Lakeside Memorial Lawn Crematorium

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

With Technical Support by:
HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
11 Natoma Street, Suite 155
Folsom, CA 95630

January 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study (IS) addresses the proposed Lakeside Memorial Lawn Crematorium project (proposed project) and whether it may cause significant effects on the environment. The IS also assesses whether any environmental impacts of the project are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by project revision, imposition of conditions, or any 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 included as mitigation measures.

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

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

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

- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (December 2020).
- Addendum to the Folsom Lakeside Crematorium Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (November 2021).
- Cultural Resources Inventory Report for the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Storage Shed Project, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (November 2020).
- Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with Assembly Bill 52 and CEQA for the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Storage Shed Project, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (January 2021).

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Project Location

The proposed project would be constructed on an approximately 12-acre parcel situated near the western boundary of the City of Folsom in Sacramento County, California. The project site is located west of the intersection of Forrest Street/Natoma Street along Folsom Boulevard within the existing Lakeside Memorial Lawn Cemetery. It lies along the eastern shore of Lake Natoma. The crematorium would be constructed within an existing shed along the eastern boundary of the property, just west of the end of Mormon Street. The project site is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 070-0260-001. Refer to **Figure 1** for the regional location and **Figure 2** for an aerial view of the project site. All figures are included in **Appendix A**.

3.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is currently a small cemetery, with associated landscaping, outbuildings, and access roads. Lands to the south and west contain woodland habitat typical of riparian communities in the Sierra Nevada foothills. Soils at the project site are comprised of dredge tailings and other fill material.

Tailing piles between the site and Folsom Boulevard prevent the site from being visible from that street. To the west is also the Jedidiah Smith Memorial Trail that runs along the eastern shore of Lake Natoma. The trail, also known as the American River Bike Trail, connects Folsom Lake (north of the project site) to the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers in Downtown Sacramento. It is a part of the American River Parkway that is operated by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. To the north of the project site is a small residential neighborhood with single-family dwellings. Folsom Boulevard runs in a north/south line just east of the property. East of Folsom Boulevard is a large, developed area containing single-family homes, apartment complexes, a mobile home park, and some small businesses. The more regional setting is primarily characterized by residential development with a commercial shopping center to the east.

The project site is generally flat, ranging from about 175 to 185 feet above mean sea level. There are no wetlands, streams, or jurisdictional features located on the project site.

3.3 Project Characteristics

The project would be located in an existing metal shed on the grounds of the existing Lakeside Memorial Lawn Cemetery. The shed can be reached by following Mormon Street to its terminus, making a slight left turn, and continuing for approximately 100 feet down an access road. The proposed project includes the installation of one HCT Apex-250 crematory manufactured by Hartwick Combustion. The shed would be modified to accommodate this device, but the shed's footprint would not be expanded. The shed currently covers 1,071 square feet. Further, a 10 foot by 15-foot walk-in cooler would be installed inside the shed to provide temporary, short-term storage of human remains prior to cremation. Two 250-gallon propane tanks would be installed on a proposed concrete pad along the northern side of the shed to provide power for the crematorium, as no gas lines currently exist on the property. The pad would cover approximately 38.3 square feet of ground. A small exhaust stack would be installed on the roof of the shed.

The applicant anticipates 1-4 cremations on business days (Monday through Friday) with the total number of cremations not exceeding 500 per year. Average cremation time is approximately 90 minutes. Refer to **Figure 3** for the site design plan in **Appendix A**.

Parking and Circulation

Diagonal parking spaces can be found along both sides of Mormon Street. At the terminus of Mormon Street, members of the public may continue straight onto a main cemetery access road to find an additional parking lot. All existing parking spaces would be maintained. Access to the project site directly would continue to be provided by a smaller existing access road located at the southwestern terminus of Mormon Street. Both the smaller access road and the main access road can be reached at the terminus of Mormon Street, but the two roads do not form a continuous loop due to a fence line dividing them. No new parking spaces or facilities would be constructed.

As the crematorium would not be located in or near a funeral home and would be separate from any funeral services or public gatherings provided by the project applicant, access would only need to accommodate a small number of staff members with business at the site.

Emergency Vehicle Access

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.

Utilities

The cemetery is currently serviced with potable water and irrigation water from the City of Folsom. There is no need to seek a "will serve" letter as the City currently provides water and the crematory would not substantially increase flow demand. The City also provides solid waste collection and disposal services; the project is not expected to result in a significantly increased demand for solid waste removal.

As an existing facility, Lakeside Memorial Lawn maintains adequate fire response infrastructure for both current operations and the proposed project. The City Fire Department reviewed the project application and did not raise any concerns regarding the adequacy of water supply or site access.

The cemetery is currently served with an electricity supply from the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD). Electrical connections already exist for the shed, and may be upgraded as needed as part of the proposed project. Installation and operation of the crematory would not result in a significant increase in demand for electricity on the project site.

The cemetery, including the shed, does not have an existing sewer line. This project would not require access to, or construction of, a sewer line. The two 250-gallon propane tanks and a concrete pad for securing them would be constructed along the northern edge of the shed to provide power for the crematorium.

Stormwater flows on the site are retained and drained to Lake Natoma. There would be no change in the hydrologic regime of the project site due to the installation or operation of the proposed project.

Landscaping

Existing landscaping at the cemetery and around the shed consists of mature broad-leaved, coniferous, trees and palms. These trees and landscaping also provide shade for much of the cemetery and many of the parking spaces. An irrigated lawn surrounds the existing cemetery plots, and a smaller lawn surrounds the rear of the shed (i.e., the non-service entrance side). Native oak/gray pine woodland habitat surrounds the cemetery.

No new landscaping installation or modification is proposed. Native habitat in the vicinity of the project would not be disturbed. No built footprint would be expanded.

Fencing

An existing brick and wrought iron fence demarcate the boundary to the cemetery from the Forrest Street side, but does not extend the length of Mormon Street. A wooden fence currently separates the front side of the shed (facing the access road) from the back side and extends both north and south of the shed. The fencing south of the shed further extends to block the access road and restrict access between the lawn to the west of the shed and the access road to the east of the shed.

Grading

No grading of the site would be required.

3.4 City Regulation of Urban Development

General Plan

The City of Folsom updated and adopted its current comprehensive General Plan in August 2018. The General Plan is a long-term planning document that guides growth and land development in the City. It provides the foundation for establishing community goals and supporting policies, and directs appropriate land uses for all land parcels within the City. The project site is designated as Open Space (OS) in the City of Folsom General Plan. It is also within the Historic District and within a Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Transit Priority Area.

Zoning Ordinance

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

The project site is currently within the Open Space/Public Primary Area of the Historic District (OS/P), with an underlying zoning of Open Space and Conservation (OSC). The applicant is seeking a Conditional Use Permit from the City to authorize their installation of a crematory.

3.5 Other City Regulation of Urban Development

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

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 February 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.

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

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

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

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

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

Existing Utilities – Regulates the relocation and protection of utilities.

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

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

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

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

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

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 1** and

incorporated by reference into the project description. 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 1. 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, 2010 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), 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.

4.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project objectives, as expressed by the applicant, are to:

- Provide cremation services for those who currently live in and around Folsom, as no such services currently exist in the City;
- Provide cremation services for members of the population whose customs or religions require such practices;
- Prepare for an increase in the demand for cremation services as cremations become more popular in California and as Folsom's population grows;
- Upgrade existing facilities to capitalize on a business opportunity that has proven successful for the applicant elsewhere in California.

5.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS

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

- Conditional Use Permit

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

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

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 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 Program EIR for the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan. The Folsom 2035 General Plan is a project that is related to the proposed project and, pursuant to §15152(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, tiering of environmental documents is appropriate. State CEQA Guidelines §15152(e) specifically provides that:

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

The above-mentioned Program EIR and this Initial Study can be reviewed at the following location:

City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 East Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
Contact: Mr. Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner
(916) 461-6209

6.3 Incorporation of the Folsom General Plan and East Area Facilities Plan EIRs by Reference

The Program EIR for the Folsom 2035 General Plan is a comprehensive document. Due to various references to the Folsom 2035 General Plan Program EIR 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, the program EIR document is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.

6.4 Summary of Folsom 2035 General Plan EIR

The 2035 General Plan Program EIR focused on the secondary or indirect effects of implementing the 2035 General Plan. Indirect physical changes to the environment (impacts) that could result from

implementation of 2035 General Plan are addressed in the appropriate technical chapters of the Program EIR. Likewise, inconsistency with an adopted plan, in general, is not considered a direct physical impact to the environment, but may result in impacts, which are discussed in the appropriate technical chapters. According to this definition, potential secondary or indirect environmental effects may be divided into two broad classes:

- Coverage Impacts - Those that result from development or other activities covering land or otherwise physically interfering with a resource (e.g., constructing a paved parking lot over a sensitive biological resource); and,

- Intensity Impacts - Those that result from increased levels of human activity (e.g., increases in traffic levels leading to increased emissions of criteria air pollutants).

The 2035 General Plan does not identify any additional areas designated for urban uses beyond those set forth in the 1988 General Plan as amended through fall 2017. Therefore, the environmental analysis concentrates its evaluation on those undeveloped areas designated for urban uses and the resources still present within them, including within the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) area, south of Highway 50.

Coverage Impacts

These impacts are based on the conversion of existing vacant parcels to a developed land use. Conversion can result in the eradication of, or damage to, a resource, revealing of environmental conditions detrimental to a developed land use, or exposure of the developed use to an existing environmental hazard. For the purposes of evaluating these effects, the Program EIR assumed that all land identified for urban uses in the 2035 General Plan would be developed with such uses within the 20-year planning horizon.

For areas designated for urban or infrastructure uses by the 2035 General Plan, potential coverage effects for certain environmental topics were assessed in a multi-step process. Quantitative evaluations began with a review of resources potentially affected by the implementation of the 2035 General Plan project, and the areal extent of identified resources.

To determine the locations where a resource could be converted to developed uses under the proposed 2035 General Plan, an inventory of each environmental resource within each urban area project boundary was completed. Using geospatial data, or geographic information systems (GIS), all parcels or lots within the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area were identified as developed or vacant. Vacant parcels were further identified as being located north of Highway 50, or south of Highway 50 within the FPASP area.

For vacant parcels north of Highway 50, the analysis identified 453 total vacant parcels encompassing 441 acres. Of these 453 parcels, 377 are lots within existing single-family residential subdivisions totaling 163 acres, with a gross median lot size of 16,125 square feet. Of the remaining 76 parcels, the majority are designated for commercial or multi-family uses. For these uses, the total acreage is 278 acres with a gross median parcel size of 37,150 square feet. Once the 453 parcels were identified, each was evaluated using aerial photographs to determine its condition. As evidenced on the aerial photographs, the overwhelming majority of both the single-family residential and commercial/multi-family residential parcels are remnant areas within subdivisions or larger development projects, and most have been disturbed by prior rough grading and/or the construction of roads and utilities.

There are a total of 3,336 acres in the FPASP area south of Highway 50, of which 1,118 acres would remain in open space. The remaining 2,218 acres would be developed with a variety of urban land uses and supporting infrastructure. Although potential environmental impacts could occur throughout the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area, the majority of the land available for new development of urban uses (77 percent of the citywide total or 2,218 acres) would be located within the FPASP area.

The possibility of potential coverage impacts was determined by layering maps of sensitive resources (e.g., sensitive species, areas of naturally occurring asbestos, flood hazards) over the map of vacant parcels. The results of this type of analysis are reported in the following chapters of the PEIR: 6. Aesthetics and Visual Resources, 7. Agricultural and Forestry Resources, 9. Biological Resources, 10. Cultural Resources, 11. Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources, 13. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 14. Hydrology and Water Quality, and 18. Tribal Cultural Resources.

Intensity Impacts

Intensity impacts, such as those for traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise, depend upon both the location and level of human activity. Other impacts, such as those to public services and utilities depend upon the size of the served population.

The 2035 General Plan proposed no increases in the amount of land identified for urban uses beyond that currently identified in the 1988 General Plan as amended. However, the development of urban uses on vacant land designated and available for residential and employment uses would result in an increase in the number of people and jobs in the City over existing (2015/2017) conditions. For intensity impacts, the PEIR evaluated a forecast of 2035 conditions consistent with the land uses identified in the 2035 General Plan.

The 2035 development forecast is based on a buildout model for use in the analysis of future traffic conditions. Summarily, the buildout model forecasts full development of all planned land uses within the existing city limits, full buildout of the Easton and Glenborough projects as approved by Sacramento County, and background land use assumptions outside of the City, Glenborough, and Easton consistent with the land use assumptions of Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). Because the MTP/SCS forecasts conditions for the year 2036, the buildout model used in the Program EIR interpolates 2035 conditions, the horizon year for the proposed Folsom General Plan.

As with the Coverage Impact analysis, the Intensity Impact Analysis focused on the difference between the location and level of human activity currently existing (2015/2017), and the level of activity that would exist with implementation of the 2035 General Plan. The results of this type of analysis are reported in the following chapters of the Program EIR: 8. Air Resources, 12. Global Climate Change, 15. Noise and Vibration, 16. Public Services and Recreation, 17. Transportation, and 19. Utilities and Service Systems.

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that may require mitigation to reduce the impact from "Potential Impact" to "Less than Significant" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture/Forestry Resources	■ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	■ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	■ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

8.0 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
■	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.
☐	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an environmental impact report is required.
☐	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potential impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect I) 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.
☐	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

1/3/21

Date

Josh Kinkade

Printed Name:

City of Folsom

For:

9.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Responses to the following questions and related discussion indicate if the proposed project will have or will potentially have a significant adverse impact on the environment, either individually or cumulatively with other projects. All phases of project planning, implementation, and operation are considered. Mandatory Findings of Significance are located in Section 9.XXI below.

A. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. 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" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

C. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts.

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).

I. AESTHETICS

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

The project site is currently a small cemetery, with associated landscaping, outbuildings, and access roads. Lands to the south and west contain woodland habitat typical of riparian communities in the Sierra Nevada foothills. Soils at the project site are comprised of dredge tailings and other fill material. Tailing piles between the site and Folsom Boulevard prevent the site from being visible from that street. To the west is also the Jedidiah Smith Memorial Trail that runs along the eastern shore of Lake Natoma. To the north is a small residential neighborhood with single family dwellings. Folsom Boulevard runs in a north/south line just east of the property. East of Folsom Boulevard is a large, developed area containing single family homes, apartment complexes, a mobile home park, and some small businesses. The more regional setting is primarily characterized by residential development with a commercial shopping center to the east.

The project would be located in an existing metal shed on the grounds of the existing Lakeside Memorial Lawn Cemetery. The shed can be reached by following Mormon Street to its terminus, making a slight left turn, and continuing for approximately 100 feet down an access road. The proposed project includes the installation of one HCT Apex-250 crematory manufactured by Hartwick Combustion. The shed would be modified to accommodate this device, but its footprint would not be expanded. It currently covers 1,071 square feet. A small exhaust stack would be added to the roof of the shed. This stack would be approximately 19.5 feet above grade, and would project approximately 10 feet above the existing roof of the shed. The crematory would be placed in the northwest corner of the shed. Two 250-gallon propane tanks would be installed on a proposed concrete pad along the northern side of the shed to provide power for the crematorium, as no gas lines currently exist. An existing wooden fence would shield these tanks from view from the publicly used areas of the cemetery.

Existing landscaping at the cemetery and around the shed consists of mature broad-leaved, coniferous, and palm trees. These trees also provide shade for much of the cemetery and many of the parking spaces. An irrigated lawn surrounds the existing cemetery plots and a smaller lawn surrounds the rear of the shed (i.e., the non-service entrance side). Native oak/gray pine woodland habitat exists surrounding the cemetery. No new landscaping installation or modification is proposed. Native habitat in the vicinity of the project would not be disturbed. No built footprint would be expanded.

An existing brick and wrought iron fence marks the edge of the cemetery from the Forrest Street side, but does not extend the length of Mormon Street. A wooden fence currently separates the front side of the shed (facing the access road) from the back side and extends both north and south of the shed. The fencing south of the shed further extends to block the access road and restrict access between the lawn to the west of the shed and the access road to the east of the shed. No changes to fencing are proposed as part of this action.

The access side of the shed that would be used for crematory operations is shielded from view from the rest of the cemetery by wooden fencing. A gravel berm shields views of the shed from the east, including from Folsom Boulevard. No external modifications to the shed are proposed.

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 presence of 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 of Folsom or any other public agency. Additionally, the site of proposed modifications is already largely shielded from public view and would remain so. 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. There are no state or locally designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the proposed project site (Caltrans 2020). Implementation of the proposed project would not adversely affect scenic resources within a designated scenic highway, and no impact would occur.

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 crematory would be placed inside a shed that already exists on the property and that is already mostly shielded from public view. The only external modifications would be the addition of two 250-gallon propane tanks on a concrete pad near the edge of the building and the addition of a small exhaust stack to the roof of the shed. Given that external modifications would be very minor and that the building is already mostly shielded from view, any impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The project would not result in any external glow or light source. No impact would occur.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?	☐	☐	☐	■

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 Farmland Finder classifies the project site as “Urban and Built Up” and “Other Land” (i.e., not farmland or potential farmland) (CDC 2020c).

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey report generated for the project site indicates that no Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance occurs on the project site (NRCS 2020).

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), pursuant to the California Important Farmland Finder (CDC 2020c). Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use or enacted into a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The project site is not zoned or designated as farmland, and the surrounding land uses are primarily residential developments and open space as part of an urban greenbelt. Therefore, the nature and location of the project would not directly or indirectly result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. No impact would occur.

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

No impact. No changes to the landscape are proposed, no removal of trees is proposed, and no expansion of a building footprint is proposed. No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. No changes to the landscape are proposed, no removal of trees is proposed, and no expansion of a building footprint is proposed. No impact would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY

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?	☐	☐	■	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	■	☐

The Air Quality section of this document is based upon the approach, methodology, results, and conclusions outlined in the project-specific Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (HELIX 2020) and the subsequent addendum analysis (HELIX 2021); both documents were prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. and are included as **Appendix B**.

Environmental Setting

The City of Folsom lies within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), near the southeastern edge. The SVAB consists of all or parts of eleven counties spanning from Solano and Sacramento counties in the south to Shasta County in the north. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws for Sacramento County, including the project area.

The climate of the SVAB is characterized by hot, dry summers and mild, rainy winters. During the year, the temperature may range from 20 to 115 degrees Fahrenheit with summer highs usually in the 90s and winter lows occasionally below freezing. Average annual rainfall is about 20 inches with snowfall being very rare. The prevailing winds are moderate in strength and vary from moist breezes from the south to dry land flows from the north. The mountains surrounding the Sacramento Valley create a barrier to airflow, which can trap air pollutants in the valley when certain meteorological conditions are present, and a temperature inversion (areas of warm air overlying areas of cooler air) exists. Air stagnation in the autumn and early winter occurs when large high-pressure cells lie over the valley. The lack of surface wind during these periods and the reduced vertical flow caused by less surface heating reduces the influx of outside air and allows pollutants to become concentrated in the air. The surface concentrations of pollutants are highest when these conditions are combined with increased levels of smoke or when temperature inversions trap cool air, fog, and pollutants near the ground. The ozone season (May through October) in the SVAB is characterized by stagnant morning air or light winds with

the breeze arriving in the afternoon out of the southwest from the San Francisco Bay. Usually the evening breeze transports the airborne pollutants to the north out of the SVAB. During about half of the days from July to September, however, a phenomenon called the "Schultz Eddy" prevents this from occurring. Instead of allowing for the prevailing wind patterns to move north carrying the pollutants out of the valley, the Schultz Eddy causes the wind pattern and pollutants to circle back southward. This phenomenon's effect exacerbates the pollution levels in the area and increases the likelihood of violating the federal and state air quality standards (SMAQMD 2020a).

Regulatory Setting

Criteria Pollutants

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the federal agency that administrates the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended in 1990, has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for several air pollution constituents known as criteria pollutants, including: ozone (O_3); carbon monoxide (CO); coarse particulate matter (PM_{10}; particles 10 microns or less) and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$; particles 2.5 microns or less); sulfur dioxide (SO_2); and lead (Pb). As permitted by the Clean Air Act, California has adopted the more stringent California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air constituents. Ground-level ozone is not emitted directly into the environment but is generated from complex chemical and photochemical reactions between precursor pollutants, primarily reactive organic gases (ROGs; also known as volatile organic compounds [VOC]), [1] and oxides of nitrogen (NO_X). PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are generated from a variety of sources, including road dust, diesel exhaust, fuel combustion, tire and brake wear, construction operations and windblown dust. In addition, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ can also be formed through chemical and photochemical reactions of precursor pollutants in the atmosphere.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for the ambient air quality standards. 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. An "unclassified" designation indicates that insufficient data was available to determine the status. The air quality attainment status of Sacramento County is shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2. 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

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

Pollutant	State of California Attainment Status	Federal Attainment Status
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Attainment	Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide ($N0_2$)	Attainment	Attainment
Lead	Attainment	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Attainment	Attainment
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	No Federal Standard

Sources: SMAQMD 2020a.

Sacramento County is designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state PM_{10} standards, and the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standards. The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws in Sacramento County. Attainment plans for meeting the federal air quality standards are incorporated into the State Implementation Plan (SIP), which is subsequently submitted to the USEPA, the federal agency that administrates the Federal CAA of 1970, as amended in 1990. The current air quality plan applicable to the project, the *Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan* (Regional Ozone Plan), was developed by the SMAQMD and adjacent air district to describe how the air districts in and near the Sacramento metropolitan area will continue the progress toward attaining state and national ozone air quality standards (SMAQMD 2017).

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.

Crematories are a potential source of TACs as a result of trace metals and organic compounds that accumulate in the body throughout a person’s life and are released during combustion of human remains, and as a result of trace organic compounds that are formed in the combustion process. These TACs include: metals and inorganics (i.e., arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, copper, hydrogen

fluoride, lead, mercury, nickel, selenium, zinc); VOCs (i.e., benzene, toluene, xylenes, vinyl chloride); aldehydes (i.e., acetaldehyde, formaldehyde); polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs); polychlorinated dibenzodioxins (dioxins; PCDD); and polychlorinated dibenzofurans (furans; PCD). Prolonged exposure to significant concentrations of these TACS can result in a variety of adverse health effects including cancers, chronic conditions, and/or acute conditions, depending on the substance and level of exposure. Based on the results of the Health Risk Assessment (HRA), described below, hexavalent chromium and mercury are the primary drivers of the health risks from crematory emissions because the health risks from crematory emissions of these substances are one or more orders of magnitude greater than the health risks from other TACs in crematory emissions.

Increased Cancer Risks – Hexavalent Chromium. Hexavalent chromium is a toxic form of the element chromium. Hexavalent chromium compounds are man-made and widely used in many different industries. Prolonged exposure to airborne hexavalent chromium may result in lung cancer. Although exposure to high levels of airborne hexavalent chromium may result in irritation or damage to the nose, throat, and lungs, breathing small amounts of hexavalent chromium even for long periods does not cause respiratory tract irritation in most people (Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] 2006).

Non-Cancer Chronic and Acute Health Risks – Mercury. Mercury is a naturally occurring element that is found in its elemental form (commonly known as quicksilver), in organic compounds which accumulate in fish and shellfish, and in inorganic compounds mainly occurring in contaminated drinking water. Mercury is a neurotoxin that can result in a range of chronic neurological disorders and developmental issues. The specific health effects of mercury are dependent on the form and amount of mercury in the exposure, the duration of the exposure, and the age of the individual (USEPA 2020b).

Sensitive Receptors

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. 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).

Residential areas are considered sensitive receptors to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. Children and infants are considered more susceptible to health effects of air pollution due to their immature immune systems, developing organs, and higher breathing rates. As such, schools are also considered sensitive receptors, as children are present for extended durations and engage in regular outdoor activities.

The closest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are multiple single-family residences adjacent to the cemetery to the north, between 450 and 750 feet from the proposed crematory location, and mobile homes across Folsom Boulevard to the east, approximately 700 feet from the proposed crematory location; see Figure 3, *Receptor Locations*, attached to the air quality report. The closest schools to the project site are the Folsom Montessori School approximately 3,200 feet (0.6 miles) to the northeast and the Golden Valley Charter River School. That school is located across Lake Natoma from

the project site and, though it is approximately 2.7 miles away by car, its physical location is about 3,000 feet (just over one-half mile) northwest of the project site.

Methods

Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Criteria pollutant and precursor emissions for long-term operation of the proposed crematory were calculated using propane combustion emissions factors from the USEPA AP-42 Compilation of Emissions Factors Chapter 1.5 (USEPA 2008), and crematory emissions factors provided by the SMAQMD, which combined USEPA AP-42 data and the USEPA Factor Information Retrieval Program (SMAQMD 2020b).

Crematory Health Risks

Potential health risks to nearby sensitive receptors from the emission of TACs during operation of the proposed crematory were analyzed after consultation with the SMAQMD and in accordance with the OEHHA Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments (OEHHA 2015).

TAC Emissions

Toxic emissions from the cremation process were estimated based on emissions factors provided by the SMAQMD and on maximum cremation process rates provided by Caring Service Group of 200 pounds per hour and 100,000 pounds per year. The TAC emissions factors provided by SMAQMD were based on data in a test report from CARB that measured emissions from two propane-fired crematories (SMAQMD 2020b)

Dispersion Modeling

Localized concentrations of TACs were modeled using Lakes AERMOD View version 9.8.3. The Lakes program utilizes USEPA's AERMOD gaussian air dispersion model version 19191. Plot files from AERMOD using unitized emissions (one gram per second) from the crematory stack were imported into CARB's Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program (HARP), Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool (ADMRT) version 19121. The ADMRT calculated ground-level concentrations of TACs utilizing the imported plot files and the annual and hourly emissions inventory (provided in detail in Attachment A to the Air Quality report).

Source Parameters

Based on data provided by the crematory manufacturer, emissions from the proposed crematory were modeled as a point source emitting from the exhaust stack at 19.5 feet above the ground. The stack diameter was set at 20 inches, the exhaust gas temperature was set to 1080 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), the gas exit velocity was set to 14.7 feet per second, and the stack was assumed to have a rain cap resulting in a near-zero initial vertical gas velocity. Downwash from the existing shed housing the proposed crematory was modeled using the Building Profile Input Program (BPIP – a building preprocessing program for AERMOD).

Meteorological Data

SMAQMD provides pre-processed meteorological data suitable for use with AERMOD (SMAQMD 2014) for projects within Sacramento County. The available data set most representative of conditions in the project vicinity was from the Sacramento Executive Airport station, approximately 19 miles southwest of the project site. The Sacramento Executive Airport set includes 5 years of data collected between 2010 to 2014. Rural dispersion coefficients were selected in the model to reflect the existing undeveloped and open nature of the immediate project vicinity. A wind rose for the Sacramento Executive Airport shows an average speed of 6.6 miles per hour from the south (Iowa Environmental Mesonet 2019). The wind rose graphic is included in Attachment B to the air quality report.

Terrain Data

United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Elevation Dataset (NED) files with a 10-meter resolution covering an area approximately 500 meters (1,640 feet) around the project site were used in the model to cover the analysis area. Terrain data was imported to the model using AERMAP (a terrain preprocessing program for AERMOD).

Receptor Modeling

To develop risk isopleths (linear contours showing equal level of risk) and ensure that the area of maximum impact was captured, receptors were placed in a cartesian grid 690 meters by 490 meters (approximately 2,264 feet by 1,608 feet), centered on the proposed crematory with a grid spacing of 10 meters (33 feet) and a receptor height (flagpole height) of 1.2 meters (4 feet) above the ground. Additional discrete receptors were placed at the residential property line of the 37 closest identified sensitive receptors and the 4 closest off-site worker buildings. See Figure 3 for the discrete receptor locations relative to the TAC source.

Risk Determination

Health risks resulting from localized concentration of TACs emitted by the proposed crematory were estimated using the ADMRT. The latest cancer slope factors, chronic Recommended Exposure Limits (REL), acute RELs and exposure paths for all TACs, as designated by CARB, are included in the ADMRT. For the residential cancer risk, an exposure duration of 30 years was selected in accordance with the OEHHA (2015) guidelines. In accordance with OEHHA guidelines, the model conservatively assumes that residents would be standing and breathing outdoors at the location of the property line closest to the crematory every day between 17 and 21 hours per day (depending on the age group, starting with infants in utero in the third trimester of pregnancy) for 30 years. For off-site worker cancer risk, an exposure duration of 25 years was selected with an assumption of 8 hours per day, 5 days per week of exposure while standing outside. The mandatory minimum exposure pathways and the OEHHA derived breathing intake rate percentile method were selected.

Significance Criteria

The following potential air quality impacts are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a significant impact is identified if the project would result in any of the following:

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

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?
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

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), the SMAQMD has adopted screening tables and thresholds which lead agencies can use to determine the significance of a development project's short-term construction and long-term operational pollutant emissions. The SMAQMD's project-level thresholds of significance for mass emissions of criteria pollutant and precursors and exposure to TACs are shown in **Table 3**.

Table 3. SMAQMD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Operational Emissions Threshold
ROG	65 pounds per day
NO_X	65 pound per day
PM10	80 pounds per day/14.6 tons per year[1]
PM2.5	82 pounds per day/15 tons per year[1]
TAC Exposure Incremental Increased Cancer Risk	10 in 1 million
TAC Exposure Non-Cancer Hazard Index	1

Source: SMAQMD 2020c

[1] Thresholds for PM is zero unless all feasible best available control technology/best management practices (BACT/BMPs) are applied.

Evaluation of Air Quality

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Consistency with the air quality plan is determined by whether the project would hinder implementation of control measures identified in the air quality plan or would result in growth of population or employment that is not accounted for in local and regional planning. The SMAQMD's Regional Ozone Plan and the SIP are the applicable air quality plans for the projects developed within Sacramento County.

The project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Open Space, but the project would require a conditional use permit to install and operate a crematory in the Open Space and Conservation zoning designation of the project site. The project would not result in population growth in the City and employment growth would be limited to a few personnel to operate the crematory. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the local and regional growth assumptions used in developing the Regional Ozone Plan and the SIP. In addition, as described in impact discussion b), below, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase of any criteria pollutant. Therefore, 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 in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Construction (Short-Term) Emissions

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction of the project would involve the use of a crane for several hours to unload the chiller and crematory from the truck, and the use of a mini excavator or skid steer loader for one day and one truck load of concrete to install a small pad for the two propane tanks.

According to the SMAQMD's CEQA Guide, projects that are 35 acres or less in size generally will not exceed the SMAQMD's construction NO_X or PM thresholds of significance. However, all construction projects regardless of the screening level are required to implement the SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (also known as Best Management Practices [BMP]; SMAQMD 2020b). The BMPs satisfy the requirements of SMAQMD's Rule 403, *Fugitive Dust*, which requires every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates. ROG emissions during construction are generally associated with the application of architectural coatings. The project does not propose any new structures and would not require substantial amounts of painting and would not result in significant emissions of ROGs. Therefore, construction of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant and the impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-01.

Mitigation Measure AIR-01: Implement SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices.

City approval of grading and/or improvement plans for the proposed project shall include the following SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices:

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

- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways shall be covered.

- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.

- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots shall be paved as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes (as required by the state airborne toxics control measure [Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations]). Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.

- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determine to be running in proper condition before it is operated.

Operation (Long-Term) Emissions

Less than Significant. The project would result in long-term operational emissions from vehicles that drive to and from the project and from operation of the crematory.

Because there are no crematories currently operating in Folsom, demand for cremation services is filled by transporting the deceased to facilities outside of the City. Therefore, operations of the project would not result in new vehicle trips (nor the associated emissions in the region). Instead, the project would replace existing regional vehicle trips with shorter trips (and reduced associated emissions).

Operation of a propane-fired crematory would be considered a new stationary source of emissions. The project may be subject to SMAQMD's Rule 201, *General Permit Requirements*, and Rule 202, *New Source Review*. The project would be required to implement best available control technology (BACT) for the minimization of emissions. BACT for crematories is incorporated into the product design in the form of controls which ensure maintenance of the correct temperatures and cycle times, and a secondary combustion chamber which ensures oxygenation and complete combustions of all fuels. As described in the Methods sections above, Criteria pollutant and precursor emissions for long-term operation of the proposed crematory were calculated using propane combustion emissions factors from AP-42 and crematory emissions factors provided by SMAQMD. The project's calculated criteria and precursor operational emissions are compared to the SMAQMD thresholds in **Table 4.** A printout of the calculation sheets is included in Attachment A of the air quality report.

Table 4. Operational Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions

Pollutant	Project Emissions	SMAQMD Threshold	Exceed Threshold?
Daily Emissions (pounds per day)			
ROG	0.1	**65**	*No*
NO_X	1.2	**65**	*No*
CO	0.9	**None**	*No*
SO_X	0.4	**None**	*No*
PM_{10}	0.3	**80**	*No*
$PM_{2.5}$	0.3	**82**	*No*
Annual Emissions (tons per year)			
ROG	0.01	**None**	*No*
NO_X	0.15	**None**	*No*
CO	0.11	**None**	*No*
SO_X	0.05	**None**	*No*
PM_{10}	0.03	**14.6**	*No*
$PM_{2.5}$	0.03	**15**	*No*

Source: SMAQMD 2020b; SMAQMD 2020c

As shown in **Table 4**, the project's operational emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors would not exceed the SMAQMD daily or annual thresholds. Therefore, the project's operational emissions would

not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. Crematories are a potential source of TACs as a result of trace metals and organic compounds that accumulate in the body and are released during combustion, and trace organic compounds that are formed in the combustion process. An HRA was conducted to determine potential community health risks from exposure to TACs emitted from the proposed crematory, as described in the Methods section above.

Health risks associated with cancer from development projects are estimated using the incremental excess cancer risk expressed as cancer cases per one million exposed individuals. The incremental excess cancer risk is an estimate of the chance a person exposed to specific sources of a TACs may have of developing cancer from that exposure beyond the individual's risk of developing cancer from existing background levels of pollutants in the ambient air. For context, the average cancer risk from TACs in the ambient air for an individual living in an urban area of California is 830 in 1 million (CARB 2015). Cancer risk estimates do not mean, and should not be interpreted to mean, that a person will develop cancer from estimated exposures to toxic air pollutants.

Health risks associated with chronic and acute effects from a development project are quantified using the maximum hazard index. A hazard index is the potential exposure to a substance divided by the reference exposure level (the level at which no adverse effects are expected). A hazard index of less than one indicates no adverse health effects are expected from the potential exposure to the substance. The maximum hazard index is the sum of hazard indices for pollutants with non-cancer health effects that have the same or similar adverse health effects.

The modeled point of maximum impact for the project (geographic point outside of the project site with the highest estimated incremental cancer risk and maximum hazard index) would be a point near the project boundary approximately 96 feet southeast of the proposed crematory exhaust stack, at approximately Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates Zone 10, 657982 meters east, 4281757 meters north. The maximum health risk exposure at this point would be a residential incremental cancer risk of 3.2 in 1 million and a residential non-cancer chronic hazard index of 0.09. This point of maximum impact is in an area zoned as Open Space Conservation District containing dredge tailings from past gold mining. No residents or workers are anticipated to be at the point of maximum impact for prolonged periods.

The maximum estimated community incremental excess cancer, chronic and acute health risks due to exposure to the project TAC emissions from long term operation of the proposed crematory are presented in **Table 5**. These estimates are conservative (health protective) and assume that the resident or worker is outdoors for the entire exposure period. The modeled locations of the Maximum Exposed Individual Resident (MEIR) and the point of maximum impact, along with the residential cancer risk isopleths (contours of equal risk), are shown in Figure 4, *Cancer Risks*. The complete HRA model output, including tables of health risks for all modeled discrete receptors and isopleth figures for incremental cancer risk, non-cancer chronic hazard index and acute hazard index are included as Attachment B to the air quality report.

Table 5. Maximum Exposed Individual Incremental Cancer Risk and Hazard Index

	MEI Resident Cancer Risk	MEI Worker Cancer Risk	MEI Resident Chronic Hazard Index	MEI Worker Chronic Hazard Index	MEI Acute Hazard Index
Results	0.6 in 1 million	<0.1 in 1 million	0.02	0.02	0.20
Threshold	10 in 1 million	10 in 1 million	1	1	1
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Lakes AERMOD View version 9.8.3 and CARB ADMRT version 19121. See Attachment B for model inputs, outputs, and risk isopleths.
MEI = Maximum Exposed Individual.

As shown in **Table 5**, the maximum incremental increased cancer risks and maximum non-cancer chronic and acute hazard index due to exposure to TACs from long-term operation of the proposed crematory would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC 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 Diesel equipment could generate diesel exhaust odors during construction activities. The generation of odors during the construction period would be temporary, intermittent, and dispersed within a short distance from the active work area. Once operational, potential odors from human remains prior to cremation would be minimized either by immediately processing remains or by temporarily storing remains in the proposed refrigeration chiller. Operation of the crematory would not be a significant source odors or other emissions due to the BACT features of the crematory, including process temperature and cycle time controls, as well as secondary combustion chambers which ensure the complete combustion of all solids, liquids, and gaseous fuels. Therefore, 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

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?	☐	☐	■	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

The project site features open space habitat consisting of maintained grass with an open canopy of a variety of native and exotic tree species. The property that encompasses the project site features an open cemetery, lawns, associated landscaping, and the existing shed in which the crematory would be installed. Existing landscaping at the cemetery and around the shed consists of mature broad-leaved, coniferous, and palm trees. Lands to the south and west of the property contain native oak/gray pine woodland habitat typical of riparian communities in the Sierra Nevada foothills. To the west of the project site, the Jedediah Smith Memorial Trail and Lake Natoma run on a north/south axis. The open spaces to the south and west are a part of the American River Parkway operated by the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

There are no jurisdictional wetlands, riparian, or other special status habitats located on or immediately adjacent to the project site.

Regulatory Framework Related to Biological Resources

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

State and Federal Endangered Species Acts

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

California Code of Regulations and California Fish and Game Code

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

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

California Native Plant Protection Act

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

Nesting and Migratory Birds

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

City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance

Requirements related to biological resources also include protection of existing trees and specifies measures necessary to protect both ornamental and native oak trees.

Chapter 12.16 of the Folsom Municipal Code, Tree Preservation, 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 2018b). The Tree Preservation Ordinance establishes policies, regulations, and standards necessary to ensure that the City will continue to preserve and maintain its "urban forests". Anyone who wishes to perform "Regulated Activities" on "Protected Trees" must apply for a permit with the City. Regulated activities include:

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

Protected trees include:

- Native oak trees with a diameter of 6 inches or larger at breast height for single trunk trees or 20 inches or larger at combined diameter at breast height of native oak multi-trunk trees
- Heritage oak trees are native oaks with a trunk diameter of 19 inches or larger at breast height or native oaks with a multi-trunk diameter of 38 inches or larger at breast height
- Landmark trees are a tree or group of trees determined by the City Council to be a significant community benefit
- Street trees within the tree maintenance strip or contained on the master tree list

Jurisdictional Waters

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

Biological Resources Present in the Project Site

Land Cover Type

The land cover type present on the project site is mostly maintained lawn with an open overstory of native and exotic trees. The land is within the Open Space/Public (OS/P) Primary Area of the Historic District with underlying zoning of Open Space and Conservation (OSC). Land cover adjacent to the project site is primarily developed to the north and east, oak/gray pine woodland to the south and west, along with the Jedediah Smith Memorial Trail and Lake Natoma that run on a north-south axis to the west of the project site.

Wildlife

The project site provides habitat for disturbance-tolerant wildlife species typical of urban and suburban areas. Species present likely include resident and migratory passerines, raptors, and waterfowl, along with small mammals and reptiles adapted to a moderate level of human activity.

Special-Status Species with the Potential to Occur

The regionally occurring special-status species in the Folsom area are typically associated with aquatic habitats including perennial waterbodies, wetlands, and/or vernal pools, or are associated with relatively undisturbed contiguous stands of oak or riparian woodland. The project site is developed and lacks any aquatic habitats. Species expected to use the site would be highly adaptable common species tolerant of disturbance and urban areas.

No special-status wildlife species are expected to occur on the project site with the possible exception of a special-status bird using the project site as a temporary stopover in transit to or from more suitable habitats.

Other Migratory Birds and Nesting Birds

While no special-status bird species are expected to nest on the project site, marginal habitat is present on the site for a variety of common bird species that nest in trees, on buildings, or on the ground in urban and suburban areas.

Protected Trees

No site grading or removal of any trees, protected or otherwise, is proposed.

Jurisdictional Waters

No potential waters of the U.S. and/or State are present on the project site.

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. No habitat modifications are proposed. No sensitive species are expected to use the site, although birds protected under the MBTA may use the vicinity of the site for roosting, foraging, and nesting. While the delivery and installation of the crematory would likely result in a small increase in vehicles and workers visiting the site, those increases are expected to be insignificant relative to the number of workers and members of the public who visit the cemetery each day. Birds roosting in nearby trees may be temporarily flushed by the arrival of workers or equipment, but any birds using the site are likely already accustomed to a moderate level of human activity. A less than significant impact would occur.

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

No Impact. No external modifications to the shed are proposed beyond the addition of two 250-gallon propane tanks on a concrete pad along the edge of the building and the addition of the proposed stack to the roof. Those modifications would occur in an area already subject to vehicle and worker visits and maintenance activity and would not affect any native habitat in the vicinity of the project site. No modifications to any habitat, vegetation, or landscaping are proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. No potential waters of the U.S. or State exist on the project site. No modification of any habitat is proposed. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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. No external modifications are proposed except for the installation of two 250-gallon propane tanks on a concrete pad adjacent to a building already in use as a service shed. No modification of any landscaping, habitat, or vegetation is proposed as part of this project. There would be no impact.

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

No Impact. No modifications to, or removals of, any habitat, vegetation, trees, or landscaping are proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

No 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

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 as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	■	☐	☐

The Cultural Resources section of this document is based upon the approach, methodology, and conclusions outlined in the project-specific Cultural Resources Inventory Report prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (2020). All phases of the cultural resources investigation were conducted or supervised by Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) Lisa Westwood, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historical archaeology. Fieldwork and report contributions were conducted by Staff Archaeologist Laurel Zickler-Martin, RPA. Though the document in its entirety is incorporated by reference, the report itself is confidential and is not included as an appendix to this Initial Study.

Environmental Setting

To meet the regulatory requirements of this project, the cultural resources investigation was conducted pursuant to the provisions for the treatment of cultural resources contained within Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and in CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] § 21000 et seq.). The goal of NHPA and CEQA is to develop and maintain a high-quality environment that serves to identify the significant environmental effects of the actions of a proposed project and to either avoid or mitigate those significant effects where feasible. CEQA pertains to all proposed projects that require State or local government agency approval, including the enactment of zoning ordinances, the issuance of conditional use permits, and the approval of development project maps. The NHPA pertains to projects that entail some degree of federal funding or permit approval.

The NHPA and CEQA (Title 54 U.S. Code [USC] Section 100101 et seq. and Title 14, California Code of Regulations [CCR], Article 5, § 15064.5) apply to cultural resources of the historical and pre-contact periods. Any project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a cultural resource, either directly or indirectly, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. As a result, such a project would require avoidance or mitigation of impacts to those affected resources. Significant cultural resources must meet at least one of four criteria that define eligibility for listing on either the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (PRC § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, § 4852) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 60.4):

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.

Cultural resources eligible for listing on the NRHP are considered Historic Properties under 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 and are automatically eligible for the CRHR. Resources listed on or eligible for inclusion in the CRHR are considered Historical Resources under CEQA.

The City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications were developed and approved by the City of Folsom in May 2004 and updated in April 2015. 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 2015).

Ethnography

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.

Regional Background

California has been occupied by humans for approximately the past 10,000 years. Early groups between 10,000 and 8,000 years before present (BP) were largely mobile, small in number, and relied upon big game hunting and a limited exploitation of small game and plant resources. Between 8,000 and 5,000 BP, groups become more sedentary and stable and shifted to a greater reliance on plant resources and milling seeds and other plant matter. After about 5,000 BP, groups became more specialized, population densities increased, and regional cultures and languages developed that would form the basis for the societies encountered at the time of first European contact. Current patterns of climate and vegetation communities were in place by approximately 3,000 BP.

Nisenan or Southern Maidu

Ethnographically, the project area is in the southwestern portion of the territory occupied by the Penutian-speaking Nisenan. Nisenan inhabited the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers, and also the lower reaches of the Feather River, extending from the east banks of the Sacramento River on the west to the mid to high elevations of the western flank of the Sierra Nevada to the east (Wilson and Towne 1978). The territory extended from the area surrounding the current city of Oroville on the north to a few miles south of the American River in the south.

Individual and extended families “owned” hunting and gathering grounds, and trespassing was discouraged (Kroeber 1925; Wilson and Towne 1978). Residence was generally patrilocal, but couples had a choice in the matter (Wilson and Towne 1978). The basic social and economic group for the

Nisenan was the family or household unit. The nuclear and/or extended family formed a corporate unit. These basic units were combined into distinct village or hamlet groups, each largely composed of consanguine relatives (Beals 1933; Littlejohn 1928). Lineage groups were important political and economic units that combined to form tribelets, which were the largest sociopolitical unit identified for Nisenan (Wilson and Towne 1978). Each tribelet had a chief or headman who exercised political control over all villages within it. Villages typically included family dwellings, acorn granaries, a sweathouse, and a dance house, owned by the chief. The role of chief seems to have been an advisory role with little direct authority (Beals 1933) but with the support of the shaman and the elders, the word of the chief became virtually the law (Wilson and Towne 1978). Tribelets assumed the name of the head village where the chief resided (Beals 1933; Levy 1978).

The office of tribelet chief was hereditary, with the chieftainship being the property of a single patrilineage within the tribelet. Tribelet populations of Valley Nisenan were as large as 500 persons (Wilson and Towne 1982), while foothill and mountain tribelets ranged between 100 and 300 persons (Littlejohn 1928; Levy 1978). Each tribelet owned a bounded tract of land and exercised control over its natural resources (Littlejohn 1928). Beals (1933) estimated that Nisenan tribelet territories averaged approximately 10 miles along each boundary, or 100 square miles, with foothill territories tending to encompass more area than mountain territories.

Nisenan practiced seasonal migration, a subsistence strategy involving moving from one area or elevation to another to harvest plants, fish, and game across contrasting ecosystems that were in relatively close proximity to each other. Valley Nisenan generally did not range beyond the valley and lower foothills, while foothill and mountain groups ranged across a more extensive area that included jointly shared territory whose entry was subject to traditional understandings of priority of ownership and current relations between the groups (d'Azevedo 1963).

Important food items included small and large game, fish, acorns, roots, pine nuts, and various hardwood nuts. Further resources were obtained from coastal groups and trans-Sierran groups through trade networks. Prescribed fire was used to maintain hunting and gathering grounds and to enhance opportunities to produce and gather acorns.

The Spanish arrived on the central California coast in 1769. Early contact with the first Spanish explorers to enter California was limited to the peripheries of Nisenan territory; they occurred mainly to the south on lands of the Miwok which had been explored by José Canizares in 1776, with only ephemeral explorations into Nisenan lands. There are no records of Nisenan groups being removed to the missions. They did, however, receive escapees from the missions, as well as pressure of displaced Miwok populations on their southern borders. The first known occupation by Euro-Americans was marked by American and Hudson Bay Company fur trappers in the late 1820s establishing camps in Nisenan territories. This occupation was thought to have been peaceful (Wilson and Towne 1978).

However, in the coming decades disease decimated the Nisenan of the Sacramento Valley, and many of the survivors retreated into the hills. Both they and mountain groups of Nisenan were met with persecution and attacks from settlers following the 1848 discovery of gold. The remaining Nisenan were relegated to working in agriculture, logging, ranching, or domestic pursuits (Wilson and Towne 1978). They and their descendants faced poor living and working conditions in the coming decades, although some customs and traditional practices have been preserved through the 21st century.

Regional History

The first European to visit California was Spanish maritime explorer Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo in 1542. He visited San Diego Bay, Catalina Island, San Pedro Bay, and the northern Channel Islands. The English adventurer Francis Drake visited the Miwok Native American group at Drake's Bay or Bodega Bay in 1579.

Colonization of California began with the Spanish Portolá land expedition. The expedition, led by Captain Gaspar de Portolá of the Spanish army and Father Junipero Serra, a Franciscan missionary, explored the California coast from San Diego to the Monterey Bay Area in 1769. As a result of this expedition, Spanish missions to convert the native population, presidios (forts), and pueblos (towns) were established. The Franciscan missionary friars established 21 missions in Alta California (the area north of Baja California) beginning with Mission San Diego in 1769 and ending with the mission in Sonoma established in 1823. The purpose of the missions and presidios was to establish Spanish economic, military, political, and religious control over the Alta California territory. No missions were established in the Central Valley; the closest were in the Bay Area. The Spanish did not establish any settlements in the Central Valley.

After Mexico became independent from Spain in 1821, what is now California became the Mexican province of Alta California with its capital at Monterey. In 1827, American trapper Jedediah Smith traveled along the Sacramento River and into the San Joaquin Valley to meet other trappers of his company who were camped there, but no permanent settlements were established by the fur trappers (Thompson and West 1880).

The Mexican government closed the missions in the 1830s and former mission lands, as well as previously unoccupied areas, were granted to retired soldiers and other Mexican citizens for use as cattle ranches. Much of the land along the coast and in the interior valleys became part of Mexican land grants or "ranchos" (Robinson 1948).

John Sutter, a European immigrant, built a fort at the confluence of the Sacramento and American rivers in 1839 and petitioned the Mexican governor of Alta California for a land grant, which he received in 1841. Sutter built a flour mill and grew wheat near the fort (Bidwell 1971). Gold was discovered in the flume of Sutter's lumber mill at Coloma on the South Fork of the American River in January 1848 (Marshall 1971). The discovery of gold initiated the 1849 California Gold Rush, which brought thousands of miners and settlers to the Sierra foothills east and southeast of Sacramento.

The American period began when the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed between Mexico and the U.S. in 1848. As a result of the treaty, Alta California became part of the U.S. as the territory of California. Rapid population increase occasioned by the Gold Rush of 1849 allowed California to become a state in 1850. Most Mexican land grants were confirmed to the grantees by U.S. courts, but usually with more restricted boundaries.

Project Area History

The project area is located within the northern portion of the former 35,521-acre Rio de los Americanos land grant, which stretches from Folsom Lake in the northeast to a southwestern point nearly reaching modern-day Florin Road, approximately 3.3 miles south of central Rosemont and 3.8 miles east of Florin. In 1848, Captain Joseph Folsom pursued ownership of the Rio de los Americanos. He died in 1855, and the land grant was subsequently sold, piecemeal, for developments in agriculture, mining endeavors,

and quarrying of granite. Originally named Granite City, the city of Folsom was named for the captain in the year he died.

City of Folsom History

The first railroad in California was built from Sacramento to Folsom in 1856 by the Sacramento Valley Railroad Company (Robertson 1998). Other railroads soon connected Folsom with additional communities in the Sacramento Valley and surrounding foothills. Folsom became a transportation hub and supply center for gold miners.

Folsom State Prison opened in 1880 on 40 acres of land (California Department of Corrections [CDCR] 2010a). When it opened, it housed 44 inmates in the State's first high-security prison. Although authorized by the State legislature in 1858, construction did not begin until 1878. A dam on the American River and a hydroelectric generation facility were built by inmates (CDCR 2010b). Electricity from the Folsom Powerhouse was transmitted 22 miles to Sacramento on July 13, 1895 (American Society of Mechanical Engineers 1976). Folsom was incorporated as a City in 1945. Folsom Dam was built in 1955, creating Folsom Lake. The dam was for flood control and to provide hydroelectricity. The largest employer in the area is Intel Corporation, which built a facility in the southern part of Folsom in 1984. Folsom continues to grow as an upscale community within the Sacramento Metropolitan Area.

History of Folsom Mining

The vicinity of the project area was used historically for mining, largely by the Natomas Company, who employed broad scale dredge mining in the first half of the twentieth century.

During the early mining period of the late 1840s and early 1850s, only the creeks and streams were mined, using pans, rockers, and hand-dug shallow diggings. Two historic gold mining districts were present in Sacramento County - the Folsom, or American River, District and the Michigan Bar District (Clark 2005). In 1853, the Natoma Water and Mining Company built a system of ditches, north of the current project area, to feed water from the American River and nearby creeks into the prairie and pasture lands that were known to have gold rich deposits. Most of the shallow gold deposits had been exhausted by 1865, and drift mining, which consisted of digging shafts down to depths of 20 feet and below, resumed until the late 1890s.

The project area itself is surrounded on the west and south by dredge mining tailings and the parcel is situated along a perennial waterway; these locations were appealing locations for miners to seek gold bearing deposits. All mining operations in the immediate vicinity of the project site had ceased by 1962.

Chinese Influence on Folsom

Chinese workers, some already present in California, greatly increased in numbers following the discovery of gold. Chinese miners often utilized their skills and diligence to successfully pursue mining claims that had been overlooked by white miners. Much of the money that was made from mining was sent in remittances to family members still in China. In 1878, there were over 3,500 Chinese mining in and around Folsom. When the gold began to run out, the Chinese worked at many other jobs, including such tasks as building the first Delta levees and constructing the transcontinental railroad. They also developed small businesses becoming laundrymen, cooks, storekeepers, farmers, and fishermen. Folsom once had a Chinese community numbering about 2,500 people, complete with businesses and community institutions. The Chung Wah Chinese Cemetery is listed on the National Register of Historic

Places and is a state registered landmark. It is adjacent to the project area (PAR Environmental Services, Inc. 1995).

History of Lakeside Memorial Lawn

Not much information in academic or gray literature exists on the history of the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Cemetery. The oldest section of the Cemetery evolved from the Negro Bar mining camp internments, with the first internment being in 1849 or shortly thereafter. The Cemetery is associated with the Miller Family. Jacob Miller, a German immigrant, opened a furniture and casket shop at 709 Sutter Street in 1869 and then transitioned the business into caskets and undertaking by the early 1880s. After his passing in 1905, ownership of the business transferred first to his son, Oscar Miller, then to longtime employee Robert Claney in 1962 (Scott 2020).

The cemetery represents a combination of several old Folsom cemeteries, including the Masonic, Odd Fellows, Jewish, Citizen's, and Cook's cemeteries. Lakeside Memorial Lawn is Folsom's only active historic cemetery.

Cultural Resources Surveys

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) consists of the horizontal and vertical limits of a project and includes the area within which significant impacts or adverse effects to Historical Resources or Historic Properties could occur as a result of the project. The APE is defined for projects subject to regulations implementing Section 106 (federal law and regulations). For projects subject to the CEQA, the term project area is used rather than APE. For the purpose of this document, the terms "project area" and APE are interchangeable. When referring to the larger Lakeside Memorial Lawn facility, within which the project area is situated, the term property is used.

Records Searches

ECORP requested a records search for the property from the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at California State University-Sacramento on October 30, 2020 (NCIC search #SAC-20-152). The purpose of the records search was to determine the extent of previous surveys within a 0.25-mile (400-meter) radius of the property, and whether previously documented pre-contact or historic archaeological sites, architectural resources, or traditional cultural properties exist within this area.

In addition to the official records and maps for archaeological sites and surveys in Sacramento County, the following historic references were also reviewed: Historic Property Data File for Sacramento County (OHP 2012); *The National Register Information System* (National Park Service [NPS] 2020); *Office of Historic Preservation, California Historical Landmarks* (OHP 2019); *California Historical Landmarks* (OHP 1996 and updates); *California Points of Historical Interest* (OHP 1992 and updates); *Directory of Properties in the Historical Resources Inventory* (1999); *Caltrans Local Bridge Survey* (Caltrans 2019); *Caltrans State Bridge Survey* (Caltrans 2018); and *Historic Spots in California* (Kyle 2002).

Other references examined include a RealQuest Property Search and historic General Land Office (GLO) land patent records (Bureau of Land Management [BLM] 2020). Several historic maps and historic and recent aerial photographs were also reviewed.

The results of the records search indicate that the property has been previously surveyed for cultural resources, but the survey was performed 25 years ago under obsolete standards, and long prior to the

consideration of the type of project activity being currently proposed. Therefore, a pedestrian survey of the property was conducted for the current project under current protocols.

Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Coordination

ECORP contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on October 26, 2020 to request a search of the Sacred Lands File for the property. This search was to determine whether or not Sacred Lands have been recorded by California Native American tribes within the property, because the Sacred Lands File is populated by members of the Native American community who have knowledge about the locations of tribal resources. In requesting a search of the Sacred Lands File, ECORP solicited information from the Native American community regarding tribal cultural resources, but the responsibility to formally consult with the Native American community lies exclusively with the federal and local agencies under applicable State and federal law. Results of the search were received on November 10, 2020. The search failed to reveal the presence of Native American cultural resources in the project area. For more information, including a description of official consultation with Native tribes, see Section 9.0.XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources.

Other Interested Party Consultation

ECORP mailed letters to the Sacramento County Historical Society and the Folsom Historical Society on October 26, 2020 to solicit comments or obtain historical information that the repository might have regarding events, people, or resources of historical significance in the area. No responses to the letters sent to the Folsom Historical Society or the Sacramento County Historical Society have been received as of the preparation of this document.

Pedestrian Survey

On November 2, 2020, ECORP subjected the property to pedestrian survey under the guidance of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Identification of Historic Properties* (NPS 1983) using transects spaced 15 meters apart. ECORP expended less than half of one person-day in the field. At that time, the ground surface was examined for indications of surface or subsurface cultural resources. The general morphological characteristics of the ground surface were inspected for indications of subsurface deposits that may be manifested on the surface, such as circular depressions or ditches. Whenever possible, the locations of subsurface exposures caused by such factors as rodent activity, water or soil erosion, or vegetation disturbances were examined for artifacts or for indications of buried deposits. No subsurface investigations or artifact collections were undertaken during the pedestrian survey. The project area was photographed, and survey coverage mapped using a handheld Global Positioning System receiver.

Ground visibility in the cemetery itself was very limited, as the entire area is either paved or covered in manicured lawn; the only visible soil was immediately surrounding headstones and in sparse patches at the edges of the lawn.

Built Environment Resources

ECORP researched the shed itself to determine if it is old enough to warrant further evaluation as a cultural resource by an architectural historian. According to modern aerial photographs of the property, the shed was installed sometime between May 1993 and August 1998. As further supported by field inspection, the shed is not old enough to be considered a potential cultural resource, and therefore, it

was not recorded or considered further. Should the proposed project include demolition or remodeling of the shed, such activity would not have an impact on a cultural resource.

Evaluation of Cultural Resources

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Historical resources are outside of the site of the proposed project. No precontact or historic resources were discovered during the pedestrian survey conducted by ECORP. The existing shed is not old enough to warrant consideration as a potential historic or cultural resource. Therefore, project impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, ECORP has assessed the project area for the presence of archaeological resources. The project site itself is not in an area otherwise suspected to contain unknown archaeological resources. The site survey and surveys of written records, historical maps and photographs, and outreach to groups with knowledge of the area's history all suggest that no known or previously unknown archaeological resources would be encountered or disturbed during construction. Ground disturbing activity would be limited to shallow ground clearing and site prep for the installation of a concrete pad to support two propane tanks. Still, the potential exists for inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources during project construction. The implementation of standard archaeological resource construction mitigation (Mitigation Measures CUL-01 and CUL-02) would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-01: Avoid impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources.

Prior to the initiation of ground disturbing activity, a qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained to develop and deliver a contractor awareness training program to construction supervisors. The purpose of the training is to ensure that contractors are aware of the need to limit their activity, including equipment storage, staging, parking, and ground disturbance to only those locations identified as work areas on the official site plans.

Prior to the initiation of ground disturbing activity, a qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained to monitor the installation of temporary high-visibility exclusionary fencing along the toe of existing mine tailings features adjacent to the shed. The fencing shall remain in place until all project activities are completed. City inspectors shall include a verification of the fencing during all required inspections. In the event that exclusionary fencing has failed, the construction supervisor must re-install or repair the fence within 24 hours.

Mitigation Measure CUL-02: Minimize impacts to any previously unknown archaeological resources discovered during construction.

If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for pre-contact and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to

modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately, and no agency notifications are required.

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the City to consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines or a historic property under Section 106 NHPA, if applicable. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the City, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the site either: 1) is not an Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction.

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Though the project site is located on the property of the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Cemetery, no human remains are known to exist in the immediate vicinity of the project site. No evidence of potential human remains outside of marked graves was found in the project area during the cultural resources site survey by ECORP's archaeologist. Ground disturbing activity would be limited to shallow ground clearing and site prep for the installation of a concrete pad to support two propane tanks. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, specifically the preparation of the site for the small concrete pad, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. This is a potentially significant impact. However, if human remains were discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-03 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-03: Avoid and minimize impacts related to accidental discovery of human remains.

If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 50-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for pre-contact and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the Sacramento County Coroner (per §7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, §5097.98 of the California PRC, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the project (§5097.98 of the PRC). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate

(§5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§5097.98 of the PRC). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). If the Coroner determines that the remains are human but are not Native American, then the Coroner will direct subsequent steps to address the discovery. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the City, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to its satisfaction.

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

Environmental Setting

Electricity

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 2020a). **Table 6** provides a summary of California's electricity sources as of 2019.

Table 6. 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	31.70%

Source: CEC 2020a

Natural Gas

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 was 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 2020b).

Transportation Fuels

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 (SUV). In 2015, 15.1 billion gallons of gasoline were sold in California (CEC 2020c). 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 2020d).

Proposed Project

Potential energy use of the proposed crematory and cooler were estimated for the proposed project using assumptions provided by the manufacturer and the applicant. During projected operation, the crematory would use approximately 900.00 MMBTU (million British Thermal Units) of energy and 9,835.9 gallons of propane per year. The cooler would use approximately 15,000 kWhr (kilowatt hour) of electricity or 51.18 MMBTU of energy per year. The total energy use of the proposed crematory and cooler would be approximately 951 MMBTU per year. Additional minor increases in energy consumption may result from added time which would require lighting within and around the shed to accommodate any workers while operating the facility, and a minor increase in gasoline and/or diesel usage as remains are brought to/from the crematory and as workers drive to and from the site.

Regulatory Framework

State Regulations

California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24)

The 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, comprising Title 24, Parts 1 and 6, of the California Code of Regulations, is mandatory statewide. Local government agencies may adopt and enforce energy efficiency standards for newly constructed buildings, additions, alterations, and repairs provided the California Energy Commission finds that the standards will require buildings to consume no more energy than permitted by Title 24, Part 6. Such local standards may include adopting the requirements of Title 24, Part 6 before their effective date, requiring additional energy conservation measures, or setting stricter energy budgets.

Local Regulations

City of Folsom General Plan

The City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Utilities Element provides the following goals and policies relative to energy.

Goal PFS 8.1: Provide for the energy and telecommunications needs of Folsom and decrease the dependence on nonrenewable energy sources through energy conservation, efficiency, and renewable resource strategies now and in the future.

- PFS 8.1.3 Renewable Energy: Promote efforts to increase the use of renewable energy resources such as wind, solar, hydropower, and biomass both in the community and in City operations, where feasible.

- PFS 8.1.4 Regional Energy Conservation: Partner with neighboring jurisdictions and local energy utilities (e.g., SMUD and PG&E) to develop, maintain, and implement energy conservation programs.

- PFS 8.1.5 PACE Program: Assist in implementing the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing programs to provide residential and commercial property owners with energy efficiency and renewable energy financing opportunities.

- PFS 8.1.6 Energy-Efficient Lighting: Reduce the energy required to light Folsom's parks and public facilities by employing energy-efficient lighting technology.

- PFS 8.1.7 Energy Conservation in City Operations: Strive to achieve an overall 20 percent reduction in City facility energy usage by continuing to install energy efficiency upgrades in City facilities (buildings, parks, and infrastructure) and implementing programs to measure and track energy usage in City facilities.

Folsom Municipal Code

Chapter 14.19 of the City of Folsom Municipal Code, entitled ENERGY CODE, adopts by reference the California Energy Code, 2019 Edition, published as Part 6, Title 24, California Code of Regulations to require energy efficiency standards for structures.

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. Construction of the project would involve the use of a crane for several hours to unload the chiller and crematory from the truck, and the use of a mini excavator or skid steer loader for a day and one truck load of concrete to install a small pad for the two propane tanks. Construction equipment would be relatively small, given the small size of the project, and construction would be of short duration. Construction equipment would require gasoline, diesel, and potentially other fuel sources to operate. Additionally, a small number of workers would need to drive to and from the site.

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 and small in scale. Therefore, the project's construction-phase energy impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would increase the consumption of energy, primarily related to propane used to power the crematory and to a lesser extent from electricity used to power the cooler. During projected operation, the crematory would use approximately 900.00 MMBTU of energy and 9,835.9 gallons of propane per year. The cooler would use approximately 15,000 kWhr of electricity or 51.18 MMBTU of energy per year. The total energy use of the proposed crematory and cooler would be approximately 951 MMBTU per year. Additional minor increases in energy would include electricity to light the space when workers are present and a minor increase in worker vehicle trips to and from the site.

Additionally, adequate energy facilities are already located within and adjacent to the site serving the existing uses. The cemetery is currently served with an electricity supply from the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD). Electrical connections already exist for the shed, and may be upgraded as needed as part of the proposed project. 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. 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

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.	☐	☐	■	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	■	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	■	☐
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct and indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

Geology

Information in the "Geology" subsection is derived from County of Sacramento's General Plan Safety Element (2017) unless noted otherwise. The project site is located near the border of the Great Valley and the Sierra Nevada Geomorphic Provinces. Specifically, the site is located within the Alluvial Plain Geomorphic Subunit of the Great Valley Province, just southwest of the boundary marking the start of the Sierra Nevada Province. Quaternary deposits of up to two million years old make up the soil of this subunit, which overlies layers of clay hardpans.

The project site lays within a seismically active region, as California has numerous faults that are considered active. An active fault is defined by the State Mining and Geology Board as one that has had surface displacement within Holocene time (about the last 11,000 years). Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones are regulatory zones, delineated by the State Geologist, within which site-specific geologic studies are required to identify and avoid fault rupture hazards prior to subdivision of land and/or construction of most structures for human occupancy. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within Sacramento County. The nearest faults of any type to the project site are part of the Foothills Fault Zone's North Central Reach Section, and range from about 1.6 million to 130,000 years in age. (USGS 2014). They run north/northwest from Shingle Springs (El Dorado County) to Auburn (Placer County) and continue northward. They are not likely to be active. The nearest faults with recent earthquake activity, which are the most likely to cause shaking felt in the project area, are the Green Valley Fault Zone and the Greenville Fault Zone. Some faults in this area have experienced displacement within the past 200 years and are likely to be active; the nearest faults in these zones run north/northwest from Mt. Diablo to the southern Napa Valley (CGS 2020) and are located approximately 60 miles to the southwest of the project site.

Soils

The soil map unit for the project site is 245-Xerorthents, dredge tailings, 2 to 50 percent slopes. (NRCS 2020).

City Regulation of Geology and Soils

The City of Folsom regulates the effects of soils and geological constraints on urban development primarily through enforcement of the California Building Code, which requires the implementation of engineering solutions for constraints to urban development posed by slopes, soils, and geology. The City has additionally 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. There are no known active faults crossing the property, and the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. 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. Though the project site is in an area of relatively low risk from most earthquakes, an earthquake of moderate to high magnitude generated within the region could still cause considerable ground shaking at the site (County of Sacramento 2017). To minimize potential ground shaking effects, crematory installation should be done in accordance with any relevant

provisions of the 2019 California Building Code, along with all safety recommendations from the manufacturer. 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. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, saturated, uniformly graded, fine-grained sands. Soils at the project site are comprised of dredge tailings and other fill material; thus the soil is likely not loose nor uniformly graded. Further, only a small amount of superficial ground disturbance is proposed. Any impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

No impact. The project site is generally flat, ranging in elevation from approximately 175 to 185 feet. The project is not located adjacent to any steep or unstable areas. No impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The only ground-disturbing work undertaken during this project would be the installation of two 250-gallon propane tanks and a concrete pad that would cover approximately 38.3 square feet of ground. All other work would take place inside an existing shed. Given the small area of soil disturbed, the short duration of the work to install the tanks, and the fact that the applicant is required to ensure that any relevant BMPs for soil conservation are adhered to, any impact is expected to be 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. The site is not unstable and the project area is nearly flat. Though the project is located in an area that has a medium to high potential for subsidence (County of Sacramento 2017), soil at the project site is generally comprised of dredge tailings and other fill material (NRCS 2020). Given that, the risk for future subsidence at the project site is low. Further, the project would not disturb significant areas of ground (disturbance would be limited to approximately 38.3 square feet), would take place mostly within an existing structure, and would not add an excessive amount of weight to the site. Therefore, potential impacts from project implementation would be less than significant.

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. New ground disturbing activity and construction are not proposed as part of the project, with the exception of the construction of an approximately 38.3 square foot concrete pad to support two 250-gallon propane tanks. All other activity would take place within an existing shed. Given that no issues with expansive soils have been identified regarding the existing shed or its immediate surroundings, and that new foundation construction as part of the proposed project would be limited to a small concrete pad, any 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. Though no sanitary sewer line currently exists, there is no demand for one on the project site. No demand for the disposal of septic waste would be created as a result of this project. As no septic systems exist or are proposed, no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The proposed project area is not located in an area that is considered likely to have paleontological resources present. Paleontological resources (fossils) are the remains and/or traces of prehistoric life. Fossils are typically preserved in layered sedimentary rocks, and the distribution of fossils is a result of the sedimentary history of the geologic units within which they occur. Vertebrate fossils have been documented in nine different locations within Sacramento County. The finds encompass several hundred specimens, all within the Riverbank Formation. Because of the large number of vertebrate fossils that have been recovered from the Riverbank Formation from Sacramento County and throughout the Central Valley, this formation is considered to have high sensitivity under criteria established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995). Likewise, the Mehrten and Ione formations located within the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area may be considered to be sensitive for the presence of paleontological resources. Other geologic formations found in the 2035 Folsom Plan Evaluation Area, such as the Laguna Formation, mine/dredge tailings, and Holocene alluvium along local drainage features, would not be expected to contain fossils. The only type of soil found at the site is composed of dredge tailings and other urban fill material, and would not be expected to contain fossils. Further, very little ground disturbance is proposed.

Fossils of plants, animals, or other organisms of paleontological significance have not been discovered within the project area, nor has the project area been identified as being within any of the areas mentioned above where such discoveries are likely. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources or unique geologic features.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

The Greenhouse Gas Emissions section of this document is based upon the approach, methodology, results, and conclusions outlined in the project-specific Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning (HELIX 2020). The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment is included as **Appendix B**.

Environmental Setting

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

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

The GHGs defined under California's Assembly Bill (AB) 32, described below, include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). Each GHG differs in its ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere based on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. Estimates of GHG emissions are commonly presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential (GWP). Expressing GHG emissions in CO_2e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO_2 were being emitted. GHG emissions quantities in this analysis are presented in metric tons (MT) of CO_2e. For consistency with United Nations Standards, modeling and reporting of GHGs in California and the U.S. use the GWPs defined in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007), as shown in **Table 7**.

Table 7. Global Warming Potential and Atmospheric Lifetimes

Greenhouse Gas	Atmospheric Lifetime (years)	GWP
Carbon Dioxide (CO_2)	50-200	1
Methane (CH_4)	12	25
Nitrous Oxide (N_2O)	114	298
HFC-134a	14	1,430
PFC: Tetraflouromethane (CF_4)	50,000	7,390
PFC: Hexafluoroethane (C_2F_6)	10,000	12,200
Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF_6)	3,200	22,800

Source: IPCC 2007.
HFC: hydrofluorocarbon; PFC: perfluorocarbon

Regulatory Setting

The primary GHG reduction legislation and plans (applicable to the project) at the State, regional, and local levels are described below. Implementation of California's GHG reduction mandates is primarily under the authority of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) at the state level, SMAQMD and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) at the regional level, and the City at the local level.

Executive Order S-3-05

On June 1, 2005, Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 proclaimed that California is vulnerable to climate change impacts. It declared that increased temperatures could reduce snowpack in the Sierra Nevada, further exacerbate California's air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To avoid or reduce climate change impacts, EO S-3-05 calls for a reduction in GHG emissions to the year 2000 level by 2010, to year 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Executive Orders are not laws and can only provide the governor's direction to state agencies to act within their authority to reinforce existing laws.

Assembly Bill 32 – Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, widely known as AB 32, requires that CARB develop and enforce regulations for the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. CARB is directed by AB 32 to set a GHG emission limit, based on 1990 levels, to be achieved by 2020. The bill requires CARB to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions.

Executive Order B-30-15

On April 29, 2015, EO B-30-15 established a California GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The EO aligns California's GHG emission reduction targets with those of leading international governments, including the 28 nation European Union. California is on track to meet or exceed the target of reducing GHGs emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in AB 32. California's new emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 will make it possible to reach the goal established by EO S-3-05 of reducing emissions 80 percent under 1990 levels by 2050.

Senate Bill 32

Signed into law by Governor Brown on September 8, 2016, Senate Bill (SB) 32 (Amendments to the California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006) extends California's GHG reduction programs beyond 2020. SB 32 amended the Health and Safety Code to include Section 38566, which contains language to authorize CARB to achieve a statewide GHG emission reduction of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by no later than December 31, 2030. SB 32 codified the targets established by EO B-30-15 for 2030, which set the next interim step in the State's continuing efforts to pursue the long-term target expressed in EO B-30-15 of 80 percent below 1990 emissions levels by 2050.

California Air Resources Board

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

In response to EO B-30-15 and SB 32, all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions were directed to implement measures to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 targets. The mid-term target is critical to help frame the suite of policy measures, regulations, planning efforts, and investments in clean technologies and infrastructure needed to continue driving down emissions (CARB 2014). In December 2017, CARB adopted the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, the Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target, to reflect the 2030 target set by EO B 30 15 and codified by SB 32 (CARB 2017).

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

The SMAQMD provides direction and recommendations for the analysis of GHG impacts of a project and approach to mitigation measures in its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (SMAQMD 2020a).

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375), SACOG has developed the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. This plan seeks to reduce GHG and other mobile source emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning to reduce VMT.

City of Folsom

As part of the 2035 General Plan, the City of Folsom prepared an integrated Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy (GHG Strategy) to identify and reduce current and future community GHG emissions and those associated with the City's municipal operations. Adopted on August 28, 2018, the GHG Strategy also 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. The GHG Strategy includes goals and strategies to reduce community and municipal GHG emissions, compared to the 2005 baseline year, by 15 percent in 2020, 51 percent in 2035, and 80 percent in 2050 (City of Folsom 2018a; City of Folsom 2018c).

Significance Criteria

The following potential air quality impacts are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a significant impact is identified if the project would result in any of the following:

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

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

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(3), 15130(d), and 15183(b), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative GHG emissions effect may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases. The City General Plan Policy NCR 3.2.8 provides criteria for project-level streamlining and tiering (City of Folsom 2018a):

> 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 GHG Strategy contained 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).

Evaluation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

Less Than Significant Impact. To determine consistency with the City's GHG Strategy, the criteria outlined in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist are shown and discussed in **Table 8**.

Table 8. GHG Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist

Checklist Item	Consistent?	Discussion
Part 1: Lad Use Consistency		
A. The proposed project is consistent with the City's 2035 General Plan land use and zoning designations. If "Yes," proceed to Part 2 of the Checklist.	Yes	The project would be located within the footprint of an existing building in an existing cemetery in an area designated Open Space in the General Plan and zoned Open Space/Public (OS/P) Primary Area of the Historic District with underlying zoning of Open Space and Conservation District (OSC). According to the City Zoning Code Chapter 17.52.550 and Chapter 17.39, a cemetery is an allowed use in both the OS/P Primary Area and OSC zone with a use permit. While the project may require a new conditional use permit, the project would not require a General Plan amendment or rezone. The project would be consistent with existing project site use and land use designation the General Plan.
Part 2: GHG Reduction Measures Consistency		
E-1: Improve Building Energy Efficiency in New Development	Not Applicable	The project does not propose new buildings or substantial modifications to existing buildings.
E-2: Water Heater Replacement in Existing Residential Development	Not Applicable	The project is not an existing residential development.
E-3: Improve Building Energy Efficiency in Existing Development	Not Applicable	The project's proposed equipment would be installed within an existing metal shed and would not include any conditioned or occupied building space.
E-4: Increase Use of Renewable Energy in Existing Development	Not Applicable	The project's proposed equipment would be installed within an existing metal shed. No expansion or retrofit of existing buildings are proposed.
T-1: Reduce VMT Through Mixed and High-Density Land Use	Not Applicable	The project does not propose, and the project site open space land use designation and zoning does not permit, high density development and mixed uses.
T-2: Improve Streets and Intersections for Multi-Modal Use and Access	Not Applicable	The project does not include construction of new streets or improvement to existing streets.
T-3: Adopt Citywide TDM Program	Not Applicable	The project is not a residential, office, commercial retail, public facility or school development. The project would not include new parking spaces.
T-5: Reduce Minimum Parking Standards	Not Applicable	The project would not include new parking spaces.
T-6: Require the Use of High-Performance Renewable Diesel in Construction Equipment	Not Applicable	The project would require minimal off-road diesel construction equipment. At most, a small excavator or skid steer loader may be used for a few hours to prepare an area for a small concrete pad.
T-8: Install Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	Not Applicable	The project is not a residential development, does not propose new parking spaces, and existing parking spaces at the project building are less than 10.
SW-1: Increase Solid Waste Diversion	Not Applicable	The project would involve minimal construction activity and would not result in substantial construction waste which could be diverted.

W-1: Increase Water Efficiency in New Residential Development	Not Applicable	The project is not a new residential development and the project does not propose new indoor or outdoor water uses.
W-2: Reduce Outdoor Water Use	Not Applicable	The project does not propose substantial addition, alteration, or expansion to existing facilities or new outdoor water uses.

Source: City of Folsom 2018d

As presented in **Table 8**, the project would be consistent with the project site general plan land use designation and none of the GHG reduction measures listed in the GHG Strategy are applicable to the project. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the City's GHG Strategy and the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The impact would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in criterion a), above, the project would be consistent with the City's integrated General Plan and GHG Strategy. The GHG strategy was developed to meet the City's GHG reduction targets which were formulated to meet the statewide GHG mandates of AB 32 and SB 32. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions and the impact would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	■	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	■	☐

Environmental Setting

The project property is currently developed as a cemetery; the project site is within and immediately adjacent to an existing maintenance shed. The project site has no known past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites.

The proposed project would include the installation of two 250-gallon propane tanks immediately adjacent to the existing shed. Propane is considered a hazardous material in that is extremely flammable and may cause burns, irritations, and/or asphyxiation if humans come into direct contact with significant quantities of it (USDOT 2016). 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 California OSHA regulations (Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970).

Nearby schools include the Golden Valley Charter River School (approximately 2.7 miles west of the project site[2]), Folsom Montessori School (0.6 miles east), Sutter Middle School (1.0 mile east), Folsom Lake High School (0.9 miles east) and Folsom Middle School (2.5 miles east).

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the USEPA's Envirofacts online database (USEPA 2020a); California Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStor online database (DTSC 2020); and the USEPA's Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2020c). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, the project site is not listed as a hazardous waste site. No Superfund sites are located on or near the project site. According to the EnviroStor database, there are two potentially hazardous sites near the project site:

- City of Folsom Corporate Yard Landfill. Located approximately 0.3 miles north of the project site. Underwent voluntary cleanup. No further action required.

- A&S Custom Plating Co. Located 0.6 miles northeast of the project site. Underwent evaluation. No further action required.

No private or public airports are located within the City of Folsom. The nearest public airfield is Mather Airport, located approximately 11.7 miles southwest of the project site. Cameron Airpark is a public use airport located approximately 13 miles northeast of the project site, and McClellan Airport is a privately-owned public use airport located approximately 17 miles west of the project site.

The City of Folsom Fire Department provides fire protection services. There are four fire stations providing fire/rescue and emergency medical services within the City of Folsom with a fifth station planned near the eastern city limits. Station 35 is the nearest station to the project site and is located at 535 Glenn Drive, approximately 1.5 miles east of the project site. Station 36 is second nearest to the project site and is located at 9700 Oak Avenue, approximately 2.3 miles north of the project site. The Fire Department responds to over 6,000 requests for service annually with an average of 16.4 per day (City of Folsom 2020). The project site is easily accessible to fire service personnel. Consistent with the City's Multi-Hazard Emergency Management Plan, the City of Folsom maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes along major streets and thoroughfares (City of Folsom 2005).

The project is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area or in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2020; CSG 2020). Vegetation on the property is irrigated and includes maintained lawns and well-spaced trees with a generally open canopy and limbs pruned near ground level.

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?

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. The project would involve the installation of two 250-gallon propane tanks

[2] The school is located across Lake Natoma from the project site and, though it is approximately 2.7 miles away by car, its physical location is about 3,000 feet (just over one-half mile) northwest of the project site.

immediately adjacent to the existing maintenance shed to power the crematory. Propane is flammable and has the potential to negatively impact human health if people are directly exposed to the liquid, gas, and/or vapors in the cases of large leaks or spills (USDOT 2016). Further, significant damage to the tanks, failure of safety mechanisms, and/or the presence of an ignition source may make the tanks an explosion hazard. However, this is very unlikely for a number of reasons. The tanks would be secured in place on a concrete pad, marked conspicuously, and placed in an area at low risk of impact from any vehicle or piece of equipment. They would not be located in an area of the cemetery frequented by the public. All installation, maintenance, and operations would be done by trained individuals in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations and state regulations. The tanks would be regularly inspected to ensure soundness and proper function. Delivery of propane and filling of the tanks would be done only by licensed professionals following all applicable regulations and best practices.

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

Following construction, household hazardous materials (such as various cleansers, paints, solvents, pesticides, and automobile fluids) may occasionally be used or brought into the vicinity of the site as part of routine maintenance. 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 impacts would be less than significant for questions a) and b).

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 project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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

No Impact. The project site is not listed as a hazardous waste site on Envirofacts (USEPA 2020a), EnviroStor (DTSC 2020), or the EPA's Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2020c). Therefore, project implementation would have no impact for question d).

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 project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Plan area, and no public or private airfields are within two miles of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a

safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area, and no impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Consistent with the City's Multi-Hazard Emergency Management Plan, the City of Folsom maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes along major streets and thoroughfares (City of Folsom 2005). 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 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 an urbanized area in the City of Folsom and is provided urban levels of fire protection by the City. Landscaping on the property is well-irrigated, well-spaced, trimmed, pruned, and generally maintained. To the north of the site is a residential neighborhood, to the east is gravel/rock cover and Folsom Boulevard, and to the south and west is a greenbelt that runs parallel to Lake Natoma on a north/south axis. The natural spaces are small, with a relatively open and discontinuous canopy. The project is not likely to cause any ignition, given that the crematory will not emit sparks, and any ignition caused by other factors could be quickly controlled by the City of Folsom Fire Department and would not spread great distances given the land use and vegetation surrounding and occupying the site. As an existing facility, Lakeside Memorial Lawn maintains adequate fire response infrastructure for both current operations and the proposed project. The City of Folsom Fire Department reviewed the project application and did not raise any concerns regarding the adequacy of water supply or site access. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss due to wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	■	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	■	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is currently a small cemetery, with associated landscaping, outbuildings, and access roads. Lands to the south and west contain woodland habitat typical of riparian communities in the Sierra Nevada foothills. To the west is also the Jedidiah Smith Memorial Trail that runs along the eastern shore of Lake Natoma. The trail, also known as the American River Bike Trail, connects Folsom Lake (north of the project site) to the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers in Downtown Sacramento. It is a part of the American River Parkway that is operated by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. To the north of the project site is a small residential neighborhood with single-family dwellings. Folsom Boulevard runs in a north/south line just east of the property. East of Folsom Boulevard is a large, developed area containing single-family homes, apartment complexes, a mobile home park, and some small businesses. The more regional setting is primarily characterized by residential development with a commercial shopping center to the east.

The project site is generally flat, ranging from about 175 to 185 feet in elevation throughout. Precipitation is the only apparent source of surface water as there are no wetlands or streams located on the project site.

The project site currently retains stormwater onsite and then discharges it into Lake Natoma. There is no connection with a City sewer system. Demand for water disposal, of either sanitary waste or stormwater, is projected to be unchanged by the proposed action.

Construction of the proposed project would disturb only the amount of soil required to install a concrete pad of approximately 38.3 square feet to secure two 250-gallon propane tanks adjacent to the existing shed.

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 06067C0116H, effective August 16, 2012. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2020). The project is not located in a tsunami inundation zone (CDC 2020a).

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.

Regulatory Framework Relating to Hydrology and Water Quality

The City is a signatory to the Sacramento Countywide 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 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 9**.

Table 9. 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 by reference the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2016 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4, A5, and A6.1 published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. Purpose of the Folsom Green Building Standards Code is 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 Standards	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 2018b.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. No work would occur on the site outside of the existing shed with the exception of installing two 250-gallon propane tanks immediately adjacent to the existing shed. The tanks would cover an area of ground of approximately 38.3 square feet and thus may disturb 38.3 square feet of soil during installation. There would be an addition of approximately 38.3 square feet of impervious surface, following the completion of construction since the tanks would be built on a concrete foundation. No significant increase in wastewater or runoff is expected as a result of the project. The temporary disturbance of a small amount of soil and the potential addition of an impervious surface (approximately 38.3 square feet in both cases) would render any impacts less than significant.

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. The project does not propose any new building construction or the addition of any impervious surfaces, except for up to 38.3 square feet to be covered by propane tanks' concrete foundation. No other soil disturbance and no grading or compaction are anticipated. The small change in impervious surfaces would render any impacts to infiltration at the site or groundwater recharge to be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Approximately 38.3 square feet of soil may be disturbed for a short time during construction. Any resulting erosion impact would be less than significant.

ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off- site?

Less Than Significant Impact. Approximately 38.3 square feet of impervious surfaces would be added during construction. There would be no other addition or expansion of impervious surfaces, and existing drainage patterns and systems would not be altered. Any impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Approximately 38.3 square feet of impervious surfaces would be added during construction. There would be no other addition or expansion of impervious surfaces, and existing drainage patterns and systems would not be altered. No additional wastewater is expected to be generated by the proposed action. Existing systems are adequate to deal with existing levels of runoff. Any impact would be less than significant.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

No impact. The proposal would not alter or block any existing watercourse or drainage feature, nor would it block or impede the drainage of any floodwater from the property during times of heavy rain. There would be no impact.

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

No impact. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain nor in a tsunami inundation zone or seiche zone. No impact would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would include the disturbance of up to approximately 38.3 square feet of soil and the installation of the same amount of impervious surfaces on the project site. All other work would be conducted inside of an established building. Given the small area of soil disturbed and impervious surfaces added, any impacts to groundwater infiltration rates or groundwater quality are expected to be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	■	☐

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 project site is designated as Open Space (OS) in the City of Folsom General Plan. The following General Plan policies apply to the Open Space designation:

> LU-1.1.8: Preserve Natural Assets: Maintain the existing natural vegetation, landscape features, open space, and viewsheds in the design of new developments.
>
> LU-1.1.9: Preserve Historic Resources: Recognize the importance of history in the City of Folsom, and preserve historic and cultural resources throughout the city, to the extent feasible.
>
> LU-1.1.10: Network of Open Space: Ensure designated open space is connected whenever feasible with the larger community and regional network of natural systems, recreational assets, and viewsheds

The proposed action would not be in conflict with the OS designation or the above policies, as disturbances would be largely limited to an existing building and a small area of existing disturbance that is shielded from public view..

The project site is currently zoned Open Space/Public (OS/P) Primary Area of the Historic District with underlying zoning of Open Space and Conservation (OSC). The applicant is seeking a Conditional Use Permit from the City to authorize their installation of a crematory.

Evaluation of Land Use and Planning

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. No new building or road construction is proposed. The project site is located within an existing cemetery outside of established residential communities. No impact would occur.

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. The project site is designated as OS in the City of Folsom General Plan. The proposed action would not conflict with the intended uses of that designation. The project site is currently zoned Open Space/Public (OS/P) Primary Area of the Historic District with underlying zoning of Open Space and Conservation District (OSC). . The applicant is seeking a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the City to authorize their installation of a crematory. Granting of the CUP from the City would render any impacts less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

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 (CDC 2020b).

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

NOISE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	■	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

The project site is located southwest of the intersection of Forrest Street/Natoma Street and Folsom Boulevard, within an existing shed on the grounds of the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Cemetery. The proposed project would include the installation and operation of a crematory within the existing shed, and the installation of a small concrete pad and two propane tanks adjacent to the shed to power the crematory. According to the manufacturer, the crematory would generate approximately 60 decibels (dB) of noise during normal operation. Noise-sensitive land uses are land uses that may be subject to stress and/or interference from excessive noise, including residences, hospitals, schools, hotels, resorts, libraries, sensitive wildlife habitat, or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute of the environment. Noise receptors (receivers) are individual locations that may be affected by noise. Noise-sensitive land uses in the project vicinity include nearby residences along Young Wo Circle, approximately 420 feet to the north/northwest, and the Folsom Village Mobile Home Park, located approximately 1,000 feet to the east across Folsom Boulevard.

Noise Terminology and Metrics

All noise level or sound level values presented herein are expressed in terms of decibels (dB), with A weighting (dBA) to approximate the hearing sensitivity of humans. Time-averaged noise levels are expressed by the symbol LEQ, with a specified duration.

The amplitude of pressure waves generated by a sound source determines the loudness of that source. Sound pressure amplitude is measured in micro-Pascals (mPa). One mPa is approximately one hundred billionth (0.00000000001) of normal atmospheric pressure. Sound pressure amplitudes for different kinds of noise environments can range from less than 100 to 100,000,000 mPa. Because of this wide range of values, sound is rarely expressed in terms of mPa. Instead, a logarithmic scale is used to

describe sound pressure level (SPL) in terms of dBA. The threshold of hearing for the human ear is about 0 dBA, which corresponds to 20 mPa.

Because decibels are logarithmic units, SPL 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 SPL of 70 dB 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 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.

Regulatory Framework

City of Folsom General Plan

The City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Safety and Noise Element provides the following goals and policies relative to noise that are applicable to this project:

GOAL SN 6.1: Protect the citizens of Folsom from the harmful effects of exposure to excessive noise and to protect the economic base of Folsom by preventing the encroachment of incompatible land uses within areas affected by existing noise-producing uses.

- SN 6.1.1 Noise Mitigation Strategies: Develop, maintain, and implement strategies to abate and avoid excessive noise exposure in the city by requiring that effective noise mitigation measures be incorporated into the design of new noise-generating and noise-sensitive land uses.

- SN 6.1.2 Noise Mitigation Measures: Require effective noise mitigation for new development of residential or other noise sensitive land uses to reduce noise levels as follows:

    - 2. For non-transportation-related noise sources: achieve compliance with the performance standards contained within Table SN-1 [**Table 10**].

Table 20. Noise Compatibility Standards

Land Use	Exterior Noise Level Standard for Outdoor Activity Areas[a]	Interior Noise Level Standard	
	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	L_{eq}, dB[b]
Residential (Low Density Residential, Duplex, Mobile Homes)	60[c]	45	N/A
Residential (Multi Family)	65[d]	45	N/A
Transient Lodging (Motels/Hotels)	65[d]	45	N/A

Land Use	Exterior Noise Level Standard for Outdoor Activity Areas[a]	Interior Noise Level Standard	
	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	L_{eq}, dB[b]
Mixed-Use Developments	70	45	N/A
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes, Museums	70	45	N/A
Theaters, Auditoriums	70	N/A	35
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	70	N/A	N/A
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	75	N/A	N/A
Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional	70	N/A	45
Industrial, Manufacturing, and Utilities	75	N/A	45

Notes: Where a proposed use is not specifically listed on this table, the use shall comply with the noise exposure standards for the nearest similar use as determined by the Community Development Department.

a. Outdoor activity areas for residential developments are considered to be the back yard patios or decks of single-family residential units, and the patios or common areas where people generally congregate for multifamily development. Outdoor activity areas for nonresidential developments are considered to be those common areas where people generally congregate, including outdoor seating areas. Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown, the exterior noise standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.
b. As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.
c. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB, Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior level of up to 65 dB, Ldn/CNEL may be allowed provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with this table.
d. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 65 dB, Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior level of up to 70 dB, Ldn/CNEL may be allowed provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with this table.

Folsom Municipal Code

Chapter 8.42 of the City of Folsom Municipal Code, entitled Noise Control, provides exterior noise level performance standards for stationary noise sources. In addition, this chapter also provides noise source exemptions which are applicable to this project.

8.42.040 Exterior noise standards.

A. It is unlawful for any person at any location within the incorporated area of the city to create any noise, or to allow the creation of any noise, on property owned, leased, occupied or otherwise controlled by such person which causes the exterior noise level when measured at any affected single- or multiple-family residence, school church, hospital or public library situated in either the incorporated or unincorporated area to exceed the noise level standards as set forth in **Table 11**.

Table 11. Exterior Noise Level Standards

Noise Level Category	Cumulative Number of minutes in any 1-hour time period	Daytime (dB) (7 a.m. – 10 p.m.)	Nighttime (dB) (10 p.m. – 7 a.m.)
1	30	50	45
2	15	55	50
3	5	60	55
4	1	65	60
5	0	70	65

Note: dB = A-weighted decibels
Source: City of Folsom Code, Noise Control 1993.

B. In the event the measured ambient noise level exceeds the applicable noise level standard in any category above, the applicable standard shall be adjusted so as to equal the ambient noise level.

C. Each of the noise level standards specified above shall be reduced by 5 dB for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring noises.

D. If the intruding noise source is continuous and cannot reasonably be discontinued or stopped for a time period whereby the ambient noise level can be measured, the noise level measured while the source is in operation shall be the noise level standards as specified above.

Noise Source Exemptions (Section 8.42.060)

Section 8.42.060 of the City of Folsom Municipal Code establishes the following activities that are considered exempt from the associated exterior noise provisions:

A. Activities conducted in unlighted public parks, public playgrounds and public or private school grounds, during the hours of 7 a.m. to dusk, and in lighted public parks, public playgrounds and public or private school grounds, during the hours of 7 a.m. to 11 p.m., including but not limited to school athletic and school entertainment events;

B. Any mechanical device, apparatus, or equipment used, related to or connected with emergency activities or emergency work;

C. Noise sources associated with construction, provided such activities do not take place before 7 a.m. or after 6 p.m. on any day except Saturday or Sunday, or before 8 a.m. or after 5 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday;

D. Noise sources associated with the maintenance of residential property provided such activities take place between the hours of seven a.m. to dusk on any day except Saturday or Sunday, between the hours of 8 a.m. to dusk on Saturday or Sunday;

E. Noise sources associated with agricultural activities on agricultural property;

F. (Section Expired)

G. Noise sources associated with the collection of waste or garbage from property devoted to commercial or industrial uses;

H. Any activity to the extent regulation thereof has been preempted by state or Federal law.

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. Construction of the project would involve the use of a crane for several hours to unload the chiller and crematory from the truck, and the use of a mini excavator or skid steer loader for a day and one truck load of concrete to install a small pad for the two propane tanks. Construction equipment would be relatively small, given the small size of the project, and construction would be of short duration. Noise generated by construction may exceed the levels permitted by section 8.42.040 of the Folsom Municipal Code; however, construction activities are exempt from those requirements provided that they take place between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on any day except Saturday or Sunday, or between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday (Folsom Municipal Code 8.42.060). The project applicant is required to comply with these requirements and ensure that all construction activities were limited to those windows.

The crematory is expected to generate 60 dB of noise during normal operations, which is below the 75 dB level authorized for cemeteries under item SN 6.1.2 of the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Safety and Noise Element. Operation would be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., so 50 dB would be the lowest standard applied by Folsom Municipal Code Section 8.42.040 for noise reaching the nearest sensitive receptor for 30 cumulative minutes of any hour during that time frame. That standard would further be lowered to 45 dB for recurring noises. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the residences located along Young Wo Circle, approximately 420 feet to the north/northwest of the proposed crematory. A rough estimate of noise levels reaching these receptors was calculated. This discussion assumes that the 60 dB measurement provided by the manufacturer refers to noise levels ten feet from the proposed crematory during operation, and assumes spherical spreading of sound from the source to the receiver (i.e., 6 decibel decrease for each doubling of distance from the noise source). An additional offset for atmospheric absorption of -1.5 dB per thousand feet was applied to the computations.

Noise from the proposed crematory's normal operations would attenuate to approximately 27.5 dB by the time it reached the nearest sensitive receptors. This does not account for the added muffling effect of the shed containing the crematory. Consequently, the proposed project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of applicable standards, and impacts from the project would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the project would involve the use of a crane for several hours to unload the chiller and crematory from the truck, and the use of a mini excavator or skid steer loader for a day and one truck load of concrete to install a small pad for the two propane tanks. Construction equipment would be relatively small, given the small size of the project, and construction would be for a short duration. Operation of the proposed crematory is not expected to create any new sources of vibration that could be felt outside of the immediate vicinity of the device. Therefore, any impacts 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. No public airports or private airstrips are located within two miles of the project site. Therefore, residents of the proposed project would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from air activity, and no impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Environmental Setting

The proposed project includes the installation of a crematory within an existing maintenance shed at an existing cemetery. It also involves the installation of two 250-gallon propane tanks adjacent to one side of the shed.

Evaluation of Population and Housing

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

No Impact. The project would not expand any existing service apart from providing an opportunity to cremate deceased individuals within the City of Folsom. It would not expand or provide any public service nor alter public access to any site, nor create significant new employment opportunities. No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. This project does not involve the demolition, alteration, or replacement of any housing. It would not affect local conditions to the degree than any residents would be compelled to move away. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is in an area currently served by urban levels of 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 four fire stations providing fire/rescue and emergency medical services within the City of Folsom with a fifth station planned near the eastern city limits. Station 35 is the nearest station to the project site and is located at 535 Glenn Drive, approximately 1.5 miles east of the project site. Station 36 is second nearest to the project site and is located at 9700 Oak Avenue, approximately 2.3 miles north of the project site. The Fire Department responds to over 6,000 requests for service annually with an average of 16.4 per day (City of Folsom 2020). The City of Folsom Police Department is located at 46 Natoma Street, approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the project site.

The project site is located within the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. Nearby schools include the Golden Valley Charter River School (approximately 2.7 miles west of the project site), Folsom Montessori School (0.6 miles east), Sutter Middle School (1.0 mile east), Folsom Lake High School (0.9 miles east) and Folsom Middle School (2.5 miles east). The nearest recreational feature to the site is the Jedediah Smith Memorial Trail which runs adjacent to the property near its west side. The trail runs along the shores of Lake Natoma and continues on to provide bike access to the City of Sacramento. The land to the south and west of the property, including the land surrounding the trail and the lake, is a part of the American River Parkway that is operated by the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation.

The Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) would continue to supply electricity to the project site. The City of Folsom provides potable water and irrigation water to the site. The project site does not currently have a gas line; two 250-gallon propane tanks would be installed to provide fuel for the crematory. The project site does not currently have a sanitary sewer line.

The City of Folsom has a program of maintaining and upgrading existing utility and public services within the City. Similarly, all private utilities maintain and upgrade their systems as necessary for public convenience and necessity, and as technology changes.

Evaluation of Public Services

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Folsom Fire Department is capable of responding to structure and wildland fires in addition to hazardous materials incidents. As a professionally staffed department with two stations nearby, they would be able to respond quickly and effectively in the unlikely event of a fire or hazardous materials incident at the project site. 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, 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 proposed project would not increase public access to the site and would only marginally increase the presence of workers at the site. As such, no increase in calls for service to the police department is expected under normal operating conditions. In the unlikely event of a fire or other emergency involving the crematory or the propane tanks, police would likely be called to assist with incident command and to control access to the site. The Folsom Police Department and other mutual aid departments would have sufficient resources and manpower to accommodate such an assignment, and a Less Than Significant Impact would occur.

c) Schools?

No impact. The project would not induce population growth and would not increase or decrease demand for any school facilities. No impact would occur.

d) Parks?

No impact. The project would not induce population growth and would not increase or decrease demand for any park facilities. No impact would occur.

e) Other public facilities?

No impact. The project would not induce population growth and would not significantly increase or decrease demand for any public services or utilities. No impact would occur.

XVI. RECREATION

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

The nearest recreational opportunity to the project side is adjacent to the western boundary of the property. The Jedediah Smith Memorial Trail and Lake Natoma both run along a north/south axis just west of the project site. The open space surrounding the lake and trail in the project vicinity is comprised of oak/gray pine woodland typical of the Sierra Nevada Foothills. The trail continues to the City of Sacramento and allows bike and pedestrian access. It is part of the American River Parkway. The portion of the parkway nearest the project area is administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

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?

No Impact. The proposed project would not induce population growth or increase tourism or public access or demand to any recreational site. It would not impair the quality of any existing site. No impact would occur.

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?

No Impact. The proposed project does not include any recreational facilities, nor would it induce demand for new recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

Parking and Access

The project site can be accessed from either northbound or southbound on Folsom Boulevard or from Westbound Natoma Street approaching this intersection with Folsom Boulevard. The site would be accessed by proceeding a very short distance west on Forrest Street to reach the entry gate to the cemetery and turning left onto Mormon Street.

Diagonal parking spaces can be found along both sides of Mormon Street. At the terminus of Mormon Street, members of the public may continue straight onto a main cemetery access road to find an additional parking lot. All existing parking spaces would be maintained. Access to the project site directly would continue to be provided by a smaller existing access road located at the southwestern terminus of Mormon Street. Both the smaller access road and the main access road can be reached at the terminus of Mormon Street, but the two roads do not form a continuous loop because of a fence line separating them. No new parking spaces or parking facilities would be constructed.

As the crematorium would not be located in or near a funeral home and would be separate from any funeral services or public gatherings provided by the project applicant, access would only need to accommodate a small number of staff members with business at the site.

Roadway System

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

Folsom Boulevard is a four-lane arterial (with additional turn lanes as needed) that operates at a posted speed limit of 50 mph within the project vicinity. It is non-divided south of the intersection with Natoma Street/Forrest Street and becomes divided north of the intersection. A light rail track runs parallel to Folsom Boulevard. The intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Natoma Street/Forrest Street is controlled by a traffic light. About five miles south of that intersection, Folsom Boulevard provides access to US

Route 50. Folsom Boulevard crosses Lake Natoma about one mile north of the intersection with Natoma Street/Forrest Street.

Natoma Street is a two-lane, non-divided road that operates at a posted speed limit of 25 mph within the project vicinity. It intersects with Folsom Boulevard on the eastern side of the intersection nearest the project site. On the western side, the road becomes known as *Forrest Street* and remains a non-divided, two lane road with turn lanes as needed. Natoma Street provides access to residential and mixed-use neighborhoods to the east, and Forrest Street provides access to the cemetery, a small number of residential neighborhoods, and additional parks and businesses.

Transit, Light Rail, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

Transit services in the City of Folsom are provided by the Folsom Stage Line bus service which, as of February 4, 2019, is now operated by Sacramento Regional Transit. The Folsom Stage Line bus service provides both Fixed-Route and Dial-A-Ride services exclusively within the Folsom city limits, Monday through Friday. The nearest bus stop is approximately 0.5 miles north of the project site on Folsom Boulevard and is served by the Route 10 bus. The next nearest stop is approximately 0.7 miles south of the project site along Folsom Boulevard and is served by the Route 30 bus.

Light rail access to the site is provided by the Sacramento Regional Transit District, Light Rail to Folsom (Gold Line). The nearest stations are approximately 0.5 miles north and 0.7 miles south of the project site, respectively. Both stations are along the eastern side of Folsom Boulevard.

Bicycles can access the site from either northbound or southbound on Folsom Boulevard, or westbound from Natoma Street. Additional bike access is provided by the Jedidiah Smith Memorial Trail, which can reach Forrest Street via Young Wo Circle just west of the project site.

Pedestrians can access the site through the same routes as described for bicycles. Crossing signals and crosswalks are provided at the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Natoma Street/Forrest Street.

Airports

No private or public airports are located within the City of Folsom. The nearest public airfield is Mather Airport, located approximately 11.7 miles southwest of the project site. Cameron Airpark is a public use airport located approximately 13 miles northeast of the project site, and McClellan Airport is a privately-owned public use airport located approximately 17 miles west of the project site.

Emergency Access

The City of Folsom identifies most major streets in the City as emergency evacuation routes. The proposed project would not modify any major street and/or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route.

Evaluation of Transportation

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

No Impact. The project does not propose any alterations to any path of access for vehicle, transit, rail, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The project would not conflict with any plan, policy, or ordinance affecting the above categories. No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The proposed action would not be a destination accessible for members of the public and would only be visited by a small number of workers during construction and operation. The project would not result in a significant increase in vehicle miles traveled, and is located within one half mile of a major public transit stop (the Historic Folsom Station) which provides both bus and light rail service. No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The project does not propose any alterations to any access roads or other routes, and would not increase traffic to a point that additional risk on existing routes would be incurred. No impact would occur.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. No alterations to any access road or right of way are proposed. 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, and fire hose access to all sides of the building. No impact would occur.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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	☐	■	☐	☐
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.	☐	■	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

For discussion of the history of Native American use of the project area, see Section 9.0.V., Cultural Resources. This section is based on the Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and CEQA for the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Storage Shed Project, City of Folsom (ECORP 2021). That document is included as **Appendix C**, and a summary is provided below.

Regulatory Setting

Tribal Cultural Resources are defined in Section 21074 of the California PRC 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 included in or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, or are included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1, or are 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. Section 1(b)(4) of AB 52 established that only California Native American tribes, as defined in Section 21073 of the California PRC, are experts in the identification of Tribal Cultural Resources and impacts thereto.

AB 52 requires that the City of Folsom (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. Section 21073 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) defines California Native American tribes as "a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of the Statutes of 2004." This includes both federally and non-federally recognized tribes. For the City of Folsom, these include the following tribes that previously submitted general request letters, requesting such noticing:

- Wilton Rancheria (letter dated January 13, 2020);
- Ione Band of Miwok Indians (letter dated March 2, 2016); and,
- United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria (letter dated November 23, 2015).

The purpose of consultation is to identify Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) 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 criteria A and B 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.

City Consultation

Within 14 days of initiating CEQA review for the project, on November 25, 2020, 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 Section 21080.3.1(d) of the 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 Ione 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.

On December 11, 2020, and within the 30-day response timeframe, the City received an automated email from UAIC that acknowledged receipt of the City's notification letter, thanked the City for consulting with UAIC, and attached the tribe's consultation record for the project. The response did not include any information on TCRs and indicated that the Tribal Historic Preservation Department would review the project and respond; however, no further communication was received from UAIC. Because the tribe failed to provide comments or engage with the City pursuant to PRC 21082.3(d)(2), the City considers this consultation requirement complete.

On December 1, 2020, and within the 30-day response timeframe, a Wilton Rancheria representative responded by email to the City's initial notification letter and requested to formally initiate consultation under AB 52. She requested additional information regarding the project's environmental review process and provided Wilton Rancheria's recommended mitigation measures for TCRs, though she did not indicate that there were known TCRs within the project area. City staff shared additional details with the representative, including the Cultural Resources Inventory Report (ECORP 2020). Despite several attempts by the City to schedule a meeting with tribal representatives, the representatives did not engage with the City at any of these meeting times. Because the tribe failed to engage meaningfully with the City after a reasonable and good-faith effort composed of multiple attempts to meet with the tribe, pursuant to PRC 21082.3(d)(2), the City considers this consultation requirement complete.

All information relevant to the City's AB 52 consultation process is documented in Appendix C.

Should Wilton Rancheria, or any other culturally affiliated tribe, submit public comments, the City will consider them in accordance with Section 11(b) of AB 52; however, after completing the required notification and consultation procedures specified in AB 52 and the PRC, the City has not been provided any information about TCRs that could be affected by the proposed project. Therefore, the determination of impacts to TCRs is drawn from other lines of evidence, as summarized below.

Information about potential impacts to TCRs was drawn from the ethnographic context, the results of a search of the Sacred Lands File of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and the results of a cultural resources inventory prepared by ECORP (2020). The methods and results of these efforts are provided in ECORP (2020) and are hereby incorporated by reference (see summary in Section V, Cultural Resources).

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)?
   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 with Mitigation.

The ethnographic information reviewed for the project, including ethnographic maps, does not identify any villages, occupational areas, or resource procurement locations in or around the current project area. In addition, the Sacred Lands File failed to identify any sacred lands or tribal resources in or near the project area. The cultural resources survey did not reveal any Native American archaeological sites within or adjacent to the proposed project area. Finally, as summarized above, two of the three tribes notified of the project responded to the City's offer to consult; however, none provided any information about TCRs in the project area. This is not unexpected, as the project is in a highly disturbed environment and does not involve substantial ground disturbance.

In reviewing the lines of evidence summarized above, this project would not have an impact on known TCRs. There exists an extremely low potential for the discovery of previously unknown TCRs during project construction, but if TCRs were to be encountered, the project activity could result in a significant impact. Implementation of unanticipated discovery procedures, as provided in mitigation measure TCR-1 below, would reduce that impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure TCR-01: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources.

If potentially significant TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 50 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

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 water or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction 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?	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

The cemetery is currently serviced with potable water and irrigation water from the City of Folsom. There is no need to seek a "will serve" letter as the City currently provides water and the crematory will not substantially increase flow demand. The City also provides solid waste collection and disposal services; the project is not expected to result in a significantly increased demand for solid waste removal.

The cemetery is currently served with an electricity supply from SMUD. Electrical connections already exist for the shed, and may be upgraded as needed as part of the proposed project. Installation and operation of the crematory would not result in a significant increase in demand for electricity on the project site.

The cemetery, including the shed, does not have an existing sewer line. This project would not require access to, nor construction of, a sewer line. Two 250-gallon propane tanks would be constructed along the northern edge of the shed to provide power for the crematorium.

Stormwater flows on the site are retained and drained to Lake Natoma. There would be no change in the hydrologic regime of the project site due to the installation or operation of the proposed project.

The City of Folsom employs a design process that includes coordination with potentially affected utilities as part of project development. The City of Folsom coordinates with the appropriate utility companies to plan and potentially expand existing utilities in the project area, including water, sewer, telephone, gas, and electricity. All utility services should be able to accommodate the proposed project as no increased demand is expected except for propane, which the applicant will purchase.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Existing levels of service are expected to be adequate for most utilities, as the project applicant does not predict a significant increase in demand. The only exception is propane. The site does not currently have a gas line, so the applicant is proposing to construct two 250-gallon propane tanks adjacent to the shed to power the crematory.

Since existing levels of service are adequate for all requirements except gas, and the applicant would supply the only additional utility requirement (propane) independently of utility companies and in accordance with all manufacturer's recommendations and safety practices, any impact would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The applicant does not predict a significantly increased demand for water as a result of this project. The project consists solely of the installation of a crematory and supporting systems, and would not require significantly increased water for sanitation, irrigation, consumption, or any other uses. Any impacts would be less than significant.

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?

No Impact. The site does not currently have any sewer lines. No need for a sanitary sewer would arise as a result of this project. Any stormwater that accumulates onsite is disposed of locally into the adjacent Lake Natoma. There would not be an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces on the site apart from the addition of two 250-gallon propane tanks and a 38.3 square foot concrete foundation to support them immediately adjacent to one of the buildings. There are no foreseeable changes to the hydrologic regime or to stormwater quality or quantity. No impact would occur.

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?

No Impact. No increase in solid waste generation is expected as a result of this project apart from potentially a small and temporary increase during construction; any waste generated would be removed and disposed of by the contractor or the applicant. No impact would occur.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. No change to the amount of solid waste generated on the property or its disposal is anticipated as a result of this project. 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 1,084-acre site in the community of Sloughhouse and has a remaining capacity of 112.9 million cubic yards. The estimated cease operation date for the landfill is January 1, 2064 (CalRecycle 2018). Kiefer Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs of the City of Folsom. No impact would occur.

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?	☐	☐	☐	■
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

The project site is not located in or near a state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (CAL FIRE 2020; CSG 2020).

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. The project site is not located in or near a state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Therefore, no impact would occur for questions a) through d).

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Evaluation of Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The preceding analysis indicates that the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect air quality, cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources. See Sections 9.III, 9.V, and 9.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 reiterated below, 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.

Evaluation of air quality impacts: Construction of the project would involve short-term/temporary emissions via the use of a crane for several hours to unload the chiller and crematory from the truck, and the use of a mini excavator or skid steer loader for a one day and one truck load of concrete to install a small pad for the two propane tanks.

According to the SMAQMD's CEQA Guide, projects that are 35 acres or less in size generally will not exceed the SMAQMD's construction NOX or PM thresholds of significance. However, all construction

projects regardless of the screening level are required to implement the SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (also known as Best Management Practices [BMP]; SMAQMD 2020b). The BMPs satisfy the requirements of SMAQMD's Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, which requires every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates. Construction of the project would not result in a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant and the impact would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AIR-01**.

Evaluation of cultural resources impacts: A database records search was conducted for the project site, including a 0.25-mile buffer area, at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at California State University-Sacramento. Additionally, a pedestrian survey of the project site was conducted by ECORP Staff Archaeologist Laurel Zickler-Martin, RPA. 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 construction. Further, workers must be aware of sensitive cultural resources in the vicinity of the project area (but not on the project site) that must be protected. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-01, CUL-02, and CUL-03**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially cumulative impacts would be avoided.

Evaluation of tribal cultural resources impacts: The City of Folsom sent project notification letters to three California Native American tribes. One tribe did not respond, one responded but did not provide any information regarding TCRs, and one requested additional information and discussion but, following a good faith effort by the City, did not meet with staff and did not provide information regarding TCRs. The City relied on other methods, including those outlined in the Cultural Resources report (ECORP 2020, see Section 9.V and 9.XVIII), to evaluate the potential presence of TCRs. Although there is no evidence of tribal cultural resources 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 construction. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure TCR-01**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially cumulative impacts would be avoided.

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 air quality impacts: Construction of the project would involve short-term/temporary emissions via the use of a crane for several hours to unload the chiller and crematory from the truck, and the use of a mini excavator or skid steer loader for a one day and one truck load of concrete to install a small pad for the two propane tanks.

According to the SMAQMD's CEQA Guide, projects that are 35 acres or less in size generally will not exceed the SMAQMD's construction NOX or PM thresholds of significance. However, all construction projects regardless of the screening level are required to implement the SMAQMD's Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (also known as Best Management Practices [BMP]; SMAQMD 2020b). The

BMPs satisfy the requirements of SMAQMD's Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, which requires every reasonable precaution not to cause or allow the emissions of fugitive dust from being airborne beyond the property line from which the emission originates. Construction of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant and the impact would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AIR-01**.

Evaluation of cumulative cultural resources impacts: A database records search was conducted for the project site, including a 0.25-mile buffer area, at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at California State University-Sacramento. Additionally, a pedestrian survey of the project site was conducted by ECORP Staff Archaeologist Laurel Zickler-Martin, RPA. 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 construction. Further, workers must be aware of sensitive cultural resources in the vicinity of the project area (but not on the project site) that must be protected. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-01, CUL-02, and CUL-03**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially cumulative impacts would be avoided.

Evaluation of cumulative tribal cultural resources impacts: The City of Folsom sent project notification letters to three California Native American tribes. One tribe did not respond, one responded but did not provide any information regarding TCRs, and one requested additional information and discussion but, following a good faith effort by the City, did not meet with staff and did not provide information regarding TCRs. The City relied on other methods, including those outlined in the Cultural Resources report (ECORP 2020, see Section 9.V and 9.XVIII), to evaluate the potential presence of TCRs. Although there is no evidence of tribal cultural resources 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 construction. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure TCR-01**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially cumulative impacts would be avoided.

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 evaluation contained in this Initial Study. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

10.0 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 D**.

11.0 INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

City of Folsom
Scott Johnson, AICP, Planning Manager
Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Principal Planner
David Ludwig, Environmental Planner
Daniel Van Essen, Environmental Planner
Victor Ortiz, Senior Air Quality Specialist
Martin Rolph, Air Quality/Noise Specialist

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
Lisa Westwood, RPA

12.0 REFERENCES

Beals, R.L. 1933. Ethnology of the Nisenan. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 31(6): 355-414. Berkeley, California.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2020. General Land Office Records, Records Automation website. Accessed 21 October 2020 from http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/.

Bidwell, John. 1971. Sutter's Fort. In *California Heritage: An Anthology of History and Literature*, edited by John and Laree Caughey, pp. 134-138. F. E. Peacock Publishers, Itasca, Illinois. Revised Edition.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update. January. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf.

_____2015. Risk Management Guidance for Stationary Sources of Air Toxics. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/rma/rmgssat.pdf.

_____2008. Climate Change Scoping Plan – A Framework for Change. December. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2008-scoping-plan-documents.

_____2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf.

California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). 2009. General Reporting Protocol. January.

California Department of Conservation (CDC). 2020a. California Official Tsunami Inundation Maps. Accessed on September 25, 2020 and available online at https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps#interactive-maps.

_____ 2020b. Mines Online. Accessed on September 25, 2020 and available online at https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/index.html.

_____. 2020c. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed September 25, 2020 at https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/.

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). 2010a. Prison Facilities: Folsom State Prison. California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation. https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Facilities_Locator/docs/SB601/SAC-SB601-Quarterly-Statistical-Report.pdf.

_____. 2010b. Prison Facilities: Folsom State Prison. Special Historical Notes. California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation. http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Facilities_Locator/FSP-Special_Notes.html

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2020. State Responsibility Area Viewer: Accessed September 23, 2020 and available at: https://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2020. EnviroStor Database. Accessed on September 25, 2020 at https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2020. Scenic Highways. Accessed on September 24, 2020 from https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.

_____. 2019. Structure and Maintenance & Investigations, Historical Significance–Local Agency Bridges Database March 2019. Accessed on 21 October 21, 2020 from http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/structur/strmaint/hs_local.pdf.

_____. 2018. Structure and Maintenance & Investigations, Historical Significance–State Agency Bridges Database September 2018. Accessed on 21 October 21, 2020 from: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/structur/strmaint/hs_state.pdf.

_____. 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, Environmental Engineering, Hazardous Waste, Air, Noise, Paleontology Office. September.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2020a. 2019 Total System Electric Generation. Accessed September 28, 2020 at https://www.energy.ca.gov/almanac/electricity_data/total_system_power.html

_____.2020b. Supply and Demand of Natural Gas in California. Accessed on November 30, 2020 from: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/californias-natural-gas-market/supply-and-demand-natural-gas-california

_____. 2020c. California Gasoline Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on November 30, 2020 from https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/california-gasoline-data-facts-and-statistics

_____. 2020d. Diesel Fuel Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on November 30, 2020 from https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/diesel-fuel-data-facts-and-statistics

California Geological Survey (CGS). 2020. Fault Activity Map of California. Accessed on September 25, 2020 and available online at https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/.

California State Geoportal (CSG). 2020. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Viewer. Accessed on September, 23, 2020 from https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414.

CalRecycle. 2018. SWIS Facility Detail: Sacramento County Landfill (Kiefer)(34-AA-0001). Accessed August 23, 2018 but no longer available online.

City of Folsom. 2020a. City of Folsom Fire Department webpage. Accessed September 23, 2020 and available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/fire/about_us/default.asp.

_____. 2020b. City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications. Updated February, 2020. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/community/engineering/specs.asp.

_____. 2018a. Folsom 2035 General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report. Adopted August 28, 2018 and available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/community/planning/general_plan.asp.

_____. 2018b. Folsom Municipal Code. Adopted June 26, 2018 and available at http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom/.

_____ 2018c. 2035 General Plan Appendix A – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=34205.

_____ 2018d. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/documents/Planning/Folsom_GHG_Reduction_Checklist_FINAL.pdf

_____. 2013. City of Folsom Housing Element: 2013-2021. Adopted October. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=34291.

_____. 2005. Multi-Hazard Emergency Plan. August 1997 and May 2005.

Clark, William B. 2005. *Gold Districts of California*. Bulletin 193. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, California. Eighth Printing.

Cook, Sherburne F. 1955. "The Aboriginal Population of the San Joaquin Valley, California". Anthropological Records 16:31–80. University of California, Berkeley.

Cook, S.F. 1976. The Population of the California Indians 1769-1970. University of California Press. Berkeley, California.

County of Sacramento. 2017. General Plan Safety Element, as amended September 26, 2017. Available online at https://planning.saccounty.net/LandUseRegulationDocuments/Documents/General-Plan/Safety%20Element%20Background%20Amended%2009-26-2017.pdf.

d'Azevedo, Warren L. 1986. The Washoe. In *The Great Basin*, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 466-499. *Handbook of North American Indians,* Vol. 11: Willian G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2021. Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with Assembly Bill 52 and CEQA for the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Storage Shed Project, City of Folsom.

_____. 2020. Cultural Resources Inventory Report for the Lakeside Memorial Lawn Storage Shed Project. Not available for public release.

EDAW, Inc. 2003. Cultural Resources Inventory and Site Assessment for the: Lake Natoma State Recreation Area, Sacramento County, CA.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2020. FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Panel 06067C0116H, effective August 16, 2012. Accessed September 25, 2020 and available at https://msc.fema.gov/portal.

Folsom Telegraph. 2015a. "Where is Folsom's water going?" by Laura Newell. August 5. Available at: http://www.folsomtelegraph.com/article/8/05/15/where-folsom%E2%80%99s-water-going

_____. 2015b. "City of Folsom releases water reduction plan." May 6. Available at: http://www.folsomtelegraph.com/article/5/06/15/city-folsom-releases-water-reduction-plan

Geotechnical Consultants, Inc. 2003. Environmental Conditions – Geology. Folsom Lake State Recreation Agency. April 2003.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. 2020. Folsom Lakeside Crematorium Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment.

_____. 2021. Addendum to the Folsom Lakeside Crematorium Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment.

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/.

Iowa Environmental Mesonet. 2019. Sacramento Executive Airport Wind Rose Plot. Available at: https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/sites/windrose.phtml?station=SAC&network=CA_ASOS.

Johnson, Patti, J., 1978. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California. Washington, DC. Smithsonian Institution.

Kroeber, A.L. 1925. Handbook of the Indians of California. Bulletin 78. Bureau of American Ethnology. Washington, DC. Smithsonian Institution.

Kyle, Douglas. 2002. *Historic Spots in California*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, California.

Levy, Richard. 1978. Eastern Miwok. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California*, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 398-413. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Littlejohn, H. W. 1928. Nisenan Geography. Ms in Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Marshall, James W. 1971. The Discovery. In *California Heritage: An Anthology of History and Literature*, edited by John and Laree Caughey, pp. 191-192. F. E. Peacock Publishers, Itasca, Illinois. Revised Edition.

NPS. 2020. National Register of Historic Places, Digital Archive on NPGallery. Accessed on October 20, 2020 from https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/BasicSearch/

_____. 1983. Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. 48 FR (Federal Register) 44716-68.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2020. Soil Survey of Lakeside Memorial Lawn Cemetery in Sacramento County, California. Accessed September 24, 2020 and available at https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). 2006. OSHA Fact Sheet - Health Effects of Hexavalent Chromium. Available at: https://www.osha.gov/OshDoc/data_General_Facts/hexavalent_chromium.pdf.

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/crnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0.

OHP. 2020. *Office of Historic Preservation California Historical Landmarks Website*. Accessed on October 20, 2020 from http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21387

_____. 2012. Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for Sacramento County. On file at NCIC, California State University, Sacramento, California.

_____. 1996. California Historical Landmarks. California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, California.

_____. 1992. California Points of Historical Interest. California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, California.

PAR Environmental Services, Inc. 1995. *Cultural Resources Investigation of Lakeside Memorial Cemetery Mausoleum Complex Project, Folsom, California.* Prepared for Miller Funeral Home, 507 Scott, Folsom, CA 95630.

Robertson, D. B. 1998. *Encyclopedia of Western Railroad History*. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers.

Robinson, W. W. 1948. *Land in California: The Story of Mission Lands, Ranchos, Squatters, Mining Claims, Railroad Grants, Land Scrip, Homesteads.* University of California Press, Berkeley.

Sacramento County Regional Parks/California Department of Parks and Recreation. N.d. Trail Map of American River Parkway. Accessed on September 23, 2020 from https://regionalparks.saccounty.net/Rangers/Documents/UPDATED%20ParkwayMap.pdf

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020a. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County. Revised April. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/Residents/CEQA-Land-Use-Planning/CEQA-Guidance-Tools.

_____2020b. Electronic communications between HELIX Environmental Planning (Victor Ortiz) and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (Venk Reddy); attachments to communications containing crematory emissions calculations. August and November.

_____2020c. SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance Table. April. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/CH2ThresholdsTable4-2020.pdf.

_____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.

_____2014. AERMOD meteorological data files. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/businesses/ceqa-land-use-planning/ceqa-guidance-tools.

Scott, Kaitlyn, 2020. Lakeside Cemetery. Accessed on November 17, 2020 from https://www.folsomhistoricalsociety.org/post/lakeside-cemetery.

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.

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers. 1976. National Historic Mechanical Engineering Landmark: The Folsom Powerhouse No. 1 1895. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers. September 12.

Thompson, T.H. and A.A. West. 1880. *History of Sacramento County*. Reproduced by Howell-North, 1960, Berkeley.

United States Department of Transportation (USDOT). 2016. Emergency Response Guidebook. Accessed on September 25, 2020 from https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/sites/phmsa.dot.gov/files/docs/ERG2016.pdf.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2020a. Envirofacts: Hazardous Waste and Substance List. Accessed on September 25, 2018 at https://www3.epa.gov/enviro/.

_____. 2020b. Health Effects of Exposures to Mercury. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/mercury/health-effects-exposures-mercury. Accessed November 2020.

_____. 2020c. Superfund National Priority List. Accessed on September 25, 2020 at https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl.

_____. 2008. AP 42, Fifth Edition, Volume I Chapter 1: External Combustion Sources, 1.5 Liquified Petroleum Gas Combustion. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-09/documents/1.5_liquefied_petroleum_gas_combustion.pdf.

United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2014. 2014 National Seismic Hazards Map Source Parameters. Accessed on September 25, 2020 and available online at https://earthquake.usgs.gov/cfusion/hazfaults_2014_search/query_main.cfm.

Wilson, N. L., and A. H. Towne. 1978. Nisenan. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California*, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 387-397. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.