-feet and minimum outside turn radii of 50-feet and would be accessible to emergency vehicles. The site would also be accessible via a driveway in the northeastern corner of the site that would also provide access to the existing, adjacent Talavera Apartments and Broadstone Parkway, and it would have the same turn radii as described above. Right turn lane pockets would be constructed along the eastern side of East Bidwell Street to provide access to both the proposed new road and the proposed driveway immediately bordering East Bidwell Street. The minimum turn radii described above would also be applied to internal roads and driveways circulating throughout the project site such that emergency vehicles would have access to all site buildings and units.

Existing sidewalks along Cavitt Drive would be maintained. New sidewalks would be constructed to provide access to each of the proposed buildings and parking areas. Additionally, new sidewalks would be constructed to provide pedestrian access between the project site and Broadstone Parkway, East Bidwell Street, and Cavitt Drive. Additionally, a bike trail would be constructed in coordination with the City between East Bidwell Street and the project site.

The proposed project would include a total of 523 parking spaces. This would consist of 285 spaces in tuck-under garages, six spaces in one standalone, detached garage, 202 surface spaces, and 30 tandem surface spaces. The parking supply includes 12 Americans with Disabilities Act accessible spaces, and 12 electric vehicle charging spaces, of which six would be equipped with charging infrastructure. Proposed parking would be provided at a ratio of 2.04 spaces per dwelling unit.

The Design Guidelines for Multi-Family Development (1998) require multi-family apartment projects to provide 1.5 parking spaces for a one-bedroom unit, 1.75 parking spaces for a 2-bedroom unit, 2.00 parking spaces for a 3-bedroom unit, and 1.00 guest parking space for per every five units. Applying the parking recommendations of the Design Guidelines for Multi-Family Development, the proposed project would require 490 spaces (when rounding up). The applicant proposes providing a total of 523 parking spaces (which would equal approximately 2.04 parking spaces per unit), which would exceed this requirement.

The Folsom Municipal Code requires one bicycle parking space for every five residential units. With 257 residential units, the project requires 51 bicycle parking spaces. It should also be noted that Mitigation Measure GHG-01, prescribed in Section VIII – Greenhouse Gas Emissions, requires the project to provide 5 percent more bicycle parking spaces than required in the City's Municipal Code, for a total of 54 bicycle parking spaces.

3.3.2. Utilities

Proposed utilities include domestic water, sanitary sewer line, fire service line and fire water main, primary and secondary electric lines, and gas line. Domestic water would tie-in with existing public domestic water on Cavitt Drive (West of Kilrush). Water located on-site would be privately owned and maintained. A sanitary sewer line would connect to existing public sewer lines on the northwestern portion of the site. Sanitary sewer located on-site would be privately owned and maintained. The fire service line and fire water main would connect from Broadstone Parkway and the Kilrush extension. The on-site storm drain would conform to City of Folsom standards. Each residential building would include a rooftop photovoltaic (solar) system ranging from 10kW to 16kW per building.

3.3.3. Sustainability Features

The project design incorporates sustainable features consistent with General Plan Goal LU 9.1 and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). The project would exceed the 2019 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) by 15 percent or more. The project provides 12 electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces using six dual charging stations along with 41 EV-capable spaces with CALGreen. The buildings' position in a north-south orientation maximizes passive solar access and natural lighting. In addition, a rooftop photovoltaic system (approximately 412 kilowatts) would serve the community.

Hardscapes, such as decorative pavement, concrete refuse collection pads, pedestrian pathways, outdoor dining patios, outdoor lounge area and pool deck, dog park, and the bocce court would be constructed with cool paving materials (slag concrete). Cool paving areas, including shaded areas, account for approximately 68 percent of the non-roof impervious area.

3.3.4. Trash/Recycling

Seven trash/recycling/compost areas would be constructed throughout the facility. Each would include four trash, four recycling, and three yard compost collection containers. Private landscape contractors would haul green waste (organic material) from the project site.

3.3.5. Fencing and Signage

The project site would be enclosed by a combination of retaining walls with tubular steel fencing on top or a tube steel fence. Portions of the project site, including the proposed dog park, would be enclosed using a 30-inch-tall retaining wall capped with a 48-inch-tall steel tube fence. Other portions of the project site would be enclosed using a 6-foot-tall steel tube fence.

3.3.6. Landscaping

Outside the clubhouse would be a large pool, spa, cabanas, outdoor kitchens, bocce ball, fire pits, and lounge areas. Additional outdoor amenities would include landscaped courtyards and walkways adjacent to the residential buildings, along with two dog parks with synthetic turf. Landscaping would be designed to complement the buildings and make a positive contribution to the overall aesthetics of the site. HVAC units would be roof-mounted and screened from sight to allow for additional landscaping. The landscape would be water efficient and low maintenance. Low-profile shrubs, including screening shrubs, are planned along with shade and canopy trees. Tree species would include dwarf strawberry tree, Japanese blueberry tree, Natchez crape myrtle, swan hill olive, Keith Davey Chinese pistache, valley oak, cork oak, interior live oak, accolade elm, frontier elm, hybrid fan palm, and city sprite zelkova. The planting design features a variety of Mediterranean-style, native or naturalized, drought-tolerant, and low-fuel species complementary of the architectural style and setting.

3.4 Construction and Phasing

The project site would be graded in a single phase and balanced on the project site and adjacent future commercial area as needed. The project's construction will be completed in nine-phases and take approximately 3 years to complete.

3.5 City Regulation of Urban Development

3.5.1. General Plan

The site is designated as Community Commercial (CC) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The CC designation provides for community-based retail and service uses intended to serve residential neighborhoods within the city. This designation allows for a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.2-0.5. In addition, the site has been assigned an overlay designation (East Bidwell Street Mixed-Use Overlay) by the General Plan.

The General Plan also designates the site within the East Bidwell Corridor overlay (EBC Overlay), which allows mixed-use development and allows commercial and residential uses that are mutually compatible along East Bidwell Street. The EBC Overlay allows multi-family housing as well as retail commercial, restaurants, office, and other compatible uses. The acceptable density range within this overlay is 20-30 dwelling units per acre, and the acceptable floor area ratio is 0.5 to 1.5. The density of the proposed project would be 19.63 dwelling units (DU) per acre (rounded to 20 DU/acre). Given that the project site is within the EBC Overlay, the proposed multi-family use is consistent with the existing General Plan designation.

3.5.2. Zoning Ordinance

The zoning designation of the site is SP 95-1 (Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan) with an underlying specific plan designation of C-2 (Central Business District). In the C-2 (Central Business District) zone, apartments are not an expressly permitted use (Zoning Code 17.22.030).

Currently, the proposed project is not consistent with the Zoning Code, FMC Chapter 17.22. However, state law makes clear that a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective General Plan standards and criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the General Plan (Gov. Code § 65589.5(j)(4).) While the zoning for the project site (C-2) does not expressly allow residential development, that prohibition is inconsistent with the General Plan (EBC Overlay), with which the project complies. Accordingly, state law prohibits a finding that the proposed project is inconsistent with applicable zoning standards or requires a re-zone (Gov. Code § 65589.5(j)(4)) and it also prohibits a denial of the project based on inconsistency with the zoning ordinance (Gov. Code § 65589.5(d)(2)(A)).

The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). Section 5.4.2 of the Broadstone 3 Specific Plan identifies that a PD Permit is required for multi-family land uses. The purpose of the PD Permit is to allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. With the PD Permit, the project's site plan, elevations, and overall project design would be evaluated, and specific development standards defined. If a PD Permit were to be granted, the project would be deemed consistent with the existing zoning district applicable to the site.

3.5.3. Community Development Department Standard Construction Conditions

The City's standard construction requirements are set forth in the City of Folsom, Community Development Standard Construction Specifications updated in July of 2020. A summary of these requirements is set forth below and incorporated by reference into the project description. Copies of these documents may be reviewed at the City of Folsom, Community Development Department, 50 East Natoma Street, Folsom, California 95630.

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

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

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

Water Pollution – Requires compliance with City water pollution regulations, including National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) provisions.

Sound Control Requirements – Requires that all construction work comply with all local sound control and noise level rules, including the Folsom Noise Ordinance (discussed further below), and that all construction vehicles be equipped with a muffler to control sound levels.

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

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

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

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

Existing Utilities – Regulates the relocation and protection of utilities.

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

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

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

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

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

3.5.4. City of Folsom Municipal Code

The City regulates many aspects of construction and development through requirements and ordinances established in the Folsom Municipal Code. These requirements are summarized in **Table 2**, and hereby incorporated by reference into the Project Description as though fully set forth herein. Copies of these documents may be reviewed at the City of Folsom, Office of the City Clerk, 50 East Natoma Street; Folsom, California 95630.

Table 2. City of Folsom Municipal Code Regulating Construction and Development

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
8.42	Noise Control	Establishes interior and exterior noise standards that may not be exceeded within structures, including residences; establishes time periods for construction operations.
8.70	Stormwater Management and Discharge Control	Establishes conditions and requirements for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm-drainage system; requires preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans.
9.34	Hazardous Materials Disclosure	Defines hazardous materials; requires filing of a Hazardous Material Disclosure Form by businesses that manufacture, use, or store such materials.
9.35	Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances	Establishes standards for the construction and monitoring of facilities used for the underground storage of hazardous substances, and establishes a procedure for issuance of permits for the use of these facilities.
12.16	Tree Preservation	Regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees.
13.26	Water Conservation	Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.
14.19	Energy Code	Adopts the California Energy Code, 2019 Edition, published as Part 6, Title 24, C.C.R. to require energy efficiency standards for structures.
14.20	Green Building Standards Code	Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2019 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4, A5, and A6.1 published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encourage sustainable construction practices.
14.29	Grading Code	Requires a grading permit prior to the initiation of any grading, excavation, fill or dredging; establishes standards, conditions, and requirements for grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage, and revegetation.
14.32	Flood Damage Prevention	Restricts or prohibits uses that cause water or erosion hazards, or that result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights; requires that uses vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage; controls the modification of floodways; regulates activities that may increase flood damage or that could divert floodwaters.

4.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project objectives are to:

- Provide a variety of housing opportunities consistent with the 2035 General Plan, including the Housing Element, which identifies guiding principles, goals, and policies for housing choices for all generations.
- Develop housing opportunities at an infill location served by existing infrastructure and proximate to services and commercial development.

5.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS

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

- Planned Development Permit for a 257-unit multi-family apartment project in the C-2 PD zone.
- Tentative Parcel Map

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

- Adoption of the Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program: The City of Folsom Planning Commission will act as the lead agency as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will have authority to determine if the Initial Study is adequate under CEQA.
- Approval of project: The City of Folsom Planning Commission will consider approval of the project and the entitlement described above.

6.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

6.1 City of Folsom General Plan

The Program EIR for the City of Folsom General Plan (2018) provides relevant policy guidance for this environmental analysis. The EIR evaluated the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan (2035 General Plan) (City of Folsom 2018a). The Program EIR is intended to provide information to the public and to decision makers regarding the potential effects of adoption and implementation of the 2035 General Plan, which consists of a comprehensive update of Folsom's current General Plan. The 2035 General Plan consists of a policy document, including Land Use and Circulation Diagrams.

6.2 Tiering

"Tiering" refers to the relationship between a program-level EIR (where long-range programmatic cumulative impacts are the focus of the environmental analysis) and subsequent environmental

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

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

In the case of the proposed project, this Initial Study tiers from the EIR for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan, and the EIR for the City of Folsom General Plan. The Folsom General Plan, as amended, is a project that is related to the proposed project and, pursuant to §15152(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, tiering of environmental documents is appropriate.

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

City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 East Natoma Street (2nd Floor)
Folsom, CA 95630
Contact: Mr. Steve Banks, Principal Planner
(916) 461-6207

6.3 Incorporation of the Folsom 2035 General Plan and Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan EIRs by Reference

The EIRs for the Folsom 2035 General Plan and the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan are comprehensive documents. Due to various references to the Folsom 2035 General Plan and Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan EIRs in this proposed project, and to its importance relative to understanding the environmental analysis that has occurred to date with respect to development in the Folsom area, both documents are hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15150.

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

7.1 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The lead agency has defined the column headings in the environmental checklist as follows:

- A. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant even with the incorporation of mitigation. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- B. “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the inclusion of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” All mitigation measures are described, including a brief explanation of how the measures reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced.
- C. “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project does not create an impact that exceeds a stated significance threshold.
- D. “No Impact” applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. “No Impact” answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

The explanation of each issue identifies the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Where appropriate, the discussion identifies the following:

- a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identifies where earlier analyses are available for review.
- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identifies which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and states whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” 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.

I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The project site is currently undeveloped and rough graded. An existing SMUD substation sits near the eastern boundary of the site along Cavitt Drive; this substation would be unchanged by the proposed project. East of Cavitt Drive is a residential subdivision (Village 3A of the Broadstone Unit 3 Specific Plan Area) and Handy Family Park. The site is also bordered to the east by the Talavera Apartments. North of the site is Broadstone Parkway and a commercial shopping center. Along the west boundary, a railroad corridor with a bicycle trail separates the project site from East Bidwell Street; across East Bidwell Street is another commercial shopping center. South of the project site is vacant, rough graded land which may be developed into multifamily residential or mixed-use commercial development in the future.

The proposed project would include the construction of 257 new apartment units within 33 three-story buildings (405,732-gross sf). One standalone six-car garage would be constructed. Additionally, a one-story clubhouse would be constructed that would include 6,063-sf of amenity area and 1,104-sf of building support area. Maximum building height of the residential buildings, at the roofline, would be approximately 30 feet 1 inch above grade, and the parapets would screen the building-attached mechanical equipment from view, including HVAC units. The development would include 232 outdoor parking spaces adjacent to the proposed buildings.

Landscaping is proposed to complement the proposed building design and would include low-profile shrubs and canopy trees. Trees of various sizes would be planted in the parking lot areas and surrounding the apartment buildings. Existing trees and vegetation outside of the project grading limits to the south and east would not be removed. The project would blend proposed landscaping in with the existing surrounding landscaping.

Evaluation of Aesthetics

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

No impact. Neither the project site nor the surrounding areas are scenic vistas due to the existing nearby commercial and residential developments. Further, neither the project site, nor views to or from the project site, have been designated as important scenic resources by the City or any other public agency. Therefore, the proposed development would not interfere with or degrade a scenic vista, and no impact would occur.

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

No impact. The site is currently vacant and rough graded, with one existing SMUD substation. A few trees are located along the western and northern boundaries of the parcel. No other potential scenic resources are at the project site. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is the segment of US Highway 50 from Placerville to Echo Summit, beginning approximately 19 miles east of the project site (Caltrans 2021). Given that no eligible or designated state scenic highways are located near the project site, there would be no impact.

- c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is located within an urbanized area of Folsom, surrounded by commercial and residential development. The site is rough graded and the existing character of the site would be modified further by the proposed development. Although the proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the site and the surrounding area, the proposed project is consistent with types of uses envisioned and permitted in the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan and the Folsom General Plan. Renderings of the proposed project are presented as **Figures 3A-3D**. The project is consistent with the C-2 PD zone development standards and would be designed consistent with the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan Design Guidelines and the City's Design Guidelines for Multi-Family Development. The design guidelines are intended to establish and reinforce the neighborhood character of the Broadstone Specific Plan through the use of quality design, materials, and colors. The proposed land use is consistent with the overall suburban character and ongoing development in the vicinity, and is expected to integrate into the existing and planned development of the area. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on visual character and no mitigation is necessary.

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

Less than significant impact. The project would include a combination of free-standing parking lot lights, recessed carport lights, walkway lights, and building-attached lights. To minimize potential lighting-related impacts, free-standing parking lot lights and recessed carport lights would be screened, shielded, and directed downward to minimize glare towards the surrounding properties. New lighting installed with the development of the proposed project would be subject to City standard practices regarding

night lighting that would be made a condition of approval of the PD Permit. The proposed apartment buildings and other project features would comply with design standards outlined in the Folsom Municipal Code. The exterior of the proposed apartment buildings would not be made of reflective materials that would introduce a new source of glare, and existing City standards would limit light spillover and intensity. Therefore, impacts would be a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is necessary.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

No agricultural activities or timber management occur on the project site or in adjacent areas and the project site is not designated for agricultural or timberland uses. The California Important Farmlands Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation (CDC) classifies the project site and surrounding area as Urban and Built-Up land (CDC 2021). Urban and Built-Up Land is land occupied by structures or infrastructure to accommodate a building density of at least one unit to 1.5-acres, or approximately six structures to 10.0-acres.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey report generated for the project site (NRCS 2021) indicates that the soil unit at the site, Argonaut-Auburn complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes, is not Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, or Unique Farmland.

Evaluation of Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No impact. The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance (Farmland), as indicated in the CDC Important Farmland Finder (CDC 2021). Therefore, the project would have no impact on important farmland resources.

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

No impact. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

- c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

OR

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

No impact. The project site is not zoned for, nor used as, timberland or forest land, and is mostly devoid of tree cover except for a small number of ornamental trees growing near the site borders. See Section 8.IV for a discussion of any impacts to these trees. Because the project site is not designated nor zoned as forest land or timber land, is not used for such a purpose, and would not naturally support a crop of commercial timber species, no impact would occur for c) and d).

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

No impact. Because no portion of the City or the project site are zoned for forest land or timberland, and the project site is not zoned for agriculture nor designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, no impact would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted air quality modeling (CalEEMod) for the proposed project based primarily on the preliminary site plan and the Transportation Impact Study conducted by T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (2021). Air quality modeling output files and quantitative results are presented in **Appendix B**.

Environmental Setting

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

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

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as people with

asthma, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The EPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for seven air pollution constituents. As permitted by the Clean Air Act, California has adopted more stringent air emissions standards (California Ambient Air Quality Standards, or CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air constituents.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for any state standard. An “attainment” designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A “nonattainment” designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once. The air quality attainment status of the SVAB, including the City of Folsom, is shown in **Table 3**.

Table 3. Sacramento County – Attainment Status

POLLUTANT	STATE OF CALIFORNIA ATTAINMENT STATUS	FEDERAL ATTAINMENT STATUS
Ozone (1-hour)	Nonattainment	No Federal Standard
Ozone (8-hour)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Nonattainment	Attainment
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	Attainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Lead	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	Attainment	Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	No Federal Standard

Sources: SMAQMD 2020.

Sacramento County is designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state PM₁₀ standards, and the federal PM_{2.5} standards. Concentrations of all other pollutants meet state and federal standards.

Ozone is not emitted directly into the environment, but is generated from complex chemical reactions between ROG, or non-methane hydrocarbons, and NO_x that occur in the presence of sunlight. ROG and NO_x generators in Sacramento County include motor vehicles, recreational boats, other transportation sources, and industrial processes. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} arise from a variety of sources, including road dust, diesel exhaust, fuel combustion, tire and brake wear, construction operations and windblown dust.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TAC) are a diverse group of air pollutants that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. TACs can cause long-term chronic health effects such as cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, asthma, bronchitis, or genetic damage, or short-term acute effects such as eye watering, respiratory irritation (a cough), runny nose, throat pain, and headaches. TACs are considered either carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic based on the nature of the health effects associated with exposure to the pollutant. For carcinogenic TACs, there is no level of exposure that is considered safe and impacts are evaluated in

terms of overall relative risk expressed as excess cancer cases per one million exposed individuals. Noncarcinogenic TACs differ in that there is generally assumed to be a safe level of exposure below which no negative health impact is believed to occur. These levels are determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

The Health and Safety Code (§39655[a]) defines TAC as “an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health.” All substances that are listed as hazardous air pollutants pursuant to subsection (b) of Section 112 of the CAA (42 United States Code Sec. 7412[b]) are designated as TACs. Under State law, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), acting through CARB, is authorized to identify a substance as a TAC if it determines the substance is an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness, or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health.

Diesel engines emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, including both gaseous and solid material. The solid material in diesel exhaust is referred to as diesel particulate matter (DPM). Almost all DPM is 10 microns or less in diameter, and 90 percent of DPM is less than 2.5 microns in diameter (CARB 2021a). Because of their extremely small size, these particles can be inhaled and eventually trapped in the bronchial and alveolar regions of the lung. In 1998, CARB identified DPM as a TAC based on published evidence of a relationship between diesel exhaust exposure and lung cancer and other adverse health effects. DPM has a notable effect on California’s population—it is estimated that about 70 percent of total known cancer risk related to air toxics in California is attributable to DPM (CARB 2021a).

Air Quality Monitoring

The SMAQMD operates a network of ambient air monitoring stations throughout the Sacramento region. The purpose of the monitoring stations is to measure ambient concentrations of criteria air pollutants and determine whether the ambient air quality meets state and federal standards, pursuant to the CAAQS and the NAAQS. The nearest ambient monitoring station to the project site is the East Natoma Street monitoring station located approximately 3 miles northwest of the project site. The closest monitoring station with data for PM₁₀ is the Sacramento – Branch Center Road 2 monitoring station, approximately 13.6 miles southwest of the project site. Air quality data collected monitoring stations for the years 2018 through 2020 are shown in **Table 4**.

Table 4. Summary of Annual Air Quality Data for Folsom Area Air Quality Monitoring Stations

POLLUTANT	2018	2019	2020
<i>Ozone (O₃): Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street</i>			
Maximum concentration 1-hour period (ppm)	0.105	0.087	0.038
Maximum concentration 8-hour period (ppm)	0.094	0.073	0.036
Days above 1-hour state standard (>0.09 ppm)	5	0	0
Days above 8-hour state/federal standard (>0.070 ppm)	19	2	0
<i>Coarse Particulate Matter (PM₁₀): Monitoring location: Sacramento – Branch Center Road 2</i>			
Maximum 24-hour concentration (µg/m ³)	200.0	53.0	201.0
Measured Days above 24-hr state standard (>50 µg/m ³)	4	1	10
Measured Days above 24-hr federal standard (>150 µg/m ³)	1	0	1
Annual average (µg/m ³)	26.5	18.4	33.2
Exceed state annual standard (20 µg/m ³)	Yes	No	Yes
<i>Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}): Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street</i>			

Maximum 24-hour concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	104.5	25.4	19.6
Measured Days above 24-hour federal standard ($>35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	9	0	0
Annual average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	10.2	*	*
Exceed state and federal annual standard ($12 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	No	*	*
<i>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2): Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street</i>			
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)	0.029	0.015	*
Days above state 1-hour standard (0.18 ppm)	0	0	*
Days above federal 1-hour standard (0.100 ppm)	0	0	*
Annual average (ppm)	0.003	*	*
Exceed annual federal standard (0.053 ppm)	No	*	*
Exceed annual state standard (0.030 ppm)	No	*	*

Source: CARB 2021b.

ppb = parts per billion; ppm = parts per million; $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter, * = insufficient data available.

As Shown in **Table 4**, the state 1-hour ozone standard was exceeded on 5 days in 2018, the federal 8-hour ozone standard was exceeded on 19 days in 2018 and 2 days in 2019, and the state/federal PM_{10} and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ standards were exceeded on multiple day in 2018 through 2020. There were no exceedances of NO_2 standards in 2018 through 2020.

Air Quality Attainment Planning

In order to work towards attainment for ozone, PM_{10} and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, the EPA Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards requires that each state containing nonattainment areas develop a written plan for cleaning the air in those areas. The plans developed are called State Implementation Plans (SIP). Through these plans, states outline efforts they will make to try to correct the levels of air pollution and bring their areas back into attainment. The status of air quality attainment planning for the Sacramento area is listed below (SMAQMD 2017):

- 8-Hour O_3 .** The Sacramento region was classified by the EPA as a “serious” nonattainment area on June 15, 2004 for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, with an attainment deadline of June 15, 2013. Emission reductions needed to achieve the air quality standard were identified using an air quality modeling analysis. An evaluation of proposed control measures and associated ROG and NO_x emission reductions concluded that no set of feasible controls were available to provide the needed emission reductions before the attainment deadline year. Given the magnitude of the shortfall in emission reductions, and the schedule for implementing new control measures, the earliest possible attainment demonstration year for the Sacramento region is determined to be the “severe” area deadline of 2019. Section 181(b)(3) of the Clean Air Act permits a state to request that the EPA reclassify a nonattainment area to a higher classification and extend the time allowed for attainment. This process is appropriate for areas that must rely on longer-term strategies to achieve the emission reductions needed for attainment. The EPA approved this request on May 5, 2010. The Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan was developed by the air districts in the Sacramento region to bring the region into attainment for the ozone NAAQS and CAAQS. The plan is a joint project between the SMAQMD, and four other air districts in the Sacramento region (SMAQMD 2017).

- **1-Hour O₃.** On May 9, 2011, EPA proposed to determine that California is no longer required to implement or submit a CAA Section 185 fee program for 1-hour ozone as a revision to the SIP for the Sacramento Metro 1-hour ozone nonattainment area. EPA has also taken an “interim final” action to stop sanctions from applying to the Sacramento Metro Area.
- **PM₁₀.** In March 2002, the EPA officially determined that Sacramento County had attained the PM₁₀ standards. In November 2010, the SMAQMD formally requested that the EPA redesignate Sacramento County from nonattainment to attainment for PM₁₀. The EPA approved this request effective October 28, 2013. The SMAQMD additionally adopted a PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan. The first Maintenance Plan showed maintenance from 2012 through 2022. A Second Maintenance Plan will be prepared and submitted by The SMAQMD to demonstrate maintenance for ten additional years, through 2032.
- **PM_{2.5}.** The Sacramento PM_{2.5} nonattainment area designation met the PM_{2.5} NAAQS by December 31, 2011. On May 9, 2012, CARB submitted a request that EPA find the Sacramento region in attainment for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. EPA issued a proposed rule for Determination of Attainment for the Sacramento Nonattainment Area on October 26, 2012 and a final rule for Determination of Attainment on July 15, 2013. EPA used the updated 2010-2012 ambient air quality data for determination and the final rule became effective on August 14, 2013 (SMAQMD 2017) (EPA 2013). On May 10, 2017, the EPA found the area attained the 2006 24-hour NAAQS by the attainment date of December 31, 2015 based on monitoring data for 2013-2015. The 2013 Maintenance Plan and will be updated and submitted in the future based on the clean data finding made by the EPA.
- **CO.** The region is currently designated attainment for 1-hour and 8-hour CO standards. The Maintenance Plan developed for CO in 1996 was revised in 2004 to extend the 1996 CO Maintenance Plan demonstration to 2018.

Evaluation of Air Quality

While the final determination of whether or not a project has a significant effect is within the purview of the lead agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b), SMAQMD recommends that its air pollution thresholds be used to determine the significance of project emissions. The criteria pollutant thresholds and various assessment recommendations are contained in SMAQMD’s Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (CEQA Guide; 2020, revised), and are discussed under the checklist questions below.

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

Less than Significant Impact. In accordance with SMAQMD’s CEQA Guide, construction-generated NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, and operational-generated ROG and NO_x (all ozone precursors) are used to determine consistency with the Ozone Attainment Plan. The Guide states (SMAQMD 2020 p. 4-6):

By exceeding the District’s mass emission thresholds for operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}, the project would be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the District’s air quality planning efforts.

As shown in the discussion for question b) below, the project's construction-generated emissions of NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} and operation-generated emissions ROG and NO_x would not exceed SMAQMD thresholds. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and the impact would be less than significant.

- b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less than Significant Impact. The Sacramento region is in non-attainment for ozone (ozone precursors NO_x and ROG) and particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀). The project's emissions of these criteria pollutants and precursors during construction and operation are evaluated below.

Construction Emissions

SMAQMD's CEQA Guide includes construction screening levels to determine if a project would exceed the NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} threshold of significance. However, because the proposed project includes cut-and-fill operations of approximate 50,000 cubic yards (balance on-site, no import or export of soil), the construction screening levels are not recommended for use. As such, the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0 was used to quantify project-generated construction emissions. The model output sheets are included in Appendix B. Construction emissions would be generated by vehicle engine exhaust from off-road construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips.

The project's construction period emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} are compared to the SMAQMD construction thresholds in **Table 5**. The SMAQMD does not have a recommended threshold for construction-generated ROG. However, quantification and disclosure of ROG emissions is recommended. The SMAQMD considers any emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} to be significant unless the Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices are implemented, also known as Best Management Practices (BMPs). The project would implement all of the SMAQMD BMPs to control fugitive dust in accordance with SMAQMD Rule 403. The modeling accounts for emissions reductions resulting from watering exposed surfaces twice daily. As shown in **Table 5**, the proposed project construction period emissions of the ozone precursor NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds. Impacts related to construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would be less than significant.

Operational Emissions

Regional Emissions

SMAQMD provides screening levels to identify when additional analysis is necessary to determine potential significance for operational ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} emissions. The operational screening levels represent the development size at which the operational emissions thresholds of significance would not be exceeded. According to the screening thresholds, if a proposed mid-rise apartment project is less than 740 dwelling units, then the project would not have the potential to exceed SMAQMD's recommended mass emission thresholds for NO_x or ROG during operation. The PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} screening level is 1,485 dwelling units. The proposed project would develop 257 dwelling unit, less than the screening thresholds and project-specific modeling for operational emissions is not required. Therefore, impacts related to project long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, would be less than significant.

Table 5. Construction Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions

ACTIVITY	NO_x (pounds/day)	ROG (pounds/day)¹	PM₁₀ (pounds/day)	PM_{2.5} (pounds/day)
Demolition	0.6	5.6	1.0	0.4
Site Preparation	3.8	37.1	10.8	6.2
Grading	4.2	42.9	6.1	3.3
Underground Utilities	1.1	10.4	0.6	0.4
Paving	1.5	14.1	1.0	0.6
Building Construction	2.8	19.8	3.3	1.5
Architectural Coatings	16.8	1.4	0.5	0.2
Maximum Daily Emissions	19.4²	42.9	10.8	6.2
<i>SMAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>82</i>
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No	No

Source of emissions estimates: CalEEMod output (Appendix B)

Source of threshold: SMAQMD 2020.

¹ Maximum daily emissions of ROG would occur in summer, maximum daily emissions of all other analyzed pollutants would occur in winter or are not seasonally dependent.

² Maximum daily emissions of ROG would be the combined emissions from Building Construction and Architectural Coating which would occur concurrently in 2023.

Impact Conclusion

The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment, and the impact would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact.

CARB and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) have identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, infants (including in utero in the third trimester of pregnancy), and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis (CARB 2005, OEHHA 2015). Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others due to the types of population groups or activities involved and are referred to as sensitive receptors. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers.

The closest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are multi-family residences approximately adjacent to the project site, approximately 80-feet to the northeast. Single family homes are located across Cavitt Drive, approximately 150-feet east of the project site. There are no schools, hospitals or daycare centers located within 0.5-mile of the project site.

Implementation of the project would result in the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, and construction worker vehicles. These vehicles and equipment would generate the TAC DPM. Generation of DPM from construction projects typically occurs in a localized area (e.g., at the project site) for a short period of time. Because construction activities and subsequent emissions vary depending on the construction activity (e.g., grading, building construction), the construction-related emissions to which nearby receptors are exposed to would also vary throughout the construction period. During some equipment-intensive activities such as grading and excavation, construction-related emissions would be higher than other less equipment-intensive activities such as building construction.

The dose (of TAC) to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance in the environment and the extent of exposure a person has with the substance; a longer exposure period to a fixed quantity of emissions would result in higher health risks. Current models and methodologies for conducting cancer health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods (typically 30 years for individual residents based on guidance from OEHHA) and are best suited for evaluation of long duration TAC emissions with predictable schedules and locations. These assessment models and methodologies do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. Cancer potency factors are based on animal lifetime studies or worker studies where there is long-term exposure to the carcinogenic agent. There is considerable uncertainty in trying to evaluate the cancer risk from projects that will only last a small fraction of a lifetime (OEHHA] 2015). In addition, concentrations of mobile source DPM emissions disperse rapidly and are typically reduced by 70 percent at approximately 500-feet (CARB 2005). Considering this information, the highly dispersive nature of DPM, and the fact that construction activities would occur at various locations throughout the project site, it is not anticipated that construction of the project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations.

According to the SMAQMD, land use development projects do not typically have the potential to result in localized concentrations of criteria air pollutants that expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This is because criteria air pollutants are predominantly generated in the form of mobile-source exhaust from vehicle trips associated with the land use development project. These vehicle trips occur throughout a paved network of roads, and, therefore, associated exhaust emissions of criteria air pollutants are not generated in a single location where high concentrations could be formed (SMAQMD 2020). Therefore, localized concentration of CO from exhaust emissions, or “CO hotspots,” would only be a concern on high-volume roadways where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited, such as tunnels or below grade highways. There are no high-volume roadways in the region with limited mixing that would be affected by project generated traffic. Once operational, the project would not be a significant source of TACs. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and the impact would be less than significant.

- d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than Significant Impact. Odors associated with diesel exhaust and ROG from application of asphalt and architectural coatings would be emitted during project construction. The odor of these emissions is objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the project site and therefore should not be at a level that would affect a substantial number of people. Further, construction activities would be temporary. As a result, impacts associated with temporary odors during construction are not considered significant.

As a residential development, operation of the project would not result in odors affecting a substantial number of people. Solid waste generated by the project would be collected by a contracted waste hauler, ensuring that any odors resulting from on-site waste would be managed and collected in a manner to prevent the proliferation of odors. The project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people, and the impact would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The discussion below is based on a biological resources evaluation conducted by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. Attached to this Initial Study as **Appendix C** are the results of several database searches conducted as part of the evaluation.

Environmental Setting

The project site is an undeveloped parcel in an urban setting surrounded by residential and commercial development. The site is bounded by the Talavera Apartment Complex to the northeast, south of Broadstone Parkway, and Broadstone Marketplace to the north/northwest, north of Broadstone Parkway. The site is bounded immediately by Cavitt Drive to the east, west of a residential subdivision and Handy Family Park. Along the west boundary, a railroad corridor separates the project site from East

Bidwell Street. To the south of the project site is a disturbed lot and Iron Point Road. The project site is not developed but has been previously rough graded.

Biological Study Methods

Biological studies conducted in support of this document included a desktop special-status species evaluation and a biological and wetland reconnaissance survey.

Special-Status Species Evaluation

For the purposes of this evaluation, special-status species are those that fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Listed as endangered or threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA), including candidate species and species proposed for listing;
- Listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), including candidate species and species proposed for listing;
- Designated as a Species of Special Concern (SSC) or watch-list (WL) species by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), or “Fully Protected” under the California Fish and Game Code (FP), or a sensitive natural community;
- Designated by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) as California Rare Plant Rank 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, or 3.

The most current available lists of special-status species known to occur and/or having the potential to occur in the project area were reviewed to determine those species’ potential to occur on the project site or otherwise be affected by project activities. The following databases were queried, and the results are included in **Appendix C**:

- The Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office list of threatened and endangered species that may occur in the project site and/or may be affected by the project (USFWS 2020);
- The California Native Plant Society list of special-status plants documented in the “Folsom and Clarksville, CA” U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quads (CNPS 2020); and
- The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) list of special-status species documented in the “Folsom and Clarksville, CA” USGS 7.5-minute topographic quads (CDFW 2020).

Biological Reconnaissance Survey

HELIX biologist Marisa Brilts conducted a biological survey on July 16, 2021. The weather during the July 16 field survey was sunny and clear with an average temperature of 84 degrees Fahrenheit. The project site and 250-foot buffer was systematically surveyed on foot to ensure total search coverage, with special attention given to portions of the project site with the potential to support special-status species. Additionally, Ms. Brilts surveyed a 250-foot buffer around the project site (refer to **Figure 4** for habitats or resources that could potentially trigger additional surveys or mitigation before the commencement of construction).

Regulatory Framework Related to Biological Resources

State and Federal Endangered Species Acts

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

California Code of Regulations and California Fish and Game Code

The official state listing of endangered and threatened animals and plants is contained in the California Code of Regulations Title 14 § 670.5. A state candidate species is one that the California Fish and Game Code has formally noticed as being under review by CDFW for inclusion on the state list pursuant to Sections 2074.2 and 2075.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. CDFW also designates Species of Special Concern that are not currently listed or candidate species.

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

California Native Plant Protection Act

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

Nesting and Migratory Birds

Nesting birds are protected by state and federal laws. California Fish and Game Code (§3503, 3503.5, and 3800) prohibits the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of any bird nests or eggs; Fish and Game Code §3511 designates certain bird species “fully protected” (including all raptors), making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. The Attorney General of California has released an opinion that the Fish and Game Code prohibits incidental take. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USC §703-711), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs that are on the federal list (50 CFR §10.13) are protected from injury or

death, and project-related disturbance must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting cycle. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit (with jurisdiction over California) has ruled that the MBTA does not prohibit incidental take (952 F 2d 297 – Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, 1991).

City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance

Requirements related to biological resources also include protection of existing trees and specifies measures necessary to protect both ornamental and native oak trees. Chapter 12.16 of the Folsom Municipal Code, the Tree Preservation Ordinance, further regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; and establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees (City of Folsom 2021c). The Tree Preservation Ordinance establishes policies, regulations, and standards necessary to ensure that the City will continue to preserve and maintain its “urban forests”. Anyone who wishes to perform “Regulated Activities” on “Protected Trees” must apply for a permit with the City. Regulated activities include:

- Removal of a Protected Tree;
- Pruning/trimming of a Protected Tree; and/or,
- Grading or trenching within the Protected zone.

Protected trees include:

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

Jurisdictional Waters

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

California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 – Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

Diversions or obstructions of the natural flow of, or substantial changes or use of material from the bed, channel, or bank of, any river, stream, or lake in California that supports wildlife resources are subject to

regulation by CDFW, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. The CDFW requires notification prior to commencement of any such activities, and a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 1601-1603, if the activity may substantially adversely affect an existing fish and wildlife resource.

Biological Reconnaissance Survey Results

Habitat Types in the Project Area

The project site consists of disturbed and ruderal habitat with ditches and culverts transecting the site (**Figure 4**). A small landscaping strip is located in the north/northwestern portion of the project site and is associated with the Talavera Apartment Complex. The project site is located on an elevated pad that slopes down to East Bidwell Street to the west and Broadstone Parkway to the north. Vegetation on the slopes differs from the elevated pad and is comprised of annual grasses including wild oats (*Avena fatua*), soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), and red brome (*Bromus madratensis*). The soil on the site is disturbed and appears to be partially comprised of fill. Vegetation on the elevated pad is characterized by sparsely distributed introduced annual grasses and other species including mustard (*Brassica* sp.), vinegarweed (*Trichostema lanceolatum*), purple sand spurry (*Spergularia rubra*), stinkwort (*Dittrichia graveolens*), and yellow star thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*). A partially graveled access road is located off Cavitt Drive and connecting to a SMUD utilities pad located within the project site. The utility pad is sparsely vegetated with prickly Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*).

Dirt and cement lined ditches as well as culverts are located throughout the site. The shallow dirt ditches located along the northwestern corner and along the western boundary of the project site were devoid of vegetation and were dry at the time of the survey. The deeper and wider cement lined ditch transecting the central portion of the project site in a general east west direction contained water conveyed water offset to the west. The water source is likely runoff from the adjacent Handy Park located to the east and the surrounding residential neighborhoods. The water flows west through numerous culverts and looks to either terminate or partially disperse along East Bidwell Street primarily east of the railroad tracks (**Figure 4**). During the July 16, 2021 survey, crews were observed cleaning debris and vegetation from the eastern portion of the ditch at the base of a culvert within the project site. Vegetation being removed included dallis grass (*Paspallum dilitatum*), and cattail (*Typha* sp.). Except for the base of the east culvert, the ditch is cement-lined and devoid of vegetation.

Surrounding Habitat Types

In addition to surveying the project site, features within a 250-foot buffer surrounding the project site (**Figure 4**) include landscaping, wetlands, and portions of the adjacent park site. Several ornamental and native trees east of the railroad tracks adjacent to East Bidwell were noted including willow (*Salix* sp.), Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), cork oak (*Quercus suber*), vitex (*Vitex agnus*), Washington hawthorn, (*Crataegus phaenopyrum*), strawberry tree (*Arbutus unedo*), Chinese pistache (*Pistacia chinensis*), and sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*). The trees and their canopy are outside of the project site and are located at the bottom of the slope of the elevated project site. However, these trees may provide nesting habitat for migratory and nesting birds and limited nesting sites for raptors due to the size and species of the trees as well as proximity to heavily trafficked East Bidwell Street. No nesting birds or raptors were observed during the July 16, 2021 survey.

Culverts and ditches convey water on and off the project site. The cement lined ditch transecting the central portion of the project site running in a general east west direction was conveying water offsite during the July 16, 2021 survey (**Figure 4**). The water flows through numerous culverts and looks to either terminate or partially disperse along East Bidwell Street primarily east of the railroad tracks creating an offsite linear aquatic feature. At the time of the survey, portions of this feature were saturated with ponding water, and contained aquatic plants including dallis grass, narrow-leaved cattail (*Typha angustifolia*), and willows (*Salix* sp.). No special-status plants or wildlife were observed within this feature.

Additional areas examined included portions of the park site to the east, the apartment complex to the northeast, and fill piles located to the south. No special-status species were observed within the 250-foot buffer. However, mature maple trees (*Acer* sp.) within the park located to the east may provide nesting habitat for raptors and other nesting and migratory birds.

Wildlife Observations

No special-status wildlife species were observed in the project site during the biological survey. Bird species observed in the vicinity of the project site include American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*) and house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*). A killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*) was observed foraging on the site during the biological survey. Additional species observed within the project site included mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura*), western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*) and domestic cat (*Felis catus*). These are common species in urban and rural residential settings, and highly tolerant of human presence.

Results of Special-Status Species Evaluation

Evaluation of Regionally Occurring Special-Status Plant Species

Prior to conducting the biological field survey, existing information concerning known habitats and special-status species that may occur in the project site was reviewed. The results of the database queries are provided in (**Appendix C**) and analyzed in the "potential to occur" table. Database queries returned 31 special-status plant species recorded in by CDFW data from the CNDDDB and data from CNPS for Folsom, Clarksville, Citrus Heights, Carmichael, Buffalo Creek, Folsom SE, Pilot Hill, Roseville, and Rocklin U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute series quadrangles. Based on field observations, published information, and literature review, no special-status plants are expected to occur within the project site.

Of these 31 potentially occurring special-status plant species, many do not have the potential to occur onsite as they are endemic to vernal pools, occur on gabbroic or serpentine soils, or are found in marshes and swamps, none of which are located within the project site. The site is primarily a rough graded pad that lacks vernal pools or other wetland habitats, with the exception of the constructed ditches, and the soil has been too disturbed to support special-status plants. The constructed dirt ditches are highly disturbed and do not appear to hold water for any significant duration and the cement lined ditch with a small unlined portion near the mouth of the eastern culvert are not suitable habitat for aquatic species.

Evaluation of Regionally Occurring Special-Status Animal Species

Prior to conducting the biological field survey, existing information concerning known habitats and special-status wildlife species that may occur in the project site was reviewed. The results of the database queries are provided in (**Appendix C**) and analyzed in the “potential to occur” table. Database queries returned a total of 44 special-status animal species that are either recorded in CNDDDB from the “Folsom, Clarksville, Citrus Heights, Carmichael, Buffalo Creek, Folsom SE, Pilot Hill, Roseville, and Rocklin” U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute series quadrangles or in the USFWS list of special-status species with the potential to occur in the project site. Of these 44 potentially occurring special-status wildlife species, three fishes, four amphibians, two reptiles, and numerous birds are associated with permanent aquatic habitat, and two branchiopods are endemic to vernal pools. There are no aquatic habitats or vernal pools on the site to provide habitat for any of these species and the site does not provide habitat for any of the regionally occurring special-status plant species. One insect, valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), is an obligate specialist on elderberry shrubs (*Sambucus* spp.). No elderberry shrubs are located on or within the 250-foot buffer of the project site.

Evaluation of Nesting Birds

Native birds are protected by the California Fish and Game Code, which prohibits direct take of adults, nests, eggs, and chicks. Disturbance that leads to nest abandonment can be considered take of eggs and chicks. Common bird species found on and adjacent to the project site include species that nest on all types of substrata, including bare ground, herbaceous and woody vegetation, culverts, poles, and structures.

Potential nesting habitat is limited on the project site and no bird nests were observed in the site; however, development of the site would result in removal of vegetation that provides potential nesting habitat for nesting birds and bare ground areas attract some ground nesting species such as killdeer and mourning dove. In addition, grasses and herbaceous vegetation in and adjacent to the site may provide nesting locations for a wide variety of common bird species. Small and larger horticultural trees occur in landscaped areas adjacent to the site along Cavitt Drive, East Bidwell Street and in the adjacent commercial development. Project construction activities would potentially result in impacts to nesting birds if construction of the proposed project commences during the typical avian breeding season (February – August). Construction activities and construction-related disturbance (noise, vibration and increased human activity) could adversely affect these species if they were to nest in or adjacent to the project area. Potential effects include physical destruction of nests by construction equipment and/or nest abandonment.

Mitigation Measure BIO-01 for nesting migratory birds is expected to reduce impacts to nesting migratory birds to less than significant.

Wetlands or Other Waters of the U.S. or State

A constructed 90-degree dirt ditch occurs along the northwest side of the project site; the approximate 250-foot dirt ditch is approximately two and a half feet wide by about one foot deep with occasional rip-rap. The ditch conveys stormwater runoff to a drop culvert at the bend of the 90-degree angle. The ditch is sparsely vegetated with ruderal and non-aquatic species. A second constructed 550-foot long ditch is located along the site's western boundary, conveying water to the drop culvert located centrally within

the dirt ditch. The ditch was sparsely vegetated with ruderal and non-aquatic species and dry at the time of the survey. The third ditch is primarily cement lined and transects the central portion of the project site in a generally east-west direction and was conveying water to the west, offsite during the survey. The water source is likely runoff from the adjacent park to the east and the surrounding residential neighborhoods. The water flows through numerous culverts and looks to either terminate or partially disperse along East Bidwell Street, primarily east of the railroad tracks. The approximate 425-foot ditch ranges from approximately two to ten feet in width and roughly the same in depth. Only the eastern portion of the ditch is not cement lined and contained wetland vegetation surrounding the base of the mouth of the culvert. At the time of the survey, crews were removing vegetation along with other debris blocking the culvert.

The following discussion is based on a review of historic aerial imagery from National Environmental Title Research (<<https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer>>). The cement-lined ditch was constructed in roughly 2002 and was reconstructed to be linear and concrete lined in 2013.

Waters of the U.S.

There are no waters of the U.S. on the site. The Navigable Waters Protection Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States” (33 CFR Part 328) exempts stormwater control features constructed or excavated in upland or in non-jurisdictional waters to convey, treat, infiltrate, or store stormwater run-off from Clean Water Act jurisdiction. The constructed ditches are constructed in fill associated with development and are exempt from jurisdiction. Therefore, the constructed ditches are exempt from Clean Water Act regulation and do not qualify as waters of the U.S.

Waters of the State

There are no waters of the state on the site as defined in the *State Wetland Definition and Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State* adopted April 2, 2019, that went into effect on May 28, 2020.

California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 – Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

There are no lakes, rivers, or streams on or adjacent to the site and therefore no resources subject to California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 – Lake and Streambed Alteration Program on the site.

Potential Impacts to Waters of the U.S./State

There are no potential waters of the U.S. or state on the site. Therefore, the project would not result in any impacts to waters of the U.S. or state.

Evaluation of Native Trees

None of the trees noted on the project site meet the definition of protected trees per the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance (City of Folsom 2021c). The trees are a combination of both native and nonnative and display signs of deferred maintenance (i.e., poor trunk and limb structure and signs of drought stress). As the trees are located adjacent to an existing masonry wall, they would likely require substantial pruning, if not removal, in the near future in order to maintain wall integrity. The trees may provide habitat for resident and migratory songbirds, but are not of suitable size or location to support nesting/perching opportunities for raptors. Project site plans (**Figure 2**) indicate that the trees would be

removed as part of implementation of the proposed project. The project proposes a landscape plan to include installation of approximately 16 shade and canopy trees along the project site's southern border (not adjacent to the masonry wall).

Evaluation of Biological Resources

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

Less than significant with mitigation. The proposed project would not affect special-status plant and wildlife species. However, common bird species protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Codes may nest on the buildings, trees, and other vegetation on or adjacent to the project site. Project construction activities would potentially result in impacts to nesting birds if construction of the proposed project commences during the typical avian breeding season (February 1–August 31). Construction activities and construction-related disturbance (noise, vibration and increased human activity) could adversely affect these species if they were to nest in or adjacent to the project area. Potential effects include physical destruction of nests by construction equipment and/or nest abandonment. Mitigation Measure BIO-01 would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to nesting birds:

Mitigation Measure BIO-01: Avoid and minimize impacts to nesting birds.

- If ground clearing activities occur during the typical bird nesting season (February 15 through August 31), pre-construction nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 500-foot radius of proposed construction areas, where access is available, no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction. If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.
- If active nests are identified in these areas, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City to develop measures to avoid disturbance of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities, or construction could be delayed until the young have fledged. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a buffer zone and monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist until the young have fledged the nest and are independent of the site. If a buffer zone is implemented, the size of the buffer zone shall be determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with the City and shall be appropriate for the species of bird and nest location.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-01, impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant.

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

No impact. No riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or other protected habitats are located on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

No impact. There are no potential waters of the U.S. or state on the site. Therefore, there would be no impact to potential waters of the U.S. or state.

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

No impact. The project site has been roughed graded and is surrounded by development including East Bidwell Street, Broadstone Parkway, Cavitt Drive, a community park, a residential subdivision, and commercial uses. The project site does not provide any wildlife movement corridors or wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, there would be no impacts to wildlife corridors or the use of native wildlife nursery sites as a result of the proposed project.

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

Less than significant impact. The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. None of the trees noted on the project site meet the definition of protected trees per the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance (City of Folsom 2021c). Removal of the trees as indicated on the project site plans (**Figure 2**) constitutes a less than significant impact; mitigation is unwarranted.

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

No impact. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan has been approved for the City of Folsom. Therefore, no impacts to an existing adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The discussion below is based on a cultural resources assessment report prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX 2021), attached to this Initial Study as **Appendix D**. This assessment, which addresses both archaeological and architectural resources, is based on the results of an archival records search, Native American coordination, and a pedestrian survey/subsurface testing of the project site.

Environmental Setting

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

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

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

The City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications were developed and approved by the City of Folsom in May 2004 and updated in July of 2020. They include Article 11 - Cultural Resources, which provides direction on actions to be taken in the event that materials are discovered that may ultimately be identified as a historical or archaeological resource, or human remains (City of Folsom 2020).

Cultural Background

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

Southern Maidu

At the time of European contact, the Southern Maidu tribe of California Native Americans, previously referred to as the Nisenan, occupied the project vicinity. The Southern Maidu occupied the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers and the lower drainages of the Feather River, bounded by the west bank of the Sacramento River to the west, the crest of the Sierra Nevada to the east, and a few miles south of the American River to the south. The northern boundary is not well established due to the Southern Maidu's linguistic similarity with neighboring groups but extended somewhere between the Feather and Yuba rivers (HELIX 2021).

The Southern Maidu constructed villages on natural rises along streams and rivers ranging in size from three to fifty houses. The houses were typically dome or conical shaped and covered with earth, tule mats, or grasses, and major villages contained a semi-subterranean dance house structure covered by earth, tule, and brush (Wilson and Towne 1978). The Southern Maidu subsistence base varied and included gathering seeds and seasonal plant resources, hunting, and fishing. The Southern Maidu were not dependent on one staple, as their territory provided abundant year-round sources of different food. Acorns were a primary food source and were stored in granaries, in addition to buckeye nuts, gray and sugar pine nuts, and hazelnuts. Ethnographic reports indicate the Southern Maidu obtained large game such as deer, antelope, tule elk, mountain lions, and black bears, by game drives, snares, decoys, deadfalls, and bows and arrows. Rabbits and other small game were hunted with sticks, blunted arrows, traps, snares, nets, fire, and rodent hooks.

The Southern Maidu political organization was centered on the tribelet and each village was governed by a headman who served as an advisor and whose position was typically passed on patrilineally, although some chiefs were chosen by the villagers (Beals 1933; Wilson and Towne 1978). Very little contact existed for the Southern Maidu outside of their tribelet area, and outside contact was typically only for ceremonies, trade, and warfare (Beals 1933). Southern Maidu disposed of their dead by cremation and then burial, usually on the morning after the person died. The deceased person's property would be burned and their house moved or destroyed. After the cremation, the bones and ashes would be gathered and buried in the village cemetery. When a death occurred away from the person's village, they would be cremated where they died and their remains returned to their village to be buried (Wilson and Towne 1978).

Historic Background

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

Spanish Period

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

Mexican Period

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

European Expansion

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

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

City of Folsom

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

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

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

Cultural Resource Record Search

On July 6, 2021, an archival records search in support of the proposed project was conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, located at California State University, Sacramento. The records searches addressed all portions of the APE and a 0.5-mile radius around the APE (hereafter referred to as the study area). Sources of information included previous survey and cultural resources files; the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility; the OHP Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File; historical topographic maps; and historical aerial photographs.

The records search identified 36 studies that have previously been conducted within the study area (**Table 6**). Five studies directly examined the current APE during their surveys; these are shown in bold in **Table 6** and discussed briefly below.

Table 6. Previous Studies Conducted within the Study Area

Report	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation
003749	1995	Smith, Kim	East Bidwell Street Scott Road Interchange Project on Route 50	Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.
003830	1997	Windmiller, R., L. A. Payen, and P. Payen	Evaluation of Cultural Resources Broadstone Unit 3 Folsom Sacramento County, California	None

Report	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation
003925	1990	Derr, Eleanor	The Broadstone Master Plan Project: Final Report	Cultural Resources Unlimited
004475	1991	Peak & Associates, Inc.	Cultural Resources Assessment of the Russell Ranch Project, Sacramento County, California	Peak & Associates, Inc.
004476	1986	Archeo-Tec	An Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance of the Proposed Russels Ranch Development Project, Folsom, California	Archeo-Tec
004477	1994	Jackson, Robert J.	Determination of Adverse Effect for the Russell Ranch Project	Pacific Legacy, Inc.
004481	1991	Lindstrom, Susan	A Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Broadstone 3 Project Involving 570 Acres Near Folsom, California, Sacramento County	None
004482	1989	Dreyer, William	A Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed El Dorado Campus of Los Cerritos Community College, Folsom, California	None
004483	1993	Peak & Associates, Inc.	A Determination of Eligibility and Effect on Cultural Resources Within the Russell Ranch Project Area, Sacramento County, California	Peak & Associates, Inc.
004489	1986	Archeo-Tec	An Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance of the Proposed Willow Creek Estates South Development Project, Folsom, California	Archeo-Tec
004520	1992	Maniery, Mary	Historic Survey Report and Historic Resource Evaluation Report for Sixteen Sites, Highway 50 Interchange Project, Post Mile 18.8 TO 23.1, Sacramento County, California	PAR Environmental Services, Inc.
004523	1989	Jensen & Associates	Addendum to an Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Broadstone Unit # 1 Subdivision Parcel, Folsom, Sacramento County, California	Jensen & Associates
004525	1991	Maniery, Mary	Archaeological Survey Report for the Highway 50 Interchange Project, Post Mile 15.8 to Post Mile 23.1, Sacramento County, California	PAR Environmental Services, Inc.
006384	2005	Golden Hills Environmental Services	Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Golf Links Substations and Interconnecting 69kV Powerline Loop	Golden Hills Environmental Services
007121	2004	Clark, Matthew	The Status of Cultural Resources Research for the Kaiser Folsom Project Area in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, CA	None
007878	2004	Peak, Melinda A.	Determination of Eligibility and Effect for the Saca Property, City of Folsom, CA	Peak & Associates, Inc.
008119	2006	Kaptain, Neal	Historic Property Survey Report for the State Route 50/ Empire Ranch Road Interchange Project	LSA
008736	2006	Windmiller, Ric	Carpenter Ranch Cultural Resources Inventory, Folsom, Sacramento County, California	None
009185	1991	Jones, D. A., M. Babal, S. D. Mikesell, and S. R. Wee	A Cultural Resources Study for the Folsom East Area Facilities Plan and Portions of the Sewer and Water Line System	Far Western Anthropological Research Group; Jackson Research Projects
010464	2010	Shapiro, W.	Archaeological Survey Report for the SMUD Lake Feeder #2 Extension Project In Sacramento County (2205-03)	Pacific Legacy, Inc.
010555	2010	Pappas, Stephen	Cultural Resources Inventory Report: Folsom Lake College Athletic Field Expansion, Phase I, Sacramento County, California, Project No. 2009-093.1	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
010712	2011	Pappas, Steven, and Lisa Westwood	Cultural Resources Inventory Report: Folsom Lake College Athletic Field Expansion, Phase II, Sacramento County, California, Project No. 2009-093.2	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
011001	2012	Westwood, Lisa, and Stephen Pappas	Folsom South of US Highway 50 Specific Plan Project: Preliminary Historic Properties Synthesis Report, Sacramento County, California, Project No. 2005-429.1	ECORP Consulting, Inc.

Report	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation
011191	2013	Armstrong, M. D., M. C, Baloiian, and A. P. Monastero	Cultural Resources Survey for the Missouri Flat-Gold Hill 115 kV Reconductoring Project El Dorado and Sacramento Counties, California	Applied Earthworks, Inc.
011337	2013	Knapp, Katherine, and Lisa Westwood	Cultural Resources Testing and Evaluation Report for the Mangini Ranch APE, Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, Sacramento County, California, ECRP Project No. 2012-037.1	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
011408	2012	Westwood, L., K. Knapp, S. Pappas, D. Quivey, and R. Mason	Cultural Resources Testing and Evaluation Report for the Carpenter Ranch Permit Area, Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project; Cultural Resources Inventory Report for the Carpenter Ranch APE within the Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
011632	2014	Pierce, Wendy	Willow Hill Reservoir Trail Project, Cultural Resource Inventory, City of Folsom, Sacramento	Pierce Archaeological Consulting
011728	2014	Westwood, Lisa	Historic Property Treatment Plan for the Non-Backbone Prairie City Road Business Park Permit Area, Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
011894	2014	Westwood, L., and K. Knapp	Finding of Effect Report for the Arcadian Heights APE Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
012049	2015	Westwood, Lisa	Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) data for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project. Generated in compliance with Section 4.4 of the approved (August 2013) Historic Property Treatment Plan for the Backbone Infrastructure permit area (SPK-2007-02159)	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
012053	2015	Westwood, Lisa	Data Recovery Report for Archaeological Sites in the Backbone Infrastructure Area of Potential Effects, Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, Sacramento County, California, ECRP Project No. 2005-429.6	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
012088	2015	Westwood, L., and K. Knapp	Historic Property Treatment for the Non-Backbone Prairie City Road Business Park Permit Area, Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, Sacramento County, California (ECORP Project No. 2009-168.8)	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
012381	2016	Pappas, Stephen	Cultural Resources Inventory Report for the Broadstone Parkway Apartments, City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
012382	2016	Webb, Megan, and Kim Tanksley	Cultural Resources Inventory Report for East Bidwell Commercial, Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
012419	2013	Knapp, Katherine, and Lisa Westwood	Historic Property Treatment Plan for the Backbone Infrastructure Permit Area, Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
012458	2015	Westwood, L., J. Adams, S. Pappas, S. Lindstrom, and R. Mason	Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project, Historic Properties Management Plan, Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.

Source: Helix 2021.

Of these 36 studies, five directly addressed the current APE:

- **Report 003830** was conducted in 1997 in support of Broadstone Unit 3, a planned 570-acre mixed-use development. The study documented NRHP evaluations of five previously documented archaeological sites, none of which are located within the current APE

- **Report 004481**, conducted in 1991, also addressed the 570-acre Broadstone 3 planning unit. The study did not document or evaluate any cultural resources within the APE.
- **Report 009185** was conducted in 1991 to investigate five planning units and a linear utility alignment for the Folsom East Area Facilities Plan. The study included surveys of Woodard Ranch, a property within which the current APE is located. The study did not document or evaluate any cultural resources within the APE.
- **Report 012381** documents a 2016 cultural resources inventory for the proposed Broadstone Parkway Apartments Project (now known as the Talavera Apartments). No cultural resources were discovered within the APE.
- **Report 012382** was conducted in 2019 in support of the proposed 33.65-acre East Bidwell Commercial Project. No cultural resources were discovered in the current APE, which the researchers noted was heavily disturbed and highly modified.

The records search also determined that there are 22 previously recorded cultural resources located within the study area (**Table 7**). One of these resources are located within the boundaries of the current APE; it is shown in bold in **Table 7** and discussed briefly below.

Table 7. Previously Documented Resources within the Study Area

Primary	Trinomial	Year	Author(s)	Description
P-34-000021	None	1991	Jones, D., D. Glover, and L. Glover	Isolated chert projectile point fragment
P-34-000022	None	1991	Jones, D., and D. Dyer	Two historic-era ceramic sherds
P-34-000335	CA-SAC-308H	1992	Maniery, M.	Folsom Mining District
P-34-000771	CA-SAC-593H	1990	Derr, E. H., and R. Derr	Two historic-era hearths
P-34-000805	CA-SAC-371H	1991	Jones, D., T. Kingsbury, D. Dyer, and S. Warnesh	Woodward Ranch Site
P-34-000806	CA-SAC-367/H	1991	Jones, D., T. Kingsbury, D. Dyer, and S. Warnesh	Gould Ranch Site
P-34-000807	CA-SAC-368	1991	Jones, D., T. Kingsbury, D. Dyer, and S. Warnesh	Prehistoric bedrock milling feature
P-34-000808	None	1991	Jones, D., D. Glover, and E. Montes	Woodard and Gould Ranch Fence
P-34-000902	None	1991	Peak, M., and R. Gerry	Historic-era stacked rock fence
P-34-000903	None	1990	Peak, M., and R. Gerry	Historic-era stacked rock fence
P-34-000990	None	1991	Syda, K., and C. Thomas	Historic-era stacked rock fence
P-34-000991	None	1991	Syda, K., and C. Thomas	Historic-era stacked rock wall and fence
P-34-001393	None	1991	Syda, K., and W. Shapiro	Historic-era ditch segment

Primary	Trinomial	Year	Author(s)	Description
P-34-001480	CA-SAC-903H	1990	Derr, E. H., and K. McIvers	Rhoads' Branch Ditch
P-34-001482	CA-SAC-905H	1991	Jones, D., D. Glover, and E. Montes	Keefe-McDerby Mine Ditch
P-34-001765	None	2006	Windmiller, R.	Historic-era stacked rock fence
P-34-001809	None	2006	Windmiller, R.	Historic-era fence line marked by a narrow berm
P-34-001812	None	2006	Windmiller, R.	Historic-era rock pile
P-34-001813	None	2006	Windmiller, R.	Historic-era rock pile
P-34-004621	None	2012	Pappas, S., and D. Quivey	Isolated dredge cable fragment
P-34-004623	None	2012	Pappas, S., and D. Quivey	Historic-era rock pile
P-34-005120	None	1991	Syda, K., and W. Shapiro	Placerville & Sacramento Valley Railroad

Source: HELIX 2021.

One previously documented resource is located within the current APE:

- P-34-000021** is an isolated prehistoric chert projectile point fragment that was originally discovered in 1991, and is the only resource previously documented within the current APE. An effort was made to relocate the artifact in 2016, but the area had been graded and it could not be found. The artifact would have been located near the northwestern end of the APE.

Historic topographic maps (Clarksville 1953; Folsom 1941 and 1944) and historic aerial photographs failed to provide any information about previous occupation or use of the APE. In all of these documents the APE is portrayed as an open, undeveloped landscape, although aerial photographs indicate that extensive grading had begun by 2002.

Native American Coordination

On September 1, 2021, HELIX requested that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conduct a search of their Sacred Lands File for the presence of Native American sacred sites or human remains in the vicinity of the proposed project area. As of the date of the cultural resources assessment report, no response from NAHC has been received (**Attachment D**).

During consultation with the City under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), the Wilton Rancheria indicated that a Tribal Cultural Resource was located in the northwestern portion of the APE, in the area where P-34-000021, an isolated prehistoric chert projectile point fragment, was found in 1991. Wilton Rancheria did not provide specific information about the size or nature of the resource, but requested that limited subsurface testing be conducted in the area where it was thought to be located.

The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) requested consultation with the City in an email dated September 30, 2021. UAIC indicated the presence of a TCR located to the west of the project site but have not provided more specific information as of the date of the cultural resources assessment report.

Archeological Survey Results

On August 24, 2021, HELIX Senior Archaeologist Clarus Backes, RPA conducted a pedestrian survey to characterize any prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources located within the APE. During the

survey, the ground surface throughout the APE was examined for the presence of historic-era artifacts (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics), prehistoric artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris), and other features that might represent human activity that took place more than 50 years ago. Photographs of the APE are presented in **Attachment C**.

The APE consists of disturbed vacant land that is transected by ditches and culverts. The northwestern portion of the APE slopes gently down to East Bidwell Street to the west and Broadstone Parkway to the north (Photograph 1), while the southeastern portion of the APE consists of a pad that rises approximately 10 to 15 feet above the rest of the APE (Photograph 2); the pad holds a partially graveled access road leading to a small Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) utilities compound. Shallow dirt ditches line the APE's northern and western margins (Photograph 3). A larger, cement-lined ditch bisects the APE from east to west, terminating at culverts at either end (Photograph 4).

The soil on the site has been heavily graded, and consists of a mix of rounded and angular cobbles in a matrix of compact, patchy sand and silt, suggesting that it is comprised at least partially of imported fill. Sparse annual grasses cover the area and allowed good surface visibility during the survey.

Cultural materials within the APE were limited to modern roadside and windblown trash. No historic-era or prehistoric artifacts or features were found during the survey.

On September 3, 2021, HELIX archaeologists Clarus Backes, RPA and Jentin Joe conducted limited subsurface testing to determine the presence or absence of intact subsurface archaeological deposits within the APE. This type of testing is typically conducted if there is limited visibility due to dense vegetation cover, or if the APE is likely to contain archaeological materials that have been buried due to the deposition of soils by alluvial or other processes.

Six shovel test pits (STP) were excavated to establish whether intact subsurface archaeological deposits are present; each STP measured approximately 30 centimeters (cm) in diameter and was excavated in 20 cm levels until an impenetrable layer such as bedrock or cobbles was encountered. Soils from each STP were dry screened through 3.1 millimeter (1/8 inch) mesh hardware cloth. A Global Positioning System (GPS) unit was used to record the locations of the STPs.

The STPs were distributed throughout the area in the northwestern portion of the APE where a potential Tribal Cultural Resource was thought to be located (Figure 3). Field observations were recorded on standard data record forms, including unit and unit level records. Soil color and texture for each 20-cm level were recorded using Munsell™ soil color charts. Each STP was backfilled upon completion.

No cultural materials were found during the test excavations. Stratigraphy and soil types were generally identical among the six STPs, and consisted of extremely compacted, dry sandy silt with approximately 50 percent angular granitic cobbles and pebbles (Munsell™ color 5YR 5/4). Soils in all six STPs appeared to have been moderately to heavily disturbed by previous grading. With the exception of STP-2, which was excavated to a depth of 35 centimeters, the maximum depth of the STPs was limited to 20 centimeters due to a layer of impenetrable cobbles.

Due to the heavy cobble layer none of the STPs could be excavated to a depth greater than 26 centimeters, and none yielded any artifacts, modified soil or rock, or faunal remains that might indicate a cultural deposit.

Evaluation of Cultural Resources

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation.

The records search determined that the entire APE has previously been surveyed for cultural resources three times. Only one resource, an isolated projectile point fragment, has been documented within the APE's boundaries. The results of the Sacred Lands File search by the NAHC are still pending, although during AB 52 consultation with the Wilton Rancheria indicated that a Tribal Cultural Resource was present near the northwestern end of the APE and requested that limited subsurface testing be conducted in that area. Additionally, UAIC indicated that potential TCRs were located west of the project site.

Although ground visibility was good, no cultural resources were found during the survey; subsurface testing yielded no cultural materials. This suggests that the likelihood of encountering surficial or shallowly buried archaeological materials during project implementation is low. However, because Wilton Rancheria states that a Tribal Cultural Resource is located within the APE, the area should be considered moderately sensitive for cultural resources at depths of 5.0-feet or more below the current ground surface. If historical or archaeological resources are discovered, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-01** would reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level for questions a) and b).

Mitigation Measure CUL-01: Inadvertent Discovery

In the event that cultural resources are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities should be halted in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. If the site cannot be avoided during the remainder of construction, an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards should then be retained to evaluate the find's significance under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and should be discussed in consultation with the City.

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No human remains are known to exist within the project area nor were there any indications of human remains found during the field survey. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as trenching and grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. This is a potentially significant impact. However, if human remains are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-01 and CUL-02 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-02: Treatment of Human Remains

Although there is no evidence to suggest the presence of human remains, the discovery of human remains is always a possibility during a project. If such an event did occur, the specific procedures

outlined by the NAHC, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, would be followed:

1. All excavation activities within 60-feet of the remains would immediately stop, and the area would be protected with flagging or by posting a monitor or construction worker to ensure that no additional disturbance occurs.
2. The project owner or their authorized representative would contact the County Coroner.
3. The coroner would have two working days to examine the remains after being notified in accordance with HSC 7050.5. If the coroner determines that the remains are Native American and are not subject to the coroner's authority, the coroner would notify NAHC of the discovery within 24 hours.
4. NAHC would immediately notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who would have 48 hours after being granted access to the location of the remains to inspect them and make recommendations for treatment of them. Work would be suspended in the area of the find until the senior archaeologist approves the proposed treatment of human remains.
5. If the coroner determines that the human remains are neither subject to the coroner's authority nor of Native American origin, then the senior archaeologist would determine mitigation measures appropriate to the discovery.

VI. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

California's electricity needs are satisfied by a variety of entities, including investor-owned utilities, publicly owned utilities, electric service providers and community choice aggregators. In 2019, the California power mix totaled 277,704 gigawatt hours (GWh). In-state generation accounted for 200,475 GWh, or 72 percent, of the state's power mix. The remaining electricity came from out-of-state imports (CEC 2021a). **Table 8** provides a summary of California's electricity sources as of 2019.

Table 8. California Electricity Sources 2019

Fuel Type	Percent of California Power
Coal	2.96
Large Hydro	14.62
Natural Gas	34.23
Nuclear	8.98
Oil	0.01
Other (Petroleum Coke/Waste Heat)	0.15
Renewables (Excluding Large Hydro)	31.70
Unspecified	7.34

Source: CEC 2021a.

Natural gas provides the largest portion of the total in-state capacity and electricity generation in California, with nearly 45 percent of the natural gas burned in California used for electricity generation in a typical year. Much of the remainder is consumed in the residential, industrial, and commercial sectors for uses such as cooking, space heating, and as an alternative transportation fuel. In 2012, total natural gas demand in California for industrial, residential, commercial, and electric power generation was 2,313 billion cubic feet per year (bcf/year), up from 2,196 bcf/year in 2010 (CEC 2021b).

Transportation accounts for a major portion of California's energy budget. Automobiles and trucks consume gasoline and diesel fuel, which are nonrenewable energy products derived from crude oil.

Gasoline is the most used transportation fuel in California, with 97 percent of all gasoline being consumed by light-duty cars, pickup trucks, and sport utility vehicles (SUVs). In 2015, 15.1 billion gallons of gasoline were sold in California (CEC 2021c). Diesel fuel is the second most consumed fuel in California, used by heavy-duty trucks, delivery vehicles, buses, trains, ships, boats, and farm and construction equipment. In 2015, 4.2 billion gallons of diesel were sold in California (CEC 2021d).

Evaluation of Energy

- a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than significant impact. Project construction would require the use of construction equipment for clearing and grubbing, grading, hauling, and building activities, as well as construction workers and vendors traveling to and from the project site. Construction equipment requires gasoline, diesel, and potentially other fuel sources to operate.

Construction of the project would incorporate on-site energy conservation features. The following practices would be implemented during project construction to reduce waste and energy consumption:

- Follow maintenance schedules to maintain equipment in optimal working order and rated energy efficiency, which would include, but not be limited to, regular replacement of filters, cleaning of compressor coils, burner tune-ups, lubrication of pumps and motors, proper vehicle maintenance, etc.;
- Reduce on-site vehicle idling; and,
- In accordance with CALGreen criteria as well as state and local laws, at least 50 percent of on-site construction waste and ongoing operational waste would be diverted from landfills through reuse and recycling.

The project's construction-related energy usage would not represent a significant demand on energy resources because it is temporary in nature. Additionally, with implementation of the low impact design features, project construction would avoid or reduce inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, the project's construction-phase energy impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would increase the consumption of energy related to electricity, natural gas, water, and wastewater. However, implementation of low impact design, energy efficient, and sustainable features would also reduce the energy usage. The project design incorporates sustainable features consistent with General Plan Goal LU 9.1 and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). The project would exceed the 2019 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) by 15 percent or more. The project provides electric vehicle parking spaces (12) and charging stations (6) consistent with CALGreen. The buildings' position in a north-south orientation maximizes passive solar access and natural lighting. A rooftop photovoltaic system (ranging from 10kW to 16kW per building) would serve the community.

Hardscapes, such as decorative pavement, concrete refuse collection pads, pedestrian pathways, outdoor dining patios, dog park, and the bocce court will be constructed with cool paving materials (e.g.,

slag concrete). Cool paving areas, including shaded areas, account for approximately 68 percent of the non-roof impervious area.

Additionally, the Folsom Municipal Code requires one bicycle parking space for every five units (which equates to 51 bicycle parking spaces required for the project). Finally, adequate energy facilities are already located within and adjacent to the site serving the existing uses. Thus, the incremental increase associated with implementation of the project would not require the construction of new energy facilities or sources of energy that would not otherwise be needed to serve the region. It is anticipated that these services would be provided from existing utilities on site, or from extensions from existing facilities immediately abutting the site. Therefore, energy impacts from project operation would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy efficiency. The project would conform to all applicable state, federal, and local laws and codes. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Geology and Soils section of this document is based on the project-specific Geotechnical Engineering Study prepared by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc (Youngdahl 2021). The environmental setting discussion below is largely from this geotechnical study, which is included as **Appendix E**.

Environmental Setting

Geology

The project site is situated on the eastern edge of Sacramento County, located within the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California. The project area and general vicinity

are underlain by the Copper Hill volcanics. The Copper Hill volcanics are a sequence of Late Jurassic-age volcanic rock that overlies the Salt Spring Slate. It is comprised of primarily andesitic or basaltic pyroclastic rocks, lava, and pillow lava with subordinate felsic porphyritic and pyroclastic rocks (Youngdahl 2021).

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. According to the geotechnical report, there are no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones (Special Studies Zones) located on the project site. Additionally, no evidence of recent or active faulting was observed during the field study.

Subsurface Conditions

Subsurface explorations by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc., were conducted on March 23, 2021, and included the excavation of 14 exploratory test pits. Test pits encountered existing fills in a dense or medium stiff and slightly moist to moist condition with the exception of Test Pit 14. Test Pit 14, located in the far southeastern portion of the site, encountered weathered bedrock from the surface to the maximum depth of exploration. In Test Pits 1 through 4, 8, 11, and 13, the fills were encountered to the maximum depth of exploration. Underlying the fill materials in Test Pits 6, 7, 9, and 12, native soils comprised of silts in a medium stiff to hard and slightly moist to moist condition were encountered. Underlying the fills and native soils in Test Pits 5, 9, and 10, weathered bedrock was encountered to the maximum depth of exploration (Youngdahl 2021).

City Regulation of Geology and Soils

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

Evaluation of Geology and Soils

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

Less than significant impact. According to the Geotechnical Report, there are no known active faults crossing the property, and the project site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone (Youngdahl 2021). Therefore, ground rupture is unlikely at the subject property, and impacts would be less than significant.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than significant impact. The site-specific geotechnical studies recommended the project site be classified as Site Class C in accordance with the 2019 California Building Code (Class A requires the least

earthquake resistant design and Class F the most earthquake resistant design). Seismic design parameters based on the 2019 California Building Code and site investigations were recommended in the geotechnical studies for use in structural design. Conformance to the current building code recommendations would minimize potential ground shaking impacts to a less than significant level.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than significant impact. Due to the absence of a permanently elevated groundwater table, the relatively shallow depth to bedrock, and relatively low seismicity of the area, the potential for damage due to site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface rupture was considered negligible in the site-specific studies (Youngdahl 2021). Therefore, liquefaction is unlikely at the subject property and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

Less than significant impact. Due to the absence of a permanently elevated groundwater table, the relatively shallow depth to bedrock, and relatively low seismicity of the area, the potential for damage due to site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface rupture was considered negligible in the site-specific studies (Youngdahl 2021). Additionally, the site has relatively flat topography. Therefore, landslides are unlikely at the subject property and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. The 2019 CBC (California Building Code) and the City's Grading Code and standard conditions for project approval contain requirements to minimize or avoid potential effects from erosion hazards. As a condition of approval, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the City would require the applicant to prepare a soils report, a detailed grading plan, and an erosion control plan by a qualified and licensed engineer. The soils report would identify soil hazards, including potential impacts from erosion. The City would be required to review and approve the erosion control plan based on the California Department of Conservation's "Erosion and Control Handbook." The erosion control plan would identify protective measures to be implemented during excavation, temporary stockpiling, disposal, and revegetation activities. Compliance with the City's regulations and the 2019 CBC requirements would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion from water to less than significant.

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?

Less than significant impact. Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil shear strength and sudden increase in porewater pressure caused by shear strains, which could result from an earthquake. Research has shown that saturated, loose to medium-dense sands with a silt content less than about 25 percent located within the top 40-feet are most susceptible to liquefaction and surface rupture or lateral spreading. Slope instability can occur as a result of seismic ground motions and/or in combination with weak soils and saturated conditions.

As also discussed under "a" ii and iii, the potential for damage due to site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface ruptures was considered negligible due to the absence of a permanently elevated groundwater table, the relatively shallow depth to bedrock, and relatively low seismicity of the area.

Therefore, the project would have less than significant impact regarding unstable geological units or soils.

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

Less than significant impact. Although not encountered in test pits, intermittent or isolated pockets of highly expansive clay soils have been found in the region, typically on top of weathered bedrock. In concentrated amounts, such clays could cause distress to concrete slab-on-grade floors and foundations if present in the upper 3-feet of the structural improvement areas. However, due to the cuts and fills associated with hillside grading activities and the potential to blend any isolated clays, if present, into the remaining materials, the geotechnical report does not recommend mitigation measures to be required. If significant quantities of previously unknown expansive clays were discovered during site preparation or construction, additional measures would be recommended from the geotechnical consultant to minimize any risk they may pose. Following the recommendations of the geotechnical studies would minimize potential impacts from project construction on expansive and potentially expansive soil, and impacts would be less than significant.

- 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?

No impact. The proposed sewer system would connect to the public sewer system and would not require septic systems or an alternative waste disposal system. No impact would occur.

- f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No previous surveys conducted in the project area have identified the project site as sensitive for paleontological resources or other geologically sensitive resources, nor have testing or ground disturbing activities performed to date uncovered any paleontological resources or geologically sensitive resources. While the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources and other geologically sensitive resources is considered low, project-related ground disturbing activities could affect the integrity of a previously unknown paleontological or other geologically sensitive resource, resulting in a substantial change in the significance of the resource. Therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-01 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measure GEO-01: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Paleontological Resources

In the event paleontological or other geologically sensitive resources (such as fossils or fossil formations) are identified during any phase of project construction, all excavations within 100-feet of the find shall be temporarily halted until the find is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate representative at the City of Folsom who shall coordinate with the paleontologist as to any necessary investigation of the find. If the find is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City shall implement those measures which may include avoidance, preservation in place, or other appropriate measures, as outlined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. completed the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist for the proposed project. This checklist is presented in **Appendix B**.

Environmental Setting

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

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

GHGs vary widely in the power of their climatic effects; therefore, climate scientists have established a unit called global warming potential (GWP). The GWP of a gas is a measure of both potency and lifespan in the atmosphere as compared to CO₂. For example, since CH₄ and N₂O are approximately 25 and 298 times more powerful than CO₂, respectively, in their ability to trap heat in the atmosphere, they have GWPs of 25 and 298, respectively (CO₂ has a GWP of 1). Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) is a quantity that enables all GHG emissions to be considered as a group despite their varying GWP. The GWP of each

GHG is multiplied by the prevalence of that gas to produce CO₂e. The atmospheric lifetime and GWP of selected GHGs are summarized in **Table 9**.

Table 9. Global Warming Potentials and Atmospheric Lifetimes

GREENHOUSE GAS	ATMOSPHERIC LIFETIME (years)	GLOBAL WARMING POTENTIAL (100-year time horizon)
Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂)	50.0–200.0	1
Methane (CH ₄)	12.0	25
Nitrous Oxide (N ₂ O)	114.0	298
HFC-134a	14	1,430
PFC: Tetrafluoromethane (CF ₄)	50,000.0	7,390
PFC: Hexafluoroethane (C ₂ F ₆)	10,000.0	12,200
Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF ₆)	3,200.0	22,800

HFC: hydrofluorocarbons; PFC: perfluorocarbons.

Source: IPCC 2007.

Regulatory Framework Relating to Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

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

In order to help avert these potential consequences, AB 32 established a State goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, which was a reduction of approximately 16 percent from forecasted emission levels, with further reductions to follow. In addition, AB 32 required CARB develop a Scoping Plan to help the state achieve the targeted GHG reductions. In 2015, Executive Order (EO) B-30-15 established California GHG emission reduction targets of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The EO aligns California's GHG emission reduction targets with those of leading international governments, including the 27 nation European Union. California met the target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in AB 32. As a follow-up to AB 32 and in response to EO-B-30-15, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was passed by the California legislature in 2016 to codify the EO's California GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

In December 2008, CARB adopted its first version of its Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan), which contained the main strategies California was to implement to achieve the mandate of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Scoping Plan establishes an overall framework for the measures to be adopted to reduce California's GHG emissions. The Scoping Plan evaluates opportunities for sector-specific reductions, integrates all CARB and Climate Action Team early actions and additional GHG reduction measures by both entities, identifies additional measures to be pursued as regulations, and outlines the role of a cap-and-trade program.

On December 14, 2017, CARB adopted the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan (2017 Scoping Plan), which lays out the framework for achieving the mandate of SB 32 (2016) to reduce statewide GHG emissions to at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by the end of 2030 (CARB 2017).

The 2017 Scoping Plan includes guidance to local governments in Chapter 5, including plan-level GHG emissions reduction goals and methods to reduce communitywide GHG emissions. In its guidance, CARB recommends that “local governments evaluate and adopt robust and quantitative locally-appropriate goals that align with the statewide per capita targets and the State’s sustainable development objectives and develop plans to achieve the local goals.” CARB further states that “it is appropriate for local jurisdictions to derive evidence-based local per capita goals [or some other metric] that the local jurisdiction deems appropriate, such as mass emissions or per service population, based on local emissions sectors and population projections that are consistent with the framework used to develop the statewide per capita targets” (CARB 2017).

Regulatory Framework Relating to Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As part of the 2035 General Plan, the City prepared an integrated Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy (Appendix A to the 2035 General Plan; adopted August 28, 2018). The purpose of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy (GHG Strategy) is to identify and reduce current and future community GHG emissions and those associated with the City’s municipal operations. The GHG Strategy includes GHG reduction targets to reduce GHG emissions (with a 2005 baseline year) by 15 percent in 2020, 51 percent in 2035, and 80 percent in 2050. The GHG Strategy identifies policies within the City of Folsom General Plan that would decrease the City’s emissions of greenhouse gases. The GHG Strategy also satisfies the requirements of CEQA to identify and mitigate GHG emissions associated with the General Plan Update as part of the environmental review process and serves as the City’s “plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases”, per Section 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, which provides the opportunity for tiering and streamlining of project-level emissions for certain types of discretionary projects subject to CEQA review that are consistent with the General Plan (City 2018).

Evaluation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The final determination of whether or not a project has a significant effect is within the purview of the lead agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b). The City’s GHG Strategy, described above, is a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Consistency with the GHG Strategy may be used to determine the significance of the project’s GHG emissions.

The City’s 2035 General Plan Policy NCR 3.2.8 and GHG Strategy include criteria to determine whether the potential greenhouse gas emissions of a proposed project are significant (City 2018).

NCR 3.2.8 Streamlined GHG Analysis for Projects Consistent with the General Plan

Projects subject to environmental review under CEQA may be eligible for tiering and streamlining the analysis of GHG emissions, provided they are consistent with the GHG reduction measures included in the General Plan and EIR. The City may review such projects to determine whether the following criteria are met:

- Proposed project is consistent with the current general plan land use designation for the project site;
 - Proposed project incorporates all applicable GHG reduction measures (as documented in the Climate Change Technical Appendix to the General Plan EIR) as mitigation measures in the CEQA document prepared for the project; and,
 - Proposed project clearly demonstrates the method, timing and process for which the project will comply with applicable GHG reduction measures and/or conditions of approval, (e.g., using a CAP/GHG reduction measures consistency checklist, mitigation monitoring and reporting plan, or other mechanism for monitoring and enforcement as appropriate).
- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. GHG emissions would be generated by the project during construction (vehicle engine exhaust from construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips) and during long-term operation (electricity and natural gas use, electricity resulting from water consumption; solid waste disposal, and vehicle engine exhaust). To determine significance of the project's GHG emissions, the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist was completed (City of Folsom 2021a; included as **Appendix B**):

Part 1: Land Use Consistency

The proposed project is consistent with the City's 2035 General Plan land use and zoning designations?

Consistent. The site is designated as Community Commercial (CC) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The CC designation provides for community-based retail and service uses intended to serve residential neighborhoods within the city. This designation allows for a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.2-0.5. In addition, the site has been assigned an overlay designation (East Bidwell Street Mixed-Use Overlay) by the General Plan.

The General Plan also designates the site within the East Bidwell Corridor overlay (EBC Overlay), which allows mixed-use development and allows commercial and residential uses that are mutually compatible along East Bidwell Street. The EBC Overlay allows multi-family housing as well as retail commercial, restaurants, office, and other compatible uses. The acceptable density range within this overlay is 20-30 dwelling units per acre, and the acceptable floor area ratio is 0.5 to 1.5. The density of the proposed project would be 19.63 dwelling units (DU) per acre (rounded to 20 DU/acre). Given that the project site is within the EBC Overlay, the proposed multi-family use is consistent with the existing General Plan designation.

The zoning designation of the site is SP 95-1 (Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan) with an underlying specific plan designation of C-2 (Central Business District). In the C-2 (Central Business District) zone, apartments are not an expressly permitted use (Zoning Code 17.22.030). Currently, the proposed project is not consistent with the Zoning Code, FMC Chapter 17.22. However, state law makes clear that a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective General Plan standards and

criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the General Plan (Gov. Code § 65589.5(j)(4).) While the zoning for the project site (C-2) does not expressly allow residential development, that prohibition is inconsistent with the General Plan (EBC Overlay), with which the project complies. Accordingly, state law prohibits a finding that the proposed project is inconsistent with applicable zoning standards or requires a re-zone (Gov. Code § 65589.5(j)(4)) and it also prohibits a denial of the project based on inconsistency with the zoning ordinance (Gov. Code § 65589.5(d)(2)(A)).

The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). Section 5.4.2 of the Broadstone 3 Specific Plan identifies that a PD Permit is required for multi-family land uses. The purpose of the PD Permit is to allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. With the PD Permit, the project's site plan, elevations, and overall project design would be evaluated, and specific development standards defined. If a PD Permit were to be granted, the project would be deemed consistent with the existing zoning district applicable to the site.

Part 2: GHG Reduction Measures Consistency (only applicable measures shown):

E-1 Building energy Sector: The project will exceed the requirements of the 2016 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) by 15 percent or more?

Consistent. The project would meet the requirement of the 2019 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6), including the requirements for onsite photovoltaic electricity generations (solar panels). According to the California Energy Commission (CEC), once rooftop solar electricity generation is factored in, homes built under the 2019 standards will use about 53 percent less energy than those under the 2016 standards (CEC 2018).

T-1 Project Location and Density: Project is located within a Transit Priority Area or with the East Bidwell Mixed-Use with a minimum density of 20 units per acre (du/ac) or a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.75?

Consistent. The project site is with the EBC Overlay and would have a density of approximately 20 dwelling units per acre.

T-3 Bicycle Parking: Project provides 5 percent more bicycle parking spaces than required in the City's Municipal Code?

Consistent with mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-01 would require the installation of bicycle parking 5 percent or more higher than the requirements of City Code section 17.57.090 (for a total of 54 bicycle parking spaces).

T-6 High-Performance Diesel (Construction only): Use high-performance diesel (also known as Diesel-HPR or Reg-9000/RHD) for construction equipment?

Consistent with mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-02 would require the use of high-performance diesel for all project construction activities.

T-8 Electric Vehicle Charging (Residential): For multifamily projects with 17 or more dwelling units, provide electric vehicle charging in 5 percent of total parking spaces?

Consistent with mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-03 would require installation of electrical vehicle charging stations in a minimum of 5 percent of the total parking spaces on the project site.

SW-1 Enhanced Construction Waste Diversion: Project diverts to recycle or salvage at least 65 percent of nonhazardous construction and demolition waste generated at the project site in accordance with Appendix A4 (Residential) of CALGreen?

Consistent with mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-04 would require a minimum of 65 percent of nonhazardous construction and demolition waste to be diverted, recycled or salvaged.

W-1 Water Efficiency: For new residential and non-residential projects, the project will comply with all applicable indoor and outdoor water efficiency and conservation measures required under CALGreen Tier 1?

Consistent with mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-05 would require implementation of all 2019 CALGreen Tier 1 applicable indoor and outdoor water efficiency and conservation measures.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-01 through -05, the project would be consistent with the City's GHG Strategy. Therefore, the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation Measure GHG-01: Bicycle Parking

In accordance with the City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-3, the project shall provide a minimum of 5 percent more bicycle parking than required in the City's Municipal Code Section 17.57.090 (for a total of 54 bicycle parking spaces).

Mitigation Measure GHG-02: High-Performance Diesel

In accordance with the City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-6, the project shall use high-performance diesel (also known as Diesel-HPR or Reg-9000/RHD) for all diesel-powered equipment utilized in construction of the project.

Mitigation Measure GHG-03: Electric Vehicle Charging

In accordance with the City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-8, the project shall provide electric vehicle charging stations in 5 percent of the total surface parking spaces on the project site (for a total of 12 EV charging stations).

Mitigation Measure GHG-04: Enhanced Construction Waste Diversion

In accordance with the City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure SW-1, the project shall divert to recycle or salvage a minimum 65 of nonhazardous construction and demolition waste generated at

the project site in accordance with Appendix A4 (Residential) of the as outlined in the California Green Building Standards Code (2019 CALGreen).

Mitigation Measure GHG-05: Water Efficiency

In accordance with the City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure W-1, the project shall comply with all applicable indoor and outdoor water efficiency and conservation measures required under 2019 CALGreen Tier 1, as outlined in the California Green Building Standards Code.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. There are numerous State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The principal overall State plan and policy is AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The quantitative goal of AB 32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 32 would require further reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The mandates of AB 32 and SB 32 are implanted at the state level by the CARB's Scoping Plan. Because the project's operational year is post-2020, the project aims to reach the quantitative goals set by SB 32. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles (AB 1493), the LCFS, and regulations requiring an increasing fraction of electricity to be generated from renewable sources are being implemented at the statewide level; as such, compliance at the project level is not addressed. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with those plans and regulations.

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for Sacramento County is the 2020 MTP/SCS adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) on November 18, 2019. The 2020 MTP/SCS lays out a transportation investment and land use strategy to support a prosperous region, with access to jobs and economic opportunity, transportation options, and affordable housing that works for all residents. The plan also lays out a path for improving our air quality, preserving open space and natural resources, and helping California achieve its goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (SACOG 2019). The transportation sector is the largest source of GHG emissions in the state. A project's GHG emissions from cars and light trucks are directly correlated to the project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT). According to the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) prepared for the project, the Project is anticipated to generate 24 percent less VMT per capita than the regional residential average and 18 percent less VMT per capita than the Folsom residential average (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2021). This VMT reduction exceeds the 15 percent reduction required by SB 743. In addition to regional VMT projections, SACOG utilizes local growth projections to develop the strategies and measures in the 2020 MTP/SCS. As discussed in question a), above, the project site is within the EBC Overlay and the project density of 20 dwelling units per acre would be within the 20 to 30 dwelling units per acre range required for residential land uses within the EBC Overlay. Therefore, the regional VMT and population growth resulting from implementation of the project would be consistent with the assumptions used in the 2020 MTP/SCS.

As discussed in question a), above, with implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-01 through GHG-05, the project would be consistent with the City's GHG Strategy, a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Therefore, the project would not conflict with CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan, the SACOG's 2020 MTP/SCS, or the City's GHG Strategy, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The project site consists of a vacant parcel that has been previously rough graded. The project site has no known past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites.

The school nearest to the project site is Folsom Lake College, located approximately 0.5-miles due northwest of the project site at 10 College Parkway, Folsom, CA. Other schools in the vicinity include Gold Ridge Elementary, approximately 0.6-miles due southwest of the project site and Vista Del Lago High School, approximately 0.7-miles due east of the project site.

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker tool (SWRCB

2021), California Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStor online tool (DTSC 2021); and the EPA's Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2021b). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, no hazardous waste sites are on the project site.

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

Evaluation of Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than significant impact. The site has no known history of past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites. Construction of the proposed project would result in an increase in the generation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes. During project construction oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, paints, solvents, and other hazardous materials may be used. If spilled, these substances could pose a risk to the environment and to human health.

Following construction, household hazardous materials such as various cleaners, paints, solvents, pesticides, pool chemicals, and automobile fluids would be expected to be used. The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to local, state, and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure.

Further, the City has set forth its hazardous materials goals and policies in the Hazardous Materials Element of the General Plan. The preventative policies protect the health and welfare of residents of Folsom through management and regulation of hazardous materials. Consequently, use of the listed materials above for their intended purpose would not pose a significant risk to the public or environment, and any impacts would be less than significant.

- 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?

Less than significant impact. As discussed above, the proposed project site has no known history of past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites and construction of the proposed project would follow all local, state and federal regulations. Following project construction, household hazardous materials such as various cleansers, paints, solvents, pesticides, pool chemicals, and automobile fluids would be expected to be used. The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as these are subject to local, state, and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure.

Further, the City has set forth its hazardous materials goals and policies in the Safety and Noise Element of the General Plan. The preventative policies protect the health and welfare of residents of Folsom through management and regulation of hazardous materials. Consequently, use of the listed materials above for their intended purpose would not pose a significant risk to the public or environment, and impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No impact. The nearest school is Folsom Lake College, located approximately 0.5-miles due northwest of the project site. There would be no impact, as there is no school within 0.25-miles of the project site.

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

No impact. The site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No hazardous materials sites are located at the project site based on review of *EnviroStor* (DTSC 2021), *Geotracker* (SWRCB 2021), and *EPA Superfund Priority List* (EPA 2021b). Therefore, project implementation would have no impact on hazards to the public or environment.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No impact. The nearest public or public use airport is Cameron Airpark, approximately 7.0-miles northeast of the project site. At this distance, the project is not within the airport land use plan area and the project would have no impact on safety hazards or excessive noise related to airports.

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

Less than significant impact. The City of Folsom maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes as identified in the *City of Folsom Evacuation Plan* (City of Folsom 2021b). The proposed project is located in evacuation plan area #30-Vista Del Lago/ Russel Ranch, which identifies Broadstone Parkway as a minor evacuation route and East Bidwell Street as a major evacuation route. The proposed project would not modify any pre-designated emergency evacuation route or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout the project site to meet the Fire Department standards for fire engine maneuvering, location of fire engine to fight a fire, rescue access to the units, and fire hose access to all sides of the building. Therefore, project impacts to the City's adopted evacuation plan and emergency plans would be less than significant.

- g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less than significant impact. The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area and it is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. It is not located near a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021). The project site is located in an urbanized area in the City of Folsom and is provided urban levels of fire protection by the City. The site is designed for clear fire lane/fire engine access and fire hose access to all parts of the buildings. The site does not border any areas of natural vegetation. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss due to wildland fires, and any impacts would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off- site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The regional setting of the project site is primarily characterized by residential development with a commercial shopping center immediately adjacent to the west. The project site gently slopes downward from both east to west and from south to north. Precipitation is the only apparent source of surface water as there are no wetlands or natural drainages located on the project site.

The on-site storm drain system for the proposed project would conform to City of Folsom standards and include design features consistent with the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions. Low Impact Design features, including a combination of bio-retention swales, basins, and planters, have been identified for each drainage management area within the proposed

expansion. Additionally, all new proposed trash enclosures would include a drain that connects to the sanitary sewer system in conformance with Storm Water Quality Guidance. The project would incorporate standard best management practices (BMP) to maintain existing water quality in accordance with City regulations.

Construction of the proposed project would disturb more than one acre of soil and would conform to the California General Construction Permit, and a SWPPP would be prepared for the proposed project. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps were reviewed for the project's proximity to a 100-year floodplain. The proposed project is on FEMA panel 06067C0104H, effective August 16, 2012. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2018). The site is not located in an area of important groundwater recharge. Domestic water in the City is provided solely by surface water sources, and the City is the purveyor of water to the project area.

On-site run-off would flow to the underground storm water drainage system. The project would incorporate standard (BMPs) to maintain existing water quality in accordance with City regulations. The site would accomplish post construction stormwater quality through the use of LID and Stormwater Quality methods, as outlined in the "Stormwater Quality Design Manual – Sacramento Region, July 2018."

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps were reviewed for the project's proximity to a 100-year floodplain. The proposed project is on FEMA panel 06067C0140H, effective August 16, 2012. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2012).

The site is not located in an area of important groundwater recharge. Domestic water in the City is provided solely by surface water sources. The City is the purveyor of water for the site.

Regulatory Framework Relating to Hydrology and Water Quality

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

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

Standard construction conditions required by the City include:

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

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

Additionally, the City enforces the following requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code as presented in **Table 10**.

Table 10. City of Folsom Municipal Code Sections Regulating the Effects on Hydrology and Water Quality from Urban Development

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

Source: City of Folsom 2021c.

Evaluation of Hydrology and Water Quality

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?
- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
 - i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
 - ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off- site?
 - iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff?
 - iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?
- e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. The project site is highly modified and has been rough graded. Implementation of the proposed project would alter the existing drainage patterns on the project site, including the concrete lined drainage channel present on the project site surface. The project would utilize the existing storm drain system and would need to construct a new connection to that system to convey water off-site. The site conditions would be replaced with impervious surfaces from the buildings, parking lot, and sidewalks or walking paths. These ground disturbing activities could expose soil to erosion and may result in the transport of sediments which could adversely affect water quality.

The proposed project would disturb more than one acre of soil and be subject to NPDES permit conditions which include the preparation of a SWPPP. Compliance with various State and local water quality standards would ensure the proposed project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge permits, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project would also be subject to all of the City's standard code requirements, including conditions for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm drainage system, and restrictions on uses that cause water or erosion hazards.

Construction of the proposed project would increase impervious services which may result in an increase in the total volume and peak discharges of stormwater runoff and could potentially degrade water quality associated with urban runoff. However, as mentioned in the Environmental Setting section, the on-site storm drain design would conform to City of Folsom standards and include design features consistent with the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions. Low Impact Design (LID) features, including a combination of bio-retention swales, basins, and planters, have been identified for each drainage management area within the proposed expansion. Further, prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the applicant would be required to submit a drainage plan to the City that shows how project BMPs capture storm water runoff during project

operations. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that water quality standards and discharge requirements would not be violated, and water quality in the project area is protected.

Drainage plans have been prepared for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan area. The overall storm water drainage systems included in those plans serve the project site. Construction on the site would be subject to NPDES permit conditions (including the implementation of BMPs) and all of the City's standard conditions and Code requirements. Operation of these requirements, which would be unchanged with approval of the project, would ensure that no adverse effects due to stormwater generation or contamination would take place. Mitigation measures from the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan EIR would be implemented, and are prescribed again here as Mitigation Measures HYD-01 and HYD-02, to reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure HYD-01: Drainage Plan

Prior to approval of improvement plans, the applicant shall submit detailed drainage plans for evaluation by the City. Approved plans shall be implemented prior to project occupancy. The drainage plans shall include measures to minimize the total amount of additional surface runoff and to limit the flows released to off-site receiving waters to existing pre-development levels in accordance with the requirements of the Folsom City Public Works Department.

Mitigation Measure HYD-02: Erosion Control Plan

Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit erosion control plans and other monitoring programs for the construction and operational phases of the proposed project for review by the City. The plans shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize and control the level of pollutants in stormwater runoff, and in runoff released to off-site receiving waters. Specific techniques may be based on geotechnical reports or the Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook of the California Department of Conservation, and shall comply with current City standards, including the Sacramento Region Stormwater Quality Design Manual.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-01 and HYD-02, potential impacts related to on-or off-site erosion, pollutants, flooding, and/or otherwise substantial degradation of water quality would be reduced to less than significant for a), c), and e).

- b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the use of groundwater supplies because domestic water in the City is provided solely from surface water sources from the Folsom Reservoir. While development of the proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the site that could affect groundwater recharge, the site is not known to be important to groundwater recharge. Further, because the proposed project would not rely on groundwater for domestic water and irrigation purposes, and the site is not an important area of groundwater recharge, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. Therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less than significant impact. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain and is not subject to flood hazard. The project site is also approximately 70 miles northeast of the nearest tsunami inundation area near Benicia, CA (California Emergency Management Agency 2009). The nearest lake is Folsom Lake, which is approximately 3.0 miles north. Based on the site's location away from the 100-year floodplain, distance from tsunami inundation area, and distance to Folsom Lake, the project site is not subject to release of pollutants due to inundation.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Land use in the project area is regulated by the City of Folsom through the various plans and ordinances adopted by the City. These include the City of Folsom General Plan and the City of Folsom Municipal Code, including the Zoning Code.

The site is designated as Community Commercial (CC) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The CC designation provides for community-based retail and service uses intended to serve residential neighborhoods within the city. This designation allows for a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.2-0.5. In addition, the site has been assigned an overlay designation (East Bidwell Street Mixed-Use Overlay) by the General Plan.

The General Plan also designates the site within the East Bidwell Corridor overlay (EBC Overlay), which allows mixed-use development and allows commercial and residential uses that are mutually compatible along East Bidwell Street. The EBC Overlay allows multi-family housing as well as retail commercial, restaurants, office, and other compatible uses. The acceptable density range within this overlay is 20-30 dwelling units per acre, and the acceptable floor area ratio is 0.5 to 1.5. The density of the proposed project would be approximately 19.63 dwelling units (DU) per acre (rounded to 20 DU/acre). Given that the project site is within the EBC Overlay, the proposed multi-family use is consistent with the existing General Plan designation.

The zoning designation of the site is SP 95-1 (Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan) with an underlying specific plan designation of C-2 (Central Business District). In the C-2 (Central Business District) zone, apartments are not an expressly permitted use (Zoning Code 17.22.030).

Evaluation of Land Use and Planning

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The project site is surrounded by residential and commercial land uses. The proposed project would subdivide a vacant lot and develop one of the parcels, requiring a tentative tract map from the City. Project construction would not barricade or reduce access to Broadstone Parkway, Cavitt Drive, or East Bidwell Street. The community would not be gated. There is an existing bike path to the

south of the site, this path would not be altered. Additionally, a new road would be constructed that would link Cavitt Drive with East Bidwell Street. The proposed project would not divide an established community, and there would be no impact.

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

Less than significant impact. Currently, the proposed project is not consistent with the Zoning Code, FMC Chapter 17.22. However, state law makes clear that a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective General Plan standards and criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the General Plan (Gov. Code § 65589.5(j)(4).) While the zoning for the project site (C-2) does not expressly allow residential development, that prohibition is inconsistent with the General Plan (EBC Overlay), with which the project complies. Accordingly, state law prohibits a finding that the proposed project is inconsistent with applicable zoning standards or requires a re-zone (Gov. Code § 65589.5(j)(4)) and it also prohibits a denial of the project based on inconsistency with the zoning ordinance (Gov. Code § 65589.5(d)(2)(A)).

The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). Section 5.4.2 of the Broadstone 3 Specific Plan identifies that a PD Permit is required for multi-family land uses. The purpose of the PD Permit is to allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. With the PD Permit, the project's site plan, elevations, and overall project design would be evaluated, and specific development standards defined. If a PD Permit were to be granted, the project would be deemed consistent with the existing zoning district applicable to the site.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The Folsom area regional geologic structure is defined by the predominantly northwest- to southeast-trending belt of metamorphic rocks and the strike-slip faults that bound them. The structural trend influences the orientation of the feeder canyons into the main canyons of the North and South Forks of the American River. This trend is interrupted where the granodiorite plutons outcrop (north and west of Folsom Lake) and where the metamorphic rocks are blanketed by younger sedimentary layers (west of Folsom Dam) (Wagner et al. 1981 in Geotechnical Consultants 2003). The four primary rock divisions found in the area are: ultramafic intrusive, metamorphic, granodiorite intrusive, and volcanic mud flows (Geotechnical Consultants 2003).

The presence of mineral resources within the City has led to a long history of gold extraction, primarily placer gold. No areas of the City are currently designated for mineral resource extraction. Based on a review of the *Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15' Quadrangle, Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California* (CDC 1984), no known mineral resources are mapped in the project area.

Evaluation of Mineral Resources

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

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

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted noise analysis for the proposed project based primarily on the preliminary site plan and the Transportation Impact Study conducted by T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (2021). Noise modeling output files and quantitative results are presented in **Appendix F**.

Environmental Setting

The existing noise environment in the vicinity of the project site is dominated by vehicular traffic, primarily on East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway. Other noise sources include ambient urban sounds associated with the commercial developments across East Bidwell Street from the project site, noise associated with multi-family apartments adjacent to the project site to the northeast, and transformer noise from an electrical utility substation within the project site.

Short-term (10 to 15 minutes) ambient noise measurements were conducted on September 23, 2021 at one on-site location and three off-site locations. Measurement M1 was conducted on Cavitt Drive adjacent to the project site, opposite from Handy Family Park. Measurement M2 was conducted on Broadstone Parkway adjacent to the project site approximately 330 feet northeast of East Bidwell Street. Measurement M3 was taken adjacent to the project site approximately 70 feet back from East Bidwell Street and 480 feet southeast of Broadstone Parkway. Measurement M4 was taken 15 feet in front of the electrical substation gate within the project site. Measurements were conducted to assess the existing ambient noise environment. Traffic counts were taken during the offsite noise measurements. The results of the ambient noise measurements are summarized in **Table 11**.

Noise-sensitive land uses are land uses that may be subject to stress and/or interference from excessive noise, including residences, hospitals, churches, schools, hotels, resorts, libraries, sensitive wildlife habitat, or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute of the environment. Noise-sensitive

land uses in the project vicinity include multi-family residences adjacent to the project site to the northeast, and single-family residences across Cavitt Drive the east.

Table 11. Ambient Noise Measurement Results

Measurement	Location	Condition	Time	dBA L _{EQ}	Traffic Count
M1	Cavitt Drive adjacent to the project site, opposite from Handy Family Park	75°F, 5 mph wind, 38 percent humidity, sunny	9:56 a.m. to 10:11 a.m. (15 minutes)	61.5	32 cars, no trucks
M2	Broadstone Parkway adjacent to the project site approximately 330 feet northeast of East Bidwell Street	79°F, 7 mph wind, 32 percent humidity, sunny	10:17 a.m. to 10:32 a.m. (15 minutes)	62.2	164 cars, 3 medium trucks, 5 heavy trucks
M3	Adjacent to the project site approximately 70 feet east from East Bidwell Street and 480 feet southeast of Broadstone Parkway	80°F, 7 mph wind, 31 percent humidity, sunny	10:37 a.m. to 10:52 a.m. (15 minutes)	65.8	Southbound traffic only: 311 cars, 3 medium trucks, 4 heavy trucks
M4	15 feet in front of the electrical substation gate within the project site.	79°F, 7 mph wind, 32 percent humidity, sunny	10:57 a.m. to 11:07 a.m. (10 minutes)	59.9	N/A

Noise Metrics

All noise-level and sound-level values presented herein are expressed in terms of decibels (dB), with A weighting, abbreviated “dBA,” to approximate the hearing sensitivity of humans. Time averaged noise levels of one hour are expressed by the symbol “LEQ” unless a different time period is specified. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is a 24-hour average, where noise levels during the evening hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. have an added 5 dBA weighting, and sound levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. have an added 10 dBA weighting. This is similar to the Day Night sound level (L_{DN}), which is a 24-hour average with an added 10 dBA weighting on the same nighttime hours but no added weighting on the evening hours.

Because decibels are logarithmic units, noise levels cannot be added or subtracted through standard arithmetic. Under the decibel scale, a doubling of sound energy corresponds to a 3 dBA increase. In other words, when two identical sources are each producing sound of the same loudness, the resulting sound level at a given distance would be 3 dBA higher than from one source under the same conditions. For example, if one automobile produces an S_{PL} of 70 dBA when it passes an observer, two cars passing simultaneously would not produce 140 dBA—rather, they would combine to produce 73 dBA. Under the

decibel scale, three sources of equal loudness together produce a sound level 5 dBA louder than one source.

Under controlled conditions in an acoustical laboratory, the trained, healthy human ear is able to discern 1 dBA changes in sound levels, when exposed to steady, single-frequency (“pure-tone”) signals in the mid-frequency (1,000 Hertz [Hz]–8,000 Hz) range. In typical noisy environments, changes in noise of 1 to 2 dBA are generally not perceptible. It is widely accepted, however, that people begin to detect sound level increases of 3 dB in typical noisy environments. Further, a 5 dBA increase is generally perceived as a distinctly noticeable increase, and a 10 dBA increase is generally perceived as a doubling of loudness.

Vibration Metrics

Groundborne vibration consists of rapidly fluctuating motions or waves transmitted through the ground with an average motion of zero. Sources of groundborne vibrations include natural phenomena and anthropogenic causes (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous (e.g., factory machinery) or transient (e.g., explosions). Peak particle velocity (PPV) is commonly used to quantify vibration amplitude. The PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration wave. For the purposes of this analysis, a PPV descriptor with units of inches per second in/sec is used to evaluate construction-generated vibration for building damage and human complaints.

Regulatory Framework

Noise Element

The Safety and 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. Policy SN 6.1.2 and Table SN-1 provide noise compatibility standards for land uses. For multi-family residential uses, noise due to traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations, and aircraft shall be reduced to or below 65 CNEL for outdoor activity areas and 45 CNEL for interior use areas.

Noise Ordinance

For stationary noise sources, the City has adopted a Noise Ordinance as Section 8.42 of the City Municipal Code (City of Folsom 1993). The Noise Ordinance establishes hourly noise level performance standards that are most commonly quantified in terms of the one-hour average noise level (L_{EQ}). Using the limits specified in Section 8.42.040 of the Noise Ordinance, noise levels generated by the project would be significant if they exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA L_{EQ} from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. at off-site residential property boundaries. Noise from the project’s air conditioning systems would be significant if exterior noise levels exceed 50 dBA, per Section 8.42.070 of the City Municipal Code. Section 8.42.060 exempts construction noise from these standards provided that construction does not occur before 7:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday.

Evaluation of Noise

- a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than significant Impact with mitigation.

Construction Noise

Project construction noise was analyzed using the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Roadway Construction Noise Model ([RCNM]; USDOT 2008), which utilizes estimates of sound levels from standard construction equipment.

The nearest noise-sensitive land uses to the project site area, the multi-family apartment buildings on the northeast side of the project site, are approximately 95 feet from the closest anticipated construction activity. The noisiest construction equipment anticipated to be used near NSLUs would be a grader used during grading. Modeling shows that the noise from a grader would be 75.4dBA L_{EQ} at the closest residential building. As construction equipment would be mobile as it moves across the project site, the noise level experienced by the neighboring uses would vary throughout the day.

According to the Folsom Municipal Code Section 8.42.060, noise sources associated with construction of the project which are conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on Monday through Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, are exempt from the City noise standard (City of Folsom 1993). Nevertheless, short-term noise would be substantially higher than existing ambient conditions, resulting in a temporarily significant noise impact. The implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would minimize noise levels to surrounding residential uses and would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Off-site Noise Impacts

Modeling of the exterior noise environment for this report was accomplished using the Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA) model version 2021. The noise models used in this analysis were developed from Computer Aided Design (CAD) plans provided by the project architect. Input variables included building mechanical equipment reference noise levels, road alignment, elevation, lane configuration, area topography, projected traffic volumes, estimated truck composition percentages, and vehicle speeds. The one-hour L_{EQ} traffic noise level is calculated utilizing peak-hour traffic. The model-calculated one-hour L_{EQ} noise output is the equivalent to the CNEL (Caltrans 2009). The modeling includes the project buildings but does not account for terrain or off-site buildings and structures. The noise modeling input and output is included in **Appendix F**.

According to the Transportation Impact Study, the project is expected to generate approximately 1,399 daily trips and 105 trips during the PM peak hour (T. Kear 2021). Future traffic noise levels presented in this analysis are based on traffic volumes derived from intersection turning counts included in the TIS for four scenarios: existing; existing plus project; existing plus approved projects (EPAP) 2026; and EPAP 2026 plus project. The traffic volumes for each analyzed road segment and scenario are included in **Appendix F**. To calculate changes in traffic noise levels, receivers were placed in the model at the closest commercial building or residential property along each road segment.

In typical outdoor environments, a 3 dBA increase in ambient noise level is considered just perceptible and a 5 dBA increase (a doubling of noise) is considered distinctly perceptible. In areas where existing or future ambient noise exceed the land use compatibility standards, an individual project's contribution to increases in ambient noise level could be considered significant if it exceeds 1.5 dBA. Because most of the areas along the analyzed road segments already exceed the land use noise compatibility standard listed in the city General Plan (60 dBA CNEL for low density residential; 65 dBA CNEL for multi-family residential and hotels, and 70 dBA for commercial), this analysis uses a threshold of a 1.5 dBA CNEL increase to be significant.

The maximum change in CNEL as a result of project-generated traffic would be 0.1 dBA CNEL, a change in ambient noise level that is lower than the threshold and is not discernable. Therefore, impacts related to the project generating a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of General Plan standards from project-generated traffic would be less than significant (**Table 12**).

Table 12. Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	Distance to Receiver (feet) ¹	Receiver Type	Existing (CNEL)	Existing + Project (CNEL)	Change in CNEL	EPAP (CNEL)	EPAP + Project (CNEL)	Change in CNEL
East Bidwell St.								
College Pkwy. to Scholar Way	110	Com.	70.1	70.1	0.0	70.7	70.7	0.0
Scholar Way to Power Center Dr.	105	Com.	70.0	70.0	0.0	70.7	70.7	0.0
Power Center Dr. to Broadstone Pkwy.	95	Com.	70.7	70.7	0.0	71.7	71.7	0.0
Broadstone Pkwy. To Via Sol	105	Com.	70.4	70.5	0.1	71.4	71.5	0.1
Via Sol to Via Felice	100	Com.	71.1	71.1	0.0	71.9	71.9	0.0
Via Felice to Iron Point Rd.	95	Com.	71.7	71.7	0.0	72.3	72.4	0.1
Iron Point Rd. to Placerville Rd.	140	Com.	71.9	71.9	0.0	72.7	72.7	0.0
Placerville Rd. to U.S. 50 Ramps	115	Com.	72.1	72.2	0.1	73.0	73.0	0.0
Broadstone Pkwy.								
East Bidwell St. to Marketplace	100	Com.	68.1	68.1	0.0	68.7	68.7	0.0
Market Place to Cavitt Dr.	160	MF	65.1	65.1	0.0	65.3	65.4	0.1
Iron Point Rd								
East Bidwell St. to Cavitt Dr.	170	Hotel	69.0	69.0	0.0	69.4	69.4	0.0
Cavitt Dr.								
Broadstone Pkwy to Kilrush Dr.	75	SF	60.5	60.6	0.1	60.6	60.7	0.1
Kilrush Dr. to Iron Point Rd.	70	SF	64.8	64.8	0.0	65.1	65.2	0.1

Source: TNM version 2.5.

Comm. = Commercial; Dr. = Drive; EPAP = Existing Plus Approved Projects; MF = Multi-Family Residential; NSLU = Noise Sensitive Land Use; Pkway. = Parkway; Rd. = Road; SF = Single-Family Residential; St. = Street
Notes: ¹ Distance measured from roadway centerline.

On-Site Traffic Noise

Exterior noise levels from traffic noise along the project frontages on East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway exceed the General Plan noise compatibility standards for multi-family residential uses. Although project-added traffic increases would not result in a substantial increase along these roadways, without noise-attenuation features built into the project's building materials, interior noise levels would exceed the City's standards for residential uses. To comply with the General Plan, for multi-family residential uses, noise due to traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations, and aircraft would need to be reduced to or below 65 CNEL for outdoor activity areas and 45 CNEL for interior use areas. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant. The implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-02 would ensure that noise reduction measures are included in building material specifications and would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

On-Site Operational Noise

Outdoor noise level from project on-site noise sources was modeled using CadnaA, as described above. The project would include the installation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units on the roof of the proposed apartment and clubhouse buildings. The project plan submittal shows the approximate rooftop location of split HVAC systems (each apartment would have a separate system with the condenser and compressor mounted on the roof and the evaporator/air handler located in the apartment). The units would be located behind a parapet wall of equal or greater height to the HVAC unit, which would provide some noise attenuation. Specific model information for the HVAC units at was not available at the time of this analysis. The modeling assumes a Carrier model 38BRC-024-34 2-ton system for each apartment (257 total), and a Carrier model 48PG07 6-ton system for each clubhouse building (two total). Receivers were placed in the model at the outdoor spaces of the closest noise sensitive land uses to the project site: the three 4-story apartment buildings facing the project site to the northeast (one receiver on each floor), and the back yards of two single-family homes across Cavitt Drive from the project site. The calculated noise levels at the receivers are shown in Table 18 and compared to the City noise ordinance nighttime standard. As shown in **Table 13**, noise from the project's HVAC systems would not exceed the City noise ordinance daytime or nighttime standard.

Long-term operation of project building HVAC systems would not result in noise levels exceeding the city noise ordinance standards, measured at the outdoor spaces of the closest noise sensitive land uses to the project site.

Table 13. Project HVAC Noise

Receiver	Floor	LEQ (dBA)	HVAC Standard (dBA)	Exceed Standard?
Apartment Building 1	1	33.0	50	No
Apartment Building 1	2	34.7	50	No
Apartment Building 1	3	36.6	50	No
Apartment Building 1	4	38.8	50	No
Apartment Building 2	1	33.9	50	No
Apartment Building 2	2	35.5	50	No
Apartment Building 2	3	36.9	50	No
Apartment Building 2	4	38.7	50	No
Apartment Building 3	1	35.1	50	No
Apartment Building 3	2	36.0	50	No
Apartment Building 3	3	37.5	50	No
Apartment Building 3	4	38.7	50	No
Single-Family Home 1	1	34.1	50	No
Single-Family Home 2	1	30.8	50	No

Mitigation Measure NOI-01: Construction Noise Reduction Measures

Construction activities shall be required to comply with the following and be noted accordingly on construction contracts:

1. Construction hours/Scheduling: The following are required to limit construction activities to the portion of the day when occupancy of the adjacent sensitive receptors are at the lowest:
 - a. Construction activities for all phases of construction, including servicing of construction equipment shall only be permitted during the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction is prohibited on Sundays and on all holidays.
 - b. Delivery of materials or equipment to the site and truck traffic coming to and from the site is restricted to the same construction hours specified above.
2. Construction Equipment Mufflers and Maintenance: All construction equipment powered by internal combustion engines shall be properly muffled and maintained.
3. Idling Prohibitions: All equipment and vehicles shall be turned off when not in use. Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines is prohibited.
4. Equipment Location and Shielding: All stationary noise-generating construction equipment, such as air compressors, shall be located as far as practical from the adjacent homes. Acoustically shield such equipment when it must be located near adjacent residences.
5. Quiet Equipment Selection: Select quiet equipment, particularly air compressors, whenever possible. Motorized equipment shall be outfitted with proper mufflers in good working order.

6. Staging and Equipment Storage: The equipment storage location shall be sited as far as possible from nearby sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measure NOI-02: On-site Interior Noise Level Reduction

For the project's habitable areas (both living rooms and bedrooms) with a direct line-of-sight to East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway, the following measures shall be incorporated in the design of the project to reduce interior noise levels to 45 CNEL or less:

- Minimum exterior wall requirement of STC 46 with a construction of standard of 3/8-inch exterior one coat stucco over 1-inch rigid R-4 insulation over 1/2-inch shearwall on 2x6 studs with 5/8-inch Type "X" Drywall.
- Minimum window requirement of STC 28 with a vinyl frame window construction of dual glazing window thickness 1/8-inch and 1/2-inch air gap.
- Appropriate means of air circulation and provision of fresh air intake shall be incorporated in the project to allow windows to remain closed for extended intervals of time so that acceptable levels of noise can be maintained on the interior.
- Buildings shall provide mechanical ventilation in accordance with the 2019 California Mechanical Code.

- b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than significant impact. An on-site source of vibration during project construction would be a vibratory roller (primarily used to achieve soil compaction as part of the foundation and paving construction), which could be used within approximately 95-feet of the multi-family residences to the northeast. The City does not state specific standards in the General Plan or Municipal Code for vibration; therefore, standards from the Caltrans' Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans 2020) are used. A large vibratory roller creates approximately 0.21-in/sec PPV at a distance of 25-feet. At a distance of 95-feet, a vibratory roller would create a PPV of 0.05-in/sec.¹ This would be substantially below the vibration criteria of 0.5-in/sec PPV for potential damage to normal buildings and blow the vibration criteria 0.2-in/sec PPV for potential damage to historical structures, as provided in by Caltrans for continuous/frequent intermittent sources (Caltrans 2020). Once operational, the project would not be a source of groundborne vibrations. Impacts associated with construction-generated vibration would be less than significant. Therefore, the project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and the impact would be less than significant.

- c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?

No impact. The closest airport to the project site is the Cameron Park Airport, approximately 7 miles to the northeast. The project site is not located in an area for which an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan has been prepared, and no public or private airfields are within two miles of the project area; therefore,

¹ Equipment PPV = Reference PPV * (25/D)ⁿ(in/sec), where Reference PPV is PPV at 25 feet, D is distance from equipment to the receptor in feet, and n= 1.1 (the value related to the attenuation rate through the ground); formula from Caltrans 2020.

the residents of the proposed project or people working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive levels of noise due to aircraft overflight, and there would be no impact.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Environmental Setting

Folsom's estimated population in 2019 was 81,328 people (U.S. Census Bureau 2019). The population is projected to increase to 97,485 by 2035 (City of Folsom 2018a). The proposed project would construct approximately 257 market rate apartment units (which would include a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units) within 33 apartment buildings.

Evaluation of Population and Housing

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

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of approximately 257 apartment units. Existing backbone infrastructure and roads in the area would not need to be expanded or extended as a result of the project.

The proposed project would accommodate the demand for housing and would not induce substantial growth in the City of Folsom. Although it is anticipated that the majority of individuals relocating to the apartment community would be from the area, it is possible that the apartments could draw in approximately 676 new residents (assuming 2.63 people per unit, based on projected household size in 2035 [City of Folsom 2008:18]). Consequently, the population of the project would likely be approximately 676 new residents. The population growth generated by the project is within the projected increase in population from planned growth as projected in the City's Housing Element. Therefore, impacts from project implementation would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

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

No impact. The project site is currently vacant. Therefore, there would be no impact on displacement of existing people or housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

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

The City of Folsom Fire Department provides fire protection services. There are five fire stations providing fire/rescue and emergency medical services within the City of Folsom. Station 37 is nearest to the project site and is located at 70 Clarksville Road, approximately 1.0-mile northwest of the project site. The Fire Department responded to 8,474 requests for service in 2020, with an average of 23.2 per day (City of Folsom 2021a). The City of Folsom Police Department is located at 46 Natoma Street, approximately 3.7-miles northwest of the project site.

The project site is located within the Folsom Cordova Unified School District and is within the attendance area for Gold Ridge Elementary School, Folsom Middle School, and Vista del Lago High School. There are several parks near the project site, including the Handy Family Park, Hillcrest Park, Nisenan Community Park, and John Kemp Community Park.

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) would supply electricity to the project site. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) provides natural gas to the area and would provide natural gas to the project site.

Evaluation of Public Services

a) Fire protection?

Less than significant impact. On-site fire suppression water would connect to the City of Folsom water supply on Broadstone Parkway and East Bidwell Street and the project would include fire hydrants, exterior Fire Department Connection assemblies, and fire riser rooms. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained on the site to meet the Fire Department standards for fire engine maneuvering, location of fire engine to fight a fire, rescue access to the units, and fire hose access to all sides of the building. The proposed project would not significantly increase fire service demands or render the current service level to be inadequate, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Police Protection?

Less than significant impact. The project site is within an urbanized area of Folsom and would increase the residential population requiring police protection services. The project would be required to pay the City's Capital Improvement New Construction Fee (Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80) to fund police services and facilities. The project includes features that reduce opportunities for crime such as adequate parking lot and site lighting (Section I.d), on-site management services, common areas visible from adjacent units, and no dead-end low-visibility areas. Potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

c) Schools?

Less than significant impact. Pursuant to Government Section 65995.1, the project would be required to pay development impact fees to the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. No new school facilities would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

d) Parks?

Less than significant impact. The 257-unit project would accommodate residents who would create additional demand for park and recreation facilities. The nearest park is Handy Family Park, located across Cavitt Drive just east of the project site at 1560 Cavitt Drive. Some additional use of community parks is anticipated, however, the parks in the area have sufficient size, facilities, and infrastructure to accommodate any increased use that may result from the project. On-site recreational facilities at the apartment complex would moderate any increase in demand for off-site parks. The project would be required to pay park fees to offset the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities. Section XVI Recreation includes additional information. Potential impacts from the proposed project on parks would be less than significant.

e) Other Facilities?

Less than significant impact. The project site is within the urban area of Folsom served by adequate police, fire, and emergency services. The apartment complex would include on-site recreational amenities to serve residents. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of parks and other public facilities or result in the degradation of those facilities. Potential impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be necessary. The impact of the project would be less than significant and mitigation would not be necessary.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The nearest park is Handy Family Park, located across Cavitt Drive just east of the project site at 1560 Cavitt Drive. The proposed project would provide some on-site recreational amenities to residents, including a clubhouse with recreation and social activities, fitness center, walking paths, a large pool, spa, bocce court, fire pits, and outdoor patios.

Evaluation of Recreation

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

Less than significant impact. Some additional use of community parks is anticipated, however, the parks in the area have sufficient size, facilities, and infrastructure to accommodate any increased use that may result from the project. On-site recreational facilities at the apartment complex would moderate any increase in demand for off-site parks. The project would be required to pay park fees to offset the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities. Potential impacts to existing parks would be less than significant.

- 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?

Less than significant impact. Community amenities would include an estimated 7,167 sf clubhouse (with 6,063 sf of amenity space and 1,104 sf of building support space) that would include a lobby, a quiet lounge, a lounge game room with a pool table and shuffle court, a kitchen, a work room, six restrooms, a pet room, a bike room, and a fitness center. Outside the clubhouse would be a large pool, spa, cabanas, outdoor kitchens, bocce ball, fire pits, and lounge areas. Additional outdoor amenities would include landscaped courtyards and walkways adjacent to the residential buildings, along with two dog parks with synthetic turf. Two leasing offices would be adjacent to the lobby within the clubhouse.

On-site facilities and existing neighborhood parks are anticipated to adequately serve the recreation demands of project residents. Potential impacts on recreational facilities would be less than significant.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The discussion below is based on a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. (T. Kear 2021). The TIS is summarized below and included in **Appendix G**.

Environmental Setting

Study Scenarios

Four scenarios were identified for inclusion in the TIS through consultation with City staff. These study scenarios were used to evaluate project impacts relevant to General Plan Policy M4.1.3 (see “General Plan Thresholds” heading within this section) relative to level of service. The analysis determined the weekday AM peak-hour and PM peak-hour level of service (LOS) at study intersections under the following scenarios:

- 1) Existing 2021 without Project condition;
- 2) Existing 2021 with Project condition;
- 3) Existing Plus Approved Projects (EPAP) 2026 without Project condition;
- 4) EPAP 2026 with Project condition.

Existing 2021 Condition with and without the Project

Analysis of the existing condition reflects the traffic volumes and roadway geometry at the time the study began. These two scenarios (with and without the Project) quantify performance measures, serve as a known reference point for those familiar with the study area, and identify project related impacts anticipated to occur if the project opened in 2021.

EPAP 2026 Condition with and without Project

EPAP scenarios, with and without the project, analyze conditions with the addition of traffic from approved and reasonably foreseeable projects that affect study intersections and segments. These

scenarios are intended to reflect anticipated traffic approximately five years into the future, when the project could reasonably be anticipated to be constructed. This “phasing analysis” is intended to assist the City of Folsom in phasing of improvements at study intersections which may be necessary to accommodate traffic from all approved and anticipated tentative maps over the next five years.

Roadway System

Brief descriptions of the key roadways serving the project site (depicted in **Figure 5**) are provided below:

- **Broadstone Parkway** in the project vicinity is a four-lane east-west arterial that wraps around the back of the Palladio shopping center from Iron Point Road to connect with Empire Ranch Road near the Sacramento-El Dorado County line. Broadstone Parkway has bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections.
- **Cavitt Drive** is a north-south two-lane collector that runs northward from Costco to Folsom Lake College. Within the vicinity of the Project, Cavitt Drive has bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections.
- **East Bidwell Street** runs through the City of Folsom from White Rock Road to Riley Street. East Bidwell Street becomes Scott Road south of US 50. Near the Project area, East Bidwell Street is a six-lane arterial roadway with bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections. The speed limit on East Bidwell Street north of US 50 is 45 mph.
- **Iron Point Road** is an east-west arterial roadway with a raised median that runs from Folsom Boulevard to the eastern city limit along the north side of US 50. Within the vicinity of the Project, Iron Point Road has six lanes, bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. The posted speed limit is 45 mph. Turn pockets are provided at intersections.

Study Intersections

The traffic impact study analyzed the following study intersections as shown in **Table 14**.

Table 14. Study Intersections

Intersection	Control
1. East Bidwell Street/College Parkway	Signal
2. East Bidwell Street/Scholar Way	Signal
3. East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive	Signal
4. East Bidwell Street/Broadstone Parkway	Signal
5. East Bidwell Street/Via Sole	Signal
6. East Bidwell Street/Via Felice	Signal
7. East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road	Signal
8. East Bidwell Street/Placerville Road	Signal
9. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound	Signal
10. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound	Signal
11. Broadstone Parkway/Marketplace	Signal
12. Via Felice Extension/Project Driveway (Does not exist without Project)	AWSC*

Intersection	Control
13. Broadstone Parkway/Cavitt Drive	Signal
14. Cavitt Drive/Kilrush Drive	TWSC**
15. Iron Point Road/Cavitt Drive	Signal

* All way stop control

** Two Way Stop Control

The traffic study analyzed the following study highway segments as shown in **Table 15**.

Table 15. US 50 Study Segments

US 50 Study Segments
A. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street diverge segment
B. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street merge segment
C. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street diverge segment
D. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street merge segment

Level of Service Methodology

Level of service (LOS) is a qualitative indication of the level of delay and congestion experienced by motorists using an intersection. Levels-of-service are designated by the letters A through F, with A being the best conditions and F being the worst (high delay and congestion). Calculation methodologies, measures of performance, and thresholds for each letter grade differ for road segments, signalized intersections, and unsignalized intersections.

Based on guidance from City staff, the following procedures described below for intersection and segment traffic operations analysis were utilized in the analysis:

Intersection Traffic Operations Analysis

Signalized Intersections

The methodology from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 6th Edition², was used to analyze signalized intersections. Level of service (LOS) can be characterized for the entire intersection, each approach, or by lane group. Control delay alone (the weighted average delay for all vehicles entering the intersection) is used to characterize level-of-service for the entire intersection or an approach. Control delay and volume to capacity ratio are used to characterize level-of-service for lane groups. The average delay criteria used to determine the level-of-service at signalized intersections is presented in **Table 16**. The HCM 2010 methodology is used as the primary method. HCM 2000 methods are only utilized where the signal phasing is incompatible with HCM 2010 methods.

Table 16. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

Level of Service	Description	Average Delay ¹ (Sec. /Vehicle.)
A	Very Low Delay: This level-of-service occurs when progression is extremely favorable, and most vehicles arrive during a green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all.	≤ 10.0
B	Minimal Delays: This level-of-service generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than at LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay.	10.1-20.0
C	Acceptable Delay: Delay increases due to only fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures (<i>to service all waiting vehicles</i>) may begin to appear at this level of service. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.	20.1-35.0
D	Approaching Unstable/Tolerable Delays: The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.	35.1-55.0
E	Unstable Operation/Significant Delays: This is considered by many agencies the upper limit of acceptable delays. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.	55.1-80.0
F	Excessive Delays: This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with oversaturation (i.e., when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection). It may also occur at high v/c ratios below 1.00 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also contribute to such delay levels.	> 80.0 or $v/c > 1.0$

Note 1: Weighted average of delay on all approaches. This is the measure used by the Highway Capacity Manual to determine LOS. Any movement with a volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c) greater than 1.0 is considered to be LOS F.

Source: Transportation Research Board (2016) Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition, Washington D.C.

Unsignalized Intersections

The methodology from HCM 6th Edition is used for the analysis of unsignalized intersections. At an unsignalized intersection, most of the main street traffic is un-delayed, and by definition has acceptable conditions. The main street left-turn movements and the minor street movements are all susceptible to delay of varying degrees. Generally, the higher the main street traffic volumes, the higher the delay for the minor movements. Separate methods are utilized for Two-Way Stop-Controlled (TWSC) intersections and All-Way Stop-Controlled (AWSC) intersections.

- **TWSC:** The methodology for analysis of two-way stop-controlled intersections calculates an average total delay per vehicle for each minor street movement and for the major street left-turn movements, based on the availability of adequate gaps in the main street through traffic. A LOS designation is assigned to individual movements or combinations of movements (in the case of shared lanes) based upon delay, it is not defined for the intersection as a whole. Unsignalized intersection LOS reported herein is for each movement (or group of movements) based upon

the respective average delay per vehicle. **Table 17** presents the average delay criteria used to determine the LOS at TWSC and AWSC intersections.

- **AWSC:** At all-way stop-controlled intersections, the level-of-service is determined by the weighted average delay for all vehicles entering the intersection. The methodologies for these types of intersections calculate a single weighted average delay and LOS for the intersection as a whole. The average delay criteria used to determine the LOS at all-way stop intersections is the same as that presented in **Table 17**. LOS for specific movements can also be determined based on the TWSC methodology.

It is not unusual for some of the minor street movements at unsignalized intersections to have LOS D, E, or F conditions while the major street movements have LOS A, B, or C conditions. In such a case, the minor street traffic experiences delays that can be substantial for individual minor street vehicles, but the majority of vehicles using the intersection have very little delay. Usually in such cases, the minor street traffic volumes are relatively low. If the minor street volume is large enough, improvements to reduce the minor street delay may be justified, such as channelization, widening, or signalization.

Table 17. Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

Level of Service (LOS)	Description	TWSC ¹ Average Delay by Movement (seconds/vehicle)	AWSC ² Intersection Wide Average Delay (seconds/vehicle)
A	Little or no delay	< 10	< 10
B	Short traffic delay	> 10 and < 15	> 10 and < 15
C	Average traffic delays	> 15 and < 25	> 15 and < 25
D	Long traffic delays	> 25 and < 35	> 25 and < 35
E	Very long traffic delays	> 35 and < 50	> 35 and < 50
F	Extreme delays potentially affecting other traffic movements in the intersection	> 50 (or, v/c > 1.0)	>50

Source: T. Kear 2021.

Note 1: Two-Way Stop Control (TWSC) LOS is calculated separately for each minor street movement (or shared movement) as well as major street left turns using these criteria. Any movement with a volume to capacity ratio (v/c) greater than 1.0 is considered to be LOS F.

Note 2: All-Way Stop Control (AWSC) assessment of LOS at the approach and intersection levels is based solely on control delay.

Signal Warrants

At each unsignalized intersection, the potential need for a traffic signal was evaluated. Traffic signal warrants are a series of standards that provide guidelines for determining if a traffic signal is appropriate. Signal warrant analyses are typically conducted at intersections of uncontrolled major streets and stop sign-controlled minor streets. If one or more signal warrants are met, signalization of the intersection may be appropriate. However, a signal should not be installed if none of the warrants are met, since the installation of signals would increase delays on the previously uncontrolled major street and may increase the occurrence of particular types of accidents.

As stated in the 2014 California Edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD 2014)³, *“An engineering study of traffic conditions, pedestrian characteristics, and physical characteristics of the location shall be performed to determine whether installation of a traffic control signal is justified at a particular location.*

The investigation of the need for a traffic control signal shall include an analysis of factors related to the existing operation and safety at the study location and the potential to improve these conditions, and the applicable factors contained in the following traffic signal warrants:

- *Warrant 1, Eight-hour Vehicular Volume*
- *Warrant 2, Four-hour Vehicular Volume*
- *Warrant 3, Peak-hour*
- *Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume*
- *Warrant 5, School Crossing*
- *Warrant 6, Coordinated Signal System*
- *Warrant 7, Crash Experience*
- *Warrant 8, Roadway Network*
- *Warrant 9, Intersection Near a Grade Crossing*

The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.”

Consistent with the industry standard of practice, the Traffic Impact Analysis did not evaluate the full panoply of warrants for traffic signals, but instead focused on the peak-hour warrant. The MUTCD states that, *“This [peak-hour] signal warrant shall be applied only in unusual cases, such as office complexes, manufacturing plants, industrial complexes, or high-occupancy vehicle facilities that attract or discharge large numbers of vehicles over a short time.”* So, the peak-hour warrant is being used in this impact analysis study as an “indicator” of the likelihood of an unsignalized intersection warranting a traffic signal in the future. Intersections that exceed the peak-hour warrant are considered (for the purposes of this impact analysis) to be likely to meet one or more of the other signal warrants (such as the 4-hour or 8-hour warrants). This peak-hour analysis is not intended to replace a rigorous and complete traffic signal warrant analysis by the responsible jurisdiction.

Unsignalized intersections were evaluated using the Peak-hour Volume Warrant (Warrant No. 3) in the California MUTCD 2014. The Peak-hour Volume Warrant was applied where the minor street experiences long delays in entering or crossing the major street for at least one hour in a day. Even if the Peak-hour Volume Warrant is met, a more detailed signal warrant study is recommended before a signal is installed. The more detailed study should consider volumes during the daily peak-hours of roadway traffic, pedestrian traffic, and accident histories.

Basic Segments

Basic freeway segments operations and level-of-service is defined by density (passenger cars per mile per lane) which depends upon traffic volumes, and segment, characteristics. These characteristics

³ Caltrans (2019) California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices - FHWA’s MUTCD 2009 Edition as amended for use in California - 2014 Edition - Revision 4, March 29, 2019. Section 4C.

include the geometry, grade, free flow speeds, and heavy vehicles. **Table 18** shows the level of service criteria for basic freeway segments.

Table 18. Level of Service Criteria – Basic Freeway Segments

Level of Service	Maximum Density (passenger vehicles per mile per lane)
A	<11
B	18
C	26
D	35
E	45
F	> 45, or Demand exceeds capacity

Source: Transportation Research Board (2010) Highway Capacity Manual, Chapter 11, Washington, D.C.

Merge and Diverge Segments

Freeway merge and diverge segments operations and level-of-service is defined by density (passenger cars per mile per lane) which depends upon traffic volumes and the ramp characteristics. These characteristics include the length and type of acceleration/deceleration lanes, free-flow speeds, number of lanes, grade, heavy vehicles, and types of facilities. **Table 19** shows the relationship of level-of-service to freeway density for merge, diverge, and weaving segments.

Table 19. Level of Service Criteria – Freeway Ramp Merge/Diverge Areas

Level of Service	Maximum Density (passenger vehicles per mile per lane)
A	<10
B	20
C	28
D	35
E	> 35
F	Demand exceeds capacity

Source: Transportation Research Board (2010) Highway Capacity Manual, Chapter 13, Washington, D.C.

General Plan Thresholds

Consistency with General Plan LOS policies for the proposed project were determined based on the methods described above and identified as either "significant" or "less than significant". General Plan Policy M4.1.3 addresses LOS:

Strive to achieve at least traffic LOS "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 temporally higher LOS 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. City Staff will report to the City Council at regular intervals via the Capital Improvement Program process for the Council to prioritize projects integral to achieving LOS D or better.

The General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) includes a criterion addressing potential impacts at locations that operate at LOS E or F under no-project conditions. Under this standard, a significant

impact would occur if the proposed project would:

Increase the average delay by five seconds or more at an intersection that currently operates (or is projected to operate) at an unacceptable level-of-service under “no-project” conditions.

For the purposes of the traffic analysis, LOS is considered potentially significant if implementation of the project would result in any of the following:

- Cause an intersection in Folsom that currently operates (or is projected to operate) at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or worse.
- Increase the average delay by five seconds or more at an intersection in Folsom that currently operates (or is projected to operate) at an unacceptable LOS E or F.

Freeway Facilities

An impact is considered significant on freeway facilities if the project causes the facility to change from an acceptable to unacceptable LOS. For facilities that are or will be operating at unacceptable LOS without the project, an impact is considered significant if:

- The existing LOS cannot be maintained with the addition of project traffic;
- The project traffic increases vehicle density on a freeway mainline segment or freeway ramp junction by 0.1 passenger cars per lane per mile;
- The project increases the number of peak-hour vehicles on a freeway mainline segment or freeway ramp junction by more than 1 percent.

Per the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, Caltrans strives to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS C and LOS D on state highway facilities. However, for the affected portion of US 50, Caltrans has established a concept LOS E threshold⁴. For consistency with other traffic impact studies performed in the City of Folsom that considered US 50, LOS E was selected as the minimum standard for all study freeway facilities.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Transit Facilities

An impact is considered significant if implementation of the project would:

- Inhibit the use of bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities.
- Eliminate existing bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities.
- Prevent the implementation of planned bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Standards of Significance

Under State Law (SB 743), vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the only metric for evaluating significant transportation impacts in environmental impact analyses required under CEQA.

Folsom General Plan policy NCR 3.1.3 addresses VMT, as stated below:

Policy NCR 3.1.3 “Encourage efforts to reduce the amount of VMT. These efforts could include

encouraging mixed-use development promoting a jobs/housing balance, and encouraging alternative transportation such as walking, cycling, and public transit.”

The City of Folsom has not yet adopted thresholds of significance for VMT. Consequently, the traffic analysis uses a qualitative screening against the Governors’ Office of Planning and Research (OPR) guidance. OPR’s guidance (Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, OPR 2018 and 2019) recommends a CEQA threshold for transportation impacts of land use projects of a 15 percent VMT reduction per capita, relative to either city or regional averages based on the California’s Climate Scoping Plan. Qualitative assessment of VMT reduction is acceptable to screen projects.

Based on these criteria, a project would be considered to have a potentially significant impact if:

- Per capita VMT from residential projects is anticipated to be greater than 85 percent of the regional average per capita VMT.
- or
- The project is anticipated to inhibit implementation of planned pedestrian, bicycle, or transit improvements.

Existing 2021 Condition

Table 20 and **Table 21** present a summary of LOS results for the study intersections and freeway segments under Existing Conditions.⁵ The results indicate that the East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive and East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road intersections exceed the General Plan level-of-service standard in the PM prior to the addition of project traffic. These locations are shown in orange highlight in the tables below. Calculation sheets for intersection delay and LOS are provided in **Appendix G**.

Table 20. Existing 2021 Intersection Delay and LOS

Intersection	Control	2021 No Project AM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2021 No Project PM Delay (Sec.) and LOS
1. East Bidwell Street/College Parkway	Signal	15.9 B	15.4 B
2. East Bidwell Street/Scholar Way	Signal	14.4 B	19.0 B
3. East Bidwell Street/ Power Center Drive	Signal	36.9 D	60.8 E
4. East Bidwell Street/Broadstone Parkway	Signal	38.2 D	37.8 D
5. East Bidwell Street/Via Sole	Signal	4.5 A	7.8 A
6. East Bidwell Street/Via Felice	Signal	7.8 A	10.2 B
7. East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road	Signal	43.8 D	121.3 F
8. East Bidwell Street/Placerville Road	Signal	11.9 B	17.1 B
9. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound	Signal	34.3 C	39.4 D
10. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound	Signal	10.2 B	15.0 B
11. Broadstone Parkway/Marketplace	Signal	14.1 B	19.1 B
12. Via Felice/Proposed Project Driveway	AWSC		
13. Broadstone Parkway/Cavitt Drive	Signal	12.0 B	12.2 B
14. Cavitt Drive/Kilrush Drive	TWSC	9.5 A (WBL)	10.0 B (WBL)
15. Iron Point Road/Cavitt Drive	Signal	18.0 B	25.7 C

⁵ Pre COVID-19 pandemic counts, collected along East Bidwell Street on March 5, 2020, were used to factor up the 2021 counts to account for short term traffic reductions caused by the economic effect of COVID-19.

Table 21. Existing 2021 US 50 Segment Density and LOS

Segment	Segment Type	2021 AM No Project Density and LOS	2021 PM No Project Density and LOS
A. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	24.5 C	17.3 B
B. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	24.4 C	19.4 B
C. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	15.8 b	21.9 C
D. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	14.9 B	23.4 C

Projected Trip Generation

The projected traffic generated by the proposed project was calculated using trip generation factors from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017) and is presented in **Table 22** below.

Table 22. Project Trip Generation

Description	ITE Land	Quantity	Metric	Daily	AM Peak-Hour			PM Peak-Hour		
					Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Multi-Family Mid-Rise	221	257 dwelling	Rate	5.44	0.32	27%	73%	0.41	60%	40%
			Trips	1,399	82	22	60	105	63	42

Source: T. Kear 2021.

Daily Rate: $T=5.45(X)-1.75$; AM and PM Peak hour rates: average rates for peak hour of generator.

Source: ITE (2017) Trip Generation Manual, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington DC.

Trip Distribution

Trip distribution was based on observed traffic counts and select zone analysis within the travel demand model, and nearby projects. New project trips were distributed as follows:

- 20% to/from the north via East Bidwell Street;
- 2% to/from the north via Cavitt Drive;
- 10% to/from the east via Broadstone Parkway;
- 8% to/from the east via Iron Point Road;
- 10% to/from the east via US 50;
- 4% to/from the south via Cavitt Drive;
- 8% to/from the south via East Bidwell Street;
- 8% to/from the west via Iron Point Road;
- 6% to/from the west via Broadstone Parkway; and
- 4% to/from the Palladio shopping center.

Existing 2021 with Project Conditions

Peak-hour traffic associated with the Project was added to the Existing 2021 turning volumes at each intersection. Delay and level-of-service were determined at the study intersections and segments. **Table 23** and **Table 24** presents a summary of the level-of-service results for the study intersections and segments.

Table 23. Existing 2021 Intersection Delay and LOS, with and without Project

Intersection	Control	2021 No Project AM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2021 No Project PM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2021 Plus Project AM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2021 Plus Project PM Delay (Sec.) and LOS
1. East Bidwell Street/College Parkway	Signal	15.9 B	15.4 B	14.3 B	15.4 B
2. East Bidwell Street/Scholar Way	Signal	14.4 B	19.0 B	13.9 B	18.9 B
3. East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive	Signal	36.9 D	60.8 E	32.5 C	60.6 E
4. East Bidwell Street/Broadstone Parkway	Signal	38.2 D	37.8 D	37.9 D	37.9 D
5. East Bidwell Street/Via Sole	Signal	4.5 A	7.8 A	7.3 A	9.3 A
6. East Bidwell Street/Via Felice	Signal	7.8 A	10.2 B	10.3 B	14.1 B
7. East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road	Signal	43.8 D	121.3 F	43.9 D	120.8 F
8. East Bidwell Street/Placerville Road	Signal	11.9 B	17.1 B	11.9 B	17.4 B
9. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound	Signal	34.3 C	39.4 D	34.7 C	40.5 D
10. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound	Signal	10.2 B	15.0 B	10.2 B	15.4 B
11. Broadstone Parkway/Marketplace	Signal	14.1 B	19.1 B	13.5 B	19.3 B
12. Via Felice/Project Driveway	AWSC			6.8 A	6.8 A
13. Broadstone Parkway/Cavitt Drive	Signal	12.0 B	12.2 B	11.9 B	12.4 B
14. Cavitt Drive/Kilrush Drive	TWSC	9.5 A (WBL)	10.0 B (WBL)	10.3 B (EB)	10.7 B (EB)
15. Iron Point Road/Cavitt Drive	Signal	18.0 B	25.7 C	16.5 B	25.9 C

Table 24. Existing 2021 US 50 Segment Density and LOS, with and without Project

Segment	Segment Type	2021 AM No Project Density and LOS	2021 PM No Project Density and LOS	2021 AM Plus Project Density and LOS	2021 PM Plus Project Density and LOS
A. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	24.5 C	17.3 B	24.5 C	17.3 B
B. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	24.4 C	19.4 B	24.4 C	19.4 B
C. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	15.8 B	21.9 C	15.8 B	22.0 C
D. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	14.9 B	23.4 C	14.9 B	23.4 C

Existing Plus Approved Projects (EPAP) 2026 Conditions

The EPAP 2026 Conditions analysis utilizes lane configurations and intersection controls from the Existing Conditions. **Table 25** presents a summary of LOS results for the study intersections under EPAP 2026 Conditions. Four intersections are anticipated to exceed the General Plan LOS standard prior to the addition of project traffic:

- East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive (PM);
- East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road (AM and PM);
- East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound (AM and PM); and
- East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound (AM and PM).

These locations are shown in orange highlight in the tables below. **Table 26** presents a summary of level-of-service results for the study freeway segments under EPAP 2026 Conditions. Zero segments are anticipated to exceed the General Plan level-of-service standard prior to the addition of project traffic. Calculation sheets for intersection delay and level-of-service are provided in **Appendix G**.

Table 25. EPAP 2026 Intersection Delay and LOS

Intersection	Control	2026 No Project AM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2026 No Project PM Delay (Sec.) and LOS
1. East Bidwell Street/College Parkway	Signal	16.1 B	15.8 B
2. East Bidwell Street/Scholar Way	Signal	15.0 B	18.9 B
3. East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive	Signal	40.0 D	57.3 E
4. East Bidwell Street/Broadstone Parkway	Signal	38.1 D	37.5 D
5. East Bidwell Street/Via Sole	Signal	4.5 A	7.6 A
6. East Bidwell Street/Via Felice	Signal	8.1 A	9.6 A
7. East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road	Signal	78.8 E	187.8 F
8. East Bidwell Street/Placerville Road	Signal	21.1 C	41.2 D
9. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound	Signal	59.5 E	87.0 F
10. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound	Signal	81.9 F	137.8 F
11. Broadstone Parkway/Marketplace	Signal	14.1 B	19.1 B
12. Via Felice/Proposed Project Driveway	AWSC		
13. Broadstone Parkway/Cavitt Drive	Signal	12.0 B	12.2 B
14. Cavitt Drive/Kilrush Drive	TWSC	9.5 A (WBL)	10.0 B (WBL)
15. Iron Point Road/Cavitt Drive	Signal	17.8 B	25.4 C

Source: T. Kear 2021.

Table 26. EPAP 2026 US 50 Segment Density and LOS

Segment	Segment Type	2026 AM No Project Density and LOS	2026 PM No Project Density and LOS
A. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	25.9 C	19.8 B
B. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	29.0 D	23.6 C
C. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	19.1 B	27.7 C
D. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	16.8 B	25.1 C

Source: T. Kear 2021.

Existing Plus Approved Projects (EPAP) 2026 with Project Condition

Peak-hour traffic associated with the Project was added to anticipated EPAP 2026 turning volumes at each intersection. Delay and LOS were then determined at the study intersections. **Table 27** and **Table 28** present a summary of the LOS results for the study intersections.

Four intersections are anticipated to continue to exceed the General Plan LOS policy after the addition of project traffic:

- East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive (PM);
- East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road (AM and PM);
- East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound (AM and PM); and
- East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound (AM and PM).

None of these locations has an increase in delay of 5 seconds or more. These locations are shown in orange highlight in the tables below. None of the study segments of US 50 are expected to exceed the General Plan level of service policy after the addition of project traffic. Calculation sheets for intersection delay and level-of-service are provided in **Appendix G**.

Table 27. EPAP 2026 Intersection Delay and LOS, with and without Project

Intersection	Control	2026 No Project AM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2026 No Project PM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2026 Plus Project AM Delay (Sec.) and LOS	2026 Plus Project PM Delay (Sec.) and LOS
1. East Bidwell Street/College Parkway	Signal	16.1 B	15.8 B	14.3 B	15.8 B
2. East Bidwell Street/Scholar Way	Signal	15.0 B	18.9 B	14.3 B	18.9 B
3. East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive	Signal	40.0 D	57.3 E	35.4 D	57.2 E
4. East Bidwell Street/Broadstone Parkway	Signal	38.1 D	37.5 D	37.8 D	37.6 D
5. East Bidwell Street/Via Sole	Signal	4.5 A	7.6 A	7.5 A	9.4 A
6. East Bidwell Street/Via Felice	Signal	8.1 A	9.6 A	10.6 B	13.2 B
7. East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road	Signal	78.8 E	187.8 F	78.6 E	187.3 F
8. East Bidwell Street/Placerville Road	Signal	21.1 C	41.2 D	41.4 C	42.8 D
9. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound	Signal	59.5 E	87.0 F	60.2 E	89.4 F
10. East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound	Signal	81.9 F	137.8 F	82.0 F	139.2 F
11. Broadstone Parkway/Marketplace	Signal	14.1 B	19.1 B	13.5 B	19.3 B
12. Via Felice/Proposed Project Driveway	AWSC			6.8 A	6.8 A
13. Broadstone Parkway/Cavitt Drive	Signal	12.0 B	12.2 B	11.9 B	12.4 B
14. Cavitt Drive/Kilrush Drive	TWSC	9.5 A (WBL)	10.0 B (WBL)	10.3 B (EB)	10.7 B (EB)
15. Iron Point Road/Cavitt Drive	Signal	17.8 B	25.4 C	16.2 B	25.6 C

Source: T. Kear 2021.

Table 38. EPAP 2026 US 50 Segment Density and LOS, with and without Project

Segment	Segment Type	2026 AM No Project Density and LOS	2026 PM No Project Density and LOS	2026 AM Plus Project Density and LOS	2026 PM Plus Project Density and LOS
A. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	25.9 C	19.8 B	26.0 C	19.9 B
B. Westbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	29.0 D	23.6 C	29.1 D	23.6 C
C. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Diverge	19.1 B	27.7 C	19.2 B	27.8 C
D. Eastbound US 50/East Bidwell Street	Merge	16.8 B	25.1 C	16.9 B	25.2 C

Source: T. Kear 2021.

Evaluation of Transportation

- a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less than significant impact. The project would not conflict with the City's policies addressing LOS.

Under the Existing 2021 scenario, two intersections that operate at a deficient level-of-service during the PM peak hour were identified:

- East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive; and
- East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road.

These two locations are anticipated to continue to operate deficiently with the addition of project traffic. Delay is anticipated to increase by less than five seconds at both locations and therefore these deficiencies are not significantly exacerbated by the project. Under the EPAP 2026 scenario, four

intersections are anticipated to exceed the General Plan level-of-service policy after the addition of project traffic:

- East Bidwell Street/Power Center Drive (PM);
- East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road (AM and PM);
- East Bidwell Street/US 50 Westbound (AM and PM); and
- East Bidwell Street/US 50 Eastbound (AM and PM).

These four locations are anticipated to continue to operate deficiently with the addition of project traffic. Delay is anticipated to increase by less than five seconds at all four locations and therefore these deficiencies are not significantly exacerbated by the project. The project would not conflict with General Plan Policy M4.1.3.

The project would not inhibit the use of bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities; eliminate existing bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities; nor would it prevent the implementation of planned bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities. Existing Class 2 bike lanes on the roads segments adjacent to the project would not be removed; existing and planned Class 1 bike trails along Iron Point Road and paralleling the rail line located east of East Bidwell Street would not be removed or precluded. The project would have a less than significant impact on program plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Less than significant impact. SB 743, passed in 2013, required OPR to develop new CEQA Guidelines that address traffic metrics under CEQA. As stated in the legislation (and Section 21099[b][2] of CEQA), upon adoption of the new CEQA guidelines, “automobile delay, as described solely by LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the CEQA guidelines, if any.” The Office of Administrative Law approved the updated CEQA Guidelines on December 28, 2018, and the changes are reflected in new CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.3). CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 was added December 28, 2018, to address the determination of significance for transportation impacts. Pursuant to the new CEQA Guidelines, VMT replaced congestion as the metric for determining transportation impacts.

To support jurisdictions’ SB743 implementation, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) developed thresholds and screening maps for residential projects⁶, using outputs from the 2016 base year travel demand model run for the 2020 MTP/SCS. SACOG travel demand model is activity/tour-based and is designed to estimate an individual’s daily travel, accounting for land use, transportation and demographics that influence peoples’ travel behaviors. For residential projects, the threshold is defined as total household VMT per capita achieving 15% of reduction comparing to regional (or any appropriate sub-area) average. The weighted average VMT from the project is 15.8 miles per capita per day. The project is anticipated to generate 76% of the regional per capita residential daily VMT of 20.82 miles and 82% of Folsom’s residential daily VMT per capita of 19.16 miles. The daily per capita VMT for the project is anticipated to be less than 85% of the regional and City residential VMT per capita. In addition, the project is proposed adjacent to commercial land uses that would reduce the number and

⁶ SACOG (2021) <https://sb743-sacog.opendata.arcgis.com/>

distance of trips necessary for goods and services. The project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on VMT.

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

Less than significant impact. Access to the project site would be provided by driveways from East Bidwell Street, from the proposed new road along the southern site boundary, and from a shared driveway with the adjacent Talavera Apartments accessing Broadstone Parkway. The driveways meet the City's design standards and would not introduce any sharp curves or dangerous intersections or be incompatible with the existing road network. City code requires a 60-foot right turn taper where right turning traffic into the Project would exceed 10 vehicles per hour and a 150-foot deceleration lane and 60-foot taper where right turning traffic is anticipated to exceed 50 vehicles per hour. Tapers and pockets may both be required by the City Engineer where arterial speeds equal or exceed 45 mph. Right turning traffic into project driveways would below these thresholds, but 150-foot deceleration lanes with 60-foot tapers would be included in the driveway design along East Bidwell Street where the posted speed limit is 45 mph. Minimum Required Throat Depth (MRTD) requirements would be met. For apartment complexes with over 160 units, the MRTD is 100-feet on arterials with greater than 60-feet of right-of way, and 50-feet for arterials with right-of-way width less than or equal to 60-feet. Project driveways accessing East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway would both exceed 100-feet. The project driveway accessing the private roadway extension of Via Felice would exceed 50-feet.

Potential geometric constraints and safety issues were evaluated in the traffic study and addressed as described above. No issues were identified that suggest atypical or unsafe frontage conditions that require additional analysis. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

- d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No impact. The project's internal drive aisles and several of the access points from surface streets are designed with minimum 25-foot inner and 50-foot outer turning radii to accommodate fire department engine access and turning movements. Emergency vehicle access would be available to the site from Cavitt Drive and East Bidwell Street. Emergency vehicle access is designed consistent with standards and is adequate. There would be no impact.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The discussion below is based on a tribal cultural resources memorandum prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (ECORP 2021), attached to this Initial Study as **Appendix H**.

Environmental Setting

CEQA, as amended by Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), requires that the City provide notice to any California Native American tribes that have requested notice of projects subject to CEQA review and consult with tribes that responded to the notice within 30 days of receipt with a request for consultation. For the City, these included the following tribes that previously submitted general request letters, requesting such noticing:

- Wilton Rancheria;
- Lone Band of Miwok Indians; and,
- United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria

The purpose of consultation is to identify Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) that may be significantly impacted by the proposed project, and to allow the City to avoid or mitigate significant impacts prior to project approval and implementation. Section 21074(a) of the PRC defines TCRs for the purpose of CEQA as:

Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (geographically defined in terms of the size and scope), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

- a) included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; and/or,*
- b) included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; and/or,*
- c) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

Because the first two criteria also meet the definition of a Historical Resource under CEQA, a TCR may also require additional consideration as a Historical Resource. TCRs may or may not exhibit archaeological, cultural, or physical indicators and can only be identified by a culturally affiliated tribe, which has been determined under State law to be the subject matter expert for TCRs.

CEQA requires that the City initiate consultation with tribes at the commencement of the CEQA process to identify TCRs. Furthermore, because a significant effect on a TCR is considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, consultation is required to develop appropriate avoidance, impact minimization, and mitigation measures. Therefore, in accordance with the requirements summarized above, the City carried out, or attempted to carry out, tribal consultation for the project.

Within 14 days of initiating CEQA review for the project, on June 16, 2021, the City sent project notification letters to the three California Native American tribes named above, which had previously submitted general consultation request letters pursuant to 21080.3.1(d) of the Public Resources Code (PRC). Each tribe was provided a brief description of the project and its location, the contact information for the City's authorized representative, and a notification that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation.

The Lone Band of Miwok Indians did not respond to the City's notification letter, and therefore, the threshold for carrying out tribal consultation with that tribe under PRC 21080.3.1(e) was not met, and no further consultation or outreach was required.

On July 13, 2021, and within the 30-day response timeframe, the City received an email from Anna Starkey of UAIC that acknowledged receipt of the City's notification letter, thanked the City for the opportunity to consult with UAIC, and indicated that there is a known TCR within the proposed project boundary. Ms. Starkey requested that a UAIC representative either be present for the cultural resources survey or conduct their own survey if one had not yet occurred. The response did not include any additional information on the TCR. Additionally, Ms. Starkey requested a copy of the cultural resources technical report and requested that her email be entered into the administrative record.

On July 14, 2021, the City formally initiated consultation with United Auburn Indian Community and stated that Ms. Starkey's email response had been entered into the administrative record, as requested. The City further confirmed that a survey had been conducted and that preparation of a buried site

potential analysis including site photographs was underway. The City indicated that it would provide a copy of the technical report upon receipt.

Accordingly, on October 8, 2021 the City transmitted the cultural resources assessment, which included a buried site potential, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc., to Ms. Starkey for her review. Subsequently, on October 11, 2021, Ms. Starkey responded to indicate that after her review of the report, UAIC had no further comments. She offered no information or confirmation about a TCR being present in the project area; however, she provided a recommended mitigation measure for unanticipated discoveries. In her correspondence, she questioned why subsurface testing was performed. In response, on October 18, the City acknowledged Ms. Starkey's October 11 comment and clarified that the testing was very limited and was needed to address other needs. The City noted that mitigation measures to address avoidance of unanticipated discoveries of Tribal Cultural Resources would be included in the CEQA document. The City concluded consultation with UAIC on October 18, 2021.

On June 25, 2021, and within the 30-day response timeframe, Wilton Rancheria representative Mariah Mayberry responded to the City's initial notification letter by email thanking the City for providing the project notification to Wilton and stated that the tribe is aware of one TCR within the project boundary. Ms. Mayberry requested to further discuss how to avoid impacts to TCRs and provided Wilton Rancheria's recommended mitigation measures for TCRs. In her response, Ms. Mayberry neither requested nor deferred consultation under AB 52 for the proposed project; however, the City elected to consult with Wilton informally.

On July 6, 2021, the City held a consultation meeting with Wilton Rancheria to discuss the purpose of the project. Robert Edgerton, a Principal Planner for Helix Environmental Planning and Lisa Westwood, Director of Cultural Resources for ECORP, attended the meeting to provide technical support at the request of the City. Ms. Mayberry stated that Wilton Rancheria's Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested the depths for the proposed grading and excavation. Mr. Edgerton stated that the site had been previously mass graded, and that utility installation will not exceed six feet below the surface. Ms. Mayberry respectfully requested the exact depth from the project applicant to determine if the project could impact previously undisturbed material. Ms. Mayberry sent an email after the meeting that provided additional locational information regarding the TCR and requested to be notified of the schedule for the cultural resources survey and stated that Wilton Rancheria's THPO recommends subsurface testing. By the time this was received, the cultural resources survey had already been completed; however, on October 8, 2021, the City transmitted the cultural resources assessment to Wilton Rancheria for their review and comment. On October 13, 2021, the City followed up with Wilton Rancheria indicating their desire to publish the environmental document and inquired whether Wilton had any additional conditions or would like to further consult. The City has not received any additional responses from Wilton Rancheria. Although consultation with Wilton was not pursuant to AB 52 (because Wilton did not formally request consultation), the City made a reasonable and good faith effort to consult and share information with the tribe and has taken comments into consideration. Should Wilton provide any additional information beyond the date of this letter, the City will consider it. Otherwise, the consultation with Wilton is considered concluded.

Evaluation of Tribal Cultural Resources

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is

geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. As discussed in Section V., Cultural Resources, the records search determined that two previously recorded resources have been documented within the project site, but no evidence of these sites remain. The NAHC Sacred Lands File search (pending) and Native American outreach did not indicate that known Native American resources are present, and no archaeological resources were encountered during the survey. Ground visibility during the time of the survey was good, making it unlikely that near-surface archaeological resources are located within the project site.

Although ground visibility was good, no cultural resources were found during the survey; further, subsurface testing yielded no cultural materials. This suggests that the likelihood of encountering surficial or shallowly buried archaeological materials during project implementation is low. However, because Wilton Rancheria states that a Tribal Cultural Resource is located within the APE, the area should be considered moderately sensitive for cultural resources at depths of 5.0-feet or more below the current ground surface. If historical or archaeological resources are discovered, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-01** (Section V) would reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level.

- ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No TCRs were identified on the project site through the records search or via subterranean testing. Impacts to unanticipated tribal cultural resources, if encountered during construction, would be potentially significant. Based on the consultation record summarized above and included in **Appendix H**, the City concludes that there would be a less than significant impact on TCR's with the incorporation of **Mitigation Measure TCR-01** regarding unanticipated discoveries.

Mitigation Measure TCR-01: Inadvertent Discovery of TCRs

If potentially significant TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find. A Native American Representative from traditionally- and culturally affiliated Native American Tribes that requested consultation on the project shall be immediately contacted and invited to assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment, as necessary. If deemed necessary by the City, a qualified cultural resources specialist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Qualifications for Archaeology, may also assess the significance of the find in joint consultation with Native American Representatives to ensure that tribal values are considered. Work at the discovery location cannot resume until the City, in consultation as appropriate and in good faith, determines that the discovery is either not a TCR, or has been subjected to culturally appropriate treatment, if avoidance and preservation cannot be accommodated.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

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

Evaluation of Utilities and Service Systems

- a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years
- c) 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?

Less than significant impact. Discussion of the project's impact on water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities follows:

Water Supply

The City's public water supply is from the Folsom Reservoir and Folsom South Canal. The City's Urban Water Management Plan calculated supply and demand at buildout of the 2035 General Plan and determined that there was sufficient supply available for normal, single dry, and multi-dry years scenarios (City of Folsom 2018a). Folsom's Water Treatment Plant has a capacity of 50 million gallons per day. According to the Urban Water Management Plan and General Plan EIR, water demand is not anticipated to exceed the City's current water rights to 38,970 acre-feet annually (City of Folsom 2018a). Because sufficient supplies are available for build out of land uses in the General Plan (including development at the proposed project site) no additional facilities would need to be constructed or expanded and impacts would be less than significant.

Water Conservation Efforts

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

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

Wastewater (Sanitary Sewer)

The City of Folsom is responsible for managing and maintaining its wastewater collection system, including 275 miles of pipeline and nine pump stations. This system ultimately discharges into the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District interceptor sewer system. Wastewater is treated at the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, located in Elk Grove.

In compliance with the 2006 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, the City of Folsom adopted a Sewer System Management Plan on July 28, 2009 which was updated and adopted on August 26, 2014. The plan outlines how the

municipality operates and maintains the collection system, and the reporting of all Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) to the SWRCB's online SSO database. Because the City has sufficient capacity to accommodate any additional demand that could result from implementation of the proposed project, and because the City is in compliance with statutes and regulations related to wastewater collection and treatment, there would be no impact and mitigation would not be necessary.

Stormwater

Folsom's Public Works Department handles stormwater management for the City, from design and construction of the storm drain system to operation and maintenance, and urban runoff pollution prevention.

Stormwater drains would be installed throughout the site, and drainage at the parking lot would be designed to prevent flooding or ponding. The on-site storm drain would conform to City of Folsom standards. On-site landscaping would also manage some on-site stormwater. Environmental impacts from these stormwater features would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

Electricity, Gas, and Telephone

Through the City's coordination with existing utility providers including SMUD for electricity, PG&E for underground gas lines, AT&T for underground telephone lines, utility providers are able to accommodate the proposed project. The project would connect to existing utility lines from adjacent streets including Broadstone Parkway and East Bidwell Street, and would not require additional facilities.

Based on the details above, the project would have a less than significant impact on water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. No mitigation is needed for questions a), b), and c).

- d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

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

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

XX. WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area and it is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. It is not located near a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021).

Evaluation of Wildfire

- a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
- c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No impact. Questions “a” through “d” are not applicable because the project site is in a Local Responsibility Area and the site is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. It is not located near a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021).

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation of Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. The preceding analysis indicates that the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and tribal cultural resources. See Sections 8.IV, 8.V, 8.VII, 8.VIII, 8.X, 8.XIII, and 8.XVIII of this Initial Study for discussion of the proposed project's potential impacts on these environmental issue areas. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those Sections, and compliance with City programs and requirements identified in this report, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. No significant or potentially significant impacts would remain.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when

viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. While the project would indirectly contribute to cumulative impacts associated with increased urban development in the City and region, these impacts have previously been evaluated by the City and considered in development of the City's General Plan as set forth in this Initial Study. Key areas of concern are discussed in detail below.

Evaluation of cumulative biological resources impacts: Implementation of the proposed project, with continued growth within Folsom and implementation of the Folsom South of US Highway 50 Specific Plan, would contribute to continued loss of habitat for biological resources by converting undeveloped areas to developed uses. The project site is disturbed, and no special status species have the potential to occur in the project site. However, common bird species protected by Fish and Game Code may nest on the building, trees, and other vegetation on or adjacent to the project site. Project construction activities would potentially result in impacts to nesting birds if construction of the proposed project commences during the typical avian breeding season (February 15 – August 31). Construction activities and construction-related disturbance (noise, vibration and increased human activity) could adversely affect these species if they were to nest in or adjacent to the project area. Potential effects include physical destruction of nests by construction equipment and/or nest abandonment. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-01**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative cultural resources impacts: A database records search was conducted for the project site, including a 0.5-mile buffer area, at the North Central Information Center at Sacramento State University. Additionally, a pedestrian survey of the project site was conducted by a HELIX archaeologist. The record search identified two resources that were partially located with the project site. No evidence of these two sites was seen during the survey, and no new cultural resources were found. Although no evidence of cultural resources of significance were noted on project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-01 and CUL-02**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative geology and soils impacts: No previous surveys conducted in the project area have identified the project site as sensitive for paleontological resources or other geologically sensitive resources, nor have testing or ground disturbing activities performed to date uncovered any paleontological resources or geologically sensitive resources. While the likelihood encountering paleontological resources and other geologically sensitive resources is considered low, project-related ground disturbing activities could affect the integrity of a previously unknown paleontological or other geologically sensitive resource, resulting in a substantial change in the significance of the resource. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-01**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts: The project must comply with the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist. The Checklist is part of the City's 2035 General Plan GHG Reduction Strategy which outlines the policies and programs that the City will

undertake to achieve its proportional share of State GHG emissions reductions. Per the Checklist, the GHG reduction measures included in the Checklist that are applicable to a project are to be incorporated into the project's CEQA documents as mitigation measures. The GHG reduction measures applicable to the proposed project are therefore included as **Mitigation Measures GHG-01 through GHG-05**. With implementation of these mitigation measures and compliance with SMAQMD's recommendations, the 2017 Scoping Plan, and the MTP/SCS, the project's impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts: Modifications to the existing drainage patterns may result in localized flooding, and an increase in impervious surfaces may result in an increase in the total volume and peak discharges of the proposed project has the potential to degrade water quality associated with urban runoff. Ground disturbing activities would expose soil to erosion and may result in the transport of sediments which could adversely affect water quality. Modifications to the onsite drainage resulting in on-or off-site erosion, pollutants, flooding, and/or otherwise substantially degrade water quality would be a potentially significant impact.

Drainage plans have been prepared for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan area. The overall storm water drainage systems included in those plans serve the project site. Construction on the site would be subject to NPDES permit conditions (including the implementation of BMPs) and the City's standard conditions and Code requirements. Operation of these requirements, which would be unchanged with approval of the project, would ensure that no adverse effects due to stormwater generation or contamination would take place. **Mitigation Measures HYD-01 and HYD-02** would be implemented, and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality.

Evaluation of cumulative noise impacts: The project would be subject to noise from vehicular traffic along East Bidwell Street (located approximately 70 feet from the project site's southwestern boundary). A significant direct impact would also occur if the project's interior use areas would be exposed to noise levels greater than 45 CNEL from roadway traffic. A 45 CNEL interior limit would be achieved if exterior locations are exposed to a noise level of 60 CNEL or less, based on a typical attenuation of 15 dB by standard residential building construction. Because noise levels at the project's facades are modeled to be above 60 CNEL from roadway traffic, interior noise levels may exceed the 45 CNEL standard. With the implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-01 and NOI-02**, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to noise.

Evaluation of cumulative tribal cultural resources impacts: The City of Folsom sent project notification letters to three California Native American tribes. Although there is no evidence of TCRs occurring or having the potential to occur on the project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures TCR-01**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially significant cumulative impacts would be avoided. Thus, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources.

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

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

9.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

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

10.0 INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

City of Folsom

Steve Banks, Principal Planner

Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.

Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Project Manager

David Ludwig, Environmental Planner

Joanne Dramko, Senior Noise Specialist

Jason Runyan, Noise Specialist

Stephen Stringer, Senior Biologist

Marisa Brilts, Staff Biologist

Victor Ortiz, Senior Air Quality Specialist

Martin Rolph, Air Quality/Noise Technician

Clarus Backes, Senior Archeologist

Jentin Joe, Staff Archeologist

John DiMartino, Geographic Information Systems

11.0 REFERENCES

- Beals, R.L. 1933. Ethnology of the Nisenan. Published in American Archaeology and Ethnology 31. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Brainerd, C. 2015, May 6. News Release: City of Folsom Releases Water Reduction Plan. Accessed on April 20, 2020 at <https://www.folsom.ca.us/civica/press/display.asp?layout=1&Entry=271>.
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. 2010. Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures: A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. August.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2021a. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health>. Accessed September 2021.
- _____. 2021b. Top 4 Measurements and Days Above the Standard. Available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php>. Accessed September 2021
- _____. 2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update. January. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf.
- _____. 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. April.
- California Department of Conservation (CDC). 2021a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2021. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from: <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. Envirostor. Accessed June 24, 2021 from <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Sacramento&tour=True>.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2021. List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. Accessed on June 24, 2021 at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>
- California Energy Commission (CEC). 2021a. 2019 Total System Electric Generation. Accessed June 24, 2021 at <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2019-total-system-electric-generation>.
- _____. 2021b. Supply and Demand of Natural Gas in California. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/californias-natural-gas-market/supply-and-demand-natural-gas-california>
- _____. 2021c. California Gasoline Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/california-gasoline-data-facts-and-statistics>

-
- _____. 2021d. Diesel Fuel Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/diesel-fuel-data-facts-and-statistics>
- _____. 2018. 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards Frequently Asked Questions. March. Available at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/Title_24_2019_Building_Standards_FAQ_ada.pdf.
- California Emergency Management Agency. 2009. Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, Benicia Quadrangle, July 31, 2009. Accessed on June 24, 2021, at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Tsunami/Maps/Tsunami_Inundation_Benicia_Quad_ContraCosta.pdf.
- California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021. Geotracker. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.
- _____. 2021a. City of Folsom Fire Department webpage. Accessed July 2, 2021 and available at: <https://www.folsom.ca.us/government/fire>.
- City of Folsom. 2021a. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist. Updated March 24. Available at: <https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/158/637522677783670000>.
- _____. 2021b. Evacuation Plan. Accessed July 2, 2021 from: <https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument?id=2229>.
- _____. 2021c. Folsom Municipal Code. Accessed July 2, 2021 at: <http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom/>.
- _____. 2020. City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications. Updated July 2020. Accessed on July 6, 2021 from: <https://www.folsom.ca.us/community/engineering/specs.asp>.
- _____. 2018. Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. Adopted August 28.
- Cook, Sherburne F. 1976. The Population of the California Indians 1769-1970. University of California Press. Berkeley, California.
- Cook, S.F. 1955. "The Aboriginal Population of the San Joaquin Valley, California". Anthropological Records 16:31–80. University of California, Berkeley.
- California Department of Conservation (CDC), Division of Mines and Geology. 1984. Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California, Open-File Report 84-50SAC. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc>.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. (ECORP). 2021. Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with Assembly Bill 52 and CEQA for the Broadstone Villas Project, City of Folsom.
-

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2012. FEMA Flood Map: Folsom, CA Map 06067C0140H. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from:
<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=Scholar%20Way%20Folsom%20Ca#searchresultsanchor>
- HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc (HELIX). 2021. Cultural Resource Assessment for the Broadstone Villas Multi-Family Apartment Project, City of Folsom, California. October.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policymakers. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. February. Available at:
<https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar4/wg1/>.
- Johnson, Patti, J., 1978. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California. Washington, DC. Smithsonian Institution.
- Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. Available at:
<https://oehha.ca.gov/air/cnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0>.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2021. Web Soil Survey. Accessed June 24, 2021 at
<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov>.
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2019. 2020 MTP/SCS. November 18. Available at:
<https://www.sacog.org/2020-metropolitan-transportation-plansustainable-communities-strategy>.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County. Revised April. Available at:
<http://www.airquality.org/Residents/CEQA-Land-Use-Planning/CEQA-Guidance-Tools>.
- _____. 2017. Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan. July. Available at:
<http://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/Sac%20Regional%202008%20NAAQS%20Attainment%20and%20RFP%20Plan.pdf>.
- Severson, T. 1973. Sacramento: An Illustrated History. California Historical Society, Sacramento, CA.
- Shoup, L.H., and R.T. Milliken. 1999. Inigo of Rancho Posolmi: The Life and Times of a Mission Indian. Novato. Ballena Press.
- T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management. 2021. Broadstone Villas Transportation Impact Study, Folsom, CA. September.
- Transportation Research Board. 2016. Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition, Washington D.C.

United States Census Bureau. 2019. QuickFacts, Folsom City, California, population estimates, July 1, 2019 (V2019). Accessed on July 2, 2021 from: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/folsomcitycalifornia>.

United States Department of Transportation. 2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2021. Superfund: National Priorities List. Accessed on June 24, 2021 from: <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl>.

_____. 2020. Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants (Green Book). Accessed on July 6, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/green-book>.

Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc (Youngdahl). 2021. Geotechnical Engineering Study for Broadstone Villas.

Wilson, Norman L. and Arlean H. Towne. 1978. "Nisenan" in *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8: California, edited by R.F. Heizer, 387-397. Washington, DC. Smithsonian Institution.

This page intentionally left blank