AC Hotel by Marriott

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for:

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

Prepared by:

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

April 2022

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

No. **Title** **Page**

LIST OF APPENDICES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
APE	Area of Potential Effects
APN	Assessors Parcel Number
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Control Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCTS	Central California Taxonomic System
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CH_4	Methane
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO2e	carbon dioxide equivalents
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
CY	cubic yards
C-3	General Commercial
dB	Decibels
dBA	A-weighted Decibel
DPM	Deiseal Particulate Matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPAP	Existing plus Approved Project
EQ Zapp	Earthquake Hazards Zone Application
EV	Electric Vehicle
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
GHG	Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GWh	Gigawatt hours
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
HVAC	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISMND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
LOS	Level of Service
LSAA	Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MRTD	Minimum Required Throat Depth
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
N_2O	Nitrous Oxide
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
O_3	Ozone
PM2.5	Fine Particulate Matter
PM10	Coarse Particulate Matter
PD	Planned Development
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric
PM	Particulate Matter
PRC	Public Resources Code
RCC	Regional Commercial Center
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy

sf	Square foot/feet
SF_6	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SUV	Sport Utility Vehicles
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SSO	Sanitary Sewer Overflows
STC	Sound Transmission Class
SWITRS	Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminants
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resources
TIS	Transportation Impact Study
TNM	Traffic Noise Model
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Insignia Hospitality Groups, Inc. (Applicant) proposes to construct the AC Hotel by Marriott (proposed project), which includes 130 rooms and 8 executive units on a 1.45-acre project site located at 510 Palladio Parkway in the City of Folsom, California.

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

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

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

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

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

- Air Quality Modeling and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist performed by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (April 2022).
- Cultural resources assessment prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning. (2022).
- Noise modeling performed by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (April 2022).
- Tribal Cultural Resource Technical Memo, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (April 2022)
- Transportation Impact Study prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (April 2022).

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Project Location

The project site is located at 510 Palladio Parkway in the City of Folsom (City) in Sacramento County, California. The project site is 1.45-acres and is located in the southeastern corner of the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway. The project site consists of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 072-308-042. The project site is in the middle of an existing parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center, and is bounded by Via Serena to the northeast, Broadstone Parkway to the west, the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center to the east, and Palladio Parkway to the southwest. The 1.45-acre project site is a part of a larger, estimated 14.22-acre parcel; the applicant proposes subdividing this parcel between the 1.45-acre site for this project and the remaining 12.77-acre parcel for parking for both the proposed project and for the existing Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The site is located within Section 8, Township 9 North, Range 8 East (Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute "Clarksville Quadrangle"). Refer to **Figure 1** for the project site and vicinity map and **Figure 2** for the site plan. Note: All figures are located in **Appendix A**.

3.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is currently an asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center is located just east of the proposed project site. Vacant, rough graded land is located to the northeast of the project site, as well as to the south. The vacant land areas may be developed into multifamily residential or mixed-use commercial development in the future. Broadstone Plaza, a commercial shopping center, is located west of the project site, and Broadstone Marketplace, a commercial shopping center, is located north of the project site. A residential development is located southwest of the project site, in between Broadstone Plaza and vacant, rough graded land.

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

Table 1. Neighboring Land Uses

Direction	Land Use
North	Commercial shopping centers; vacant, rough graded land; East Bidwell Street; Broadstone Parkway
East	Commercial shopping center; East Bidwell Street; Via Serena
South	Vacant, rough graded land; commercial shopping center; Palladio Parkway
West	Commercial shopping center; residential development; Broadstone Parkway

3.3 Project Characteristics

The proposed project includes the construction of a new hotel on a 1.45-acre project site within a total 14.22-acre parcel. A total of 130 hotel rooms and 8 executive units would be constructed in an "L-shaped" five-story tower. The first floor of the five-story hotel would be 16,000 square feet (sf), the second floor would be 17,423 sf, and floors three through five would be 17,350 sf. The total square footage of the hotel building would be 85,473 sf. The height of the proposed hotel building would be 73 feet from grade.

Level 1 would include community amenities such as a lobby and lounge area, an outdoor patio, a library, office space, a restaurant and bar, a fitness center, meeting rooms, restrooms, a kitchen, a breakfast room, a bar, and a laundry room.

Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4 would each include 36 guest rooms. The total floor occupancy load on each floor would be 86 people. Level 2 would include an elevator lobby, an ice machine room, a linen room, a mechanical room, an electrical room, and an engineer office. Level 3 would include an elevator lobby, an ice machine room, a linen room, a mechanical room, an electrical room, and a guest laundry room. Level 4 would include an elevator lobby, an ice machine room, a linen room, a mechanical room, an electrical room, and a storage room.

Level 5 would include 22 guest rooms and 8 executive units. The total floor occupancy would be 86 people. Level 5 would include an ice machine room, housekeeping space, an electrical room, and two elevator lobbies.

3.3.1. Parking and Circulation

Vehicle access for the proposed project would be located on the southern end of the project site. The proposed project would include two (2) 27-foot driveways that would be separated by three parking spaces and a landscape buffer. The internal turning radius for emergency vehicles would be 25 feet and the external turning radius would be 50 feet. The two driveways would allow access the main hotel entrance and guest drop-off/ loading area with six (6) regular car parking spaces, four (4) American Disabilities Act (ADA) parking spaces (with one (1) being a van ADA parking space). This proposed driveway would continue to wrap around the project site and would connect with Via Serena and the remaining parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center in the 14.55-acre parcel. The 14.55-acre parcel would be accessible by vehicle from existing driveways on East Bidwell Street, Broadstone Parkway, and Palladio Parkway. Internal circulation would be facilitated by a series of drive aisles from the existing paved parcel. The drive aisles would be redesigned to allow access to the hotel building and to surrounding parking spaces.

Pedestrian access would be available from proposed sidewalks located on the northern, western, and eastern sides the project boundary lines, as well as internally within the project site. The proposed sidewalks located along the boundary lines would connect to internal sidewalks that would surround the hotel building and the main guest drop-off/ loading area. The proposed sidewalks would also provide access to the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center, located just east of the project site. The existing and proposed sidewalks would double as bicycle access as well as pedestrian access. Three proposed bicycle racks are located in the southeastern portion of the project site, just south of the hotel building.

The proposed project would include a total of 162 parking spaces, on and off site. There would be 28 on-site parking spaces and 134 off-site parking spaces. On-site parking would consist of 12 regular car parking spaces (9 feet by 18 feet), 5 handicap car parking spaces (9 feet by 18 feet), 1 handicap van parking space (9 feet by 18 feet), and 10 electric vehicle (EV) charging parking spaces (8 regular, 1 van accessible, and 1 standard accessible). Off-site parking would include 134 regular car parking spaces (9 feet by 18 feet). Total parking provided would be 162 spaces with 6 being ADA compliant, and 10 being EV compliant. Proposed parking would be provided at a ratio of 1.2 spaces per dwelling unit. The City of

Folsom Zoning Code 17.57.040 requires one parking space per one sleeping room or one hotel unit in a commercial zone. However, since the proposed project site is located on existing asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center, the proposed project would deviate from the parking standards approved for this shopping center. Therefore, a parking analysis would be required to demonstrate that sufficient parking is available to serve the hotel and the remainder of the shopping center. Please refer to Section XVII. Transportation for a summary of the parking analysis.

3.3.2. Utilities

Proposed utilities include water lines, sanitary sewer lines, electrical lines, gas lines, and telephone lines. The proposed storm-drain pipe would connect to an existing storm drain system along the western boundary line of the project site. An existing domestic water system would connect to proposed domestic water pipes associated with the project site. Adjacent to the existing domestic water system would be an existing fire system connection, which would connect to proposed fire hydrants and water pipes. The proposed sanitary sewer pipes would connect to an existing sewer system next to the stop sign on the intersection of Via Serena from Broadstone Parkway. Mounted wall sconces would surround the hotel and would be subject to City standard practices regarding night lighting. Water and sewer service lines would be provided by the City of Folsom, gas lines would be provided by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), electricity lines would be provided by Sacramento Metropolitan Utilities District (SMUD), and the telephone lines would be connected to Sure West. A gas meter and emergency generator would be located in the southeastern portion of the project site, directly south of the hotel building.

3.3.3. Sustainability Features

The project design incorporates sustainable features consistent with General Plan Goal LU 9.1 and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). The project would be mitigated to meet one of the four Building Energy Sector options in the GHG Reduction Measures Consistency Checklist. The project provides 10 electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces as required under the City's General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-8 (See Attachment B in Appendix B). Hardscapes, such as parking spaces, an outdoor patio, and the main entrance would be constructed with cool paving materials. Cool paving areas, including shaded areas, account for approximately 51 percent of the non-roof impervious area.

3.3.4. Trash/Recycling

One 6-yard trash dumpster, one 6-yard mixed recyclables dumpster, and one 3-yard organics recycling dumpster would all be located in the southeastern corner of the project site. The dumpsters would be surrounded by a 30-foot by 10-foot enclosure that would have a 45-foot approach length for three total trucks.

3.3.5. Fencing and Signage

The project site would not be enclosed by fencing. The hotel building would be externally designed with consistent architectural detailing with the surrounding land uses. A retaining wall is proposed to be located outside the main hotel building entrance, in between the two (2) main entrance driveways. The three dumpsters proposed on the project site would be enclosed by a 30-foot by 10-foot wall. Signs

with the name of the hotel “AC Hotel Folsom” would be attached to the outside of the proposed hotel building. ADA parking spaces would have painted and mounted accessible signs.

3.3.6. Landscaping

Outdoor amenities located on the project site would include a paved courtyard, benches, and pedestrian/ bicycle access sidewalks. Pottery would be located near benches to enhance the visual appearance. Landscaping would be designed to complement the buildings and make a positive contribution to the overall aesthetic of the site. The landscape would be water efficient and low maintenance. Currently, a few ornamental trees exist on the project site and would be incorporated into the landscaping design for the project. Fifty (50) trees would be planted along the project boundary lines and around the hotel building. Trees on the project site would include Juniperus Chinensis ‘Blue Point’, Lagerstroemia Indica x Fauriei ‘Arapaho’, Magnolia Grandiflora ‘Edith Bogue’, Magnolia Grandiflora ‘Little Gem’, Quercus Ilex, Rhaphiolepis x ‘Montic’ TM, Ulmus Propinqua, and Washington Robusta. Low-profile shrubs, including screening shrubs, would be planted with proposed shade and canopy trees throughout the project site. The total sf of paved parking area within the project site would be 19,565 sf. The project would comply with the 50% shade requirement by providing 10,062 sf of shade, which is approximately 51% of the total paved area.

3.4 Construction and Phasing

The project would require the need for limited soil excavation on the project site. Although the majority of the development would be situated on previously developed pads and improvements, the foundation is anticipated to require piers for footings.

The construction activity is anticipated to begin March-June 2023 and would take approximately two years to complete. The project would be constructed in a phases including site preparation, demolition, grading, underground infrastructure/ utilities, physical building construction, and paving. The project would require the use of excavators, backhoes, and scaffolding.

3.5 City Regulation of Urban Development

3.5.1. General Plan

The site is designated as Regional Commercial Center (RCC) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The RCC designation provides for highway-oriented, large-scale regional retail, entertainment, business, lodging, and public uses. The proposed hotel and related amenities are consistent with the existing General Plan designation.

3.5.2. Zoning Ordinance

The zoning designation of the site is General Commercial, Planned Development District (C-3, PD). The purpose of the C-3 PD is to designate areas appropriate for heavy commercial activities. While all types of commercial activities are permitted, the C-3 zone is intended for the highest-intensity commercial activities, which include heavy auto and truck traffic. The C-3 zone should be located on major arteries and thoroughfares. Hotels are identified as a permitted land use within the Folsom Municipal Code for the C-3 PD zoning district.

The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). Preliminary design plans show that the five-story hotel building would be approximately 66 feet in height (with towers that extend up to 73 feet in height), whereas the Palladio at Broadstone Development Standards indicate that the maximum height for major buildings is three stories and 60 feet in height. A PD Permit modification would be required to modify the Development Standards to accommodate the building stories and building height. The hotel appears to meet required building setbacks based on estimated distance from the property lines. With a PD Permit, the project would be deemed consistent with the existing zoning of the project site.

Additionally, the proposed project would deviate from the parking standards approved for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center; as a result, a parking analysis would be required to demonstrate that sufficient parking is available to serve the hotel and the remainder of the shopping center. Please refer to Section XVII for a summary of the parking analysis.

3.5.3. Community Development Department Standard Construction Conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Existing Utilities – Regulates the relocation and protection of utilities.

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

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

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

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

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

3.5.4. City of Folsom Municipal Code

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

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

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
8.42	Noise Control	Establishes interior and exterior noise standards that may not be exceeded within structures, including residences; establishes time periods for construction operations.
8.70	Stormwater Management and Discharge Control	Establishes conditions and requirements for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm-drainage system; requires preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans.
9.34	Hazardous Materials Disclosure	Defines hazardous materials; requires filing of a Hazardous Material Disclosure Form by businesses that manufacture, use, or store such materials.
9.35	Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances	Establishes standards for the construction and monitoring of facilities used for the underground storage of hazardous substances and establishes a procedure for issuance of permits for the use of these facilities.

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
12.16	Tree Preservation	Regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees.
13.26	Water Conservation	Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.
14.19	Energy Code	Adopts the California Energy Code, 2019 Edition, published as Part 6, Title 24, C.C.R. to require energy efficiency standards for structures.
14.20	Green Building Standards Code	Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2019 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4, A5, and A6.1 published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encourage sustainable construction practices.
14.29	Grading Code	Requires a grading permit prior to the initiation of any grading, excavation, fill or dredging; establishes standards, conditions, and requirements for grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage, and revegetation.
14.32	Flood Damage Prevention	Restricts or prohibits uses that cause water or erosion hazards, or that result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights; requires that uses vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage; controls the modification of floodways; regulates activities that may increase flood damage or that could divert floodwaters.

4.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objective of the proposed project is to develop a five-story hotel, with 130 hotel rooms and eight executive suites, in an underused parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center.

5.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS

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

- Planned Development Permit (PD Permit) for a 130 room and eight executive suite hotel project in the C-3 PD zone.

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

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

- Approval of project: The City of Folsom Planning Commission will consider approval of the project and the entitlement described above.

6.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

6.1 City of Folsom General Plan

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

6.2 Tiering

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

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

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

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

City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street (2nd Floor)
Folsom, CA 95630
Contact: Mr. Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner
(916) 461-6209

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

7.1 DETERMINATION

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

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

A. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant even with the incorporation of mitigation. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

B. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the inclusion of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." All mitigation measures are described, including a brief explanation of how the measures reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced.

C. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project does not create an impact that exceeds a stated significance threshold.

D. "No Impact" applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. "No Impact" answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

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

a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identifies where earlier analyses are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identifies which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and states whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describes the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

I. AESTHETICS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	■
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	■
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	■	☐
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 an asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center, bounded by East Bidwell to the north, Palladio Parkway to the west and south, and Iron Point Road to the south, is located just east of the proposed project site. Vacant, rough graded land is located to the northeast of the project site, as well as to the south. Both of these vacant land areas may be developed into multifamily residential or mixed-use commercial development in the future. Broadstone Plaza, a commercial shopping center, is located west of the project site, and Broadstone Marketplace, a commercial shopping center, is located north of the project site. A residential development is located southwest of the project site, in between Broadstone Plaza and vacant, rough graded land.

The proposed project would include the construction of 130 hotel rooms and 8 executive suites in one, five (story) building (85,473 sf). Maximum building height for the proposed hotel would be approximately 73 feet from grade. A total of 28 onsite parking spaces, and 134 off-site parking spaces would be available for the proposed project. Parking for the proposed project would connect to the existing parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. An outdoor patio would be located on the northeastern corner of the hotel building, and benches, pottery, and pedestrian/ bicycle access sidewalks would be located throughout the project site to enhance the visual design. The hotel building would be externally designed with consistent architectural detailing with the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center.

Landscaping is proposed to complement the proposed building design and would include low-profile shrubs and canopy trees. Trees of various sizes would be planted along the boundary lines and would

surround the hotel building. The canopy trees would provide 10,062 sf, or 51%, of shade for the total 19,655 sf paved area. A few existing trees within the project site would not be removed, and the project would blend the existing landscaping in with the proposed landscape design.

Evaluation of Aesthetics

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

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

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

No impact. The site is currently an asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. Existing landscape, including a few existing trees are located throughout the parcel, and would be incorporated in the overall design of the project. No potential scenic resources are located within the project site. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is the segment of US Highway 50 from Placerville to Echo Summit, beginning approximately 19 miles east of the project site (Caltrans 2021). Given that no eligible or designated state scenic highways are located near the project site, there would be no impact.

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is located within an urbanized area of Folsom, surrounded by vacant land and commercial and residential development. The 1.45 acre project site is part of a larger 14.22 acre parcel, surrounded by East Bidwell Street, Broadstone Parkway, Palladio Parkway, and the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The project would convert a portion of an existing asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center into a five-story hotel building with outdoor and indoor amenities. The proposed project would be consistent with the overall use of quality design, materials, and colors of the surrounding developments. The project design would incorporate existing landscape into the proposed landscape design to enhance visual character to the site. Although the proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the site, the proposed project is consistent with the overall suburban character and ongoing development in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on visual character and no mitigation is necessary.

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

Less than significant impact. The project would include mounted wall sconces surrounding the proposed hotel building. Additionally, free-standing parking lot lights would remain along Via Serena and

within the remaining parking lot space outside the project site. The existing free-standing lights are screened, shielded, and directed downwards to minimize glare towards the surrounding areas. New lighting installed with the development of the proposed project would be subject to City standard practices regarding night lighting that would be made a condition of approval of the PD Permit. The proposed hotel and other project features would comply with design standards outlined in the Folsom Municipal Code. The exterior of the proposed hotel building would be designed with architectural detailing that would not produce glare and would not affect day or nighttime views. Therefore, impacts would be a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is necessary.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	■
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 Farmlands Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation (CDC) classifies the project site and surrounding area as Urban and Built-Up land (CDC 2021a). Urban and Built-Up Land is land occupied by structures or infrastructure to accommodate a building density of at least one unit to 1.5-acres, or approximately six structures to 10.0-acres.

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

Evaluation of Agriculture and Forestry Resources

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

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

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

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

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

OR

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

No impact. The project site is not zoned for, nor used as, timberland or forest land, and is mostly devoid of tree cover except for a few existing ornamental trees located within the project that would be incorporated into the overall landscape design. Because the project site is not designated nor zoned as forest land or timber land, is not used for such a purpose, and would not naturally support a crop of commercial timber species, no impact would occur for c) and d).

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

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

III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	■	☐
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?	☐	☐	■	☐

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted air quality modeling (CalEEMod) for the proposed project based primarily on the preliminary site plan and the Transportation Impact Study conducted by T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (2022). Air quality modeling output files and quantitative results are presented in **Appendix B**.

Environmental Setting

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

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

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These

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

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

Table 3: Sacramento County – Attainment Status

POLLUTANT	STATE OF CALIFORNIA ATTAINMENT STATUS	FEDERAL ATTAINMENT STATUS
Ozone (1-hour)	Nonattainment	No Federal Standard
Ozone (8-hour)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Nonattainment	Attainment
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Attainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Nitrogen Dioxide ($N0_2$)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Lead	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Attainment	Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	No Federal Standard

Sources: SMAQMD 2020.

Sacramento County is designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state PM_{10} standards, and the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standards. Concentrations of all other pollutants meet state and federal standards.

Ozone is not emitted directly into the environment, but is generated from complex chemical reactions between ROG, or non-methane hydrocarbons, and NO_X that occur in the presence of sunlight. ROG and NO_X generators in Sacramento County include motor vehicles, recreational boats, other transportation sources, and industrial processes. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ arise from a variety of sources, including road dust, diesel exhaust, fuel combustion, tire and brake wear, construction operations, and windblown dust.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TAC) are a diverse group of air pollutants that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. TACs can cause long-term chronic health effects such as cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, asthma, bronchitis, or genetic damage, or short-term acute effects such as eye watering, respiratory irritation (a cough), runny nose, throat pain, and headaches. TACs are considered either carcinogenic or

noncarcinogenic based on the nature of the health effects associated with exposure to the pollutant. For carcinogenic TACs, there is no level of exposure that is considered safe and impacts are evaluated in terms of overall relative risk expressed as excess cancer cases per one million exposed individuals. Noncarcinogenic TACs differ in that there is generally assumed to be a safe level of exposure below which no negative health impact is believed to occur. These levels are determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

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

Diesel engines emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, including both gaseous and solid material. The solid material in diesel exhaust is referred to as diesel particulate matter (DPM). Almost all DPM is 10 microns or less in diameter, and 90 percent of DPM is less than 2.5 microns in diameter (CARB 2022). Because of their extremely small size, these particles can be inhaled and eventually trapped in the bronchial and alveolar regions of the lung. In 1998, CARB identified DPM as a TAC based on published evidence of a relationship between diesel exhaust exposure and lung cancer and other adverse health effects. DPM has a notable effect on California's population—it is estimated that about 70 percent of total known cancer risk related to air toxics in California is attributable to DPM (CARB 2022).

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 the apartments in the Sherwood at Broadstone Apartment complex, approximately 230 feet southwest of the project site at the intersection of Clarksville Road and Broadstone Parkway. The closest school to the project site is Gold Ridge Elementary School approximately 2,226 feet (0.42 miles) to the southwest.

Methodology and Assumptions

Criteria pollutant, precursor, and GHG emissions for project construction and operation were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2020.4.0. CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and GHG emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model was developed for the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with the California air districts. CalEEMod allows for the use of default data (e.g., emission factors, trip lengths, meteorology, source inventory) provided by the various California air districts to account for local requirements and conditions, and/or user-defined inputs. The calculation methodology and default data used in the model are available in the CalEEMod User's Guide, Appendices A, D, and E (CAPCOA 2021). The CalEEMod output files are included in Attachment A to this letter.

Construction of the project is anticipated to begin as early as March 2023 and be completed in February 2025. Construction modeling assumes the longest anticipated schedule reported by the project applicant: demolition 20 days; site preparation 2 days; grading 87 days; building construction 394 days; and paving 10 days. A significant level of architectural coating is not anticipated to be used as building exterior materials would be pre-finished. Construction equipment assumptions were based on estimates from the project applicant and CalEEMod defaults. An estimated 4,500 cubic yards (CY) of cut/fill was included as soil movement during grading and 3,500 CY of import of soil was included during grading. Additionally, approximately 10 trucks of vegetation and other cleared materials would be exported during the site preparation phase, and approximately 10 trucks of demolition debris would be hauled off site during demolition. Construction emissions modeling assumes implementation of dust mitigation (watering exposed areas twice per day) to comply with the requirements of: SMAQMD Rule 403, *Fugitive Dust*.

Operational mobile emissions were modeled using the project trip generation of 504 average daily trips, including 38 new AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 6 new PM peak-hour vehicle trips, from the project Transportation Impact Study (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2022). Operational Emissions resulting from energy use, water use, and solid waste generation were modeled using CalEEMod defaults with an added 20 percent reduction in water use to account for the requirements of the 2019 CalGreen, and an additional 25 percent solid waste diversion to account for AB 341 requirements.

Standards of Significance

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

Evaluation of Air Quality

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

Less than Significant Impact. In accordance with SMAQMD's CEQA Guide, construction-generated NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, and operational-generated ROG and NO_X (all ozone precursors) are used to determine consistency with the Ozone Attainment Plan. The Guide states (SMAQMD 2020 p. 4-6):

> *By exceeding the District's mass emission thresholds for operational emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$, the project would be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the District's air quality planning efforts.*

As shown in the discussion for question 2) below, the project's construction-generated emissions of NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ and operation-generated emissions ROG and NO_X would not exceed SMAQMD thresholds. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and the impact would be less than significant.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Sacramento region is in non-attainment for ozone (ozone precursors NO_X and ROG) and particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}). The project's emissions of these criteria pollutants and precursors during construction and operation are evaluated below.

Construction Emissions

CalEEMod version 2020.4.0 was used to quantify project-generated construction emissions. Assumptions included in the model are described previously and detailed model output sheets are included in Attachment A. Construction activities were assumed to commence as early as March 2023 and be completed in early 2025. The quantity, duration, and intensity of construction activity influence the amount of construction emissions and related pollutant concentrations that occur at any one time. As such, the emission forecasts provided herein reflect a specific set of conservative assumptions based on the expected construction scenario wherein a relatively large amount of construction activity is occurring in a relatively intensive manner. Because of this conservative assumption, actual emissions could be less than those forecasted. If construction is delayed or occurs over a longer time period, emissions could be reduced because of: (1) a more modern and cleaner-burning construction equipment fleet mix than assumed in CalEEMod; and/or (2) a less intensive buildout schedule (i.e., fewer daily emissions occurring over a longer time interval).

The project's construction period emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ are compared to the SMAQMD construction thresholds in **Table 4.** The SMAQMD does not have a recommended threshold for construction-generated ROG. However, quantification and disclosure of ROG emissions is recommended. The SMAQMD considers any emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ to be significant unless the Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices are implemented, also known as Best Management Practices (BMPs). The project would implement all of the SMAQMD BMPs to control fugitive dust in accordance with SMAQMD Rule 403. The modeling accounts for emissions reductions resulting from watering exposed surfaces twice daily. As shown in **Table 4**, the proposed project construction period emissions of the ozone precursor NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds.

Impacts related to construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would be less than significant.

Table 4: Construction Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions

Construction Activity	ROG (pounds/day)	NO_X (pounds/day)	PM_{10} (pounds/day)	$PM_{2.5}$ (pounds/day)
Demolition	1.5	14.5	0.9	0.7
Site Preparation	1.2	14.5	3.6	1.9
Grading	1.4	15.3	4.0	2.1
Building Construction	1.6	12.5	0.9	0.6
Paving	0.6	5.3	0.3	0.2
Maximum Daily Emissions	**1.6**	**15.3**	**4.0**	**2.1**
SMAQMD Thresholds	*None*	*85*	*80*	*82*
Exceed Thresholds?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Source: CalEEMod (output data is provided in Attachment A)
ROG = reactive organic gases; NO_X = nitrogen oxides; PM_{10} = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter; SMAQMD= Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

Operational Emissions

Emissions generated from operational activities would include:

- Areas sources – combustion emissions from the use of landscape maintenance equipment, the reapplication of architectural coatings for maintenance, and the use of consumer products.
- Energy sources – combustion emissions from the use of natural gas appliances, water heaters, and heating systems.
- Mobile emissions – combustion, fuel evaporation, brake and tire wear, and road dust emission resulting from worker, customer, and vendor vehicle traveling to and from the project site.
- Offroad emissions – combustion emissions from backup emergency generators.

The results of the modeling for project operational activities are shown in **Table 5**, *Maximum Daily Operational Emissions*. The data is presented as the maximum anticipated daily emissions for comparison with the SMAQMD thresholds, the model output and calculation sheets are included as Attachment A to this letter. As shown in **Table 5**, the proposed project operation period emissions of the ozone precursors NO_X and ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds. Impacts related to operation-generated emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would be less than significant.

Table 5: Maximum Daily Operational emissions

Source	ROG (pounds/day)	NO_X (pounds/day)	PM_{10} (pounds/day)	$PM_{2.5}$ (pounds/day)
Area	2.1	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Energy	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.1
Mobile	1.0	1.2	1.7	0.4
Offroad	<0.01	0.1	<0.01	<0.01
Maximum Daily Emissions	**3.2**	**2.2**	**1.7**	**0.5**
SMAQMD Thresholds	*65*	*65*	*80*	*82*
Exceed Thresholds?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Source: CalEEMod (output data is provided in Attachment A)
ROG = reactive organic gases; NO_X = nitrogen oxides; PM_{10} = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter; SMAQMD= Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

As shown in **Table 4** and **Table 5**, the project's maximum daily construction or operational emissions would not exceed the SMAQMD's thresholds. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment, and the impact would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

The closest existing sensitive receptors to the project site are apartments in the Sherwood at Broadstone Apartment complex, approximately 230 feet southwest of the project site at the intersection of Clarksville Road and Broadstone Parkway. The closest school to the project site is Gold Ridge Elementary School approximately 2,226 feet (0.42 miles) to the southwest.

The dose (of TAC) to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance in the environment and the extent of exposure a person has with the substance; a longer exposure period to a fixed quantity of emissions would result in higher health risks. Current models and methodologies for conducting cancer health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods (typically 30 years for individual residents based on guidance from OEHHA) and are best suited for evaluation of long duration TAC emissions with predictable schedules and locations. These assessment models and methodologies do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. Cancer potency factors are based on animal lifetime studies or worker studies where there is long-term exposure to the carcinogenic agent. There is considerable uncertainty in trying to evaluate the cancer risk from projects that will only last a small fraction of a lifetime (OEHHA 2015). In addition, concentrations of mobile

source DPM emissions disperse rapidly and are typically reduced by 70 percent at approximately 500-feet (CARB 2005). Considering this information, the highly dispersive nature of DPM, and the fact that construction activities would occur at various locations throughout the project site, it is not anticipated that construction of the project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. The project could produce odors during construction activities resulting from heavy diesel equipment exhaust and VOC released during application of asphalt. The odor of these emissions is objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the project site and therefore should not be at a level that would affect a substantial number of people. Any odors emitted during construction activities would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature, and would cease upon the facility maintenance. As a result, impacts associated with temporary odors during construction are not considered significant.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	■	☐	☐
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 state or 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 is currently an asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center, and is bounded by Via Serena to the northeast, Broadstone Parkway to the west, the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center to the east, and Palladio Parkway to the southwest. The entire project site has been previously rough graded and covered with asphalt. Currently, a few ornamental trees exist on the project site, and would be incorporated into the landscaping design for the project.

Regulatory Framework Related to Biological Resources

State and Federal Endangered Species Acts

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

California Code of Regulations and California Fish and Game Code

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

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

California Native Plant Protection Act

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

Nesting and Migratory Birds

Nesting birds are protected by state and federal laws. California Fish and Game Code (§3503, 3503.5, and 3800) prohibits the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of any bird nests or eggs; Fish and Game Code §3511 designates certain bird species "fully protected" (including all raptors), making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. The Attorney General of California has released an opinion that the Fish and Game Code prohibits incidental take. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 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. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit (with jurisdiction over California) has ruled that the MBTA does not prohibit incidental take (952 F 2d 297 – Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, 1991).

City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance

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

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

Protected trees include:

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

Jurisdictional Waters

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

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

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

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

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. The proposed project would be located on an existing asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The current project site includes a few ornamental trees that would be incorporated into the landscaping design for the project. Common bird species protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Codes may nest on the trees on or adjacent to the project site. Project construction activities would potentially result in impacts to nesting birds if construction of the proposed project commences during the typical avian breeding season (February 1– August 31). Construction activities and construction-related disturbance (noise, vibration and increased human activity) could adversely affect these species if they were to nest in or adjacent to the project area. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to nesting birds:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Nesting Birds

- If project (construction) ground-disturbing and grubbing activities commence during the avian breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey no more than 14 days prior to initiation of project activities and again immediately prior to construction. The survey area shall include suitable raptor nesting habitat within 500-feet of the project boundary (inaccessible areas outside of the project site can be surveyed from the site or from public roads using binoculars or spotting scopes). Pre-construction surveys are not required in areas where project activities have been continuous since prior to February 1, as determined by a qualified biologist. Areas that have been inactive for more than 14 days during the avian breeding season must be re-surveyed prior to resumption of project activities. If no active nests are identified, no further mitigation is required. If active nests are identified, the following measure is required:

    - A suitable buffer (e.g., typically 300-500-feet for raptors; and 50-100-feet for passerines) shall be established by a qualified biologist around active nests and no construction activities within the buffer shall be allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (i.e., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest, or the nest has failed). Encroachment into the buffer may occur at the discretion of a qualified biologist. Any encroachment into the buffer shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine whether nesting birds are being impacted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

No impact. The project site is an existing asphalt paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The project site is surrounded by commercial development, residential development, and vacant lands that may be developed into multifamily residential or mixed-use commercial development in the future. The project site does not provide any wildlife movement corridors or wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, there would be no impacts to wildlife corridors or the use of native wildlife nursery sites as a result of the proposed project.

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

No Impact. The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. None of the ornamental trees existing on the project site meet the definition of protected trees per the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance (City of Folsom 2021c). However, the existing ornamental trees on site would be incorporated into the landscape design. The project would plant 50 additional trees and low-profile shrubs, including screening shrubs, throughout the project site. No trees would be removed and therefore there would be no impact.

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

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	■	☐	☐
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?	☐	■	☐	☐

This assessment, which addresses both archaeological and historic architectural resources, is based on the results of an archival records search and Native American coordination. No pedestrian survey of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) was conducted as the entirety of the APE is covered by an asphalt parking lot.

Regulatory Framework

California Environmental Quality Act

Pursuant to CEQA, a historical resource is a resource listed in, or eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). In addition, resources included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a local survey conducted in accordance with state guidelines, are also considered historic resources under CEQA unless a preponderance of the facts demonstrates otherwise. According to CEQA, the fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the CRHR, or is not included in a local register or survey, shall not preclude a Lead Agency, as defined by CEQA, from determining that the resource may be a historic resource as defined in California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1.7.

CEQA applies to archaeological resources when (1) the historic or prehistoric archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a historical resource, or (2) the historic or prehistoric archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a "unique archaeological resource." A unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site that has a high probability of meeting any of the following criteria (PRC § 21083.2(g)):

1. The archaeological resource contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. The archaeological resource has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. The archaeological resource is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

California Register of Historical Resources

Created in 1992 and implemented in 1998, the CRHR is "an authoritative guide in California to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state's historical resources and to

indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change" (PRC § 5024.1(a)). Certain properties, including those listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Historical Landmarks (CHLs) numbered 770 and higher, are automatically included in the CRHR. Other properties recognized under the California Points of Historical Interest program, identified as significant in historic resources surveys, or designated by local landmarks programs may be nominated for inclusion in the CRHR.
A resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, which are modeled on NRHP criteria (PRC § 5024.1(c)):

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

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historic resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. It is possible that a resource whose integrity does not satisfy NRHP criteria may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR. A resource that has lost its historic character or appearance may still have sufficient integrity for the CRHR if, under Criterion 4, it maintains the potential to yield significant scientific or historical information or specific data. Resources that have achieved significance within the past 50 years also may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, provided that enough time has lapsed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource.

Native American Heritage Commission

PRC Section 5097.91 established the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), whose duties include the inventory of places of religious or social significance to Native Americans and the identification of known graves and cemeteries of Native Americans on private lands. Under PRC Section 5097.9, a State policy of noninterference with the free expression or exercise of Native American religion was articulated along with a prohibition of severe or irreparable damage to Native American sanctified cemeteries, places of worship, religious or ceremonial sites, or sacred shrines located on public property. PRC Section 5097.98 specifies a protocol to be followed when the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner.

Cultural Context

The 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.

Prehistoric Background

Early archaeological investigations in central California were conducted at sites located in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region. The first published account documents investigations in the Lodi and Stockton area (Schenck and Dawson 1929). The initial archaeological reports typically contained descriptive narratives, with more systematic approaches sponsored by Sacramento Junior College in the 1930s. At the same time, University of California at Berkeley excavated several sites in the lower Sacramento Valley and Delta region which resulted in recognizing archaeological site patterns based on variations of inter-site assemblages. Research during the 1930s identified temporal periods in central California prehistory and provided an initial chronological sequence (Lillard and Purves 1936; Lillard, et al. 1939). In 1939, Lillard noted that each cultural period led directly to the next and that influences spread from the Delta region to other regions in central California (Lillard, et al. 1939). In the late 1940s and early 1950s, Beardsley documented similarities in artifacts among sites in the San Francisco Bay region and the Delta and refined his findings into a cultural model that ultimately became known as the Central California Taxonomic System (CCTS). This system proposed a uniform, linear sequence of cultural succession (Beardsley 1948 and 1954). The CCTS system was challenged by Gerow (1954; 1974; Gerow with Force 1968), whose work looked at radiocarbon dating to show that Early and Middle Horizon sites were not subsequent developments but, at least partially, contemporaneous.

To address some of the flaws in the CCTS system, Fredrickson (1973) introduced a revision that incorporated a system of spatial and cultural integrative units. Fredrickson separated cultural, temporal, and spatial units from each other and assigned them to six chronological periods: Paleo-Indian (10000 to 6000 B.C.); Lower, Middle and Upper Archaic (6000 B.C. to A.D. 500), and Emergent (Upper and Lower, A.D. 500 to 1800). The suggested temporal ranges are like earlier horizons, which are broad cultural units that can be arranged in a temporal sequence (Moratto 1984). In addition, Fredrickson defined several patterns—a general way of life shared within a specific geographical region. These patterns include:

- Windmiller Pattern or Early Horizon (3000 to 1000 B.C.);
- Berkeley Pattern or Middle Horizon (1000 B.C. to A.D. 500); and,
- Augustine Pattern or Late Horizon (A.D. 500 to historic period).

Brief descriptions of these temporal ranges and their unique characteristics follow.

Windmiller Pattern or Early Horizon (3000 to 1000 B.C.)

Characterized by the Windmiller Pattern, the Early Horizon was centered in the Cosumnes district of the Delta and emphasized hunting rather than gathering, as evidenced by the abundance of projectile points in relation to plant processing tools. Additionally, atlatl, dart, and spear technologies typically included stemmed projectile points of slate and chert but minimal obsidian. The large variety of projectile point types and faunal remains suggests exploitation of numerous types of terrestrial and aquatic species (Bennyhoff 1950; Ragir 1972). Burials occurred in cemeteries and intra-village graves. These burials typically were ventrally extended, although some dorsal extensions are known with a westerly orientation and a high number of grave goods. Trade networks focused on acquisition of ornamental and ceremonial objects in finished form rather than on raw material. The presence of artifacts made of exotic materials such as quartz, obsidian, and shell indicate an extensive trade network that may represent the arrival of Utian populations into central California. Also indicative of this period are rectangular Haliotis and Olivella shell beads, and charmstones that usually were perforated.

Berkeley Pattern or Middle Horizon (1000 B.C. to A.D. 500)

The Middle Horizon is characterized by the Berkeley Pattern, which displays considerable changes from the Early Horizon. This period exhibited a strong milling technology represented by minimally shaped cobble mortars and pestles, although metates and manos were still used. Dart and atlatl technologies during this period were characterized by non-stemmed projectile points made primarily of obsidian. Fredrickson (1973) suggests that the Berkeley Pattern marked the eastward expansion of Miwok groups from the San Francisco Bay Area. Compared with the Early Horizon, there is a higher proportion of grinding implements at this time, implying an emphasis on plant resources rather than on hunting. Typical burials occurred within the village with flexed positions, variable cardinal orientation, and some cremations. As noted by Lillard et al. (1939), the practice of spreading ground ochre over the burial was common at this time. Grave goods during this period are generally sparse and typically include only utilitarian items and a few ornamental objects. However, objects such as charmstones, quartz crystals, and bone whistles occasionally were present, which suggest the religious or ceremonial significance of the individual (Hughes 1994). During this period, larger populations are suggested by the number and depth of sites compared with the Windmiller Pattern. According to Fredrickson (1973), the Berkeley Pattern reflects gradual expansion or assimilation of different populations rather than sudden population replacement and a gradual shift in economic emphasis.

Augustine Pattern or Late Horizon (A.D. 500 to Historic Period)

The Late Horizon is characterized by the Augustine Pattern, which represents a shift in the general subsistence pattern. Changes include the introduction of bow and arrow technology; and most importantly, acorns became the predominant food resource. Trade systems expanded to include raw resources as well as finished products. There are more baked clay artifacts and extensive use of Haliotis ornaments of many elaborate shapes and forms. Burial patterns retained the use of flexed burials with variable orientation, but there was a reduction in the use of ochre and widespread evidence of cremation (Moratto 1984). Judging from the number and types of grave goods associated with the two types of burials, cremation seems to have been reserved for individuals of higher status, whereas other individuals were buried in flexed positions. Johnson (1976) suggests that the Augustine Pattern represents expansion of the Wintuan population from the north, which resulted in combining new traits with those established during the Berkeley Pattern.

Central California research has expanded from an emphasis on defining chronological and cultural units to a more comprehensive look at settlement and subsistence systems. This shift is illustrated by the early use of burials to identify mortuary assemblages and more recent research using osteological data to determine the health of prehistoric populations (Dickel et al. 1984). Although debate continues over a single model or sequence for central California, the general framework consisting of three temporal/cultural units is generally accepted, although the identification of regional and local variation is a major goal of current archaeological research.

Ethnographic Background

Southern Maidu

At the time of European contact, the Southern Maidu tribe of California Native Americans, sometimes referred to as the Nisenan, occupied the project vicinity. The Southern Maidu occupied the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers and the lower drainages of the Feather River, bounded by the west

bank of the Sacramento River to the west, the crest of the Sierra Nevada to the east, and a few miles south of the American River to the south. The northern boundary is not well established due to the Southern Maidu's linguistic similarity with neighboring groups but extended somewhere between the Feather and Yuba rivers.

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

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

Historic Background

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

Spanish Period

The arrival and expansion of the Spanish did not have a significant effect on the Southern Maidu way of life, as contact with the Spanish was limited, and only in the southern edge of their territory. Spanish exploration of the greater Southern Maidu territory occurred when José Canizares explored the adjacent Plains Miwok territory in 1776. There is no recorded history of any Southern Maidu being removed and forced into the Spanish Mission system as neophytes, unlike their Miwok neighbors (Wilson and Towne 1978). There are numerous accounts of neophytes fleeing the missions, and a series of "Indian Wars" broke out when the Spanish tried to return them to the missions (Johnson 1976). The Southern Maidu received some of the escaped mission neophytes and felt pressure on their southern borders from displaced Miwok villages.

Mexican Period

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

European Expansion

Jedediah Smith was the first European-American to explore the Central Valley in 1828, but other fur-trapping expeditions soon followed. In the late 1820s, American trappers, as well as ones from the Hudson's Bay Company, began establishing camps in the Southern Maidu territory to trap beavers, an occupation that was said to have been peaceful (Wilson and Towne 1978). During this period, Native American populations were declining rapidly, due to an influx of Euro-American diseases. In 1832, a party of trappers from the Hudson's Bay Company, led by John Work, traveled down the Sacramento River unintentionally spreading a malaria epidemic to Native Californians. This epidemic wiped out much of the Southern Maidu, and survivors moved into the hills. Four years later, a smallpox epidemic decimated local populations, and it is estimated that up to 75 percent of the Southern Maidu population died (Cook 1976).

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

City of Folsom

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

The town soon began to prosper with new hotels and businesses, but the real boost to the local economy came with the establishment of Folsom Prison in 1880 and the Folsom Powerhouse in 1895. Plans for Folsom Prison moved forward when the wealthy Robert Livermore and family offered to donate land in exchange for prison labor to build a hydro-electric dam across the American River to power a sawmill. Although the sawmill was never established, the family soon realized that force of the dammed water could be used to provide power to Sacramento and in 1895, Folsom made history when the first long-distance transmission of electricity spanned 22 miles from Folsom to Sacramento.
As Folsom continued to grow, bridges were constructed across the American River including the Truss Bridge in 1895 and the Rainbow Bridge in 1919. In 1945, the City of Folsom was incorporated and in 1955, Folsom Dam was constructed to provide hydroelectric power and recreation for the burgeoning local population. In the mid-1960s, Johnny Cash made the City of Folsom famous with his hit single "Folsom Prison Blues" coinciding with a time when the city's economy was centered around the prison. A huge economic boom came to Folsom in 1984 when Intel opened its vast campus and established itself as the largest private employer in the Sacramento area. In the 1990s, Folsom grew rapidly as a suburb community to Sacramento and it continues to grow today as an upscale community.

Cultural Resource Record Search

On February 14, 2022, an archival records search in support of the proposed project was conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, located at California State University, Sacramento. The records searches addressed all portions of the APE and a 0.25-mile radius around the APE (hereafter referred to as the study area). Sources of information included previous survey and cultural resources files; the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility; the OHP Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File; historical topographic maps; and historical aerial photographs.

The records search identified 9 studies that have previously been conducted within the study area (**Table 6**). One study directly examined the current APE during its survey. This study is shown in bold in **Table 6** and discussed briefly below.

Table 6: Previous Studies Conducted within the Study Area

Report	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation
003925	**1990/1995**	**Derr, Eleanor / ASI Archaeology and Cultural Resources Management**	**A Cultural Resources Study for the Broadstone Master Plan Project, Sacramento County, California: Final Report / Historic Properties Treatment Plan: Broadstone II Master Plan Study Area**	**Cultural Resources Unlimited / ASI Archaeology and Cultural Resources Management**
003830	1997	Windmiller, R., L. A. Payen, and P. Payen	Evaluation of Cultural Resources Broadstone Unit 3 Folsom Sacramento County, California	None
004481	1991	Derr, Eleanor	A Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Broadstone 3 Project Involving 570 Acres Near Folsom, California, Sacramento County	None
006384	2005	Golden Hills Environmental Services	Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Golf Links Substations and Interconnecting 69kV Powerline Loop	Golden Hills Environmental Services
007121	2004	Clar, Matthew	The Status of Cultural Resources Research for the Kaiser Folsom Project Area in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, CA	None

Report	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation
009185	1991	Jones, Deborah A., Marianne Babal, Stephen D. Mikesell, and Stephen R> Wee	A Cultural Resources Study for the Folsom East Area Facilities Plan and Portions of the Sewer and Water Line System	Far Western Anthropological Research Group and Jackson Research Projects
012381	2016	Pappas, Stephen	Cultural Resources Inventory Report for the Broadstone Parkway Apartments, City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting Inc.
012382	2016	Webb, Megan and Kim Tanksley	Cultural Resources Inventory Report for East Bidwell Commercial, Sacramento County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
013491	2020	Adams, Jeremy	Addendum to Natomas Ditch System, Rhoades' Branch Ditch HAER CA-144-B, Black and White Photographs, Written Historical and Descriptive Data and Field Notes	ECORP Consulting, Inc.

Of these nine studies, one directly addressed the current APE:

- **Report 003925 –** NCIC subsumes two reports under this report number: *A Cultural Resources Study for the Broadstone Master Plan Project, Sacramento County, California: Final Report*, prepared by Cultural Resource Management in August, 1990; and *Historic Properties Treatment Plan: Broadstone II Master Plan Study Area*, prepared by ASI Archaeology and Cultural Resources Management in 1995. The 1995 report, which is most relevant to the current project, details a cultural resource investigation and archaeological survey conducted by ASI in 1994 in advance of the proposed Broadstone II Master Plan development project, a project which encompassed an 805-acre project area bordered by Bidwell Street on the east, U.S. Highway 50 on the south, an aggregated processing plant and undeveloped area to the west, and the Broadstone Unit I development and SMUD substation to the north. ASI's investigation located 87 separate cultural resources within the project area, and these were subsequently organized by the NCIC into four discrete archaeological sites and numerous archaeological isolates. The sites include **CA-SAC-308-H** (a collection of mining features associated with the Prairie Diggings Placer Mining District, which is now understood to be part of the Folsom Mining District, a district which, as a whole, is not considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, although individual elements of the district may be eligible), **CA-SAC-458/H** (the Carpenter Ranch Complex, recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP due to poor site integrity), **CA-SAC-344/H** (a multicomponent historic and prehistoric period site determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP) and **CA-SAC-434** (a series of water conveyance features, associated with the Rhodes Branch Ditch, a major component of the Natomas Water Conveyance system, portions of which have been determined eligible for inclusion in NRHP). A series of isolates including stone piles, fence alignments and isolated artifacts, were also identified during the survey, but were not recorded as archaeological sites and therefore are considered not eligible for inclusion in NRHP. Of the cultural resources identified and documented within **Report 003925** only elements of resource **CA-SAC-308H** (also known as **P-34-000335,** or the Folsom Mining District) have the potential to be present either within, or within 0.25 miles of, the currently proposed APE. As a result, of the four sites recorded by ASI only elements of site **CA-SAC-308H** have the potential to be impacted by the currently proposed project.

In addition to revealing that elements of the Folsom Mining District (**CA-SAC-308H**, or **P-34-000335**) may be present within the currently proposed APE or within the current study area, HELIX's records search also indicated that there are three more previously recorded cultural resources located within the study

area (see **Table 7** below). Resource **CA-SAC-308H** is shown in bold in **Table 7** and discussed further below the table.

Table 7: Previously Documented Resources within the Study Area

Primary	Trinomial	Year	Author(s)	Description
P-34-000335	**CA-SAC-308H**	**1992**	**Maniery, Mary L.**	**Folsom Mining District**
P-34-000021	None	1991	Jones, D., D. Glover, and L. Glover	Isolated projectile point fragment
P-34-001480	CA-SAC-903H	1990	Derr, Eleanor and Ken Mcivers	Historic walls/fences and water conveyance system
P-34-005120	None	1991	Lindstrom, S., L. Lundemo, M. Panelli, J. Wells, and N. Wilson	Southern Pacific Railroad line

- Resource **CA-SAC-308H** (or **P-34-00335**): known as the Folsom Mining District, is comprised of a variety of elements from the Folsom region's historic mining period (spanning from the 1840s through the mid-twentieth century) including mines, quarries, tailings, mining equipment, habitation sites, roads, railroad grades, water conveyances, and structural foundations. The results of HELIX's records search suggest that elements of this historic district may be present within the currently proposed APE, and or within 0.25 miles of the APE. NCIC records suggest that the Folsom Mining District taken as a unified entity has been determined to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR, but individual elements within the district may be eligible for listing and should be evaluated as eligible or ineligible on a case-by-case basis.

Historic maps and aerial photographs examined the 1953 *Clarksville, CA* USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle map and a series of aerial photographs dating from 1952 through 2018 (NETROnline 2022). The historic USGS quadrangle map does not reveal any signs of development or site occupation within the APE as of 1953, but does show that East Bidwell Street (which runs northwest by southeast just to the north of the currently proposed APE) was already developed. The map also depicts an extension of the Southern Pacific Railroad running parallel to East Bidwell Street. Less than one mile to the south of the APE, the 1953 map also depicts US Route 50 (also known as the El Dorado Freeway).

Examination of the historic aerial photograph series suggests that the APE remained undeveloped until at least 1993. By 1998 however, aerial photographs show dirt roads within the APE, which were likely used in conjunction with the development taking place on parcels adjacent west and south of the APE, as well as on parcels to the south, east, and north of the APE which lie in the current 0.25 mile study area. By 2002 the northern portion of the APE had been completed cleared and is covered in dirt and or gravel paths while its southern portion remained in vegetated cover bisected only by a dirt path. It is also clear from the 2002 photo that Broadstone Parkway (which runs approximately northeast to southwest forming the APE's western boundary) had been developed into its current (2022) form, and that by this time the parcels to the adjacent north and west of the APE had been developed into a commercial space and residential neighborhood respectively. Finally, between 2005 and 2009 the APE in its entirety was developed into a paved parking lot intended to serve the Palladio Shopping Center, which had also been built during this four-year time period, and is located adjacent to the APE's southeast boundary. These conditions remained constant within the APE and on any adjacent lots throughout the remainder of the historic aerial photograph series (NETROnline 2022).

Native American Coordination

On February 14, 2022, HELIX requested that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conduct a search of their Sacred Lands File for the presence of Native American sacred sites or human remains in the vicinity of the proposed project area. A written response received from the NAHC on March 24, 2022, stated that the Sacred Lands File failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate area.

On March 30, 2022, HELIX sent letters to 10 Native American contacts that were recommended by the NAHC as potential sources of information related to cultural resources in the vicinity of the project area:

- Dahlton Brown, Director of Administration, Wilton Rancheria
- Grayson Coney, Cultural Director, Tsi Akim Maidu
- Pamela Cubbler, Treasurer, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe
- Regina Cuellar, Chairperson, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
- Sara Dutschke, Chairperson, Ione Band of Miwok Indians
- Steven Hutchason, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Wilton Rancheria
- Rhonda Morningstar Pope, Chairperson, Buena Vista Band of Me-Wuk Indians
- Clyde Prout, Chairperson, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe
- Jesus Tarango, Chairperson, Wilton Rancheria
- Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria

The letters advised the tribes and specific individuals of the proposed project and requested information regarding cultural resources in the immediate area, as well as any feedback or concerns they may have related to the proposed project. As of the date of this document no responses have been received.

Evaluation of Cultural Resources

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation.

The records search determined that the entire APE has previously been surveyed for cultural resources and that elements of one resource, **CA-SAC-308H** (or **P-34-00335**), known as the Folsom Mining District, have been identified as potentially lying within the currently proposed APE. NCIC records indicate that the Folsom Mining District taken as a unified entity has been determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR, but that individual elements within the district may be eligible for listing and should be evaluated as eligible or ineligible on a case-by-case basis. No pedestrian survey of the APE was conducted because the entire area is currently capped by an asphalt parking lot; nevertheless, the records search results suggest that the APE should be considered to have a low to moderate sensitivity for undocumented historic-era cultural resources.

The Sacred Lands File search by the NAHC provided no evidence that sites considered important by local Native American are located in the vicinity, although replies from individual tribal members regarding potential resources in the area are still pending. Previous research has not determined that the area has more than a low potential to contain prehistoric cultural resources, and absent additional information

from Native American sources the area should be considered to have a low sensitivity for undocumented prehistoric resources.

In summary, there is a low to moderate potential for the proposed project to encounter as yet-undiscovered historical resources or unique archaeological resources, particularly those associated with the Gold Rush era. If potential historical resources or unique archaeological resources are discovered during construction, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level for questions a) and b).

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Inadvertent Discovery

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

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No human remains are known to exist within the project area nor were there any indications of human remains found during the field survey. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as trenching and grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. This is a potentially significant impact. However, if human remains are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Treatment of Human Remains

If suspected human remains are encountered during project implementation, the specific procedures outlined by the NAHC, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, would be followed:

All excavation activities within 60 feet of the remains would immediately stop, and the area would be protected with flagging or by posting a monitor or construction worker to ensure that no additional disturbance occurs.

1. The project owner or their authorized representative would contact the County Coroner.

2. The coroner would have two working days to examine the remains after being notified in accordance with HSC 7050.5. If the coroner determines that the remains are Native American and are not subject to the coroner's authority, the coroner would notify NAHC of the discovery within 24 hours.

3. NAHC would immediately notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who would have 48 hours after being granted access to the location of the remains to inspect them and make recommendations for treatment of them. Work would be suspended in the area of the find until the senior archaeologist approves the proposed treatment of human remains.

4. If the coroner determines that the human remains are neither subject to the coroner's authority nor of Native American origin, then the senior archaeologist would determine mitigation measures appropriate to the discovery.

VI. ENERGY

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

Environmental Setting

California's electricity needs are satisfied by a variety of entities, including investor-owned utilities, publicly owned utilities, electric service providers and community choice aggregators. In 2020, the California power mix totaled 272,576 gigawatt hours (GWh). In-state generation accounted 51 percent of the state's power mix. The remaining electricity came from out-of-state imports (CEC 2021a). **Table 8** provides a summary of California's electricity sources as of 2020.

Table 8: California Electricity Sources 2020

Fuel Type	Percent of California Power
Coal	2.74
Large Hydro	12.21
Natural Gas	37.06
Nuclear	9.33
Oil	0.01
Other (Petroleum Coke/Waste Heat)	0.19
Renewables (Excluding Large Hydro)	33.09
Unspecified	5.36

Source: CEC 2021a.

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

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

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

Evaluation of Energy

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

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

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

- Limit on-site truck and equipment idling to five minutes per CARB Offroad Regulation Section 2449; and,
- In accordance with CALGreen criteria as well as state and local laws, at least 50 percent of on-site construction waste and ongoing operational waste would be diverted from landfills through reuse and recycling.

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

Operation of the proposed project would increase the consumption of energy related to electricity, natural gas, water, and wastewater. However, implementation of low impact design, energy efficient, and sustainable features would also reduce the energy usage. The project design incorporates sustainable features consistent with General Plan Goal LU 9.1 and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). The project would be mitigated to meet one of the four Building Energy Sector options in the GHG Reduction Measures Consistency Checklist. The project would provide 10 electric vehicle charging stations, as required under the City's General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-8 (See Appendix B).

Hardscapes, such as pedestrian and bicycle pathways, an outdoor patio, and the main entrance would be constructed with cool paving materials (e.g., slab concrete). Cool paving areas, including shaded areas, account for approximately 51 percent of the non-roof impervious area.

Additionally, the Folsom Municipal Code requires bicycle parking 5 percent or more higher than the requirements of City Code section 17.57.00. Finally, adequate energy facilities are already located within and adjacent to the site serving the existing uses. Thus, the incremental increase associated with implementation of the project would not require the construction of new energy facilities or sources of

energy that would not otherwise be needed to serve the region. It is anticipated that these services would be provided from existing utilities on site, or from extensions from existing facilities immediately abutting the site. Therefore, energy impacts from project operation would be less than significant.

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

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	■	☐
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 or 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

The project site is situated on the eastern edge of Sacramento County, located within the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California. The project site is not located with an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there are no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones located on the project site.

Soils

Soils on the project site are mapped entirely as Argonaut-Auburn complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes (NRCS 2021). This soil class is identified as having a high drainage.

The project would require the need for limited soil excavation on the project site. Although the majority of the development would be situated on previously developed pads and improvements, the foundation is anticipated to require piers for footings.

City Regulation of Geology and Soils

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

Evaluation of Geology and Soils

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

    i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

Less than significant impact. According to the CDC Earthquake Hazards Zone Application (EQ Zapp) Map, there are no known active faults crossing the property, and the project site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone (CDC 2021b). 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. While earthquake-induced ground shaking could occur in the project vicinity, historically, seismic activity in the Folsom area has been limited. The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with standards imposed by the City of Folsom through the Grading Code, and in compliance with California Building Code requirements. Potential impacts would be reduced to levels considered acceptable in the City and region. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects of seismic events. This would be a less than significant impact and no mitigation would be required.

    iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than significant impact. The project site is a relatively flat parking lot with elevations ranging from 377 feet to 390 feet. Additionally, the project site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as mentioned in i.) and therefore, has a low seismicity. According to the soils mapping for the site, the Argonaut-Auburn complex soils onsite have a depth to the water table greater than 80 inches (NRCS 2016). The soils on the project site do not contain the characteristics typical of soils most susceptible to

liquefaction, and because the depths to groundwater are more than 80 inches below the ground surface, it is unlikely that the proposed project would be exposed to liquefaction hazards. Therefore, liquefaction is unlikely at the project site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

Less than significant impact. The project site is currently an existing parking lot and has relatively flat topography. Elevations in the project site range from 377 feet to 390 feet. According to the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the existing on-site soil ranges from 0 to 3 percent slopes. Additionally, as mentioned in i.), the project site is not located near a fault and is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone. The topography and location of the project reduces the potential of site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface rupture to almost negligible. Therefore, landslides are unlikely at the subject property and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. Soils on the project site, Argonaut-Auburn, are well drained; however, have a high runoff potential, which would indicate a higher potential for water erosion. Ground disturbing activities during construction of the project would further increase the potential for soil erosion. The 2019 CBC (California Building Code) and the City's Grading Code and standard conditions for project approval contain requirements to minimize or avoid potential effects from erosion hazards. As a condition of approval, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the City would require the applicant to prepare a soils report, a detailed grading plan, and an erosion control plan by a qualified and licensed engineer. The soils report would identify soil hazards, including potential impacts from erosion. The City would be required to review and approve the erosion control plan based on the California Department of Conservation's "Erosion and Control Handbook." The erosion control plan would identify protective measures to be implemented during excavation, temporary stockpiling, disposal, and revegetation activities.

Compliance with the City's regulations and the California Building Code requirements would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion from water to less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

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

As also discussed under "a" ii and iii, the potential for damage due to liquefaction, slope instability, and surface ruptures was considered negligible due to the relatively flat topography and location of the project site. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impact regarding unstable geological units or soils.

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

Less than significant impact. Expansive soils shrink and swell in response to changes in moisture levels. The changes in soil volumes can result in damage to structures including building foundations, and infrastructure, if the project design does not appropriately accommodate the changing soil conditions. The project site is mapped as Argonaut-Auburn complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes (Unit 107), and NRCS does not have information regarding the shrink-swell of this soil type (NRCS 2021). The proposed project would be designed to meet seismic safety requirements specified in the California Building Code, including standards to minimize impacts from expansive soils. Therefore, impacts related to the potential hazards of construction on expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

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

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No previous surveys conducted in the project area have identified the project site as sensitive for paleontological resources or other geologically sensitive resources, nor have testing or ground disturbing activities performed to date uncovered any paleontological resources or geologically sensitive resources. While the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources and other geologically sensitive resources is considered low, project-related ground disturbing activities could affect the integrity of a previously unknown paleontological or other geologically sensitive resource, resulting in a substantial change in the significance of the resource. Therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Paleontological Resources

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Environmental Setting

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 (GHGs) 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: 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 (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), 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): CO_2 – 1; CH_4 – 25; N_2O – 298.

GHG Reduction Regulations and Plans

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

Standards of Significance

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

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

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

> Projects subject to environmental review under CEQA may be eligible for tiering and streamlining the analysis of GHG emissions, provided they are consistent with the GHG reduction measures included in the General Plan and EIR. The City may review such projects to determine whether the following criteria are met:
>
> - Proposed project is consistent with the current general plan land use designation for the project site;
>
> - Proposed project incorporates all applicable GHG reduction measures (as documented in the Climate Change Technical Appendix to the General Plan EIR) as mitigation measures in the CEQA document prepared for the project; and,

- Proposed project clearly demonstrates the method, timing and process for which the project will comply with applicable GHG reduction measures and/or conditions of approval, (e.g., using a CAP/GHG reduction measures consistency checklist, mitigation monitoring and reporting plan, or other mechanism for monitoring and enforcement as appropriate).

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 with Mitigation. GHG emissions would be generated by the project during construction (vehicle engine exhaust from construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips) and during long-term operation (electricity and natural gas use, electricity resulting from water consumption; solid waste disposal, and vehicle engine exhaust).

GHG emissions were calculated used CalEEMod, as described in Methodology and Assumptions. The results of the 2025 Operational GHG Emissions are disclosed below in **Table 9.** Additionally, the results of Construction GHG Emissions are disclosed below in **Table 10**.

Table 9: Operational GHG Emissions

Emission Sources	2025 Emissions (MT CO_2e)
Area	<0.01
Energy	306.9
Mobile	259.9
Offroad	0.1
Waste	28.5
Water	4.2
Subtotal[1]	**599.7**

Source: CalEEMod (output data is provided in Attachment A)

[1] Totals may not sum due to rounding.

GHG = greenhouse gas; MT = metric tons; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

Table 10: Construction GHG Emissions

Year of Emissions	Emissions (MT CO_2e)
2023	246.92
2024	300.54
2025	32.53
SMAQMD Construction Threshold	*1,100*

Source: CalEEMod (output data is provided in Attachment A)

To determine significance of the project's GHG emissions, the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist was completed (City of Folsom 2021a; included as Attachment B)

Part 1: Land Use Consistency

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

The project parcel is designated as Regional Commercial Center (RCC) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The zoning designation of the project site is General Commercial District (C-3) Planned Development (PD). In accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist, if the project would require a change in land use designation or a rezone, consistency would be determined by calculating the estimated the GHG emissions resulting from maximum buildout of the project site allowed using the current zoning and using the proposed zoning change. If the land use designation/zoning change would not result in an increase in annual GHG emissions, the project would be consistent (City 2021a). The project would not result in a land use designation/zoning change and therefore, there would be no change in GHG emissions.

A hotel would be an allowable use for the C-3 PD zoning district. The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). Preliminary design plans show that the five-story hotel building would be approximately 66 feet in height (with towers extending up to 73 feet in height), whereas the Palladio at Broadstone Development Standards indicate that the maximum height for major buildings is three stories and 60 feet in height. A PD Permit modification would be required to modify the Development Standards to accommodate the building stories and building height. The resulting maximum buildout for the project parcel under the existing zoning would be a hotel totaling 85,473 SF of floor space. Using CalEEMod and all model defaults, 85,473 SF of a hotel building would result in approximately 600 MT CO_2e per year.

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

E-1 Building Energy Sector: The project will meet one of the four Building Energy Sector standards in the GHG Reduction Measures Consistency Checklist?

Consistent with mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 requires that the project meet one of the four Building Energy Sector requirements of the GHG Reduction Measures Consistency Checklist (Attachment B in Appendix B).

T-1 Mix of Uses: The project is a mixed-use building with two or more uses (i.e., residential, commercial, office, etc.) or if the site is five acres or larger there are two or more uses on the site connected by protected pedestrian paths (e.g., sidewalks, elevated walkways) excluding driveways?

Consistent. The project is less than 5 acres and is located within the existing parking lot associated with the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. Implementation of the proposed hotel development would include a mix of uses including office space, a library, a fitness center, laundry rooms, a restaurant and bar, and a kitchen. Sidewalks and/or pedestrian paths would connect the hotel with adjacent land uses, including the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center.

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

Consistent with Mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-2 would require the installation of bicycle parking 5 percent or more higher than the requirements of City Code section 17.57.090.

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

Consistent with Mitigation. Mitigation Measure GHG-3 would require the use of high-performance diesel for all project construction activities.

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

Consistent. The project would provide 10 electrical vehicle charging stations, pursuant to the 2019 CalGreen Standards. The City used the CALGreen standard for land use designation, which classifies a hotel as a residential development, rather than a commercial development and calls for 10 EV parking spaces for a hotel with 151 to 200 parking spaces. Mandatory compliance with CalGreen regulations would ensure consistency with City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-8 for residential electric vehicle charging station standards.

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

Mitigation Measure GHG-4 would require a minimum of 65 percent of nonhazardous construction and demolition waste to be diverted, recycled or salvaged.

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

Mitigation Measure GHG-5 would require implementation of all 2019 CALGreen Tier 1 applicable indoor and outdoor water efficiency and conservation measures.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through -5, the project would be consistent with the City's GHG Strategy. Therefore, the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1: Building Energy Sector

In accordance with the City General Plan Reduction Measure E-1, the project shall meet one of the four Building Energy Sector Requirements of the GHG Reduction Measures Consistency Checklist (Attachment B in Appendix B).

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Bicycle Parking

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

Mitigation Measure GHG-3: High-Performance Diesel

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

Mitigation Measure GHG-4: Enhanced Construction Waste Diversion

In accordance with the City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure SW-1, the project shall divert to recycle or salvage a minimum 65 of nonhazardous construction and demolition waste generated at the project site in accordance with Appendix A5 (Residential) of the as outlined in the California Green Building Standards Code (2019 CALGreen).

Mitigation Measure GHG-5: Water Efficiency

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

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

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

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for Sacramento County is the 2020 MTP/SCS adopted by the SACOG on November 18, 2019. The 2020 MTP/SCS lays out a transportation investment and land use strategy to support a prosperous region, with access to jobs and economic opportunity, transportation options, and affordable housing that works for all residents. The plan also lays out a path for improving our air quality, preserving open space and natural resources, and helping California achieve its goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (SACOG 2019). The transportation sector is the largest source of GHG emissions in the state. A project's GHG emissions from cars and light trucks are directly correlated to the project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT). According to the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) prepared for the project, the Project is anticipated to generate

at least 15 percent less VMT per capita than the regional average (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2022). This VMT reduction meets the 15 percent reduction required by SB 743. In addition to regional VMT projections, SACOG utilizes local growth projections to develop the strategies and measures in the 2020 MTP/SCS. As discussed in question a), above, there would be no change in land use and zoning, and no change in GHG emissions would result. Therefore, the regional VMT and population growth resulting from implementation of the project would be consistent with the assumptions used in the 2020 MTP/SCS.

As discussed in question a), above, with implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-5, the project would be consistent with the City's GHG Strategy, a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Therefore, the project would not conflict with CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan, the SACOG's 2020 MTP/SCS, or the City's GHG Strategy, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	■	☐
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 existing project site is a paved parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center, that has been previously rough graded. The project site has no known past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites.

The school nearest to the project site is Gold Ridge Elementary, located approximately 0.40 miles southwest of the project site at 735 Halidon Way. Other schools in the vicinity include Folsom lake College, approximately 1 mile northwest of the project, and Vista Del Lago High School, approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the project site.

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker tool (SWRCB 2021), California Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStor online tool (DTSC 2021); and the EPA's Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2021b). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, no hazardous waste sites are on the project site.

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

Evaluation of Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

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

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

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

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

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

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

No impact. The nearest school is Golden Ridge Elementary, located 0.4 miles southwest of the project site. There would be no impact, as there is no school within 0.25-miles of the project site.

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

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

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

No impact. The nearest public or public use airport is Cameron Airpark, approximately 8.0-miles northeast of the project site. At this distance, the project is not within the airport land use plan area and the project would have no impact on safety hazards or excessive noise related to airports.

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

Less than significant impact. The City of Folsom maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes as identified in the *City of Folsom Evacuation Plan* (City of Folsom 2021b). The proposed project is located in evacuation plan area #29-Broadstone, which identifies East Bidwell Street as a major evacuation route, and Broadstone Parkway and Palladio Parkway as minor evacuation routes. The proposed project would not modify any pre-designated emergency evacuation route or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout the project site to meet the Fire Department standards for fire engine maneuvering, location of fire engine to fight a fire, rescue access to the units, and fire hose access to all sides of the building. Therefore, project impacts to the City's adopted evacuation plan and emergency plans would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area. It is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone or a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021). The project site is in an urbanized area in the City of Folsom and is provided with urban levels of fire protection by the City. The site is designed for clear fire lane/fire engine access and fire hose access to all parts of the buildings. Access roads would have an internal turning radius of 25 feet and an external turning radius of 50 feet. The site does not border any areas of natural vegetation as the project site is an existing parking lot and is surrounded by residential and commercial development. Therefore, the proposed project would not

expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss due to wildland fires, and any impacts would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	■	☐
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 regional setting of the project site is primarily characterized by residential development, vacant land, and commercial shopping centers. The project site gently slopes downward from east to west, with elevations ranging from 377 feet to 390 feet. Precipitation is the only apparent source of surface water as there are no wetlands or natural drainages located on the project site.

Proposed storm drains pipes would be installed throughout the project site and would connect to existing storm drain systems along the western project boundary line. On site landscaping would also manage some on-site stormwater. The storm drain system for the proposed project would conform to City of Folsom standards and include design features consistent with the Stormwater Quality Design

Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions. The project would incorporate standard best management practices (BMP) to maintain water quality in accordance with City regulations. Because the project site is currently an existing parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center, there would be no increase in impervious surface. Landscape would be added throughout the site to increase the area of pervious surface.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps were reviewed for the project's proximity to a 100-year floodplain. The proposed project is on FEMA panel 06067C0140H, effective August 16, 2012. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2018). The site is not located in an area of important groundwater recharge. Domestic water in the City is provided solely by surface water sources, and the City is the purveyor of water to the project area.

Regulatory Framework Relating to Hydrology and Water Quality

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

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

Standard construction conditions required by the City include:

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

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

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

Additionally, the City enforces the following requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code as presented in **Table 11**.

Table 11: City of Folsom Municipal Code Sections Regulating the Effects on Hydrology and Water Quality from Urban Development

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

Source: City of Folsom 2021c.

Evaluation of Hydrology and Water Quality

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

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

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned

stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff?

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

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

Less than significant impact. The project site is highly modified, completely rough graded, and is currently an asphalt paved parking lot. Proposed utility pipes would connect to an existing sewer system, a storm drain connection, a domestic water system connection, and a fire system connection. The project site would convert a portion of an existing parking lot into a hotel with indoor and outdoor amenities. Landscaping would be incorporated throughout the site, and existing ornamental trees on site would be incorporated into the landscape design. Impervious surfaces already exist on the project site as the site is an asphalt paved parking lot.

Although the project would be constructed mainly on previously developed pads and improvement, limited and localized soil excavation would be needed for pier footings. With minimal soil excavation required for the construction of a hotel building on an existing asphalt paved parking lot, a NPDES permit would not be required. Compliance with various State and local water quality standards would ensure the proposed project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge permits, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project would also be subject to all of the City's standard code requirements, including conditions for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm drainage system, and restrictions on uses that cause water or erosion hazards.

Further, prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the applicant would be required to submit a drainage plan to the City that shows how project BMPs capture storm water runoff during project operations. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that water quality standards and discharge requirements would not be violated, and water quality in the project area is protected. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary for questions a), c), d), and e).

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

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the use of groundwater supplies because domestic water in the City is provided solely from surface water sources from the Folsom Reservoir. The development of the proposed project would not increase the amount of impervious surface as the existing project site is a paved parking lot with minimal landscape. The proposed project would decrease impervious surface through the planting of trees and shrubs throughout the project site. Further, because the proposed project would not rely on groundwater for domestic water and irrigation purposes, and the site is not an important area of groundwater recharge, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. Therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain and is not subject to flood hazard. The project site is also approximately 70 miles northeast of the nearest tsunami inundation area near Benicia, CA (California Emergency Management Agency 2009). The nearest lake is Folsom Lake, approximately 3.0 miles to the north. Based on the site's location away from the 100-year floodplain, distance from tsunami inundation area, and distance to Folsom Lake, the project site is not subject to release of pollutants due to inundation. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	■
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 site is designated as Regional Community Commercial (RCC) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The RCC designation provides for highway-oriented, large-scale regional retail, entertainment, business, lodging, and public uses. The proposed hotel is consistent with the existing General Plan designation.

The zoning designation of the site is General Commercial Planned Development District (C-3, PD). The purpose of the C-3 PD is to designate areas appropriate for heavy commercial activities. While all types of commercial activities are permitted, the C-3 zone is intended for the highest-intensity commercial activities, which include heavy auto and truck traffic. The C-3 zone should be located on major arteries and thoroughfares. Hotels are identified as a permitted land use within the Folsom Municipal Code for the C-3 PD zoning district.

Evaluation of Land Use and Planning

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The project site is surrounded by residential and commercial land uses, as well as vacant land. The proposed project would be constructed on a 1.45 acre project site within an existing 14.55 acre parcel that is currently being used as a parking for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The proposed project would not barricade East Bidwell Street, Palladio Parkway, or Broadstone Parkway. The proposed hotel would not be gated, and the proposed driveways would connect with the remaining parking lot within the parcel. The 14.55 acre parcel, including the project site and existing parking lot, would be accessible by existing driveways on East Bidwell Street, Broadstone Parkway, and Palladio Parkway. The proposed project would not interfere with the surrounding shopping centers including the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping center, Broadstone Plaza, and Broadstone Marketplace. A parking analysis was completed by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. which determined parking was sufficient for both the proposed project and the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center.

Please refer to Section XVII. Transportation for a summary of the Parking Analysis. Therefore, the proposed project would not divide an established community, and there would be no impact.

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project site has a general plan land use designation of Regional Commercial Center (RCC), and a zoning designation of General Commercial Center Planned Developed District (C-3, PD).

The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). Preliminary design plans show that the five-story hotel building would be approximately 66 feet in height (with towers that extend up to 73 feet in height), whereas the Palladio at Broadstone Development Standards indicate that the maximum height for major buildings is three stories and 60 feet in height. A PD Permit modification would be required to modify the Development Standards to accommodate the building stories and building height. The hotel appears to meet required building setbacks based on estimated distance from the property lines. Additionally, the proposed project would deviate from the parking standards approved for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center; as a result, a parking analysis would be required to demonstrate that sufficient parking is available to serve the hotel and the remainder of the shopping center. The parking analysis prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. concluded parking was sufficient for both the proposed project and the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. Please refer to Section XVII for a summary of the Parking Analysis.

With a PD Permit, the project would be deemed consistent with the existing zoning and Development Standards and impacts would be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	■
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. Based on a review of the *Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15' Quadrangle*, *Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California* (CDC 1984), no known mineral resources are mapped in the project area.

Evaluation of Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

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

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

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	■	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	■	☐

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a Noise and Vibration Assessment. Noise modeling output files and quantitative results are presented in **Appendix C**.

Environmental Setting

Existing Noise Environment

The project site is located within the northwest parking lot of the Palladio at Broadstone shopping center. Noise sources in the project vicinity are dominated by traffic noise from East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway. Additional noise sources in the area include building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems for the shopping center to the southeast and typical parking lot noise.

Noise-Sensitive Land Uses

Noise-sensitive land uses (NSLUs) 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. The closest existing NSLUs to the project site are the apartments in the Sherwood at Broadstone Apartment complex, approximately 230 feet west of the project site at the intersection of Clarksville Road and Broadstone Parkway. Additional future NSLUs in the project vicinity are multi-family residences at the Broadstone Villas project, approximately 600 feet northeast of the project site, across East Bidwell Street. As of this analysis, the Broadstone Villas project has been approved by the City but has not been constructed. See Figure 3 in Appendix C as attached to this document.

Noise Survey

A site visit and noise survey were on conducted on March 22, 2022, which included two short-term (10 minute) ambient noise measurements. Measurement M1 was conducted on the eastern corner of the project site on the sidewalk next to Via Serena (an internal street for the Palladio at Broadstone shopping center). Measurement M2 was conducted on the southeast side of Broadstone Parkway, between the intersection with Clarksville Road and Via Serena. Traffic counts were conducted during measurement M2. The noise measurement survey notes are included as Attachment A to this report. The measured noise levels are shown on Table 12, *Noise Measurement Results*.

Table 12: Noise Measurement Results

M1	
Date	March 22, 2022
Time	1:51 p.m. – 2:01 p.m.
Location	Via Serena, eastern side of the project site
Noise Level	53.6 dBA L_{EQ}
Notes	Noise primarily from vehicular traffic on East Bidwell Street, Via Serena, and within the Palladio at Broadstone parking lots.
M2	
Date	March 22, 2022
Time	2:07 p.m. – 2:17 p.m.
Location	Southeast side of Broadstone Parkway, between Clarksville Road and Via Serena.
Noise Level	62.5 dBA L_{EQ}
Notes	Noise primarily from traffic on Broadstone Parkway. Traffic count: 99 cars, 1 medium truck.

Regulatory Framework

City of Folsom General Plan Noise Element

The Safety and Noise Element of the City of Folsom General Plan regulates noise emissions from public roadway traffic on new development of residential or other noise sensitive land uses. Policy SN 6.1.2 and Table SN-1 from the General Plan provide noise compatibility standards for land uses. For transient lodging (e.g., motels, hotels) noise due to traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations, and aircraft shall be reduced to or below 65 CNEL for outdoor activity areas and reduced to or below 45 CNEL for interior use areas. For other land uses that may be affected by project-generated traffic noise, the exterior noise compatibility limit is: 60 CNEL for single-family residential uses; 65 CNEL for multi-family residential uses; and 70 CNEL for commercial residential uses (City 2021d).

Policy SN 6.1.8 requires construction projects and new development anticipated to generate a significant amount of vibration to ensure acceptable interior vibration levels at nearby noise-sensitive uses based on Federal Transit Administration criteria. Table SN-3 from the General Plan provides vibration impact criteria. For construction with infrequent vibration events, impacts would be significant if nearby residences are subject to ground borne vibrations in excess of 80 VdB (City 2021d).

City of Folsom Municipal Code

For stationary noise sources, the City has adopted a Noise Ordinance as Section 8.42 of the City Municipal Code (City of Folsom 1993). The Noise Ordinance establishes hourly noise level performance standards that are most commonly quantified in terms of the one-hour average noise level (L_{EQ}). Using the limits specified in Section 8.42.040 of the Noise Ordinance, noise levels generated on the project site for 30 or more minutes in any hour would be significant if they exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA L_{EQ} from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., measured at off-site residential property boundaries. Section 8.42.060 exempts construction noise from these standards provided that construction does not occur before 7:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday.

Methodology and Assumptions

Noise Modeling Software

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

Modeling of the exterior noise environment for this report was accomplished using the Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA) model version 2021. Traffic noise was evaluated within CadnaA using the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5 (USDOT 2004). The noise models used in this analysis were developed from the site plan provided by the project architect. Input variables included building mechanical equipment reference noise levels, road alignment, lane configuration, projected traffic volumes, estimated truck composition percentages, and vehicle speeds.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

The one-hour L_{EQ} traffic noise level is calculated utilizing peak-hour traffic. The model-calculated afternoon peak hour (PM peak hour) L_{EQ} noise output is the equivalent to the CNEL (Caltrans 2009). The modeling includes the project buildings but does not account for terrain or off-site buildings and structures. The project Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) did not include an intersection analysis or data for calculation of peak hour traffic volumes on streets in the project vicinity (T. Kear 2022). Existing and future traffic for East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway Traffic was estimated from intersection turning counts included in the TIA for the Broadstone Villas project (T. Kear 2021). Because the project trip distribution was not available, all project PM peak hour trips reported in the project TIA (6 total) were conservatively assumed to travel on all analyzed roadway segments. The PM peak hour traffic volumes used in the analysis is shown in Table 13, *PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes*. The noise modeling input and output is included as Attachment B to this report. Traffic was assumed to be comprised of a typical mix of vehicles for suburban streets in California: 96 percent cars and light trucks; 3 percent medium trucks and buses; and 1 percent heavy trucks.

Table 13: PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Roadway Segment	Existing (2021)	Existing (2021) + Project	Cumulative (2026)[1]	Cumulative (2026) + Project[1]
East Bidwell Street – Iron Point Road to Broadstone Parkway	3,894	3,900	4,621	4,627
East Bidwell Street – Broadstone Parkway to Scholar Way	3,469	3,475	4,103	4,109
Broadstone Parkway – Iron Point Road to East Bidwell Street	1,822	1,828	1,842	1,848
Broadstone Parkway – East Bidwell Street to Scholar Way	1,795	1,801	1,802	1,808

Source: T. Kear 2021; T. Kear 2022

[1] Cumulative traffic volumes include approved projects.

Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning

The project would use commercial-sized HVAC units located on the rooftop of the building. The units would be located behind a parapet wall of equal or greater height to the HVAC unit, which would provide substantial noise attenuation. The exact HVAC model has not been determined as of this analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, twenty Carrier 50PG 12-ton HVAC units, with a sound power level (S_{WL}) of 80.0 dBA, were used to model the noise impacts from the proposed project's HVAC system (Carrier 2008). The manufacturer's noise data for the HVAC units is provided below in Table 14, *HVAC Condenser Noise Data.* Standard HVAC planning assumes approximately one ton of HVAC for every 350 SF of habitable space (American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Engineers [ASHRAE] 2012). Based on the 85,473 SF building size, approximately 244 tons of HVAC would be required for the project which equals twenty Carrier 50PG 12-ton units (or similar systems).

Table 14: HVAC Condenser Noise Data (S_{WL} dBA)

63 Hz	125 Hz	250 Hz	500 Hz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	8 kHz	Overall Noise Level
90.4	83.1	80.9	77.8	75.2	70.0	66.1	57.6	80.0

Source: Carrier 2008

S_{WL} = sound power level; Hz = Hertz; kHz = kilohertz

Emergency Generator

The project would include an approximately 77-kilowatt (kW) emergency generator. The site plan shows a security enclosure around the generator. However, the details of the enclosure construction were not known at the time of this analysis. Therefore, no noise reduction from noise barriers around the generator was assumed in the modeling. The specific model of generator has not been determined as of this analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, a Generac model QT080 80 kW generator with a rated sound output of 74 dBA measured at 23 feet was used to model the noise impacts from the proposed project's generator (Generac 2022).

Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, implementation of the project would result in a significant adverse impact if it would:

1. Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the City of Folsom General Plan or noise ordinance;

2. Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground borne noise levels; or

3. 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 use airport or private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise.

Per the City General Plan, impacts related to the generation of noise on the project site would be significant if noise levels generated on the project site would be significant if they exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA L_{EQ} from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. at off-site residential property boundaries. For traffic-related noise, impacts would be considered significant if the project would cause ambient noise levels at nearby NSLUs to exceed the noise compatibility limits defined in the City General Plan or would increase by ambient noise levels by 1.5 CNEL or more.

In accordance with the City Municipal Code, any noise from project construction activity would be considered significant for construction occurring before 7:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday. In addition, construction noise measured at off-site NSLUs would be significant if it resulted in a perceived doubling of loudness, estimated to be an increase of 10 dBA above ambient noise levels.

In accordance with the City Municipal Code, excessive ground-borne vibration would occur if construction-related ground-borne vibration exceeds 80 VdB at nearby residential properties.

Evaluation of Noise

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation.

Construction Noise

The nearest NSLUs to the project site area are multi-family residences approximately 230 feet west of the project site. Heavy earthmoving equipment would have the potential to be used along the project's periphery, including rubber-tired dozers, backhoes, and graders. Modeling shows that the combined noise from a dozer, backhoe and grader would result in 69.9 dBA L_{EQ} at the closest residential property. Because construction equipment would be mobile as it moves across the project site, the noise level experienced by the neighboring uses would vary throughout the day. The modeling output for the anticipated construction equipment is included in Attachment B to this report.

According to the City Code Section 8.42.060, noise sources associated with construction of the project which are conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, are exempt from the City noise standard (City 1993). Furthermore, the calculated short-term construction noise would be

approximately 3 dBA higher than the calculated ambient traffic noise (see the off-site traffic noise discussions, below). A 3 dBA increase in ambient noise levels is generally just perceptible in typical outdoor environments and daytime construction noise increases would be less than significant. Nighttime construction noise is not anticipated for the project. However, nighttime construction is not exempt from the City Noise Ordinance and would exceed the nighttime standard of 45 dBA if it were to occur, resulting in a temporarily significant noise impact.

Operational Noise

Off-Site Traffic Noise

As described above, modeling of the exterior noise environment for this report was accomplished using CadnaA and the TNM. According to the TIA, the project is expected to generate approximately 504 daily trips and 6 trips during the PM peak hour (T. Kear 2022). Future traffic noise levels presented in this analysis are based on traffic volumes (as described above) for the existing (2021), existing (2021) plus project; cumulative (2026); and cumulative (2026) plus project scenarios. The modeling does not account for intervening terrain or structures (e.g., sound walls, buildings).

The calculated off-site traffic noise levels are shown in Table 15, *Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels*. In typical outdoor environments, a 3 dBA increase in ambient noise level is considered just perceptible and a 5 dBA increase is considered distinctly perceptible. In areas where existing or future ambient noise exceeds the land use compatibility standards, an individual project's contribution to increases in ambient noise level could be considered significant if it exceeds 1.5 dBA. Because most of the areas along the analyzed road segments already exceed the land use noise compatibility standard listed in the city General Plan (60 dBA CNEL for low density residential; 65 dBA CNEL for multi-family residential and hotels, and 70 dBA for commercial), this analysis uses a threshold of a 1.5 dBA CNEL increase to determine significance of the impact.

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

On-Site Noise

Potential noise sources on the project site, including roof-top mounted HVAC systems and a ground level mounted emergency generator, were analyzed using the CadnaA software. Modeling assumed one hour of continuous operation of all equipment. Modeled noise levels were analyzed at receivers placed at the property line of nearby NSLUs (see Figure 3 for NSLU areas), and at the closest buildings of the Palladio at Broadstone shopping center to the southeast, at a height of five feet above the ground. The modeled 1-hour (L_{EQ}) noise level at the adjacent property lines is compared with the City nighttime standard in Table 4, *Operational On-Site Noise*. As shown in Table 16, noise from the project's HVAC systems would not exceed the City noise ordinance nighttime standard of 45 dBA L_{EQ}. Since the City's daytime noise ordinance standard (50 dBA L_{EQ}) is higher than the nighttime standard, impacts from project on-site noise would be less than significant.

Table 15: Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	Existing (2021) (CNEL)	Existing + Project (CNEL)	Change in CNEL	2026 (CNEL)	2026 + Project (CNEL)	Change in CNEL
East Bidwell Street – Iron Point Road to Broadstone Parkway (multi- family residential uses)	67.0	67.0	<0.1	67.1	67.1	<0.1
East Bidwell Street – Broadstone Parkway to Scholar Way (commercial uses)	69.5	69.5	<0.1	69.6	69.6	<0.1
Broadstone Parkway – Iron Point Road to East Bidwell Street (multi- family residential uses)	69.5	69.5	<0.1	70.1	70.2	0.1
Broadstone Parkway – East Bidwell Street to Scholar Way (single- family residential uses)	72.4	72.4	<0.1	73.1	73.1	<0.1

Source: TNM version 2.5

Table 16: Operational On-Site Noise

Receptor	Description			
		Modeled Nighttime Noise	Nighttime Standard	Exceed Standards?
R1	Multi-family residences across Broadstone Parkway	28.9	45	No
R2	Future multi-family residences across East Bidwell Street	28.5	45	No
C1	Palladio at Broadstone retail building	31.2	45	No[1]
C2	Palladio at Broadstone retail building	32.1	45	No[1]

Source: CadnaA; City Noise Ordinance Sections 8.42.050

[1] Commercial land uses are not considered noise sensitive and the ordinance standard does not apply.

On-Site Traffic Noise

Modeling of the exterior noise environment on the project site was accomplished using the CadnaA model and the road segment traffic volumes, as described above.

Exterior Noise

As discussed above, the City General Plan Safety and Noise Element has established an exterior noise standard of 65 dBA CNEL for transient lodging outdoor activity areas, defined as: “Outdoor activity areas for nonresidential developments are considered to be those common areas where people generally congregate, including outdoor seating areas.” (City 2021d). The patio located at the eastern corner of the hotel would be the outdoor activity areas for the project The modeling shows ground level noise for the patio area would be approximately 64 dBA CNEL. This noise level would not exceed the City exterior noise standard and the impact would be less than significant.

Interior Noise

Standard building design and construction using current building codes provides approximately 20 dBA of exterior to interior noise reduction with the windows and doors closed. The noise at the exterior facades for the project buildings was modeled for hotel rooms on the second through fifth floors facing towards East Bidwell Street (northeast) and Broadstone Parkway (northwest), and is shown in Table 17, *Building Exterior Noise Levels*.

Table 17: Building Exterior Noise Levels

Hotel Room Floor	Northeast Wall (CNEL)	Northwest Wall (CNEL)
Second	63.7	63.7
Third	63.6	63.7
Fourth	63.6	63.7
Fifth	63.6	63.8

Source: CadnaA version 2021

Buildings with exterior noise levels exceeding 65 dBA could result in interior noise levels in excess of the City General Plan Safety and Noise Element standard of 45 dBA CNEL. No exterior noise levels would exceed 65 dBA CNEL. Interior noise impacts would be less than significant.

Impact Conclusion

If project construction activities were to occur outside the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, construction noise generated by the project would not be exempt for the City's noise ordinance nighttime exterior standard of 45 dBA, and the impact would be potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation measure NOI-1 would restrict construction hours.

The addition of permanent project-generated traffic vicinity on roadways would not result in a discernable increase in ambient noise levels. The project would not expose future project customers to noise levels that exceed compatibility guidelines in the General Plan.
Long-term operation of project would not result in noise levels from on-site sources, including HVAC systems and an emergency generator, exceeding the city noise ordinance standards, measured at the property line of the closest NSLUs to the project site.

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-01, the project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the Folsom General Plan or noise ordinance and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure NOI-01: Construction Noise Reduction Measures

Construction Hours/Scheduling: Construction activities for all phases of construction, including servicing of construction equipment shall only be permitted during the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction shall be prohibited on Sundays and on all holidays. Delivery of materials or equipment to the site and truck traffic coming to and from the site shall be restricted to the same construction hours specified above.

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

Less than significant impact. An on-site source of vibration during project construction would be a vibratory roller (primarily used to achieve soil compaction as part of the foundation and paving construction), which could be used within approximately 230 feet of the multi-family residences across Broadstone Parkway to the west. A large vibratory roller creates approximately 0.21 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet, or 94.4 VdB. At a distance of 230 feet, a vibratory roller would create a PPV of 0.018 in/sec, or 73 VdB.[1] This would not exceed the City General Plan residential standard of 80 VdB for infrequent events. Once operational, the project would not be a source of groundborne vibrations. Therefore, the project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and the impact would be less than significant.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Less than significant impact. The closest airports to the project site are the Cameron Park Airport, approximately 7.6 miles to the northeast, and Mather Airport, approximately 10.7 miles to the southwest. The project site is not located within the influence area or noise contours for the Cameron Park Airport (El Dorado County 2012). The project site is located within the review area identified in the Mather Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The project site is beneath the approach paths for runways 22 Left and 22 Right, however, the project site is not with the 60 dBA noise contour for the airport (Sacramento County Association of Governments 2020). Therefore, although the project site is subject to overflight by aircraft approaching and departing Mather Airport, the customers of the proposed project or people working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive levels of noise due to aircraft or airport operations, and the impact would be less than significant.

[1] Equipment PPV = Reference PPV * $(25/D)^n$(in/sec), where Reference PPV is PPV at 25 feet, D is distance from equipment to the receptor in feet, and n= 1.1 (the value related to the attenuation rate through the ground); formula from Caltrans 2020. VdB = 20 * Log(PPV/4/10^{-6}).

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Environmental Setting

Folsom's estimated population in 2019 was 81,328 people (U.S. Census Bureau 2019). The population is projected to increase to 97,485 by 2035 (City of Folsom 2018a). The proposed project would construct a five (5) story hotel with 130 rooms and 8 executive suites on a 1.45-acre project site.

Evaluation of Population and Housing

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

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of an 85,473 sf hotel building with 130 hotel rooms and 8 executive suites. The project would be constructed on an existing parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. Existing backbone infrastructure and roads in the area would not need to be expanded or extended as a result of the project. Proposed vehicle and pedestrian entrance driveways would connect to existing roads in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not interfere with existing driveways on East Bidwell Street, Palladio Parkway, Broadstone Parkway, and Via Serena.

The proposed project would not induce substantial growth in the City of Folsom. The proposed hotel complex would bring in guests for a temporary period of time and would not result in permanent population growth. It is anticipated that employees associated with the proposed project would reside locally. However, if future employees move to the City of Folsom for work, it would be within the projected increase in population from planned growth as projected in the City's Housing Element. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation would be required.

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

No impact. The project site is currently a parking lot for the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. Therefore, there would be no impact on displacement of existing people or housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	■	☐
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 all utilities and services. Public services provided by the City of Folsom in the project area include fire, police, school, library, and park services. The site is served by all public utilities including domestic water, wastewater treatment, and storm water utilities.

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

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

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) would supply electricity to the project site. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) provides natural gas to the area and would provide natural gas to the project site. Water and sewer services would be provided by the City of Folsom, and telephone lines would be provided by SureWest.

Evaluation of Public Services

a) Fire protection?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would connect on-site fire suppression to an existing fire suppression system on the eastern boundary line. The project would include fire hydrants, exterior Fire Department Connection assemblies, and fire riser rooms. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained to meet the Fire Department standards for fire engine maneuvering, location of fire engine to fight a fire, rescue access to the units, and fire hose access to all sides of the building. The internal turning radius for emergency vehicles would be 25 feet and the external turning radius would be 50 feet. The proposed project would not significantly increase fire service demands or render the current service level to be inadequate, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Police Protection?

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

c) Schools?

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

d) Parks?

Less than significant impact. The proposed hotel would accommodate guests staying in the City of Folsom and would create a temporary demand for park and recreational facilities. The nearest park is Handy Family Park, located approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site at 1560 Cavitt Drive. Some additional temporary use of community parks is anticipated, however, the parks in the area have sufficient size, facilities, and infrastructure to accommodate any increased use that may result from the project. The proposed project would include outdoor recreational facilities, such as an outdoor patio and pedestrian/ bicycle access pathways, and indoor amenities, such as a fitness center, a bar and restaurant, meeting rooms, a lobby and lounge area, etc. Even with the inclusion of outdoor and indoor amenities, the development of the proposed project could create a short-term, temporary increase of nearby parks and recreational facilities. However, a temporary increase to nearby recreational facilities due to short-term guests staying in the hotel would not create any long-term impacts to parks. Additionally, the project would be required to pay park fees to offset the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities. Therefore, potential impacts from the proposed project on parks would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

e) Other Facilities?

Less than significant impact. The project site is within the urban area of Folsom served by adequate police, fire, and emergency services. The proposed hotel building could create a short-term, temporary increase in park demand, but would not create a long-term impact. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of parks and other public facilities or would result in the degradation of those facilities. Potential impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be necessary.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	■	☐
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 park is Handy Family Park, located approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site at 1560 Cavitt Drive. The proposed project would provide some on-site recreational amenities to residents, including an outdoor patio, benches, and pedestrian/ bicycle access pathways throughout the project site. The proposed project would also include a variety of indoor amenities including a fitness center, meeting rooms, a lobby and lounge area, a kitchen, a library, office space, a bar and restaurant, and a laundry room. Additionally, the proposed project would have a pedestrian access pathway to the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center located just east of the project site, as well as pedestrian/ bicycle access to additional commercial shopping centers in the vicinity of the project site.

Evaluation of Recreation

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would bring in temporary guests that might result in an increase of short-term use of community parks. However, parks in the area have sufficient size, facilities, and infrastructure to accommodate any short-term increased use that may result from the project. Onsite outdoor and indoor facilities associated with the hotel would moderate any increase in demand for offsite parks. The project would be required to pay park fees to offset the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities. Potential impacts to existing parks would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. Indoor and outdoor amenities would be located throughout the project site. Indoor amenities include a fitness center, a lobby and lounge area, restrooms, a library, a kitchen, a bar and restaurant, meeting rooms, office space, and a laundry room. Outdoor amenities include an

outdoor patio on the eastern side of the hotel building, and benches, pedestrian access, and bicycle access pathways located throughout the project site. The proposed pedestrian pathways would connect to the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center located just east of the project site.

The projects indoor and outdoor facilities as well as existing neighborhood parks are anticipated to adequately serve the recreation demands of temporary guests of the proposed hotel. Potential impacts on recreational facilities would be less than significant.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	■	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	■

The discussion below is based on a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. (T. Kear 2022). The TIS is summarized below and included in **Appendix D**.

Environmental Setting

Study Scenarios

Two scenarios were identified for inclusion in this TIS through consultation with City staff. These study scenarios were used to evaluate Project impacts:

- Existing 2022 without Project condition
- Existing 2022 with Project condition

Analysis of the existing condition reflects the traffic volumes and roadway geometry at the time the study began. This scenario quantifies performance measures for the existing condition and serves as a known reference point for those familiar with the study area. These scenarios, with and without the Project, identify Project related impacts anticipated to occur if the Project opened this year.

The Palladio and Project Area Roadways

The Palladio shopping center, where the Project is located, consists of approximately 562.7 ksf of commercial space plus two cinemas with a combined 23 movie screens.

- 500,394 square feet of Retail/Restaurant space,
- 62,352 square feet of office space, and
- 1,450 cinema seats

Required parking per City requirements is 2,764 spaces for the existing uses. There are currently 3,272 spaces, which provides 508 excess parking spaces. (Note that the Project will increase required parking while eliminating parking spaces. Adequacy of the supplied parking with the Project is discussed in Section 4.1 of this report.

East Bidwell Street runs through the City of Folsom from White Rock Road to Riley Street. Near the Project area, East Bidwell Street is a six-lane arterial roadway with a raised median, bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections. The speed limit on East Bidwell Street north of US 50 is 45 mph. East Bidwell Street fronts the eastern edge of the Palladio.

Iron Point Road is an east-west arterial roadway with a raised median that runs from Folsom Boulevard to the eastern city limit along the north side of US 50. Within the vicinity of the Project, Iron Point Road has six lanes, bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. The posted speed limit is 45 mph. Turn pockets are provided at intersections.

Palladio Parkway is a private two-lane north-south roadway fronting the western edge of the Palladio. Folsom stage line route 10 utilizes Palladio Parkway. The roadway includes turn pockets, curb, gutter, and sidewalks. Raised medians are provided near the intersection with Iron Point Rd and the intersection with Broadstone Parkway. Posted speed 25 mph.

Broadstone Parkway in the project vicinity is a four-lane arterial. It is an east-west connection running from Iron Point Rd to Empire Ranch Road near the Sacramento - El Dorado County line, wrapping around the northern edge of the Palladio. Broadstone Parkway has bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections. Folsom Stage Line route 10 fronts the Project along Broadstone Parkway, with the nearest stops being approximately 250 feet and 350 feet from the Project (depending on direction of travel). Posted speed is 45 mph.

Methodology and Significance Criteria

Trip Generation

Trip Generation is estimated as part of the Project analysis and used to document that traditional level-of-service analysis is not required for the Project. Project trip generation is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual[2], to estimate daily, AM peak-hour, and PM peak-hour trips for the Project, and the remainder of the Palladio shopping center. Internal trip capture between the Project and the reminder of the Palladio was estimated based on the methodologies published by the Transportation research board[3], and ITE[4]

Vehicles Miles Traveled

Under State Law (SB 743), on July 1, 2020, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will become the only metric for evaluating significant transportation impacts in environmental impact analyses required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Without specific General Plan guidance for VMT thresholds, this analysis uses a qualitative screening against The Governors' Office of Planning and Research (OPR) guidance of a 15% per capita VMT reduction and utilizes OPR's suggested exemption for affordable housing projects.

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

[2] ITE (2021) ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th ed, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington DC.
[3] NCHRP (2011) Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Estimation for Mixed-Use Developments, Transportation Research Board, Washington DC.
[4] ITE (2017) Trip Generation Handbook, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington DC.

Policy NCR 3.1.3 "Encourage efforts to reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). These efforts could include encouraging mixed-use development promoting a jobs/housing balance, and encouraging alternative transportation such as walking, cycling, and public transit."

OPR has published guidance recommending a CEQA threshold for transportation impacts of land use projects of a 15% VMT reduction per capita, relative to either city or regional averages based on the California's Climate Scoping Plan[5]. Qualitative assessment of VMT reduction is acceptable to screen projects[6].

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

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

To support jurisdictions' SB743 implementation, The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) staff developed thresholds and screening maps for residential and office projects, using outputs from the 2016 base year travel demand model run for the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (MTP/SCS). SACOG travel demand model is activity/tour based and is designed to estimate an individual's daily travel, accounting for land use, transportation and demographics that influence peoples' travel behaviors.

For residential projects, the threshold is defined as total household VMT per capita achieving 15% of reduction compared to regional (or any appropriate sub-area) average. The SACOG screening map uses "hex" geography, with each hex being about 1000 feet on edge. Residential VMT per capita per hex is calculated by tallying all household VMTs, including VMT traveling outside the region, generated by the residents living at the hex and divided by the total population in the hex. Hexes are then color coded with green and blue hexes depicting neighborhoods with at least a 15% reduction in residential VMT relative to the SACOG region. Yellow, orange, pink and red hexes have less than a 15% VMT reduction.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Transit Facilities

Pedestrian, bicycle, and transit impacts are based on a review of attributes of the proposed project and published plans from the City and schedule/route information from Sacramento Regional RT, Folsom Stage Lines, and El Dorado County Transit. A Project impact is considered significant if implementation of the Project would:

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

[5] OPR (2018) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts In CEQA, http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf.
[6] OPR's webinar on SB 743 implementation, 4/16/2020.

Parking and Onsite Circulation Review Methodology

Parking and internal circulation analysis is based on a comparison between the attributes of the Project and City requirements for parking and emergency vehicle access. Crash history at the Palladio's adjacent driveways is also summarized and discussed. Access or parking that fail to meet city requirements are considered to be deficient[7], as is the potential addition of traffic to any driveway found to have a comparatively high rate of accidents which could be prevented or reduced by safety treatments would be considered an impact.

Assessment of Proposed Project

Trip Generation

Projected traffic generated by the proposed Project is provided in **Table 18**. Because the Project is anticipated to generate fewer than 50 new external AM or PM peak-hour trips, no level-of-service analysis is required or performed. Internal trip calculations are attached for reference.

Vehicles Miles Traveled

Folsom General Plan policy NCR 3.1.3 addressed vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as shown below:

Policy NCR 3.1.3 "Encourage efforts to reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). These efforts could include encouraging mixed-use development promoting a jobs/housing balance, and, encouraging alternative transportation such as walking, cycling, and public transit."

The Governors' Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has published guidance recommending a CEQA threshold for transportation impacts of land use projects of a 15% VMT reduction per capita, relative to either city or regional averages, based on the California's Climate Scoping Plan[8]. Qualitative assessment of VMT reduction is acceptable to screen projects[9].

Under State Law (SB 743), VMT became the only CEQA threshold of significance for transportation impacts on July 1, 2020. Without specific General Plan guidance for VMT thresholds, this analysis uses qualitative screening against OPR's guidance of a 15% per capita VMT reduction.

[7] "Deficient" is used rather than "impact" where the concern relates to a General Plan or City requirement rather than a CEQA impact.

[8] OPR (2018) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts In CEQA, http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf.

[9] OPR's webinar on SB 743 implementation, 4/16/2020.

Table 18: Project Trip Generation

Land Use	ITE Land Use	Quantity	Units	Category	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
						Tot	In	Out	Tot	In	Out
AC Hotel (Project)	#312	138	Rooms	Total Rate	4.02	0.34	41%	59%	0.35	59%	41%
				Total Veh Trips	555	47	19	28	48	28	20
Palladio Retail (Occupied)	#820	263.2	KSF	Total Rate	37.01	2.87	55%	45%	4.09	50%	50%
				Total Veh Trips	9741	755	415	340	1076	538	538
Palladio Retail (Available)	#820	108.3	KSF	Total Rate	37.01	2.87	55%	45%	4.09	50%	50%
				Total Veh Trips	4008	311	171	140	443	222	221
Palladio Restaurants (Occupied)	#932	90.9	KSF	Total Rate	66.72	13.68	57%	43%	16.35	51%	49%
				Total Veh Trips	9,744	1244	709	535	1486	758	728
Preschool & Daycare (Occupied)	#565	4.4	KSF	Total Rate	47.62	11.73	57%	43%	11.82	47%	53%
				Total Veh Trips	210	52	30	22	52	24	28
Medical (Occupied)	#720	10.1	KSF	Total Rate	36.00	3.74	59%	41%	4.79	40%	60%
				Total Veh Trips	364	38	22	16	48	19	29
Aquarium (Occupied)	#580	22.5	KSF	Total Rate	n/a	0.35	40%	60%	0.66	71%	29%
				Total Veh Trips	n/a	8	3	5	15	11	4
Palladio Cinemas	#445	23	Screens	Total Rate	220	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.11	49%	521%
				Total Veh Trips	5060	n/a	n/a	n/a	624	306	318
Palladio Office Uses (Occupied)	#712	29	KSF	Total Rate	14.39	2.61	60%	40%	3.15	42%	58%
				Total Veh Trips	417	76	46	30	91	38	53
Palladio Office Uses (Available)	#712	34.3	KSF	Total Rate	14.39	2.61	60%	40%	3.15	42%	58%
				Total Veh Trips	494	90	54	36	108	45	63
Palladio Total (Occupied without Project)				Total Veh Trips	25,536	2173	1225	948	3392	1694	1698
Palladio Total (Available)				Total Veh Trips	4,502	401	225	176	551	267	284
Project				Total Veh Trips	555	47	19	28	48	28	20
				Palladio Internal to/from Hotel	> 51	9	1	8	42	25	17
				New External Project Trips	**< 504**	**38**	**18**	**20**	**6**	**3**	**3**

Trip Generation Source

ITE (2021) ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th ed, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington DC.

Trip Internalization Source

NCHRP (2011) Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Estimation for Mixed-Use Developments, Transportation Research Board, Washington DC.

ITE (2017) Trip Generation Handbook, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington DC.

To support jurisdictions' SB743 implementation, SACOG developed thresholds and screening maps. Commercial (office) and residential projects have separate screening tools to screen office projects located in areas with work-tour VMT 15% below the regional average for office projects and residential projects located in areas with residential VMT 15% below the regional average. The Project (a hotel) is being treated as a residential project for screening purposes because its primary function is short to medium term housing. It should also be noted that, in general, hotel projects reduce VMT. The Project site is not located in an area with a unique draw, but rather will pull from other existing hotels. The proximity to gas, food, and general retail establishments in the adjacent shopping center is anticipated to reduce trips over a stand-alone hotel development. The net effect of the Project on VMT should shift

trips from other properties to create more efficient origin-destination pairs, and to reduce ancillary trips by hotel guests and employees through utilization of the adjacent shopping. If the Project is not constructed, potential guests would stay at the next most convenient hotel which is in general going to be further from the business or resident the hotel guests ultimately need to visit. SACOG generated these maps using outputs from the 2016 base year travel demand model run for the 2020 MTP/SCS. SACOG's travel demand model is activity/tour based and is designed to estimate an individual's daily travel, accounting for land use, transportation and demographics that influence peoples' travel behaviors. For residential projects, the threshold is defined as total household VMT per capita achieving 15% of reduction compared to regional average VMT. The map uses HEX geography. Residential VMT per capita per HEX is calculated by tallying all household VMTs, including VMT traveling outside the region, generated by the land uses within the HEX and divided by the total population in the HEX. Green hexagons denote areas where residential VMT is 50% to 85% of the regional average and yellow hexagons denote areas where residential VMT is 85% to 100% of the regional average. Orange denotes anticipated VMT greater than the regional average.

The Project is located within one of the green hexagons with average residential VMT of 15.45 miles per capita (per day). The Project is anticipated to generate less than 85% of the regional, county, or City of Folsom average per capita residential daily VMT.

Internal Circulation and Site Plan Review

Parking Requirements

Parking is discussed both in terms of the Project, and the Palladio shopping center as a whole (accounting for reciprocal parking). Note that the Palladio has unique parking requirements that reflect existing reciprocal parking agreements.

City requirements for the Project:

- 138 rooms at 1 space per room = 138 spaces;
- Other facilities (retail, office, food services @ 1 space per 225 for sqft for retail/dining and 1 space per 250 sqft for office) = 20 spaces;
- Total required parking = 158 spaces.

Project parking spaces provided:

- On-site parking: 28 spaces (12 regular + 5 handicap + 1 handicap van accessible + 8 regular EV charging + 1 handicap EV Charging + 1 handicap van accessible EV Charging = 28);
- Reciprocal Parking in adjacent Palladio surface lot: 134 spaces;
- Total parking provided = 162 spaces.

City Requirements for the Palladio with the Project:

Note that the Palladio has unique parking requirements that reflect existing reciprocal parking agreements.

- Retail/Restaurant: 500,394 sqft @ 1 space per 225 sqft = 2,224 spaces.
- Office: 62,352 sqft @ 1 space per 250 sqft = 250 spaces.
- Cinema: 1450 seats at 1 space per 5 seats = 290 spaces.
- Project (AC Hotel) = 162 spaces.
- Total required parking = 2,926 spaces.

Palladio with Project parking provided:

- Existing 3272 spaces;
- Less, lost surface parking at Project site of 218 spaces;
- Plus, new on-site parking at Project site of 28 spaces;
- Total Palladio parking with Project = 3,110 spaces.

The project provides four excess parking spaces, and the Palladio, as a whole, provides 184 excess parking spaces with the addition of the Project.

Minimum Required Throat Depth

Minimum Required Throat-Depth (MRTD): The Project does not change the provided throat depth of the Palladio driveways. The Palladio includes less than 800 ksf of space (existing land uses, assuming 120 KSF for the cinemas and 86 KSF for the Project). Development standards require 975-feet of throat depth for an 800 ksf shopping center accessing streets with greater than a 60' right-of-way[10]. This 975-foot length represents vehicle storage equivalents, which means the total required length may be achieved by summing the throat depths for several access points if more than one access point is to serve the site.

Throat-Depth Provided: Aerial imagery shows 10 Palladio driveways with a combined throat depth of approximately 1,600 feet.

Emergency Vehicle Access

The Project's internal drive aisles are designed with minimum 25-foot inner and 50-foot turning radii to accommodate Fire Department access.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Transit Facilities

The Project does not inhibit the use of bicycle or pedestrian facilities; eliminate existing bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; or prevent the implementation of planned bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. On-site pedestrian walkways wrap around most of the Project, with seven crosswalks connecting to the rest of the Palladio.

Accident History and Safety

Five years (1/1/2015 – 12/31/2020) of Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) collision data for the three Palladio driveways closest to the Project were reviewed to identify any potential safety issues associated with the Project access points. Two injury accidents occurred at the northernmost Palladio driveway to East Bidwell Street during that period:

- All parties in both accidents were headed southbound on East Bidwell Street;
- Both were rear-end crashes where the at-fault party rear-ended a stopped vehicle and were cited for unsafe speed.

[10] Folsom (2020) Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards, site access Table 12-1, https://www.folsom.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=66183.89&BlobID=38340.

These two accidents associated with through traffic on East Bidwell Street and downstream signals and would not be affected by Project traffic utilizing that driveway. There were no reported accidents at the Palladio driveways to Broadstone Parkway or Palladio Parkway.

Site triangles were also reviewed at the three Palladio driveways closest to the Project. The Palladio driveway to Broadstone Parkway is located on the inside of a corner where landscaping can limit visibility. It should be noted that this potential issue was not identified during site visits and likely does not exist today, but should be monitored and maintained by the applicant.

Evaluation of Transportation

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

Less than significant impact. The project does not inhibit the use of bicycle or pedestrian facilities; eliminate existing bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; or prevent the implementation of planned bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. On-site pedestrian walkways wrap around most of the project, with crosswalks connecting to the rest of the Palladio at Broadstone Shopping Center. The project would have a less than significant impact on program plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system.

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

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

To support jurisdictions’ SB743 implementation, SACOG developed thresholds and screening maps. Commercial (office) and residential projects have separate screening tools to screen office projects located in areas with work-tour VMT 15% below the regional average for office projects and residential projects located in areas with residential VMT 15% below the regional average. The Project (a hotel) is being treated as a residential project for screening purposes because its primary function is short to medium term housing. It should also be noted that, in general, hotel projects reduce VMT. The Project site is not located in an area with a unique draw, but rather will pull from other existing hotels. The proximity to gas, food, and general retail establishments in the adjacent shopping center is anticipated to reduce trips over a stand-alone hotel development. The net effect of the Project on VMT should shift trips from other properties to create more efficient origin-destination pairs, and to reduce ancillary trips by hotel guests and employees through utilization of the adjacent shopping. If the Project is not constructed, potential guests would stay at the next most convenient hotel which is in general going to be further from the business or resident the hotel guests ultimately need to visit.

SACOG generated these maps using outputs from the 2016 base year travel demand model run for the 2020 MTP/SCS. SACOG's travel demand model is activity/tour based and is designed to estimate an individual's daily travel, accounting for land use, transportation and demographics that influence peoples' travel behaviors. For residential projects, the threshold is defined as total household VMT per capita achieving 15% of reduction compared to regional average VMT. The map uses HEX geography. Residential VMT per capita per HEX is calculated by tallying all household VMTs, including VMT traveling outside the region, generated by the land uses within the HEX and divided by the total population in the HEX. Green hexagons denote areas where residential VMT is 50% to 85% of the regional average and yellow hexagons denote areas where residential VMT is 85% to 100% of the regional average. Orange denotes anticipated VMT greater than the regional average.

The project is located within one of the green hexagons with average residential VMT of 15.45 miles per capita (per day). The Project is anticipated to generate less than 85% of the regional, county, or City of Folsom average per capita residential daily VMT, and therefore is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on VMT.

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. Access to the project site would be provided from existing driveways on Palladio Parkway, Broadstone Parkway, and East Bidwell Street.

The project does not change the provided throat depth of the Palladio driveways. The Palladio includes less than 800 ksf of space (existing land uses, assuming 120 KSF for the cinemas and 86 KSF for the Project). Development standards require 975-feet of throat depth for an 800 ksf shopping center accessing streets with greater than a 60' right-of-way. This 975 foot length represents vehicle storage equivalents, which means the total required length may be achieved by summing the throat depths for several access points if more than one access point is to serve the site. Aerial imagery shows 10 Palladio driveways with a combined throat depth of approximately 1,600 feet which would meet the City's minimum throat depth standard. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on minimum required throat depth.

Five years (1/1/2015 – 12/31/2020) of Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) collision data for the three Palladio driveways closest to the Project were reviewed to identify any potential safety issues associated with the Project access points. Two injury accidents occurred at the northernmost Palladio driveway to East Bidwell Street during that period:

- All parties in both accidents were headed southbound on East Bidwell Street;
- Both were rear-end crashes where the at-fault party rear-ended a stopped vehicle and were cited for unsafe speed.

These two accidents associated with through traffic on East Bidwell Street and downstream signals and would not be affected by Project traffic utilizing that driveway. There were no reported accidents at the Palladio driveways to Broadstone Parkway or Palladio Parkway.

Crash history does not indicate any safety concerns at Project driveways. However, corner sight distance for right turning vehicles from the Palladio driveway to northeast bound Broadstone Parkway is limited.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures TRA-1 and TRA-2 would reduce all potential impacts regarding limited visibility and traffic safety to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Maintain Street Trees

The applicant shall ongoingly maintain street trees front the Project along Broadstone Parkway, southwest of the Palladio driveway to maintain a 430 foot sight distance for right turning vehicles exiting the Palladio.

Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Driveway Utilization

The applicant shall ongoingly ensure all commercial delivery trucks for the project would utilize the northern most Palladio driveway to Palladio Parkway.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No impact. The Project's internal drive aisles are designed with minimum 25 foot inner turning radii and 50-foot external turning radii to accommodate Fire Department engine access and turning movements. Emergency vehicle access would be available to the site from existing driveways on Palladio Parkway, Broadstone Parkway, and East Bidwell Street. Emergency vehicle access is designed consistent with standards and is adequate. There would be no impact.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	■	☐
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.	☐	■	☐	☐

A Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) Memo was prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. on April 6, 2022. The TCR Memo is included as **Appendix E**.

Environmental Setting

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

- Wilton Rancheria (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 and updated per UAIC via email on September 29, 2021).

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

as:

> *Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (geographically defined in terms of the size and scope), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:*
>
> *a) included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; and/or,*
>
> *b) included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; and/or,*
>
> *c) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

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

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

Within 14 days of initiating CEQA review for the Project, on January 28, 2022, the City sent Project notification letters to the three California Native American tribes named above that had previously submitted general consultation request letters pursuant to Section 21080.3.1(d) of the PRC. The letter provided each tribe with 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 conducting tribal consultation with that tribe under PRC 21080.3.1(e) was not met. No further attempts at consultation were required by state law.

Wilton Rancheria did not respond to the City's notification letter, and therefore, the threshold for conducting tribal consultation with that tribe under PRC 21080.3.1(e) was not met. No further attempts at consultation were required by state law.

On February 9, 2022, the City received an email from tribal representative Anna Starkey, within the 30-day response timeframe, that acknowledged receipt of the City's notification letter and informed the City that they did not find any areas of oral history, sacred lands, or other culturally sensitive areas of concern in or near the Project Area. Ms. Starkey, however, noted that there are previously recorded sites in the general area, according to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and inquired about the archaeological recommendations and whether any subsurface testing would be

recommended for the Project Area. She provided UAIC's standard unanticipated discovery measures and some suggested language for the CEQA document and stated that unless indigenous cultural resources are identified through the cultural study, consultation can be concluded with the City in agreement.

Subsequently, on March 23, 2022, Ms. Starkey emailed the City to inquire on the City's reaction to her February 9 email. Because HELIX was waiting on the results of the records search, no information could be shared by the City at that time. On March 25 and 28, 2022, and on behalf of the City, ECORP Consulting, Inc. provided a copy of a previous cultural resources report obtained from the CHRIS by HELIX and information from the design team about the grading plans, respectively. After reviewing the information provided by the City, UAIC responded on April 5, 2022 to indicate that because the area was primarily composed of fill, the tribe recommends standard unanticipated discovery measures and use of tribe-specific language in the CEQA document, as originally provided in February 2022, and included in **Appendix F**. On April 5, 2022, the City responded to confirm agreement and concluded consultation with UAIC.

Evaluation of Tribal Cultural Resources

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

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

Less than significant impact. As discussed in Section V., Cultural Resources, the records search determined that the entire APE has previously been surveyed for cultural resources and that elements of one resource, **CA-SAC-308H** (or **P-34-00335**), known as the Folsom Mining District, have been identified as potentially lying within the currently proposed APE. NCIC records indicate that the Folsom Mining District taken as a unified entity has been determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR, but that individual elements within the district may be eligible for listing and should be evaluated as eligible or ineligible on a case-by-case basis. No pedestrian survey of the APE was conducted because the entire area is currently capped by an asphalt parking lot; nevertheless, the records search results suggest that the APE should be considered to have a low to moderate sensitivity for undocumented historic-era cultural resources.

The Sacred Lands File search by the NAHC provided no evidence that sites considered important by local Native American are located in the vicinity, and the individual tribal members confirmed there are no potential resources or areas of concern on or near the project site. Previous research has not determined that the area has more than a low potential to contain prehistoric cultural resources, and absent additional information from Native American sources the area should be considered to have a low sensitivity for undocumented prehistoric resources.

From the conclusions from the records search, Sacred Lands File search, and the confirmations from the individual tribal members, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. Information about potential impacts to TCRs was drawn from UAIC's provided information, the ethnographic context, and the results of a records search conducted by HELIX with the CHRIS. In summary, 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. The cultural resources records search did not reveal any Native American archaeological sites within or adjacent to the Proposed Project Area, and the property had been graded and fully paved at the time the Palladio was constructed. Finally, as summarized in **Appendix E**, of the three tribes notified of the Project, only UAIC responded to the City's offer to consult. As part of that consultation, UAIC provided information that there are no known TCRs in the Project Area.

Based on the consultation record summarized above and included in **Appendix E**, the City concludes that there would be a less than significant impact on TCR's with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1 regarding unanticipated discoveries.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Unanticipated Discovery of TCRs

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, who meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Qualifications for Archaeology, may also assess the significance of the find in joint consultation with Native American Representatives to ensure that Tribal values are considered. Work at the discovery location cannot resume until the City, in consultation as appropriate and in good faith, determines that the discovery is either not a TCR, or has been subjected to culturally appropriate treatment, if avoidance and preservation cannot be accommodated.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	■	☐
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

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

Evaluation of Utilities and Service Systems

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

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

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

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

Water Supply

The City's public water supply is from the Folsom Reservoir and Folsom South Canal. The City's Urban Water Management Plan calculated supply and demand at buildout of the 2035 General Plan and determined that that there was sufficient supply available for normal, single dry, and multi-dry years scenarios (City of Folsom 2018a). Folsom's Water Treatment Plant has a capacity of 50 million gallons per day. According to the Urban Water Management Plan and General Plan EIR, water demand is not anticipated to exceed the City's current water rights to 38,970 acre-feet annually (City of Folsom 2018a).

The project proposes domestic water pipes located throughout the project site that would connect to an existing domestic water system along the eastern boundary line. Additionally, proposed fire hydrants and water pipes would connect to an existing fire system connection on the eastern boundary line.

Because sufficient supplies are available for build out of land uses in the General Plan (including development at the proposed project site) no additional facilities would need to be constructed or expanded and impacts would be less than significant.

Water Conservation Efforts

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

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

Wastewater (Sanitary Sewer)

The City of Folsom is responsible for managing and maintaining its wastewater collection system, including 275 miles of pipeline and nine pump stations. This system ultimately discharges into the

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District interceptor sewer system. Wastewater is treated at the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, located in Elk Grove.

In compliance with the 2006 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, the City of Folsom adopted a Sewer System Management Plan on July 28, 2009 which was updated and adopted on August 26, 2014. The plan outlines how the municipality operates and maintains the collection system, and the reporting of all Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) to the SWRCB's online SSO database. The project site design includes proposed sanitary sewer pipes that would connect to an existing sewer system next to the stop sign on the intersection of Via Serena from Broadstone Parkway. The existing sewer system would support all wastewater needs for the proposed project site.

Because the City has sufficient capacity to accommodate any additional demand that could result from implementation of the proposed project, and because the City is in compliance with statutes and regulations related to wastewater collection and treatment, there would be no impact and mitigation would not be necessary.

Stormwater

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

Proposed storm drains pipes would be installed throughout the site and would connect to existing storm drain systems along the western boundary line. The on-site storm drain would conform to City of Folsom standards. On site landscaping would also manage some on-site stormwater. Environmental impacts from these stormwater features would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

Electricity, Gas, and Telephone

Through the City's coordination with existing utility providers including SMUD for electricity, PG&E for underground gas lines, and Sure West for underground telephone lines, utility providers are able to accommodate for the proposed project. The project would connect to existing utility lines in the vicinity of the project site and would not require additional facilities. A gas meter and emergency generator would be located in the southeastern portion of the project site, directly south of the hotel building.

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

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

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

Less than significant impact. The City of Folsom provides solid waste, recycling, and hazardous materials collection services to its residential and business communities. In order to meet the State mandated 50 percent landfill diversion requirements stipulated under AB 939, the City has instituted several

community-based programs. The City offers a door-to-door collection program for household hazardous and electronic waste, in addition to six “drop off” recycling locations within the City.

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

XX. WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
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 located in a Local Responsibility Area, and it is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2021. Additionally, the project site is not located near a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021).

Evaluation of Wildfire

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	■	☐	☐
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 substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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

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

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

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

Evaluation of cumulative biological resources impacts: Implementation of the proposed project would include the construction and operation of a hotel building on an existing paved parking lot which includes a few ornamental trees. The project site is disturbed, and no special status species have the potential to occur in the project site. However, common bird species protected by Fish and Game Code may nest on the building, trees, and other vegetation on or adjacent to the project site. Project construction activities would potentially result in impacts to nesting birds if construction of the proposed project commences during the typical avian breeding season (February 15 – August 31). Construction activities and construction-related disturbance (noise, vibration and increased human activity) could adversely affect these species if they were to nest in or adjacent to the project area. Potential effects include physical destruction of nests by construction equipment and/or nest abandonment. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-1**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative cultural resources impacts: An archival records search was conducted for the project site, including a 0.5-mile buffer area, at the North Central Information Center at Sacramento State University. The records search determined that the entire APE has previously been surveyed for cultural resources and that elements of one resource, known as the Folsom Mining District, have been identified as potentially lying within the currently proposed APE. NCIC records indicate that the Folsom Mining District taken as a unified entity has been determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR, but that individual elements within the district may be eligible for listing and should be evaluated as eligible or ineligible on a case-by-case basis. No pedestrian survey of the APE was conducted because the entire area is currently capped by an asphalt parking lot. Although no evidence of cultural resources of significance were noted on project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative geology and soils impacts: No previous surveys conducted in the project area have identified the project site as sensitive for paleontological resources or other geologically sensitive resources, nor have testing or ground disturbing activities performed to date uncovered any paleontological resources or geologically sensitive resources. While the likelihood encountering paleontological resources and other geologically sensitive resources is considered low, project-related ground disturbing activities could affect the integrity of a previously unknown paleontological or other geologically sensitive resource, resulting in a substantial change in the significance of the resource. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1,** the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts: The project must comply with the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist. The Checklist is part of the City's 2035 General Plan GHG Reduction Strategy which outlines the policies and programs that the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of State GHG emissions reductions. Per the Checklist, the GHG reduction measures included in the Checklist that are applicable to a project are to be incorporated into the project's CEQA documents as mitigation measures. The GHG reduction measures applicable to the proposed project are therefore included as **Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-5**. With implementation of these mitigation measures and compliance with SMAQMD's recommendations, the 2017 Scoping Plan, and the MTP/SCS**,** the project's impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative noise impacts: Noise sources in the project vicinity are dominated by traffic noise from East Bidwell Street and Broadstone Parkway. Additional noise sources in the area include building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems for the shopping center to the southeast and typical parking lot noise. If project construction activities were to occur outside the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, construction noise generated by the project would not be exempt for the City's noise ordinance nighttime exterior standard of 45 dBA, and the impact would be potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation measure NOI-1 would restrict construction hours. With **Mitigation Measures NOI-1,** the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to noise.

Evaluation of transportation impacts: The transportation impacts associated with the project were conducted by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. Two injury accidents occurred at the northernmost Palladio driveway to East Bidwell Street. Crash history does not indicate any safety concerns at Project driveways; however, corner sight distance for right turning vehicles from the Palladio driveway to northeast bound Broadstone Parkway is limited. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures TRA-1** and **TRA-2** would reduce all potential impacts regarding limited visibility and traffic safety to a less than significant level and would contribute to any significant cumulative impacts related to transportation.

Evaluation of cumulative tribal cultural resources impacts: The City of Folsom sent project notification letters to three California Native American tribes. Although there is no evidence of TCRs occurring or having the potential to occur on the project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. Additionally, the UAIC Tribe recommended standard unanticipated discovery measures and use of tribe-specific language in the CEQA document. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures TCR-1**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially significant cumulative impacts would be avoided. Thus, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources.

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. Because of site conditions, existing City regulations, and regulation of potential environmental impacts by other agencies, the proposed project would not have

the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings as demonstrated in the detailed evaluation contained in this Initial Study.

9.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

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

10.0 INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

City of Folsom
Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Project Manager
Julia Pano, Environmental Planner
Victor Ortiz, Senior Air Quality Specialist
Martin Rolph, Air Quality/Noise Technician
Clarus Backes, Senior Archeologist
John DeMartino, Geographic Information Systems

11.0 REFERENCES

American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE). 2012. ASHRAE Handbook.

Beals, R.L. 1933. Ethnology of the Nisenan. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 31(6):335-414.

Beardsley, R.K. 1948. Cultural Sequences in Central California Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 14:1-28.

1954. Temporal and Areal Relationships in Central California Archaeology. *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 25, Berkeley.

Bennyhoff, J. 1950. Californian Fish Spears and Harpoons. *University of California Anthropological Records* 9(4):295-338.

Brainerd, C. 2015, May 6. News Release: City of Folsom Releases Water Reduction Plan. Accessed on March 15, 2022 at https://www.folsom.ca.us/civica/press/display.asp?layout=1&Entry=271.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2021. User's Guide for CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0. Available at: http://www.caleemod.com/.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2022a. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health. Accessed March 2022.

2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update. January. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf.

2014. First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/first_update_climate_change_scoping_plan.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 Department of Conservation (CDC). 2021a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed on January 20, 2022 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/.

2021b. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Accessed on March 30, 2022 from: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp

California Department of Conservation (CDC), Division of Mines and Geology. 1984. Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California, Open-File Report 84-50SAC. Accessed on January 20, 2022 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2021. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Accessed on January 22, 2022 from: https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. Envirostor. Accessed January 22, 2022 from https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Sacramento&tour=True.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2021. List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. Accessed on January 22, 2022 at: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways

2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. April. Available at: https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2021a. 2020 Total System Electric Generation. Accessed April 5, 2022 at https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2019-total-system-electric-generation.

2021b. Supply and Demand of Natural Gas in California. Accessed on April 5, 2022 from: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/californias-natural-gas-market/supply-and-demand-natural-gas-california

2021c. California Gasoline Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on April 5, 2022 from https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/california-gasoline-data-facts-and-statistics

2021d. Diesel Fuel Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on April 5, 2022 from https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/diesel-fuel-data-facts-and-statistics

California Emergency Management Agency. 2009. Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, Benicia Quadrangle, July 31, 2009. Accessed on January 27, 2022, at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Publications/Tsunami-Maps/Tsunami_Inundation_Benicia_Quad_Solano.pdf

CalGreen. 2019 California Green Building Standards Code. California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11. Available at: https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/CAGBC2019JUL21S/cover

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021. Geotracker. Accessed on January 20, 2022 from: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.

Carrier. 2008. 50PG03 – 28 Product Data. Available at: http://www.aireclima.com/carrier/pdf/50PG-5PD.pdf.

City of Folsom. 2021a. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist. Updated March 24. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/158/637522677783670000.
2018. Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. Adopted August 28.

_____ 2021b. Evacuation Plan. Accessed January 30, 2022 from: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument?id=2229.

_____ 2021c.Folsom Municipal Code. Accessed January 20, 2022 at: http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom/.

2021d. 2035 General Plan Safety and Noise Element. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/7565/637667924531470000. Amended August 24.

_____ 2018. Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. Adopted August 28.

1993. Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 8.42, Noise Control. Available at: http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom/.

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

Dickel, D.N., P. D. Schulz, and H.M. McHenry. 1984. Central California: Prehistoric Subsistence Changes and Health. In *Paleopathology at the Origins of Agriculture*, edited by Mark Nathan Cohen and George J. Armelagos, pp. 439–462. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, FL.

ECORP Consulting, Inc. (ECORP). 2021. Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with Assembly Bill 52 and CEQA for the AC Hotel by Marriott project, City of Folsom.

El Dorado, County of. 2012. El Dorado County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: Cameron Airpark Airport; Georgetown Airport; Placerville Airport. Available at: https://www.edctc.org/airport-land-use-compatability-plans-and-fee-schedule.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2012. FEMA Flood Map: Folsom, CA Map 06067C0140H. Accessed on January 30, 2022 from: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=510%20Palladio%20Parkway%20Folsom

Fredrickson, D.A. 1973. Early Cultures of the North Coast Ranges, California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

GENERAC. 2022. Standby Generators, Liquid Cooled Gaseous engine; Models QT070 to QT150. Available at: https://www.generac.com/generaccorporate/media/library/content/all-products/generators/home-generators/qt-series/generac-home-backup-generators-qt-series-70kw-80kw-100kw-130kw-150kw_spec-sheet.pdf.

Gerow, B.A. 1954. The Problem of Cultural Sequences in Central California Archaeology. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences.

1974. Comments on Fredrickson's Cultural Diversity. *Journal of California Anthropology* 1(2):239-246.

Gerow, B.A., with R. Force. 1968. *An Analysis of the University Village Complex with a Reappraisal of Central California Archaeology*. Stanford University Press. Stanford., California.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc (HELIX). 2021. Cultural Resource Assessment for the AC Hotel by Marriott, City of Folsom, California. April.

Hughes, R.E. (editor). 1994. *Toward a New Taxonomic Framework for Central California Archaeology: Essays by James A. Bennyhoff and David A. Fredrickson.* Assembled and edited by Richard E. Hughes. Contributions of the University of California No. 52, Archaeological Research Facility, Berkeley, CA.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policymakers. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. February. Available at: https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar4/wg1/.

Johnson, J.J. 1976. Archaeological Investigations at the Blodgett Site (CA-SAC-267), Sloughhouse Locality, California. Report submitted to the U.S. National Parks Service, Western Regional Office, Tucson, AZ.

Lillard, J.B. and W.K. Purves. 1936. The Archaeology of the Deer Creek-Cosumnes Area, Sacramento Co., California. Sacramento Junior College Department of Anthropology Bulletin 1.

Lillard, J.B., R.F. Heizer, and F. Fenenga. 1939. An Introduction to the Archaeology of Central California. Sacramento Junior College Department of Anthropology, Bulletin 2.

Moratto, M.J. 1984. *California Archaeology*. San Diego. Academic Press.

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.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2021. Web Soil Survey. Accessed January 20, 2022 at http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov.

Ragir, S.R. 1972. The Early Horizon in Central California Prehistory. *Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility* 15. Berkeley, CA.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2019. 2020 MTP/SCS. Available at: https://www.sacog.org/2020-metropolitan-transportation-plansustainable-communities-strategy.

Sacramento County Association of Governments. 2020. Mather Airport – Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. September. Available at: https://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/mather_draft_alucp.pdf?1601659275.

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

Schenck, W.E., and E.J. Dawson. 1929. Archaeology of the Northern San Joaquin Valley. *American Archaeology and Ethnology* 25.

Severson, T. 1973. *Sacramento; an Illustrated History, 1839 to 1874: from Sutter's Fort to Capital City.* California Historical Society

Shoup, Laurence H., and Randall T. Milliken. 1999. *Inigo of Rancho Posolmi: the Life and Times of a Mission Indian*. Ballena Press, Novato, California.

T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. April 2022. AC Hotel by Marriott Transportation Impact Study.

2021. Broadstone Villas Transportation Impact Analysis. September.

United States Census Bureau. 2019. QuickFacts, Folsom City, California, population estimates, July 1, 2019 (V2019). Accessed on January 20, 2022 from: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/folsomcitycalifornia.

U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). 2008. Roadway Construction Noise Model version 1.1. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/.

2004. Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/traffic_noise_model/tnm_v25/.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2021. Superfund: National Priorities List. Accessed on January 24, 2022 from: https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl.

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

This page intentionally left blank