HELIX Environmental Planning

Creekside Apartments Project

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

September 2023 | 02576.00075.001

Prepared for:

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

Prepared by:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
1180 Iron Point Road, Suite 130
Folsom, CA 95630

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (cont.)

LIST OF APPENDICES

Table of Contents (cont.)

LIST OF FIGURES
(contained in Appendix A)

LIST OF TABLES

Table of Contents (cont.)

LIST OF TABLES

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB	Assembly Bill
ACM	asbestos containing material
amsl	above mean sea level
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
BA	bathroom
Bcf/year	billion cubic feet per year
BD	bedroom
BMPs	best management practices
BP	Business and Professional Office
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CadnaA	Computer Aided Noise Abatement
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers
CARB	California Air Resources Control Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CH4	methane
City	City of Folsom
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2e	carbon dioxide equivalents
CREC	Controlled REC
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CRPR	County Rare Plant Register
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
CY	cubic yard
DBH	diameter at breast height
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
DSH	diameter at standard height
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
Du/ac	dwelling units per acre

Acronyms and Abbreviations (cont.)

EBC	East Bidwell Corridor
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	executive order
EPAP	Existing Plus Approved projects
EQ Zapp	Earthquake Hazards Zone Application
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
EV	electric vehicle
FAR	floor area ratio
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMC	Folsom Municipal Code
Ft	feet
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	greenhouse gases
GWh	gigawatt hours
GWP	global warming potential
HFC	hydrofluorocarbon
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISA	International Society of Arboriculture
IS/MND	Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
L_{EQ}	one-hour average noise level
LID	low impact development
LOS	level of service
M	meter
Madrone	Madrone Ecological Consulting, LLC
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MT	metric tons
MTDR	minimum required throat depth
MTP/SCS	Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
MWELO	Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NO_X	oxides of nitrogen

Acronyms and Abbreviations (cont.)

NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSLU	noise-sensitive land uses
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OLR	overland release
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PD	Planned Development
PFC	perfluorocarbon
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric
PM_{10}	coarse particulate matter
$PM_{2.5}$	fine particulate matter
PO	Professional Office
PRC	Public Resources Code
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
RCNM	Roadway Construction Noise Model
REC	Recognized Environmental Conditions
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RRFB	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SCOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
SIP	State Implementation Program
SLCP	short-lived climate pollutant
SLF	Sacred Lands File
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SSO	Sanitary Sewer Overflow
SUV	sport utility vehicle
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SWITRS	Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resource
TIS	Transportation Impact Study

Acronyms and Abbreviations (cont.)

TNM	Traffic Noise Model
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VMT	vehicles miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WEAT	Workers Environmental Awareness Training

Initial Study Information Sheet

1.	Project title:	Creekside Apartments
2.	Lead agency name and address:	City of Folsom Community Development Department 50 Natoma Street Folsom, CA 95630
3.	Contact person and phone number:	Josh Kinkade; Associate Planner (916) 461-6209
4.	Project location:	North of East Bidwell Street, East of Blue Ravine Road, and West of Creekside Drive, City of Folsom, CA 95630
5.	General plan designation:	Professional Office (PO)
6.	Zoning:	Business and Professional Office (BP) Planned Development (PD)

7. Description of project: The Creekside Apartments Project (project) is a 188-unit multi-family rental housing community with a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units arranged in four, four-story buildings. The project site would include surfaced driveways and parking spaces surrounding the four buildings to accommodate 334 parking stalls. The project site would also include a 5,900-square foot clubhouse/leasing office with indoor amenities, as well as landscaping and outdoor amenities such as a swimming pool, lounge, outdoor patio with seating, covered outdoor kitchen with barbeque, and a multi-sport court for sports such as basketball.

8. Surrounding land uses and setting: The 7.71-acre polygonal shaped project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. Elevations in the project site range from 290 feet to 335 feet above mean sea level (amsl). Humbug Creek and Willow Creek Bike Trail are located directly north of the project site. Commercial and retail development, multi-family apartment communities, assisted living facilities, and medical buildings are located south of the site. Single-family residences are located further south past the medical buildings. Commercial and retail development are located west of the site. Commercial development, retail development, and open space are located north of the site. Single-family residences are located further north past the commercial development. Medical buildings, health and wellness businesses, and multi-family apartment communities are located east of the site.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement:

    - State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB)
    - California Air Resources Board (CARB)
    - California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
    - Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)
    - Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)

10. California Native American tribes may traditionally and culturally be affiliated with the project area and may request consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. Below is a summary of the plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc. Please see Section 11.XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, for further discussion.

Formal invitations to participate in Assembly Bill (AB) 52 consultation on the proposed project were sent by the City to four tribal representatives on May 9, 2023. The representatives included:

- Sara D. Setshwaelo, Ione Bank of Miwok Indians
- Anna Starkey, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
- Ralph Hatch, Wilton Rancheria
- Raymond C. Hitchcock, Wilton Rancheria

The United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC) and Wilton Rancheria engaged in consultation. Both UAIC and Wilton Rancheria determined that the project site does not include any known Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs). No further consultation was requested from UAIC and Wilton Rancheria. Therefore, on September 5, 2023, the City formally concluded consultation with Wilton Rancheria, and on September 20, 2023, the City formally concluded consultation with UAIC pursuant to PRC Sections 21080.3.2(b)(1) and 21082.3(d)(1).

1.0 Introduction

Tekin & Associates, LLC (project applicant) proposes to develop the Creekside Apartments (proposed project), which includes construction and operation of a 188-unit multi-family rental housing community on a 7.71-acre site. The project site is located north of East Bidwell Street, east of Blue Ravine Road and west of Creekside Drive in the City of Folsom.

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)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 IS/MND 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 8 of this IS/MND.

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

2.0 Project Background

The proposed project is comprised of Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) 071-0040-161-0000, 071-0040-162-0000, and 071-0040-163-0000 in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California. The following project specific technical reports or surveys were used in preparation of this IS/MND and are incorporated by reference:

- Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with AB 52 and CEQA, prepared by HELIX (September 2023).
- Biological Resources Assessment by Madrone (August 2023).
- Special-Status Plant Survey Report by Madrone Ecological Consulting (July 2023).
- Preliminary Drainage Study by Baker-Williams Engineering Group (June 2023).
- Traffic Impact Study by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. (June 2023).
- Cultural Resources Assessment by HELIX (September 2023).
- Noise Impact Analysis by HELIX (September 2023).
- Air Quality Assessment, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis by HELIX (September 2023).

- Preliminary Arborist Report by CalTLC (April 2023).
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment by Teracon Consultants, Inc. (October 2022).
- Geotechnical Engineering Study by Wallace Kuhl & Associates (November 2022).

3.0 Project Description

3.1 Project Location

The project site is located north of East Bidwell Street, east of Blue Ravine Road and west of Creekside Drive, in the City of Folsom (City), Sacramento County, California. The project site is approximately 7.71 acres and is identified as APN 071-0040-161-0000, 071-0040-162-0000, and 071-0040-163-0000, commonly known as 1571, 1591, and 1575 Creekside Drive, Folsom, CA 95630. The project site's frontage is along Creekside Drive. The site is located within Township 9 North & 10 North, Range 8 East, and Section 6 & 31 of the United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute "Folsom Quadrangle". Refer to Figure 1 for the Site and Vicinity Map, Figure 2 for the Aerial Map, and Figure 3 for the Site Plan (Note: All figures are located in Appendix A).

3.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The 7.71-acre polygonal shaped project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. Elevations in the project site range from 295 feet to 325 feet amsl. Humbug Creek and the Willow Creek Bike Trail are located directly north of the project site. Commercial and retail development, multi-family apartment communities, assisted living facilities, and medical buildings are located south of the site. Single-family residences are located further south past the medical buildings. Commercial and retail development are located west of the site. Commercial development, retail development, and open space are located north of the site. Single-family residences are located further north past the commercial development. Medical buildings, health and wellness businesses, and multi-family apartment communities are located east of the site. Neighboring land uses are summarized in Table 1, *Neighboring Land Uses*.

Table 1
NEIGHBORING LAND USES

Direction	Land Use
North	Blue Ravine Road, Commercial and Retail Development, Open Space, Single-Family Residences
East	Creekside Drive, Medical Buildings, Health and Wellness Businesses, Multi-Family Apartment Communities
South	East Bidwell Street, Medical Buildings, Commercial and Retail Development, Multi-Family Apartment Communities, Assisted Living Facilities, Single-Family Residences
West	East Bidwell Street, Commercial and Retail Development

3.3 Project Characteristics

The proposed project is a 188-unit multi-family rental housing community with a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units arranged in four, four-story buildings. The buildings are labeled: Building A, B, C, and D. The project site would include surfaced driveways and parking spaces surrounding the four buildings to accommodate 334 parking stalls. The project site would also include a 5,900-square foot clubhouse/leasing office with indoor amenities, as well as landscaping and outdoor amenities.

The four, four-story buildings would include a total of 64 one-bedroom units, 68 two-bedroom units, and 56 three-bedroom units. Residential units would range from 693 to 1,195 square feet. The floorplans would include a full kitchen, living space, bedroom(s), bathroom(s), indoor storage, and outdoor storage. The number of bedroom units within Buildings A-D are described in Table 2, *Building Label/Unit Mix*, below.

Table 2
BUILDING LABEL/UNIT MIX

Building Label	1 BD / 1 BA	2 BD / 2 BA	3 BD / 2 BA	Total Units per Building
A	13	24	20	57
B	20	16	12	48
C	20	16	12	48
D	11	12	12	35
			Total	**188**

*BD=Bedroom; BA=Bathroom

The project design would be consistent with the Humbug Willow Creek Guidelines. Building materials include stucco, fiber-cement “wood-look” siding, stone veneer, painted steel railings, and asphalt shingle roofing. The maximum building height would be 52-feet 6-inches to the top of the roof ridge.

Community amenities would include a 5,900-square foot, clubhouse/leasing office with a maximum height of 28 feet to the roof ridge on the eastern side of the project site. The clubhouse would include lounge areas, large screen television, meeting space, resident computer stations, fitness room, restrooms, and leasing office. Outdoor amenities feature a swimming pool, lounge, and shade structures adjacent to the clubhouse. The northern end of the project site would include an outdoor patio with seating, covered outdoor kitchen with barbeque counter, sink, tables, and a television. To the west of the outdoor patio would include a dog run, and to the east of the outdoor patio would include a multi-sport court for sports such as basketball.

3.4 Access and Circulation

Primary vehicle access to the site would be from a proposed gated, main access driveway along Creekside Drive. Internal drive aisles (26-feet in width) would provide internal access to Buildings A-D, the clubhouse/leasing office, parking stalls, and all outdoor amenities. An additional emergency vehicle access driveway would be located west of the main access driveway, along Creekside Drive. The internal drive aisles would connect to the main vehicle access driveway and the emergency vehicle access driveway.

Primary pedestrian access to the project site would be from accessible pedestrian pathways located around the northern, southern, and eastern sides of the project site. Two pedestrian gates would be located adjacent to the dog run, along the Willow Creek Bike Trail; two pedestrian gates would be located at the entrance of the site, along Creekside Drive.; and an existing pedestrian staircase would be located in the northeastern corner of the project site. Access to the Willow Creek Bike Trail is located in the northeastern edge of the project site and would remain in its current condition. The pedestrian pathways would provide a walking route for residents.

An existing bus stop is located on the eastern side of Creekside Drive. As part of the proposed project, the bus stop would be relocated along the frontage of the project site, on the western side of Creekside Drive. The bus stop would include an ADA accessible pad and bus stop signage. Additionally, a sidewalk would be placed between the relocated bus stop and the existing bus stop across Creekside Drive.

3.5 Parking

The proposed project would include a total of 334 parking spaces located in asphalt paved areas along the inside perimeter of the project site. The parking supply includes 238 surface parking spaces, 40 garage parking spaces, and 56 carport spaces for a total ratio of 1.78 spaces/unit. The project requires 1.5 parking spaces/unit under Folsom Zoning Code Section 17.17.100, for a total of 282 required parking spaces. The project would exceed the total required number of parking spaces required under Folsom Zoning Code Section 17.17.100.

The project would include 34 electric vehicle (EV) capable parking spaces, 84 EV ready parking spaces, and 17 EV charger parking spaces. The total electric vehicle ready parking spaces would be approximately 25 percent of the total parking spaces, which meets the electric vehicle charging station requirement outlined by California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; Title 24, Part 11).

In addition, a series of bicycle racks would be installed to provide short-term bicycle parking areas. The Folsom Municipal Code requires one bicycle parking space for every five residential units. With 188 residential units, the project requires approximately 38 bicycle parking spaces. A total of five bike racks areas would accommodate a total of 20 short-term bicycle parking spaces. The project would also include 20 long-term bicycle parking spaces, a bicycle café, and indoor bicycle lockers within Building D. The total provided short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces would equal 40 bicycle parking spaces, which exceeds the requirement of 38 bicycle parking spaces per the Folsom Municipal Code.

3.6 Utilities and Services

Water

Water service would be extended into the project site from Creekside Drive by connecting to an existing eight-inch water stub located in the southeastern corner of the project site. The water stub would connect to an existing 12-inch water main located on the eastern side of Creekside Drive, near the northeastern corner of the project site.

Wastewater

Sewer service would be served by constructing a sewer manhole over an existing eight-inch sewer main along the project frontage. The new manhole would be located in the southeastern corner of the project site. Drainage systems would be directed toward the southwestern corner of the project site where there is an existing 24-inch diameter culvert that crosses under the existing Willow Creek Bike Trail towards Humbug Creek. Hamburg Creek is located north of the project site. Stormwater quality for the project site would adhere to the City of Folsom's Stormwater Quality Program.

3.7 Sustainability Features

The project design incorporates sustainable features consistent with CALGreen. The project would include 34 EV capable parking spaces, 84 EV ready parking spaces, and 17 EV charger parking spaces.

The total electric vehicle ready parking spaces would be approximately 25 percent of the total parking spaces, consistent with CALGreen. Additionally, the buildings would be positioned in a roughly north-south orientation maximizing passive solar access, roof cooling, and natural lighting.

3.8 Fencing and Signage

Open, metal wrought iron fencing would surround the perimeter of the project site. The northern, southern, and eastern sides of the project site would include 72-inch fencing, and the western side of the project site would include 48-inch fencing. Retaining walls would be located along the eastern and western sides of the project site. One freestanding community-identification monument sign would be located at the main vehicle access driveway, along Creekside Drive. The colors and building materials of the monument sign would complement the project design style and color palette.

3.9 Trash Enclosure

One trash enclosure would be located in the western corner of the project site. One trash compactor would be located in the northern portion of the project site. The trash enclosure would be designed to accommodate trash, recycling, and composting dumpsters.

3.10 Landscaping

The overall landscape concept is to create a consistent treatment of all landscaped areas with high quality outdoor environments and amenity areas. Landscaping would emphasize the planting of trees to shade the open space and would install usable turf near the center of the project site that is native to the region or well-adapted to the climatic and soils conditions of the project site. Landscape improvements would require minimal maintenance and irrigation, and the use of drought-tolerant plant materials would be maximized. Drought-tolerant plant materials would be planted in conformance with local and State Water Conservation requirements. All proposed landscaping would comply with the California Department of Water Conservation Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO).

The proposed landscaping plan would include 6 Street Trees, 36 Accent Trees, 69 Evergreen-Small Vertical Accent Trees, 20 Evergreen Conifer Trees, 44 Subordinate Shade Trees, 18 Broadleaf Evergreen-Courtyard Trees, four Specimen Accent Trees, 14 Vertical Allee Trees, 28 Shade Trees, 10 Subordinate Street Trees, 18 Broadleaf Evergreen-Shade Trees, 26 Evergreen-Native Screen Trees, and 67 Mitigation Trees. The landscaping plan would also include 5,460 square feet of Evergreen Hedge, 76,222 square feet of shrub areas, and 3,469 square feet of turf area.

The Folsom Municipal Code (FMC, Section 17.57 G (3) Planters, Landscaping) states that trees shall be interspersed through the parking area so that in 15 years, 40 percent of the parking lot will be in shade at high noon. The total surfaced or paved area of the project site is 110,286 square feet; therefore, the total required shade (50 percent) would be 55,143 square feet. With the proposed landscaping, the project would provide 55,790 square feet of shade, exceeding the minimum shade requirements under the Folsom Municipal Code and the California Green Code.

3.11 Construction and Phasing

Site grading would occur in one phase. The grading operation would include the over excavation and re-compaction of building pads. The approximate excavation (cut) volume is estimated to be around

50,300 cubic yards (CY) while the embankment (fill) volume is estimated to be approximately 54,600 CY. There would be a soil import requirement of approximately 4,000 CY to balance the project site subject to final design. The existing material on the site that is cut during the grading process would be reused for the required fill. Construction would likely begin in October 2023 and would take approximately two years to complete.

4.0 City Regulation of Urban Development

4.1 General Plan

The site is designated as Professional Office (PO) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan and subject to the General Plan's East Bidwell Corridor (EBC) Mixed Use Overlay. The PO designation provides for low-intensity business and professional offices that are compatible with higher-intensity residential uses and the EBC Mixed Use Overlay provides for a mixture of commercial and residential uses including multifamily housing at a density of 20-30 dwelling units per acre.

4.2 Zoning Ordinance

The zoning designation of the site is in the Business and Professional (BP) District with a Planned Development (PD) overlay. According to Section 17.22.30 of the Folsom Municipal Code, the BP zoning district generally permits office building and related uses such as banks, doctor's offices, general business office, and general uses. The purpose of a BP zoning district is to provide an area for business and professional office and compatible related uses. This zoning district is intended to promote a harmonious development of business and professional office areas with adjacent commercial or residential development. While the BP zoning does not itself allow for residential uses either by right or with a conditional use permit, California Government Code section 65589.5(j)(4) states that "a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective general plan standards and criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the general plan".

5.0 Other City Regulation of Urban Development

5.1 Community Development Department Standard Construction Conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Existing Utilities – Regulates the relocation and protection of utilities.

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

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

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

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

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

5.2 City of Folsom Municipal Code

The City regulates many aspects of construction and development through requirements and ordinances established in the Folsom Municipal Code. These requirements are summarized in Table 3, *City of Folsom Municipal Code Regulating Construction and Development*, 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 3
CITY OF FOLSOM MUNICIPAL CODE REGULATING CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
8.42	Noise Control	Establishes interior and exterior noise standards that may not be exceeded within structures, including residences; establishes time periods for construction operations.
8.70	Stormwater Management and Discharge Control	Establishes conditions and requirements for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm-drainage system; requires preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans.
9.34	Hazardous Materials Disclosure	Defines hazardous materials; requires filing of a Hazardous Material Disclosure Form by businesses that manufacture, use, or store such materials.
9.35	Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances	Establishes standards for the construction and monitoring of facilities used for the underground storage of hazardous substances and establishes a procedure for issuance of permits for the use of these facilities.
12.16	Tree Preservation	Regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees.
13.26	Water Conservation	Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.
14.19	Energy Code	Adopts the California Energy Code, 2019 Edition, published as Part 6, Title 24, C.C.R. to require energy efficiency standards for structures.
14.20	Green Building Standards Code	Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2019 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4, A5, and A6.1 published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and 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.

6.0 Project Objectives

The objective of the project is to provide a multi-family rental housing community consistent with the 2035 General Plan, including the Housing Element, which identifies guiding principles, goals, and policies for housing choices.

7.0 Required Approvals

A listing and brief description of the regulatory permits and approvals required to implement the proposed project are provided below. This IS/MND is intended to address the environmental impacts associated with all of the following decision action and approval:

- A tentative map combining the three project parcels;
- Planned Development Permit (PD Permit); and
- Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

The purpose of the PD Permit is to allow for greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. With the PD Permit, the project's site plan, elevations, and overall project design would be evaluated, and specific development standards would be defined. A CUP is required to allow for development of a four-story, multi-family apartment complex that exceeds 35 feet in height.

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 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 entitlements described above.

8.0 Previous Relevant Environmental Analysis

8.1 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.

8.2 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 IS/MND 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. CEQA Guidelines §15152(g) specifically provides that:

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

9.0 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

10.0 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 (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
☐	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: **9/27/23**

Josh Kinkade — Printed Name — Date: **9/27/23**

11.0 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. 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 7.71-acre polygonal shaped project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. Elevations in the project site range from 290 feet to 335 feet amsl. Humbug Creek and Willow Creek Bike Trail are located directly north of the project site. Commercial and retail development, multi-family apartment communities, assisted living facilities, and medical buildings are located south of the site. Single-family residences are located further south past the medical buildings. Commercial and retail developments are located west of the site. Commercial development, retail development, and open space are located north of the site. Single-family residences are located further north past the commercial development. Medical buildings, health and wellness businesses, and multi-family apartment communities are located east of the site.

Impact Analysis

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 development, retail development, residential development, and medical buildings. 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 (City 2018a). 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 project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The nearest officially designated State scenic highway is the segment of US Highway 50 from Placerville to Echo Summit, approximately 19 miles east of the project site (Caltrans 2023). Therefore, the project would not impact scenic resources, such as trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings within a state scenic highway, and no impact would occur.

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is located within an urbanized area of Folsom, surrounded by commercial development, retail development, residential development, and medical buildings. The site is vacant and undeveloped, and the existing character of the site would be modified by the proposed development. The proposed project would construct a 188-unit, multi-family rental housing community with a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units arranged in four, four-story buildings. The project site would include surfaced driveways and parking spaces surrounding the four buildings to accommodate 334 parking stalls. The project site would also include a 5,900-square foot clubhouse/leasing office with indoor amenities, as well as landscaping and outdoor amenities.

Building materials would include stucco, fiber-cement “wood-look” siding, stone veneer, painted steel railings, and asphalt shingle roofing. Stone veneer is used to provide a visual “weight” to anchor the base of the building. The use of gable roof forms provides a residential look and feel to contrast the surrounding commercial and office buildings. The siding material placement creates movement along the building elevation to create visual interest in the massing and form of the four-story buildings. The maximum building height of the four buildings would be 52 feet, 6-inches to the top of the roof ridge. Please refer to Figure 4, Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8 for visual renderings of Building A-D and the clubhouse/leasing office.

In order to accommodate for the change in existing character, the proposed project would implement landscaping, site amenities, and building designs to blend the proposed project with surrounding development. The proposed four, four-story buildings and clubhouse/leasing office would be located within the center of the project site and would be surrounded by parking spaces and outdoor amenities including an outdoor patio, dog run, and multi-sport courts. The outdoor amenities and landscaped areas with various trees, shrubs, and outdoor amenities would add to the overall visual aesthetic of the project site.

The proposed project is consistent with the types of uses envisioned and permitted in the Folsom General Plan, as housing at a density of 20-30 units per acre is allowed in the EBC Mixed Use overlay that applies to the project. Due to this overlay, the project would not require a rezone from the current BP District zoning designation to allow for development of multi-family housing. Entitlement requests for this project would include a PD Permit and a CUP. The CUP is required to allow for development of buildings that exceed two stories or 35 feet in height. The PD Permit is required for site design, architecture, and landscaping of a multi-family rental housing community on the project site. The proposed land use is consistent with the overall suburban character and ongoing development in the

vicinity and is expected to integrate into the existing and planned development of the area. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on visual character and no mitigation is necessary.

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

Less than significant impact. The project would include downcast black painted dimmed metal housing lighting located throughout the project site. To minimize potential lighting-related impact, all lighting would be screened, shielded, and directed downward to minimize glare towards the surrounding commercial, medical, and residential developments. 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 under the PD Permit. The proposed rental housing units and other project features would comply with design standards outlined in the Folsom Municipal Code, Chapter 17.06. The exterior of Building A-D would be designed with architectural detailing that would not produce glare and would not affect day or nighttime views. Additionally, existing City standards would limit light spillover and intensity. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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. Additionally, the project site is not designated for agricultural, or timberland uses. The California Important Farmlands Map prepared for Sacramento County by the California Resources Agency classifies the project site mainly as Other Land; a small portion along the project sites' southern boundary line is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land (California Department of Conservation [DOC] 2023a). Other Land is land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry, or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres (DOC 2023a). Urban and built-up land is land occupied by structures or infrastructure to accommodate a building density of at least one unit to one and one-half acres, or approximately six structures to ten acres (DOC 2023a).

Impact Analysis

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 Sacramento County Important Farmland Map (DOC 2023a). Therefore, the project would have no impact on these 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 or a Williamson Act construct. There would be no impact.

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))?

No impact. The project site is not zoned or designated as farmland, and the surrounding land uses are primarily commercial development, retail development, residential development, and medical buildings. Therefore, the nature and location of the project would not directly or indirectly result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. No impact would occur.

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

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, no impact would occur for questions d) and e).

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment was prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) on September 8, 2023. The assessment is summarized below and is included as Appendix B to this IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

The City of Folsom lies within the eastern edge of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The 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 (USEPA), the federal agency that administrates the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended in 1990.

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

Regulatory Setting

Criteria Pollutants

Criteria pollutants are defined and regulated by State and federal law as a risk to the health and welfare of the public and are categorized into primary and secondary pollutants. Primary air pollutants are those that are emitted directly from sources, including carbon monoxide (CO); ROG, also known as volatile organic compounds (VOCs); NO_X; sulfur dioxide (SO_2); coarse particulate matter (PM_{10}); fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$); and lead. Of these primary pollutants, CO, SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and lead are criteria pollutants. ROGs and NO_X are criteria pollutant precursors and go on to form secondary criteria pollutants through chemical and photochemical reactions in the atmosphere. The principal secondary criteria pollutants are Ozone and nitrogen dioxide (NO_2).

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with State and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The USEPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants. As permitted by the Clean Air Act (CAA), California has adopted the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air pollutant constituents.

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 4, *Sacramento County – Attainment Status*.

Table 4
SACRAMENTO COUNTY – ATTAINMENT STATUS

Pollutant	State of California Attainment Status	Federal Attainment Status
Ozone (1-hour)	Nonattainment	No Federal Standard
Ozone (8-hour)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Nonattainment	Attainment
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Attainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Lead	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Attainment	Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	No Federal Standard

Source: 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.

Ground-level ozone is not emitted directly into the environment but is generated from complex chemical reactions between the precursor pollutant ROGs (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 (TACs) 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 Particulate Matter

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 2.5 microns or less in diameter (CARB 2023). 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 the total known cancer risk related to air toxins in California is attributable to DPM (CARB 2023).

Asbestos Containing Materials

Asbestos is a mineral fiber that naturally occurs in some rock and soil. Long-term exposure to airborne asbestos fibers has been linked to major health effects including lung cancer; mesothelioma, a rare form of cancer that is found in the thin lining of the lung, chest and abdomen and heart; and asbestosis, a serious progressive, long-term, non-cancer disease of the lungs (USEPA 2023a). Because of its fiber strength and heat resistance, asbestos has been used in a variety of building construction materials for insulation and as a fire retardant, primarily in buildings constructed before 1979. Asbestos fibers may be

released into the air by the disturbance of asbestos containing material (ACM) during renovation and demolition activities.

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 visitors and employees located within medical office buildings, approximately 50 feet to the west, 15 feet to the east, and 300 feet to the south of the project site. The closest school to the project site is Folsom Middle School approximately 1,000 feet (0.2 mile) to the northeast. It should be further noted that the closest residential property is approximately 430 feet to the north of the project site.

Methodology and Assumptions

Criteria pollutant and precursor emissions, and GHG emissions for the project construction activities and long-term operation were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2022.1.1.12. 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 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 model calculates emissions of criteria pollutants, ozone precursors, and GHGs, including PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, ROGs, NO_X, and CO_2e. The calculation methodology and input data used in CalEEMod can be found in the CalEEMod User's Guide Appendices A, C, and D (CAPCOA 2022). The input data and subsequent construction and operation emission estimates for the proposed project are discussed below.

Construction Assumptions

Construction of the project is anticipated to begin as early as October 2023 and be completed in October 2025. Total building area square footage was based on a preliminary site plan provided by the project applicant and total landscape square footage was based on a preliminary landscaping plan provided by the project applicant. Construction modeling assumes the longest anticipated schedule reported by the project applicant: site preparation 20 days; grading 20 days; trenching (underground

infrastructure/utilities) 60 days; and building construction 340 days. It is anticipated building construction and trenching would overlap for approximately two months in 2024. Construction equipment assumptions were based on estimates from CalEEMod defaults. An estimated 50,300 CY of cut and an estimated 60,000 CY of fill is anticipated as soil movement during grading and an estimated 10,000 CY of import/export of soil is anticipated during grading. Approximately 50 truck trips per day, or a total of 1,000 truck trips, are anticipated for import/export of soil during grading. 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*.

Operation Assumptions

Operational mobile emissions were modeled using the project trip generation of 854 average daily trips, including 71 new AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 76 new PM peak-hour vehicle trips, from the project Transportation Impact Study (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2023). Operational emissions resulting from energy use, refrigerant use, area use, and solid waste generation were modeled using CalEEMod defaults with an additional 25 percent solid waste diversion to account for AB 341 requirements. Annual anticipated outdoor water use was provided by the project applicant with an added 20 percent reduction in water use to account for the requirements of the 2019 CALGreen.

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.

Impact Analysis

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 operation-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 (b) 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 2022.1.0 was used to quantify project-generated construction emissions. Construction activities were assumed to commence as early as October 2023 and be completed in October 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 5, *Construction Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions*. 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 (BMP). The project would implement all of the SMAQMD BMP to control fugitive dust in accordance with SMAQMD Rule 403. The modeling accounts for emissions reductions resulting from watering exposed surfaces twice daily.

As shown in Table 5, the proposed project construction period emissions of the ozone precursor NO_X, 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 5
CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA POLLUTANT AND PRECURSOR EMISSIONS

Construction Year(s)	ROG (pounds per day)	NO_X (pounds per day)	PM_{10} (pounds per day)	$PM_{2.5}$ (pounds per day)
2023	19.7	41.5	9.7	5.7
2024	21.4	19.7	2.4	1.1
2025	1.7	12.1	2.0	0.8
Maximum Daily Emissions	**21.4**	**41.5**	**9.7**	**5.7**
SMAQMD Thresholds	*None*	*85*	*80*	*82*
Exceed Thresholds?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Source: CalEEMod
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 emissions from fuel evaporation, brake and tire wear, and road dust emission resulting from worker and resident vehicles traveling to and from the project site.

The results of the modeling for project operational activities are shown in Table 6, *Maximum Daily Operational Emissions*. The data is presented as the maximum anticipated daily emissions for comparison with the SMAQMD thresholds.

As shown in Table 6, *Maximum Daily Operational Emissions*, 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 6
MAXIMUM DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Source	ROG (pounds per day)	NO_X (pounds per day)	PM_{10} (pounds per day)	$PM_{2.5}$ (pounds per day)
Area	5.8	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Energy	<0.1	1.0	0.1	<0.1
Mobile	3.6	3.3	1.9	0.4
Maximum Daily Emissions	**9.4**	**3.9**	**2.0**	**0.4**
SMAQMD Thresholds	*65*	*65*	*80*	*82*
Exceed Thresholds?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Source: CalEEMod
Numbers may not total due to rounding.
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

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 visitors and employees located within medical office buildings, approximately 50 feet to the west, 15 feet to the east, and 300 feet to the south of the project site. The closest school to the project site is Folsom Middle School approximately 1,000 feet (0.2 mile) to the northeast. It should be further noted that the closest residential property is approximately 430 feet to the north of the project site.

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

IV. Biological Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

A Special-Status Plant Survey Report was prepared by Madrone Ecological Consulting on July 5, 2023. The assessment is summarized below and is included as Appendix C to the IS/MND. Additionally, a Preliminary Arborist Report, Tree Inventory & Impact Summary was prepared by CalTLC on April 21, 2023, and is included as Appendix D to the IS/MND. A Biological Resources Assessment was prepared by Madrone Ecological Consulting in August 2023 and is included as Appendix E to the IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

The 7.6-acre Creekside Folsom property (or called the Study Area) is located north of East Bidwell Street and Creekside Drive, and south of Humbug Creek. The site is bounded to the west and north by an open space corridor along Humbug Creek. To the east and south, the Study Area is surrounded by urban commercial development.

Existing Site Conditions

The Study Area is comprised almost entirely of large cobble tailing piles remaining from historic dredge mining throughout the region. The tops and sides of the tailing piles have very little soil, and as a result are very sparsely vegetated with weedy upland species, such as yellow star thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), and wild oats (*Avena fatua*). Two shrubs that commonly colonize disturbed areas, coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*) and Armenian blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*) have established in some areas forming nearly mono-typic stands. Clay fines have accumulated in the low areas between the tailing piles (these are commonly referred to as “slickens deposits”). A number of very large trees and shrubs typical of mesic areas have been established within these low areas. However, presumably due to recent droughts, herbaceous and small perennial plant species in the low areas are primarily upland in nature, apart from a couple of small seasonal wetlands. Elevations within the Study Area range from approximately 295 feet amsl in the west to 325 feet near the eastern edge.

Terrestrial Vegetation Communities

Disturbed Annual Brome Grassland

The vast majority of the site is comprised of disturbed annual brome grassland. This community is dominated by ripgut brome, wild oats, yellow star-thistle, hedge parsley (*Torilis arvensis*), winter vetch (*Vicia villosa*), rose clover (*Trifolium hirtum*), and Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*).

Valley Oak Woodland

The low areas between the tailing’s piles are comprised of a Valley oak (Quercus lobata) woodland. This community is dominated by Valley oak, interior live oak (*Quercus wislizenii*), and Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*). Other tree and shrub species occurring commonly in this community include Goodding’s black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), Armenian blackberry, western poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), and grape (Vitis vinifera).

Coyote Brush Scrub

Coyote brush has formed dense stands in a few locations within the Study Area. Some of the denser areas are monotypic stands, while other areas have an understory of disturbed annual brome grassland.

Armenian Blackberry Brambles

Some expansive stands of Armenian blackberry bramble occur within the Study Area. The density of these stands precludes other plants from becoming established in these areas, and they are monotypic stands.

Urban/Dirt Roads

A paved bike trail and paved roadways occur along the outer edges of the Study Area; these have been mapped as Urban. Additionally, a well-established dirt road and dirt trails occur within the Study Area. These areas remain almost entirely unvegetated year-round. Neither the paved areas nor the unvegetated areas represent habitat for special-status species.

Aquatic Resources

An aquatic resources delineation has been conducted throughout the Study Area in accordance with U.S. Army Core of Engineers (USACE) protocol. A total of approximately 0.017 acres of aquatic resources were delineated within the Study Area. These aquatic resources are comprised of three small seasonal wetlands. This delineation has been submitted to the USACE with a request for an Approved Jurisdictional Determination, as we believe that the aquatic resources mapped within the Study Area are isolated and not subject to USACE jurisdiction.

Seasonal Wetland

Three seasonal wetlands have been mapped within the Study Area. All three of these features occur in the low areas between tailings piles, but they are each slightly different. One was inundated during winter and spring surveys and supported waterpepper (*Persicaria hydropiper*) as a dominant around the perimeter where water was shallow enough for emergent vegetation. The second is a marginal feature that saturates but does not appear to inundate with much frequency, and the herbaceous layer is dominated by Baltic rush (*Juncus balticus* ssp. *ater*) and common sedge (*Carex praegracilis*). The last seasonal wetland is a shallow, inundated feature along a pedestrian path through a tailing's depression. It was almost entirely unvegetated at the time of the survey, but Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum*) and annual rabbitfoot grass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*) (both hydrophytes) were present in trace amounts.

Protected Trees

CalTLC conducted an arborist survey of the trees within the majority of the Study Area, and those with driplines that overlap the edge of the Study Area. They surveyed a total of 126 trees, 103 of which are within the Study Area. A total of 99 of the 126 trees are native oaks greater than 6-inch diameter at standard height (DSH), which are protected by the Tree Ordinance. Although four Fremont's cottonwood trees have trunks with sufficient DSH to be considered Heritage Trees, they are not protected under the Tree Ordinance as the City's Master Tree List excludes this species due to high water needs and weak limb attachments. In addition, Madrone conducted a survey of the northern portion of the Study Area that was not surveyed by CalTLC, and found two interior live oaks and four Valley oaks that had been planted as mitigation for another project. Although all six of these trees have a DSH much smaller than 6" (they are each roughly 3" DSH), as they were planted as mitigation for another project, they are considered Regulated Trees and thus are also considered Protected Trees

under the tree ordinance. These 105 Protected Trees (comprised of 99 Native Oak Trees and six Regulated Trees) are summarized in Table 7, *Protected Trees within the Study Area*, below.

Table 7
PROTECTED TREES WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

Tree Type	Fair or Better Condition		Poor Condition		Dead or Dying (0-1)		Total	
	# Trees	DSH Inch	# Trees	DSH Inch	# Trees	DSH Inch	# Trees	DSH Inch
Valley Oak	38	475	15	157	2	11	55	643
Interior Live Oak	25	254	23	199	2	15	50	468
Total	**63**	**729**	**38**	**356**	**4**	**26**	**105**	**1,111**

Methodology

Madrone Ecological Consulting, LLC (Madrone) biologist Tara Collins conducted a special-status plant survey of the Study Area on April 18, May 18, and June 26, 2023. Meandering pedestrian surveys were conducted throughout the Study Area. The surveys were floristic in nature, which means that all plant species observed on-site were identified to the taxonomic level necessary to determine rarity. Thus, if a special-status plant was present but not on the target list, it would have been detected and documented.

Additionally, R. Cory Kinley, International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist #WE-9717A, Tyler Thomson, ISA Certified Arborist #WE-12751A and Ed Stirtz #WE-0510AM visited the property between November 22, 2021, and April 2nd, 2023 to provide species identification, measurements of diameter at breast height (DBH) and canopy, field condition notes, recommended actions, ratings, and approximate locations for the trees.

Madrone senior biologist Daria Snider conducted field surveys of the Study Area on November 2 and December 7, 2022 and January 4, April 18, May 18, and June 15, 2023 to assess the suitability of habitats on-site to support special-status species and to conduct an aquatic resources delineation in accordance with USACE protocol. A meandering pedestrian survey was conducted throughout the Study Area.

Special Status Species

Plants

Madrone botanists conducted rare plant surveys of the Study Area targeting the species listed below on April 18, May 18, and June 23, 2023. No special-status plants were found during the survey.

Big-Scale Balsamroot

Big-scale balsamroot (*Balsamorhiza macrolepis* var. *macrolepis*) is not federally or state listed, but it is classified as a CRPR List 1B.2 plant. The disturbed annual grassland and Valley oak woodland throughout the Study Area provide suitable habitat for this species. There are no CNDDB records of this species within five miles of the site (CNDDB 2023). This species was not observed during the 2023 protocol-level special status plant surveys of the Study Area.

Spicate Roseinweed

Spicate rosinweed (*Calycadenia spicata*) is not federally, or state listed, but it is classified as a California Rare Plant Ranks (CRPR) List 1B.3 plant. The disturbed annual grassland and Valley oak woodland throughout the Study Area provide suitable habitat for this species. There are no California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) records of this species as this species was only very recently added to the CRPR list and is not yet tracked by the CNDDB. However, the California Consortium of Herbaria contains two collections of this species within less than a mile of the site, both over 100 years ago. This species was not observed during the 2023 protocol-level special status plant surveys of the Study Area.

Dwarf Downingia

Dwarf downingia (*Downingia pusilla*) is not federally or state listed, but it is classified as a CRPR List 2B.2 plant. The seasonal wetland on the dirt road represents marginally suitable habitat for this species. One record of dwarf downingia has been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the site (CNDDB 2023). This species was not observed during the 2023 protocol-level special status plant surveys of the Study Area.

Tuolumne Button-Celery

Tuolumne button-celery (*Eryngium pinnatisectum*) is not federally or state-listed, but it is classified as a CRPR List 1B.2 plant. The seasonal wetlands within the Study Area provide marginally suitable habitat for this species. There are no CNDDB records of this species within five miles of the site (CNDDB 2023). This species was not observed during the 2023 protocol-level special status plant surveys of the Study Area.

Invertebrates

Crotch Bumble Bee

The disturbed annual grassland within the Study Area represents marginally suitable habitat for Crotch bumble bee. This community contains flowering plants for much of the year; however, many of the flowering species are non-native, the grassland is sparse due to the cobble substrate, and the entire area is subject to frequent anthropogenic disturbance. Due to the fact that Crotch bumble bee is currently absent from most of the Central Valley and areas west of the Central Valley of California, and the low quality of habitat onsite, there is a very low potential for the species to be present within the Study Area. There are no documented occurrences of this species within 5 miles of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Amphibians

California Red-Legged Frog

The Study Area is outside of the range for California red-legged frog as defined by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS; USFWS 2022). Additionally, the only potential aquatic habitat in the vicinity (the adjacent Humbug Creek) is occupied by large numbers of predatory fish and bullfrogs, which would consume California red-legged frog larvae. Due to these factors, there is no potential for California red-legged frog to be present within the Study Area. However, out of an abundance of caution, Madrone senior biologist Dustin Brown conducted a protocol level survey for California red-legged frogs. The survey was negative.

Reptiles

Western Pond Turtle

Suitable habitat for this species is present in Humbug Creek, adjacent to the western and northern edges of the Study Area. This species has a low potential to use portions of the Study Area close to the creek as movement habitat. Five occurrences of western pond turtle have been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the site, the nearest of which is just over one mile east of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Birds

Tricolored Blackbird

Tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor), which is currently in decline throughout the state, is listed as threatened under the CESA. The cattails and tules in the adjacent Humbug Creek provide suitable nesting habitat and the disturbed grassland within the Study Area could provide extremely marginal foraging habitat. Six occurrences of tricolored blackbird have been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the site, the nearest of which is just over one mile east of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023). The Study Area gets extremely heavy use on the pedestrian trails, and no reports of the species have been made to eBird, despite the presence of a wildlife viewing platform immediately adjacent to the Study Area overlooking the cattails. This species is extremely unlikely to utilize habitats within the Study Area.

Swainson's Hawk

Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is a raptor species that is not federally listed, but is listed as threatened by CDFW. Trees within the Study Area provide suitable nesting habitat, but the disturbed annual grasslands within the mine tailings represent very low quality foraging habitat. This site's urban location and distance from large areas of suitable foraging habitat further diminish the likelihood that this species would utilize the Study Area. Three occurrences of Swainson's hawk have been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the site, the nearest of which is a historic record centered in downtown Folsom (CNDDB 2023).

Olive-Sided Flycatcher

The olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*) is not listed and protected pursuant to either the California or federal Endangered Species Acts; but it is a CDFW species of special concern. Although the Study Area is outside of this species' breeding range, it has been documented in the vicinity of the Study Area (eBird 2023), and suitable spring and fall foraging habitat is present in the Valley oak woodlands within the Study Area. Olive-sided flycatcher has not been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

White-Tailed Kite

White-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*) is not federally or state listed but is a CDFW fully protected species. Trees within the Study Area provide suitable nesting habitat, but the disturbed annual grasslands within the mine tailings represent very low quality foraging habitat. This site's urban location and distance from large areas of suitable foraging habitat further diminish the likelihood that this species would utilize the

Study Area. Five occurrences of white-tailed kite have been documented in the CNDDB within 5 miles of the site, the nearest of which 2.25 miles east of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Bald Eagle

Bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) is listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and is fully protected under state law and the federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. The CNDDB lists one occurrence of this species within five miles of the Study Area, an active nest on the edge of Folsom Lake in February 2015 (CNDDB 2023). Foraging habitat is plentiful in the vicinity of the Study Area, and the large trees could provide nesting habitat; however, the urban nature of the site substantially reduces the likelihood that this reclusive species would nest on-site.

Mammals

Pallid Bat

Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*) is not federally or state listed, but is considered a CDFW species of special concern, and is classified by the WBWG as a High priority species. Tree hollows and exfoliating bark on trees throughout the Study Area represent suitable roosting habitat for pallid bat. One record of pallid bat has been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Townsend's Big-Eared Bat

Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*) is not federally listed, but it is a Candidate for state listing, and is classified by the WBWG as a High priority species. Large tree hollows could provide marginally suitable roosting habitat for Townsend's big-eared bat. Townsend's big-eared bat has not been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Silver-Haired Bat

Silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*) is not federally or state listed, but is classified by the WBWG as a Medium priority species. Tree hollows and exfoliating bark on trees throughout the Study Area represent suitable roosting habitat for silver-haired bat. Two records of silver-haired bat have been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Western Red Bat

Western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*) is not federally or state listed, but is considered a CDFW species of special concern, and is classified by the WBWG as a High priority species. Western red bat has not been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Hoary Bat

The hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*) is not federally or state listed, but is classified by the WBWG as a Medium priority species. Trees within the oak woodland and riparian woodland represent suitable roosting habitat for hoary bat. Hoary bat has not been documented in the CNDDB within five miles of the Study Area (CNDDB 2023).

Impact Analysis

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 impact with mitigation.

Special-Status Plant Species

No special-status plant species were observed during the 2023 protocol-level special-status plant surveys of the Study Area; however, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

Crotch Bumble Bee

The disturbed Annual Brome Grassland within the Study Area represents marginally suitable habitat for Crotch bumblebee, which is listed as a candidate species under the California Endangered Species Act (ESA). Approximately 4.6 acres of marginally suitable habitat for this species will be impacted by the Project. The removal of this marginally suitable habitat is not expected to have a significant impact on the bee. As a result, no mitigation for this removal has been recommended.

Western Pond Turtle

Project construction would affect disturbed annual grassland and Valley oak woodland near and adjacent to Humbug Creek. If present at the time of construction, western pond turtle nests in these areas could be destroyed and/or individual turtles moving through these areas could be injured or killed during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Nesting Birds

The Study Area provides potential nesting habitat for a number of special-status bird species as well as migratory species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Special-status species that could potentially be affected by loss of nesting habitat as a result of construction include Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and bald eagle. If present in the development area at the time of construction, the nests of these species could be destroyed. Suitable nesting habitats within the Study Area for other special-status species such as tricolored blackbird, are associated with areas outside of the development footprint, but nesting activity could be disturbed by construction activity. Migratory songbirds could nest throughout the development area, and construction activity could destroy active nests if they are present in the work area(s). Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Winter Foraging Birds

The olive-sided flycatcher has the potential to utilize the Valley oak woodland within the Study Area for winter foraging. As there is a relatively large amount of this vegetation type in the vicinity, this species is not anticipated to be impacted. Impacts would be less than significant.

Roosting Birds

Trees throughout the Study Area are habitat for various special-status bats species. If special-status bats were roosting in trees to be removed by Project construction, they could be injured or killed during the removal. Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Additionally, Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would be implemented to ensure a Worker Environmental Awareness Training is prepared and administered to project construction crews. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Special-Status Plant Species

Special-status plant surveys conducted throughout the Study Area in 2023 were negative, but given enough time, plants may become established in areas where suitable habitat exists. If construction does not commence prior to April 2026, another round of special-status plant surveys shall be conducted in areas proposed for impact prior to commencement of construction. Surveys shall be conducted area in accordance with the Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories for Federally Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Plants (USFWS 2000), the Botanical Survey Guidelines of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS 2001), and Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities (CDFW 2018). This protocol includes conducting surveys at the appropriate time of year when plants are in bloom.

If no special-status plant species are found, no further mitigation would be required. If special status plants are found within proposed impact areas, and they are perennials, such as big-scale balsamroot or spicate calycadenia, then mitigation could consist of digging up the plants and transplanting them into a suitable avoided area on-site prior to construction. If the plant found is an annual such as dwarf downingia, then mitigation could consist of collecting seed-bearing soil and spreading it into a suitable constructed wetland at a mitigation site. If special-status plants shall be impacted, a mitigation plan shall be developed and approved by the City. Mitigation for the transplantation/establishment of rare plants shall result in no net loss of individual plants after a five (5) year monitoring period.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Western Pond Turtle

A western pond turtle survey shall be conducted in all areas where construction activities will occur within 150 feet of Humbug Creek within 48 hours prior to construction. A report summarizing the methods and results of this survey shall be submitted to the City prior to construction. A brief email with the appropriate information is sufficient. If no western pond turtles or nests are found, no further mitigation is necessary. If a western pond turtle is observed within the proposed impact area, a qualified biologist shall relocate the individual to suitable habitat along Humbug Creek, outside of the proposed impact area prior to construction. If a western pond turtle nest is observed within the proposed impact area, the nest shall be fenced off and avoided until the eggs hatch. The exclusion fencing shall be placed no less than 25 feet from the nest. A qualified biologist shall monitor to ensure that hatchlings do not disperse into the construction area. Relocation of hatchlings will occur as stipulated above, if necessary.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Nesting Raptors and Other Birds

The following nest survey requirements apply if construction activities take place during the typical bird breeding/nesting season (typically February 15 through September 1).

Swainson's Hawk

A targeted Swainson's hawk nest survey shall be conducted throughout the proposed construction area and publicly accessible areas within 0.25 mile of the proposed construction area no later than 14 days prior to construction activities. If active Swainson's hawk nests are found within 0.25 mile of a construction area, construction shall cease within 0.25 mile of the nest until a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged or it is determined that the nesting attempt has failed. If the applicant desires to work within 0.25 mile of the nest, the applicant shall consult with CDFW and the City to determine if the nest buffer can be reduced. The Project applicant, the Project biologist, the City, and CDFW shall collectively determine the nest avoidance buffer, and what (if any) nest monitoring is necessary. If an active Swainson's hawk nest is found within the Project site prior to construction and is in a tree that is proposed for removal, then the Project applicant shall implement additional mitigation recommended by a qualified biologist based on CDFW guidelines and obtain any required permits from CDFW.

Other Birds

A pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist throughout the proposed construction area and within a 500-foot radius of proposed construction areas, where access is available, no more than seven days prior to the initiation of construction. If there is a break in construction activity of more than two weeks, then subsequent surveys shall be conducted.

If active raptor nests or a tricolored blackbird nesting colony are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. If active songbird nests are found, a 100-foot no disturbance buffer will be established. These no-disturbance buffers may be reduced if a smaller buffer is proposed by the Project Biologist and approved by the City (and CDFW if it is a tricolored blackbird nesting colony) after taking into consideration the natural history of the species of bird nesting, the proposed activity level adjacent to the nest, habituation to existing or ongoing activity, and nest concealment (are there visual or acoustic barriers between the proposed activity and the nest). A qualified biologist can visit the nest as needed to determine when the young have fledged the nest and are independent of the site or the nest can be left undisturbed until the end of the nesting season.

Survey Report

A report summarizing the survey(s), including those for Swainson's hawk, shall be provided to the City within 30 days of the completed survey and is valid for one construction season. If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.

Changes to Buffers and Completion of Nesting

Should construction activities cause a nesting bird to do any of the following in a way that would be considered a result of construction activities: vocalize, make defensive flights at intruders, get up from a brooding position, or fly off the nest, then the exclusionary buffer shall be increased such that activities are far enough from the nest to stop this agitated behavior. The exclusionary buffer will remain in place until the chicks have fledged or as otherwise determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with the City.

Construction activities may only resume within the buffer zone after a follow-up survey by a qualified biologist has been conducted and a report has been prepared indicating that the nest (or nests) are no longer active, and that no new nests have been identified.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Roosting Bats

A qualified biologist shall conduct a bat habitat assessment of all potential roosting habitat features, within the proposed impact footprint. This habitat assessment shall identify all potentially suitable roosting habitat and may be conducted up to 1 year prior to the start of construction.

If potential roosting habitat is identified (cavities in trees, etc.) within the areas proposed for impact, the biologist shall survey the potential roosting habitat during the active season (generally April through October, or from January through March on days with temperatures in excess of 50 degrees F) to determine presence of roosting bats. These surveys are recommended to be conducted utilizing methods that are considered acceptable by CDFW and bat experts. Methods may include evening emergence surveys, acoustic surveys, inspecting potential roosting habitat with fiberoptic cameras or a combination thereof.

A report summarizing the methods and results of the surveys shall be submitted to the City prior to tree removal and (if applicable) prior to bat exclusion as detailed below. If Townsend's big-eared bat is identified within any of the trees planned for removal, CDFW shall be notified; consultation under Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code may be necessary.

If any other roosting bats are identified within any of the trees planned for removal, or if presence is assumed, the trees shall be removed outside of pup season only on days with temperatures in excess of 50 degrees F. Pup season is generally during the months of May through August. Two-step tree removal shall be utilized under the supervision of the qualified biologist. Two-step tree removal involves removal of all branches of the tree that do not provide roosting habitat on the first day, and then the next day cutting down the remaining portion of the tree.

Additionally, it is recommended that all other tree removal be conducted from January through March on days with temperatures in excess of 50 degrees F to avoid potential impacts to foliage-roosting bat species.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Worker Environmental Awareness Training

Prior to any ground-disturbing or vegetation-removal activities, a Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT) shall be prepared and administered to the construction crews. The WEAT will include the following: discussion of the state and federal Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Project's permits and CEQA documentation, and associated mitigation measures; consequences and penalties for violation or noncompliance with these laws and regulations; identification of special-status wildlife, location of any avoided aquatic resources; hazardous substance spill prevention and containment measures; and the contact person in the event of the discovery of a special-status wildlife species. The WEAT will also discuss the different habitats used by the species' different life stages and the annual timing of these life stages. A handout summarizing the WEAT information shall be provided to workers to keep on-site for future reference.

Upon completion of the WEAT training, workers will sign a form stating that they attended the training, understand the information presented and will comply with the regulations discussed. Workers will be shown designated "avoidance areas" during the WEAT training; worker access should be restricted to outside of those areas to minimize the potential for inadvertent environmental impacts. Fencing and signage around the boundary of avoidance areas may be helpful.

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?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. Valley oak woodland is designated as Sensitive Natural Community by CDFW. The project proposes to impact all 1.9 acres of this community directly and permanently within the Study Area. Mitigation Measure BIO-6 would be implemented to reduce impacts to the Valley oak woodland Sensitive Natural Community to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: No Net Loss of Valley Oak Woodland

To achieve no net loss of Valley oak woodland acreage, mitigation shall include one or more of the following components:

- Establish or restore Valley oak woodland on or off-site;
- Preserve or enhance existing Valley oak woodland at an off-site location within Sacramento County; and/or
- Purchase suitable credits at an agency approved mitigation bank.

The Project proponent shall compensate for any loss of Valley oak woodland resulting from project implementation at a minimum 1:1 replacement ratio. The proposed mitigation plan shall be provided to and approved by the City prior to removal of the Valley oak woodland on-site. If the mitigation plan calls for establishing a new area of Valley oak woodland on or off-site, it shall include a provision to monitor the compensation area for a period of five years following planting. Note that this mitigation requirement may be combined with the Protected Tree Mitigation outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-7. As many of the impacted trees occupy this Valley oak woodland, they should not be double mitigated.

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?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. An aquatic resources delineation has been conducted throughout the Study Area in accordance with USACE protocol. A total of approximately 0.017-acre of aquatic resources were delineated within the Study Area. These aquatic resources are comprised of three small seasonal wetlands. All of the approximately 0.017 acre of seasonal wetlands mapped within the Study Area will be impacted by the project. The project would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-7 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: USACE Compliance

If the USACE agrees that the seasonal wetlands are not subject to their jurisdiction, then a permit from the USACE is not required. If the USACE determines that the seasonal wetlands are subject to their jurisdiction, the Project applicant shall apply for a Section 404 permit from the USACE.

The applicant shall apply for a Section 401 Water Quality Certification or Waste Discharge Requirement from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) depending on the outcome of the USACE determination of jurisdiction and adhere to the conditions.

The City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Policy NCR 1.1.3 requires preparation of a wetland mitigation and monitoring plan that "describes the habitats present within the proposed project site and establishes a plan for the long-term monitoring and mitigation of sensitive habitats." Given that no aquatic resources will be avoided within the Study Area, this Plan is expected to simply summarize the wetlands mapped on-site, and the mitigation for impacts agreed upon with the RWQCB (and the USACE if applicable)during the regulatory process.

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?

Less than significant impact. The Study Area is located in a largely urban setting, with existing development to the northeast, east, and south. However, Humbug Creek and its associated riparian corridor run along the western and northern edges of the Study Area. Humbug Creek and the associated riparian is undoubtedly utilized by both aquatic and terrestrial wildlife as a movement corridor. A frequently used broad paved multi-use trail separates Humbug Creek and its riparian from the Study Area. Given the frequency of use, this likely almost entirely precludes wildlife crossing during the day, but it is likely that wildlife crosses the path to access the site during the evening hours. Regardless, as the site is otherwise surrounded by urban development, wildlife is not expected to use the site to migrate to or from the surrounding urban development. Wildlife likely utilizes the site primarily for foraging and shelter purposes, and not for movement/migration. Therefore, development of the Study Area would not result in impacts to wildlife migration/movement and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. A total of 105 Protected Trees, comprised of 55 Valley oaks and 50 interior live oaks (as detailed in Table 7), are located within the Study Area. Of those trees, 101 will be removed by Project construction. Mitigation reductions are available for trees with a condition rating below "3", and for trees that will be impacted by structures (as opposed to other site amenities). Table 8, *Trees Proposed for Impact*, below details the Protected Trees that will be impacted in each of these categories.

Table 8
TREES PROPOSED FOR IMPACT

Impact Type	Fair or Better Condition (3-5)		Poor Condition (2)		Dead or Dying (0-1)		Total	
	# Trees	DSH Inch	# Trees	DSH Inch	# Trees	DSH Inch	# Trees	DSH Inch
Within Buildable Area	35	432	25	230	3	23	63	685
Outside Buildable Area	24	252	13	126	1	3	38	381
Total	**59**	**684**	**38**	**356**	**4**	**26**	**101**	**1,066**

Based upon our understanding of the Project, it would require the removal of 101 Protected Trees with a combined DSH of 1,066 inches. Of those 101 Protected Trees, four (26 DSH inches) are rated as Dead or Dying, and the Tree Ordinance does not require mitigation for removal of those trees. An additional 38 trees (356 DSH inches) are rated as having Major Structure or Health Problems, and although mitigation is required for their removal, the mitigation ratio is only 0.5:1. The remaining 60 trees (696 DSH inches) are rated fair or better and would require full mitigation for removal. However, in addition to the mitigation reduction for poor condition, the Tree Ordinance also allows for mitigation reduction of 50 percent for any trees within the buildable area of a residential parcel. Table 9 below summarizes the DSH inches of mitigation that are anticipated to be required for implementation of this Project as proposed. Mitigation Measure BIO-8 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Protected Tree Mitigation

To mitigate the loss of Protected Trees, the Project Applicant shall obtain a Tree Permit from the City of Folsom prior to Improvement Plan approval. The City shall review the Tree Permit application as well as the final site improvement plans and determine the precise mitigation requirement at that time. The Tree Ordinance outlines options for mitigation with replacement trees on-site, or via payment of an in-lieu fee. Tree replacement equivalents are provided in Table 9, *Summary of Mitigation of Protected Trees* below, and the current (July 2023) in-lieu fee is $250 per DSH inch.

Table 9
SUMMARY OF MITIGATION OF PROTECTED TREES

Condition	DSH Impacted	Mitigation Ratio	DSH Mitigation Required
Impacts within the Buildable Area			
Rating 0-1	23	None	0
Rating 2	230	0.25:1	57.5
Rating 3-5	432	0.5:1	216
Impacts Outside the Buildable Area			
Rating 0-1	3	None	0
Rating 2	126	0.5:1	63
Rating 3-5	252	1:1	252
Total	**1,066**		**588.5**

DSH = diameter at standard height

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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

A Cultural Resource Letter Report was prepared by HELIX on September 8, 2023. The assessment is summarized below and is included as Appendix F to this IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

Study Area

The cultural resources study area for the proposed Project is defined as the geographic area where project activities may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties of archaeological or buildings, structures, objects or features that are 45 years or older. The study area for the current undertaking includes approximately 7.71 acres within the City of Folsom in Sacramento County, California. The Project area is in Section 6 of Township 9 North Range 8 East and Section 31 of Township 10 North Range 8 East on the USGS 7.5-minute *Folsom* Quadrangle Map.

Regulatory Setting

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires that proposed projects be analyzed to determine whether it may cause significant effects to the environment, including historical resources. 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. 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 CEQA Lead Agency from determining that the resource may be a historic resource as defined in California PRC Section 5024.1.7.

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 as a California Historical Landmark. This includes Points of Historical Interest such as sites, buildings, features or events that are of local (city or county) significance; those designated after December 1997 and recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission are listed in the CRHR. A resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may also be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, per the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 11.5, Section 4850 et seq:

Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or

Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or

Criterion 3: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.

Criterion 4: It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

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.

California Health and Safety Code 7050.5

Health and Safety Code 7050.5 establishes that the intentional disturbance, mutilation, or removal of interred human remains is a misdemeanor. This code also requires that upon the discovery of human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery excavation, disturbance of land shall cease until a county coroner makes a report. The code also requires that the county coroner contact the NAHC within 24-hours if he or she determines the remains to be of Native American origin.

Native American Heritage Commission

PRC Section 5097.91 established the 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 (PRC §5097.94). The NAHC is responsible for bring forth actions regarding the prohibition or mitigation 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 §5097.94 and §5097.98 specify steps to be followed when the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner, including repatriation under the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act of 2001 and assisting landowners with developing agreements with appropriate Native American groups for the dignified treatment of Native American burials and associated cultural material.

Local Laws and Regulations

The City of Folsom has adopted ordinances and standard conditions to protect historical and cultural resources. These include the Folsom Municipal Code (FMC Chapter 17.52), which establishes a Historic District Commission and codifies the Historic District Design and Development Guidelines; City of Folsom Historic Register that maintains an inventory of important buildings and structures associated with Folsom's history between approximately 1850 to 1950. The City of Folsom 2035 General Plan, Chapter 10, Cultural Resources, includes several policies that establish the procedures and standards related to cultural resources (see Policy NCR 1.1.4 and 5.1.1 to 5.1.6).

Methodology

Records Searches. HELIX requested a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, North Central Information Center (NCIC) at California State University, Sacramento on April 19, 2023. The records search encompassed the study area, consisting of the approximate 7.71-acre Project area and surrounding 0.25-mile area. The objective of the records search was to identify (1) prior cultural resource investigations completed in the Project study area; and (2) indigenous or historical resources previously documented in the Project study area. Additional desktop research included a review of previous study reports, cultural resource records (Department of Parks and Recreation [DPR] forms), historical USGS topographic maps, historical aerial imagery, and the Historic Properties Directory of the Office of Historic Preservation to identify NRHP and CRHR eligible or listed resources. The California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, as well as the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Update, Environmental Impact Report, Cultural Resource chapter listings were reviewed to develop an understanding of the historical resources and landscape within and encompassing the Project study area.

Native American Outreach. On April 19, 2023, HELIX requested a records search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) to identify recorded locations of Native American sacred sites or human remains within the Project area. A written response received from the NAHC on July 10, 2023, stated that the results of the SLF search returned negative, but that HELIX should still reach out to 11 Native American points of contacts to see if they had any additional information about cultural resources in the project vicinity which they would like to share. On July 31, 2023, HELIX sent letters to the suggested points of contact.

Cultural Resource Pedestrian Survey. On May 11, 2023, HELIX Staff Archaeologist Jentin Joe, under the close supervision of HELIX Senior Archaeologist Ben Siegel, M.A. RPA, completed an intensive pedestrian survey of the Project Area. The survey involved the systematic investigation of the Project area's ground surface by walking in parallel 15-meter (m) transects. During the survey the ground surface was examined for artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, fire-affected rock, indigenous ceramics), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a indigenous cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings

(e.g., standing exterior walls, postholes, foundations, wells) or historic debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics). Ground disturbances such as gopher holes, burrows, cut banks, and drainage banks were also visually inspected.

Records Searches

NCIC Previous Studies

HELIX's requested records search at the NCIC identified fifteen cultural resource studies which have been previously conducted within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project Area. Four of these studies overlapped with at least a portion of the currently proposed APE. Each of the fifteen previously conducted investigations are described briefly in Table 10, while the four previous studies which at least partially overlap with the currently proposed APE are discussed below the table.

Table 10
PREVIOUS STUDIES CONDUCTED WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

Report #	Year	Author(s)	Title	Within Project Area	Within 0.25-mile radius
000155	1977	Greenway, Gregory	An Archaeological Survey of the Oak Avenue Parkway, Ashland Water Transmission Main and Storage, Blue Ravine Water Transmission Main, and the Lew Howard Memorial Park for the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California		X
000179	1978	Peak, Ann S. and Associates	Cultural Resource Assessment of the Rancho Circle Development, Folsom, Sacramento County, California		X
000289	1985	Peak & Associates, Inc.	Cultural Resource Assessment of the Blue Ravine Oaks Development, Folsom, Sacramento County, California		X
003762	1993	Sugnet & Associates	Section 404 Reg. Compliance Pre-Discharge Notification Reg. #199101232 Willow Creek Estates South, Unit 10	X	
003959	1987	Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.	Draft Environmental Impact Report for Blue Ravine Oaks East		X
004489	1986	Archeo-Tec	An Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance of the Proposed Willow Creek Estates South Development Project Folsom, California	X	
004491	1986	Peak & Associates, Inc.	Field Reinspection for the Blue Ravine Oaks East Project		X
004518	1988	Lindstrom, Susan	A Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Cerros-Morrison Homes Project at Willow Springs Hill near Folsom, California Sacramento County		X

Report #	Year	Author(s)	Title	Within Project Area	Within 0.25-mile radius
006703	2004	Jensen, Peter	Archaeological Inventory Survey Creekview Corporate Center Development Project, c. 7 acres Adjacent to Humbug Creek and Creekside Drive, Folsom, Sacramento County, California	X	
007926	1987	McKenna, Jeanette A. and Keven J. Peter	An Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of a Five Hundred Acre Parcel within the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California		X
008066	2004	Crawford, Karen	Historic Property Survey Report: East Bidwell Street/Blue Ravine Road, Final Archaeological Survey Report/ Historic Resource Evaluation Report for the Proposed Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Across East Bidwell Street, City of Folsom, Sacramento County		X
009192	2007	Furry, John	Archaeological/Historical Survey of the Morrison Homes Bike Trail Project		X
009890	2007	Jensen, Sean Michael	Creekview Professional Center Development Project	X	
011374	2012	Foutch, Amy	PG&E External Corrosion Direct Assessment (ECDA) on Line EW10 0617-06 Station 138+98, Folsom		X
013890	1993	Turney, Paul	Historic Report for the Southern Pacific Transportation Company Abandonment Exemption in Sacramento County		X

Report # 003762, entitled Section 404 Regulatory Compliance Pre-Discharge Notification Regulatory Number #199101232, Willow Creek Estates South Unit 10 Folsom California, was prepared by Sugnet & Associates on October 7, 1993. The APE studied by Report # 003762 entirely encompasses the current APE. By and large this report is a wetlands study, though there is mention that archival research was conducted to investigate the presence or absence of cultural resources within the APE, and that no archaeological sites have been recorded within the confines of the Willow Creek Estates South project area. Bedrock Milling sites were found within Willow Creek Estates South (Draft and Final EIR) but none were located within the currently proposed Project Area (Sugnet & Associates 1993:5.4).

Report # 004489, entitled *An Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance of the Proposed Willow Creek Estates South Development Project, Folsom, California* was prepared by Archeo-Tec in February 1986. The 784.6-acre APE for this report entirely covered the current APE, and exceeded its boundaries to the west, east, and south. The cultural investigation associated with Report #004489 consisted of a literature review at the Archaeological Study Center at California State University at Sacramento and an intensive archaeological surface reconnaissance of the APE. The archival research revealed that no archaeological sites had been previously recorded within the confines of the report's APE, but that this was a result from a lack of previous archaeological studies conducted within the APE. The pedestrian

survey associated with this report made use of 20 meter transects. Ultimately three indigenous archaeological sites (named AT-1, AT-2, and AT-3) were located during the survey. These sites were recorded as bedrock mortar features, containing between two and seven utilized, course-grained volcanic boulders. The report concludes that there is a "reasonable possibility for the existence of potentially significant indigenous period archaeological resources in the vicinity of AT-1, AT-2 and AT-3" and "recommended that a limited program of subsurface archaeological testing be implemented in the vicinity of these three bedrock mortar features". However, none of these three resources lie within the currently proposed APE, and as such neither they, nor materials associated with these sites are anticipated to be impacted by the proposed project.

Report # 006703, entitled Archaeological Inventory Survey Creekview Corporate Centre Development Project, c. 7 acres Adjacent to Humbug Creek and Creekside Drive, Folsom, Sacramento County, California, was prepared by Peter M. Jensen in March 2004. The cultural investigation associated with Report #006703 focused on an APE strikingly similar the currently proposed APE, though it appears to extend a bit further to the southwest (extending to Placerville Road). The report included a records search at the NCIC, Native American consultation, and a pedestrian survey of the APE. No evidence of indigenous activity or cultural resources was found within the APE associated with Report #006703. However, there was evidence that a Historic-era cultural resource CA-SAC-308-H/P-34-335 (the Folsom Mining District) extended onto the Project Area. While the resource as a whole consists of the entire placer mining area which surrounds the town of Folsom and which once extended along the American River, the evidence of this site found to lie within the APE consists only of waste rock piles (often called "tailings"). Jensen evaluated the waste rock piles/tailings within the APE under the CRHR and NRHP criteria, and noted that (a) the absence of historic artifacts or features makes the rock piles impossible to date, making it impossible to link the site components within the APE to specific mining events; (b) the rock piles cannot be associated with people significant in California or U.S. history; (c) according to records on file at the NCIC, there are large numbers of recorded waste rock and tailing debris piles which essentially duplicate the attributes of the piles within the APE, and thus the observed rock piles are not rare or underrepresented nor indicative of a "distinctive type" or "distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction"; and (d) as there are no artifacts or features associated with the waste rock, and as there has been more recent borrowing of some of the waste rock material for adjacent construction projects which has affected feature integrity, "further data recovery could not be expected to expand our understanding or appreciation of this portion of [the historic site] beyond that which has already been achieved in the existing site document filed with the NCIC."

Ultimately, argues Jensen, "the waste rock piles within the project area do not contain unevaluated data categories important in local, regional, California or United States history." As a result, Jensen recommended that "the waste rock/tailings features present within the project area do not contribute to significance per CEQA or National Register eligibility for site CA-SAC-308-H." Furthermore "all surrounding lands have been fully developed for commercial and related use, with very substantial buildings and structures erected and constructed. As a consequence, the integrity of the historic landscape itself within this portion of the City of Folsom has been completely destroyed the viewscape at this location retains none of its original historic attributes or qualities". As the portions of historic-era resource CA-SAC-308-H (the Folsom Mining District) found within the currently proposed APE was recommended as not contributing to the historical significance of the district per CEQA or eligibility per the National Register, Jensen ultimately recommended that the development of the currently proposed project area be granted archaeological clearance, so long as an inadvertent discoveries protocol was adopted.

Report # 009890, entitled *Archaeological Inventory Survey Creekview Professional Center Development Project, c. 7.72 acres Sacramento County, California* was written by Sean Michael Jensen and was prepared in October of 2007. The cultural investigation associated with Report #008980, focused on an APE strikingly similar to both the currently proposed APE, and the APE associated with Report #006703 though it appears to extend a bit further to the southwest (extending to Placerville Road) than the currently proposed APE. The investigation associated with Report #009890 included a records search at the NCIC, Native American consultation, and a pedestrian survey. Similar to the findings of Report #006703, this investigation found no evidence of indigenous presence or activity within the APE, but found that a portion of the Folsom Mining District (CA-SAC-308-h/P-34-335) extends into the APE. It was also noted within the report that prior to the pedestrian survey, the "client's representatives suggested possible 'holes' or 'mine pits' within the waste rock piles within the subject property. These have filled with water and are the source of the "wetlands" for which Corps of Engineers permitting may be required if they are to be infilled or otherwise impacted. However, observations made during the 2004 Jensen survey and the present re-survey suggest that the "holes" are simply pockets or depressions created at the juncture between separate episodes of rock deposition; the absence of rock material at the margins of areas where rock was deposited has resulted in what appears during the 2007 survey to be a 'hole' or 'excavation', but which in fact is an 'artifact' related to the manner of waste rock deposition itself." As a result, report #9890 interpreted these "holes" as depressions caused by the deposition of waste rock piles, and that they do not constitute sperate features related to the Folsom Mining District or any other cultural resource. Beyond the waste rock piles/tailings which were again identified within report #9890's pedestrian survey (as they were within the pedestrian survey conducted in association with report #006703), no historical resources were encountered within the APE. Report #9890 again evaluated the waste rock piles/tailings under the CRHR and NRHP eligibility criteria, and arrived at the same conclusion as report #006703, that, "the waste rock/tailings debris piles … do not contribute to [the historical] significance [of the Folsom Mining District] per CEQA or National Register eligibility for site CA-SAC-308-H." As a result, the report recommends that the "portion of historic site CA-SAC-308-H located within the APE is recommended non-contributing with respect to the National Register of Historic Places eligibility, and not significant per CEQA… [and that] archaeological clearance is recommended for the proposed project, so long as inadvertent discoveries protocols for both cultural materials and human remains are adopted.

Previously Recorded Resources

HELIX's requested NCIC records search identified nine previously recorded historic or indigenous-era resources located within a 0.25 mile radius of the currently proposed Project Area. One of those previously recorded resources, the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-00308H) was found to at least partially lie within the currently proposed APE. The nine previously identified resources within the Project vicinity are described within Table 11, and the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-00308H) is discussed in further detail below the table.

Table 11
PREVIOUSLY RECORDED RESOURCES WITHIN 0.25-MILE OF THE STUDY AREA

Primary (P-34-)	Trinomial	Year	Age	Description	Within Project area?
000009	N/A	1987	HIS	Mine/quarries/tailings	No
000335	CA-SAC-000308H	1995	HIS	Folsom Mining District, foundations/structure pads, water conveyance system and mine/ quarries/tailings	Yes
000629	N/A	1987	PRE	Feature RC-1, bedrock milling feature	No
000818	CA-SAC-000625	1986	PRE	Feature AT-2, bedrock milling feature	No
000820	CA-SAC-000627	1986	PRE	Site #4 WCO-2, bedrock milling feature	No
000821	CA-SAC-000628	1987	PRE	Site #3 WCO-1, bedrock milling feature and pestle	No
000920	CA-SAC-000673H	1988	HIS	Willow Springs Dairy; dairy farm	No
005120	N/A	1991	HIS	Placerville and Sacramento Valley Railroad; train	No
005211	N/A	2007	PRE	Morrison Homes Trail #1; bedrock milling feature	No

Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H). Dating to the Folsom historic mining period (1840s through the mid-twentieth century), the Folsom Mining District **c**onsists of the entire placer mining area surrounding the town of Folsom that once extended along the American River. The district incorporates the previous boundaries of the Folsom Mining District, the American River Placer Mining District, and numerous other, previously recorded smaller districts, along with separate features, structures, and objects distributed over an area in excess of 30 square miles. Features and sites within this district include mines, quarries, tailings, mining equipment, habitation sites, roads, railroad grades, water conveyance systems, and structural foundations. The Folsom Mining District is listed on the CRHR and NRHP. Records on file with the NCIC suggest that portions of this district may lie within the currently proposed APE, however cultural resource surveys covering the currently proposed APE which were conducted in 2004 and 2007 (associated with report #s 006703 and 009890 discussed in the previous section of this report) revealed that the only resources associated with the Folsom Mining District within the currently proposed APE are waste rock piles/tailings. Furthermore, it was the conclusion of both report #s 006703 and 009890 that these waste rock piles do not contribute to the CRHR or NRHP eligibility of the Folsom Mining District. As such these resources do not merit further consideration for the current undertaking as they do not require protection under CEQA or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Nonetheless, an examination of these rock piles/tailings and a search for any additional features or artifacts that might be associated with the Folsom Mining District became the focal point of HELIX's pedestrian survey of the APE.

Historic Map and Aerial Imagery Analysis

Historic maps encompassing the Project area were examined to better understand historic period land uses and developments within the Project Area. Maps examined included USGS Folsom 15' Quadrangle Maps from 1941, 1944, 1954 and 1967. HELIX's review of these maps; however, did not reveal any information pertaining to historic period developments and or land use within the APE.

HELIX staff also examined a series of historic aerial photographs dating from 1952 to 2020 to better understand historic-era development in the vicinity of the APE (NETROnline 2023). The 1952 photograph shows the APE as a vacant lot, with no structures or signs of previous agricultural development. Within this photograph, East Bidwell Street (to the south of the APE) and Blue Ravine Road (to the west of the APE) are already present as paved roads. At this time the parcel to the adjacent south of the APE is also still in open space. These conditions remain constant on site at least through 1966, however by 1984, Creekside Drive had been constructed. By 1993, the hospital complex to the east of the APE was under development. By 1998, it is also clear that a small commercial complex was developed in the parcel to the south of East Bidwell Street. Some small commercial structures also appear to have been developed to the west of the APE sometime between 1993 and 1998. By 2002, the parking lot for the hospital complex to the east of the APE had been constructed and five additional structures appear to be added to the complex. Between 2002 and 2005, what appears to be a small commercial center appears to have been constructed to the immediate south of the APE and a dirt trail was constructed leading northwest across the APE from Creekside Drive. A driveway leading to the small commercial center from Creekside Drive was also constructed sometime between 2002 and 2005, as well as a bike trail along the northwest border of the APE. These conditions on the APE and in the surrounding vicinity appear to have remained constant through 2020 (NETROnline 2023).

Ultimately, HELIX's Historic Map and Aerial Imagery analysis did not reveal any traces of historic era activity or development within the currently proposed APE.

Native American Outreach

HELIX used SLF to identify recorded locations of Native American sacred sites or human remains within the Project area. A written response received from the NAHC on July 10, 2023, stated that the results of the SLF search returned negative, but that HELIX should still reach out to 11 Native American points of contacts to see if they had any additional information about cultural resources in the project vicinity which they would like to share. On July 31, 2023, HELIX sent letters to the suggested points of contact. These Native American points of contact included:

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

As of the date of this report, only one response, a letter from the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians Cultural Resources Department, has been received. In this letter, dated August 21, 2023, the tribe did not report the location of any sensitive cultural resources within the project vicinity, and requested that the tribe be added as a consulting party in the identification of any Tribal Cultural Properties. No additional responses have been received from the NAHC recommended Native American contacts.

Intensive Pedestrian Survey

On May 12, 2023, HELIX Staff Archaeologist Jentin Joe surveyed the entirety of the 7.71-acre APE. The surveyor used transects spaced 10 meters apart to conduct a systematic investigation of the APE. During the survey, the ground surface was examined for artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, fire-affected rock, and indigenous ceramics), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a indigenous cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, postholes, foundations, wells), or historic debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics). Representative survey photographs are found in Attachment D.

In the northwest quadrant of the APE vegetation was found to be quite dense. A canopy of small acorn bearing oak trees extends just south of the concrete walkway that borders the northern boundary of the property. There is also a “pit” located in between several waste rock piles/tailings piles matching the description of the reported “pits” mentioned in Report #009890 which was found to be completely covered over in vegetation, with dense brambles preventing pedestrian access. Waste rock covers a large portion of the ground in this area with small, broken, palm-sized brown/black cobbles making up a majority of the waste rock piles. Originating within this northwestern quadrant and extending into the southwest and northeast portions of the APE, is an approximately 100-foot tall hill that towers over the APE and surrounding commercial buildings. The surveyor also noted considerable trash within the northwestern quadrant of the APE which is the result of a homeless encampment in this section.

The northeast quadrant of the APE is characterized by waste rock piles/tailings. These remains mostly border the northern edge of a secondary “pit” area that makes up the majority of this section. The rocks that make up these tailings mostly consist of palm sized brown and grey cobbles of granitic and metavolcanic rock. Observable soils in this area consists of very compact, light grey silt loam, with a significant level of small and mid-sized rock and cobble inclusions. A foot worn pathway was also noted along the “pit” within this quadrant which is also bordered by tailings on both sides and runs approximately 150 feet. The “pit” in this section of the APE is even larger than the one in the northwest quadrant. It essentially runs from the eastern corner of the APE to the center. The pit within this quadrant is also entirely overgrown on all of its slopes with bramble, preventing pedestrian access.

The southeast and southwest quadrants of the APE are both are on a raised hilltop above Creekside Drive and are heavily vegetated with waist high dry grasses which afforded the surveyor only modest ground surface visibility (approximately 30-40 percent). The southeast and southwest quadrants are at an elevation approximately 30 feet above street level but, were found to be relatively flat at their top.

Ultimately the APE was thoroughly inspected during the survey and no indigenous era resources were encountered. Furthermore, the only traces of historic era resources found within the APE consisted of waste rock piles/tailings that had been noted by previous surveys of the APE in 2004 and 2007, associated with the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H). HELIX prepared a continuation sheet on the DPR forms for the Folsom Mining District, depicting and describing the

current conditions of these rock waste piles/tailings. Copies of these DPR forms can be found in Attachment E of this report. No additional artifacts or features associated with these rock waste piles/tailings were observed by HELIX's surveyor.

Impact Analysis

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 cultural resource investigation for the proposed project included a records search of the Northern California Information Center (NCIC) database, desktop archival research including historical map and aerial image analysis, Native American outreach, and an intensive pedestrian survey of the Project Area. The records search at the NCIC identified fifteen previously conducted cultural investigations in the vicinity of the APE, four of which included an examination of the currently proposed Project Area. Of particular interest were Report #006703 and #009890 as their associated cultural investigations covered project areas strikingly similar to the currently proposed APE. Through their records searches, native American outreach efforts, and pedestrian surveys of the area, these reports concluded that the only cultural resources lying within the currently proposed APE consisted of waste rock piles/tailings associated with the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H). Furthermore, both reports recommended that the waste rock/tailings debris piles do not contribute to the significance per CRHR or NRHP eligibility of the Folsom Mining District and as such do not require further consideration for the purposes of project development. The NCIC records search also revealed that the rock piles/tailings associated with the Folsom Mining District are the only previously recorded cultural resources that lie within the APE. As a result of these records search findings, HELIX made it a priority to confirm the findings of Report #006703 and #009890 during the 2023 intensive pedestrian survey of the APE.

On May 12, 2023, HELIX Staff Archaeologist Jentin Joe surveyed the entirety of the 7.71-acre APE. Ultimately the APE was thoroughly inspected during the survey and no indigenous era resources were encountered. Furthermore, the only traces of historic era resources found within the APE consisted of the waste rock piles/tailings that had been noted by previous surveys of the APE in 2004 and 2007, associated with the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H). No additional artifacts or features associated with these rock waste piles/tailings were observed by HELIX's surveyor.

As a result of HELIX's cultural investigation of the currently proposed APE, HELIX is inclined to agree with the findings of Report #006703 and #009890, in that the only cultural resources that appear to be located within the APE are waste rock/tailings piles associated with the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308h), and that furthermore, due to the lack of additional features or datable artifacts or artifact scatters in association with these waste rock/tailings piles, these piles do not contribute to the significance per CRHR or NRHP eligibility of the Folsom Mining District and as such do not require further consideration for the purposes of the currently proposed project.

HELIX recommends that there would be no effect on historic properties, including archaeological and built-environment resources, as a result of project implementation. No additional studies, archaeological work, or construction monitoring are recommended. However, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would be implemented in the event that activities that might disturb the project area's ground surface over the course of the project encounter previously

unrecorded cultural resources beneath the ground surface. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and Mitigation Measure CUL-2, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Accidental Discovery of Cultural Resources

In the event that cultural resources are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities shall be halted within 100 feet of the discovery. Cultural resources could consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, wood, or shell artifacts, or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. In and around the waste rock/tailings piles associated with the Folsom Mining District (that are known to lie within the APE, there is also the possibility to encounter artifacts related to mining activities and or miner work camps. If the resources cannot be avoided during the remainder of construction, an archaeologist, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, shall be retained to assess the resource and provide appropriate management recommendations. If the discovery proves to be CRHR- or NRHP-eligible, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and shall be discussed in consultation with the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Accidental Discovery of Human Remains

Although considered highly unlikely, there is always the possibility that ground disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown human remains. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, Public Resource Code (PRC) Section 5097.98 must be followed. Once project-related earthmoving begins and if there is a discovery or recognition of human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the specific location, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98, or

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

    - The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission;

    - The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or

    - The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

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.

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 for 51 percent of the state's power mix. The remaining electricity came from out-of-state imports (CEC 2021a). Table 12 provides a summary of California's electricity sources as of 2020.

Table 12
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).

Impact Analysis

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. Energy used for construction would primarily consist of fuels in the form of diesel and gasoline for the operation of construction equipment and construction worker vehicles. While construction activities would consume petroleum-based fuels, consumption of such resources would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction. The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment estimated the proposed project's GHG emissions using CalEEMod (Appendix B). 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 that would exceed the requirement of the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6), by 15 percent or more. The project would provide 17 EV charging parking spaces, 84 EV ready parking spaces, and 34 EV capable parking spaces, as required under the City's General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-8 and would provide 40 bicycle parking spaces, as required under the City's General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-3. Additionally, the buildings would be positioned in a roughly north-south orientation maximizing passive solar access, roof cooling, and natural lighting.

During operations, the majority of fuel consumption resulting from the project would involve the use of motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site, as well as fuels used for alternative modes of transportation that may be used by residents. It should be noted that over the lifetime of the project, the fuel efficiency of vehicles is expected to increase. As such, the amount of gasoline consumed as a result of vehicular trips to and from the project site during operation is expected to decrease over time.

Based on these considerations, implementation of the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Impacts 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

A Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared by Wallace Kuhl & Associates on February 4, 2022, and was revised on November 11, 2022. The Geotechnical Engineering Report is summarized below and is included as Appendix G to the IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

Regional and Site Geology

The project site is located in the Great Valley geomorphic province of California, a 500-mile, northwest trending structural trough, generally constrained to the west by the Coast Ranges and to the east by the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Range. The Great Valley consists of two valleys lying end-to-end, with the Sacramento Valley to the north and the San Joaquin Valley to the south.

The Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys have been filled to their present elevations with thick sequences of sediment derived from both marine and terrestrial sources. The sedimentary deposits range in thickness from relatively thin deposits along the eastern valley edge to more than 25,000 feet in the south-central portion of the Great Valley. The sedimentary geologic formations of the Great Valley province vary in age from Jurassic to Quaternary, with the older deposits being primarily marine in origin. Younger sediments are continentally derived and were typically deposited in lacustrine, fluvial, and alluvial environments with their primary source being the Sierra Nevada Range.

Soils

Soils on the project site are mapped entirely as Xerorthents, dredge tailings, 2 to 50 percent slopes and Argonaut-Auburn complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes (NRCS 2023). The soil drainage class is characterized as medium to somewhat excessively drained and has a low to medium runoff class.

In late 2001, Wallace-Kuhl & Associates, Inc. excavated and sampled a total of 25 test pits (TP 1 through TP 25) to a maximum depth of about 18 feet below existing site grades at the project site. Most of the test pits identified the presence of dredge tailings. The dredge tailings encountered by the test pits can generally be described as consisting of a homogenous mixture of gravels and cobbles with varying percentages of sand, silt, and clay. Although a few boulders up to 16 inches in the largest dimension were observed during in the test pits and on the surface soils, the cobbles are generally less than 12 inches in diameter, with typical cobble size generally ranging between 4 to 6 inches in overall diameter. Additionally, seven of the test pits encountered clay and silt deposits, generally referred to as “slickens deposits.”

Test pits excavated near Creekside Drive encountered native silty and sandy gravel and cobble conglomerates which do not appear to have been disturbed by dredging. These conglomerates appear variably cemented and were much more difficult to excavate with a backhoe than the disturbed soils in other areas of the site.

Groundwater Conditions

In 2001, groundwater was reportedly encountered in the eight of the 25 test pits at various depths ranging from three feet to 12.5 feet below existing grades at the site grades. In December of 2022, groundwater was encountered at a depth of about three feet below existing grades. This groundwater is anticipated to be seasonal water commonly referred to as “perched” groundwater.

Regulatory Setting

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 adopted a Grading Code (Folsom Municipal Code Section 14.29) that regulates grading citywide to control erosion, storm water drainage, revegetation, and ground movement.

Impact Analysis

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 DOC Earthquake Hazards Zone Application (EQ Zapp) Map, there are no known active faults crossing the project site, and the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (DOC 2023b). The nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is the Cleveland Hill Fault located approximately 53 miles north of the site.

According to the Fault Activity Map of California, prepared by the California Geological Survey, the closest fault to the site is indicated to be the Bear Mountain Fault Zone, located approximately four miles east of the site. Therefore, ground rupture is unlikely at the subject property, and the impact 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 site-specific Geotechnical Engineering Survey identified the project site as Site Class D in accordance with the 2019 California Building Code (CBC; Class A requires the least earthquake resistant design and Class F the most earthquake resistant design). The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with standards imposed by the City of Folsom through the Grading Code, and in compliance with CBC requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects of seismic events. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

    iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than significant impact. Liquefaction is a soil strength and stiffness loss phenomenon that typically occurs in loose, saturated cohesionless soils because of strong ground shaking during earthquakes. The potential for liquefaction at a site is usually determined based on the results of a subsurface geotechnical investigation and the groundwater conditions beneath the site. Hazards to buildings associated with liquefaction include bearing capacity failure, lateral spreading, and differential settlement of soils below foundations, which can contribute to structural damage or collapse.

Based upon the results of the current and previous subsurface explorations, the known site geologic, seismologic, regional groundwater and soil conditions, the potential for liquefaction occurring at this site is low (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2022). Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

Less than significant impact. The project site is currently vacant and has relatively flat with gently sloping topography. Elevations in the project site range from 290 feet to 335 feet amsl. Additionally, as mentioned in question a.i), the project site is not located near a fault and is not located within an Alquist-Priolo 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. Soil on the project site, Xerorthents, dredge tailings, is classified as somewhat excessively drained and has a low runoff class, and Argonaut-Auburn complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes, is classified as medium drained and has a medium runoff class. A low to medium runoff class designation would indicate a low to medium potential for water erosion. Ground disturbing activities during construction of the project could increase the potential for soil erosion. The CBC 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 DOC "Erosion and Control Handbook." The erosion control plan would identify protective measures to be implemented during excavation, temporary stockpiling, disposal, and revegetation activities. With the approval of a soils report, grading plan, and an erosion control plan, impacts relating to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. As discussed under questions a.ii) and a.iii), the potential for damage due to liquefaction, slope instability, and surface ruptures was considered less than significant due to the relatively flat topography and the location of the project site. With regard to other potential geologic instability hazards, the Project would be designed in accordance with the CBC, which includes measures to reduce geologic impacts.

One sample of near-surface soil was submitted to Sunland Analytical Lab of Rancho Cordova, California, for testing to determine pH, minimum resistivity, chloride, and sulfate concentrations, and minimum resistivity to help evaluate the potential for corrosive attack upon buried concrete. The results of the corrosivity testing revealed a soil pH of 4.27 and a minimum resistivity of 1530 ohm-centimeters. The California Department of Transportation Corrosion and Structural Concrete Field Investigation Branch, 2021 Corrosion Guidelines (Version 3.2), considers a site to be corrosive to foundation elements if one or more of the following conditions exists for the representative soil and/or water samples taken: has a chloride concentration greater than or equal to 500 ppm, sulfate concentration greater than or equal to 1500 ppm, or the pH is 5.5 or less (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2022). Based on this criterion, the on-site

soil is considered corrosive to steel reinforcement properly embedded within Portland cement concrete for the samples tested. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce the impact of corrosive soils on the project.

The Geotechnical Engineering Report by Wallace Kuhl & Associates prepared recommendations for site clearing and preparation, site grading, engineered fill construction, final subgrade preparation, fill and excavation slop construction, utility trench backfill, foundation design, interior floor slab support, floor slab moisture penetration resistance, perimeter block walls and retaining walls, exterior flatwork, site drainage, pavement design, and geotechnical engineering observation and testing during earth (see Appendix G for more detail on site recommendations). With the implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2, outlined below, the impacts relating to unstable soils in the project area would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Evaluation of Corrosivity to On-Site Soils

Prior to construction, a construction engineer shall be consulted to determine and define the soil corrosion potential on the project site. The project structural engineer shall evaluate the requirements of the 2019 CBC and determine the applicability of the requirements to the site.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Implementation of Recommendations in the Geotechnical Engineering Report

A Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared by Wallace Kuhl & Associates on February 4, 2022 and was revised on November 11, 2022. The project applicant shall implement all applicable recommendations approved by a California-licensed geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist prior to issuance of a grading permit.

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. Based on visual observations of the surficial soils at the site and a review of the test pit logs performed as part of a previous study, most of the site soils are essentially granular, and are anticipated to have a low expansion potential (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2022). The results of previous laboratory tests performed on slicken deposits indicate the clays have a very high expansion potential and would not be suitable for use as fill within the structural areas. Additionally, the proposed project would be designed to meet the seismic safety requirements specified in the CBC, including standards to minimize impacts from expansive soils. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater 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-3 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment was prepared by HELIX on September 8, 2023. The assessment is summarized below and is included as Appendix B to the IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

The City of Folsom lies within the eastern edge of the SVAB. The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and State laws in the project area. As required by the 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 SIP, which is subsequently submitted to the USEPA, the federal agency that administrates the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended in 1990.

The 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 NO_X and ROG, which result in Ozone formation. High concentrations of Ozone are reached in the Folsom area due to intense heat, strong and low morning inversions, greatly restricted vertical mixing during the day, and daytime subsidence that strengthens the inversion layer. The greatest pollution problem in the Folsom area is from NO_X.

Regulatory 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 gases (GHG) because they function like a greenhouse by letting sunlight in but preventing heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere. GHGs are emitted by natural processes and human (anthropogenic) activities. Anthropogenic GHG emissions are primarily associated with the burning of fossil fuels during motorized transport, electricity generation, natural gas consumption, industrial activity, manufacturing, and other activities; deforestation; agricultural activity; and solid waste decomposition.

The GHGs defined under California's 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 are 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.

Senate Bill 100: Approved by Governor Brown on September 10, 2018, SB 100 requires that all retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers be procured from 100 percent eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources by the end of 2045.

Assembly Bill 1279: Approved by Governor Newsom on September 16, 2022, AB 1279, the California Climate Crisis Act, declares the policy of the State to achieve net zero GHG emissions as soon as possible, but no later than 2045, and achieve and maintain net negative GHG emissions thereafter, and to ensure that by 2045, Statewide anthropogenic GHG emissions are reduced to at least 85 percent below the 1990 levels. AB 1279 anticipates achieving these policies through direct GHG emissions reductions, removal of CO_2 from the atmosphere (carbon capture), and an almost complete transition away from fossil fuels.

California Air Resources Board Scoping Plan: The Scoping Plan is a strategy CARB develops and updates at least once every five years, as required by AB 32. It lays out the transformations needed across our society and economy to reduce emissions and reach our climate targets. The current 2022 Scoping Plan is the third update to the original plan that was adopted in 2008. The initial 2008 Scoping Plan laid out a path to achieve the AB 32 mandate of returning to 1990 levels of GHG emissions by 2020, a reduction of approximately 15 percent below business as usual. The 2008 Scoping Plan included a mix of incentives, regulations, and carbon pricing, laying out the portfolio approach to addressing climate change and clearly making the case for using multiple tools to meet California's GHG targets. The 2013 Scoping Plan assessed progress toward achieving the 2020 mandate and made the case for addressing short-lived climate pollutants (SLCPs). The 2017 Scoping Plan also assessed the progress toward achieving the 2020 limit and provided a technologically feasible and cost-effective path to achieving the SB 32 mandate of reducing GHGs by at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. On December 15, 2022, CARB approved the 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality (2022 Scoping Plan). The 2022 Scoping

Plan lays out a path to achieve targets for carbon neutrality and reduce anthropogenic GHG emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels no later than 2045, as directed by AB 1279. The actions and outcomes in the plan will achieve significant reductions in fossil fuel combustion by deploying clean technologies and fuels; further reductions in SLCPs; support for sustainable development; increased action on natural and working lands to reduce emissions and sequester carbon; and the capture and storage of carbon (CARB 2022).

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 vehicle miles traveled (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 GHGs. 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 GHGs", 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 2018a).

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 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 visitors and employees within medical office buildings, approximately 50 feet to the west, 15 feet to the east, and 300 feet to the south of the project site. The closest school to the project site is Folsom Middle School approximately 1,000 feet (0.2 mile) to the northeast. It should be further noted that the closest residential property is approximately 430 feet to the north of the project site.

Methodology and Assumptions

Criteria pollutant and precursor emissions, and GHG emissions for the project construction activities and long-term operation were calculated using CalEEMod, Version 2022.1.1.12. 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 emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model was developed for 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 model calculates emissions of criteria pollutants, ozone precursors, and GHGs, including PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, ROGs, NO_X, and CO_2e. The calculation methodology and input data used in CalEEMod can be found in the CalEEMod User's Guide Appendices A, C, and D (CAPCOA 2022). The input data and subsequent construction and operation emission estimates for the proposed project are discussed below.

Construction Assumptions

Construction of the project is anticipated to begin as early as October 2023 and be completed in October 2025. Total building area square footage was based on a preliminary site plan provided by the project applicant and total landscape square footage was based on a preliminary landscaping plan provided by the project applicant. Construction modeling assumes the longest anticipated schedule reported by the project applicant: site preparation 20 days; grading 20 days; trenching (underground infrastructure/utilities) 60 days; and building construction 340 days. It is anticipated building construction and trenching would overlap for approximately two months in 2024. Construction equipment assumptions were based on estimates from CalEEMod defaults. An estimated 50,300 CY of cut and an estimated 60,000 CY of fill is anticipated as soil movement during grading and an estimated 10,000 CY of import/export of soil is anticipated during grading. Approximately 50 truck trips per day, or a total of 1,000 truck trips, are anticipated for import/export of soil during grading. 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 Assumptions

Operational mobile emissions were modeled using the project trip generation of 854 average daily trips, including 71 new AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 76 new PM peak-hour vehicle trips, from the project Transportation Impact Study (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2023). Operational emissions resulting from energy use, refrigerant use, area use, and solid waste generation were modeled using CalEEMod defaults with an additional 25 percent solid waste diversion to account for AB 341 requirements. Annual anticipated outdoor water use was provided by the project applicant with an added 20 percent reduction in water use to account for the requirements of the 2019 CALGreen.

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 GHG 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 2018a).

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 Climate Action Plan (CAP)/GHG reduction measures consistency checklist, mitigation monitoring and reporting plan, or other mechanism for monitoring and enforcement as appropriate).

Impact Analysis

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

Less than significant impact 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 using CalEEMod, as described in *Methodology and Assumptions*.

The results of the construction GHG Emissions are disclosed below in Table 13, *Construction GHG Emissions*. Due to the cumulative nature of GHGs, SMAQMD recommends amortizing a project's construction emissions over the operational lifetime of the project. Therefore, the construction emissions are amortized (i.e., averaged) over 30 years and added to operational emissions in this analysis.

Table 13
CONSTRUCTION GHG EMISSIONS

Year of Emissions	Emissions (MT CO_2e)
2023	149
2024	561
2025	159
Total	**869**
Amortized Construction Emissions	28.9

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

The results of operational GHG Emissions are disclosed below in Table 14, *Operational GHG Emissions*.

Table 14
OPERATIONAL GHG EMISSIONS

Emission Sources	2026 Emissions (MT CO_2e)
Area	3
Energy	291
Mobile	914
Water	7
Waste	58
Refrigerant	>1
Subtotal[1]	**1,273**
Amortized Construction Emissions	**29**
Total	**1,302**

Source: CalEEMod
[1] Totals may not sum due to rounding.
GHG = greenhouse gas; MT = metric tons;
CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

To determine significance of the project's GHG emissions, the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist was completed (City 2021a).

Part 1: Land Use Consistency

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

Yes (Consistent). The project parcel is designated as PO in the Folsom 2035 General Plan and is subject to the General Plan's EBC Overlay. The zoning designation of the project site is BP with a PD overlay. 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 require a land use designation or zoning change and would be consistent with the residential densities of the EBC Overlay. The following entitlements are requested to implement the project:

1. Planned development for site design, architecture, and landscaping for a 188-unit multi-family residential project.

2. A Conditional Use Permit would be required as proposed development would exceed two stories and 35 feet in height.

The project is consistent with applicable development standards for the BP-PD zoning district. As shown in Table 14 above, the proposed project is anticipated to result in approximately 1,302 MT CO_2e per year.

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

E-1 Building Energy Sector: Will the project comply with Tier 1 or Tier 2 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen)?

Yes (Consistent). The project would comply with Tier 1 CALGreen.

T-1 Mix of Uses: Will the project be located within a Transit Priority Area (1/2-mile of a light rail station) or within the East Bidwell Mixed-Use Overlay and has a mix of uses (i.e., residential, office, commercial, etc.) with a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) or a Floor Area Ration (FAR) of 0.75?

Yes (Consistent). The project is located within the East Bidwell Mixed-Use Overlay and would include construction of 188 dwelling units on a 7.71-acre project site. The project would result in a density of 24.25 dwelling units per acre.

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

Yes, with mitigation (Consistent with Mitigation). The project would provide 40 bicycle parking spaces, which is 5 percent more than required. Approximately, 20 bicycle parking spaces would be short-term, and 20 bicycle parking spaces would be long-term. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 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): Does the project use high-performance diesel (also known as Diesel-HPR or Reg-9000/RHD) for construction equipment?

Yes, with mitigation (Consistent with Mitigation). Mitigation Measure GHG-2 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, does the project provide electric vehicle charging in 5 percent of total parking spaces?

Yes, with mitigation (Consistent with Mitigation). The project would provide a total of 334 parking spaces. A total of 17 parking spaces would be EV chargers, 84 parking spaces would be EV ready, and 34 parking spaces would be EV capable. Mitigation Measure GHG-3 would require installation of 17 EV charging stations based on the 334 total parking spaces proposed for the project.

SW-1 Enhanced Construction Waste Diversion: Does the project divert 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?

Yes, with mitigation (Consistent with Mitigation). 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, will the project comply with all applicable indoor and outdoor water efficiency and conservation measures required under CALGreen Tier 1?

Yes, with mitigation (Consistent with Mitigation). 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 GHG 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: 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-2: 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-3: Electric Vehicle Charging

In accordance with the City General Plan GHG Reduction Measure T-8, the project shall provide 17 electric vehicle charging stations based on the 334 total parking spaces proposed for 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 (CALGreen 2019).

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 original overall State plan and policy was AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The quantitative goal of AB 32 was to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 32 extended the requirements of AB 32 by requiring further reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. AB 1279, the California Climate Crisis Act, was approved on September 16, 2022, and declares the policy of the State to achieve net zero GHG emissions as soon as possible, but no later than 2045, and achieve and maintain net negative GHG emissions thereafter, and to ensure that by 2045, Statewide anthropogenic GHG emissions are reduced to at least 85 percent below the 1990 levels. The 2022 CARB Scoping Plan lays out a path to achieve targets for carbon neutrality and reduce anthropogenic GHG emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels no later than 2045, as directed by AB 1279. 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 GHG 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 VMT. The project is anticipated to generate less than 82 percent of the regional per capita residential daily VMT of 20.82 miles. According to the Transportation Impact Study (TIS), the project would generate an average residential VMT of 17 miles per capita (per day) (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2023). This VMT 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 2022 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared by Terracon Consultants, Inc. on October 5, 2022. The Phase I ESA is summarized below and is included as Appendix H to the IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

The project site is currently undeveloped and has no past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites. The schools nearest to the project site are Folsom Middle School, approximately 900 feet northeast of the site, Blanche Sprentz Elementary School, approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the site, Guidepost Montessori at Folsom, approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the site, and Folsom Educational Academy, approximately one mile southeast of the site.

Historical Information

Based on a review of the historical information, the site consisted of undeveloped land from the early 1890s to the mid-1910s, apparent mine tailings with vegetation from the center to northwest by the late 1930s to the mid-1980s, mine tailings were no longer apparent by the early 1990s and the site remained vacant to the present day.

The northeastern adjoining properties consisted of undeveloped land by the early 1890s to late 1990s and developed with existing commercial buildings by the mid-2000s to the present. The southeastern adjoining properties consisted of undeveloped land from the early 1890s to the early 1980s, developed Creekside Drive adjoining the site by the mid-1980s, and developed with the existing commercial buildings with associated parking lot since the early 1990s. The southwestern adjoining properties consisted of undeveloped land from the early 1890s to the mid-1910s, developed a primary highway with minor mine tailings near the northwest corner from the early 1940s to the early 1990s, developed existing commercial buildings since the late 1990s. The northwestern adjoining properties consisted of undeveloped land followed by a creek by the early 1890s to the mid-1910s, apparent mine tailings followed by a light duty road by the late 1930s to the mid-1940, light duty road improved to Green Valley by the early 1950s, Green Valley redeveloped into Blue Ravine Road by the late 1960s to the early 1980s, mine tailings were no longer apparent by the early 1990s, and developed the existing buildings by the late 1990s. The site and the adjoining properties were subject to mining in the early-1900s. Historical mining activities often utilized heavy metals, mercury in particular, in methods to extract ore. However, the surrounding areas have been developed with no reported incidents or impacts that may be attributed to historical mining activities.

Database Search

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the SWRCB Geotracker (SWRCB 2023); California Department of Toxic Substance Control's (DTSC) EnviroStor online tool (DTSC 2023); and the USEPA's Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2023b). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, no hazardous waste sites are located 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).

Impact Analysis

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

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

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

Further, the City has set forth its hazardous materials goals and policies in the Hazardous Materials Element of the General Plan (City 2018a). 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 would therefore cause a less than significant impact.

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. These regulations protect the health and welfare of residents of Folsom through management and regulation of hazardous materials in a manner that focuses on preventing problems. With the implementation of these regulations, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be low, and therefore would cause a less than significant impact.

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

Less than significant impact. The nearest school is Folsom Middle School, approximately 900 feet east of the site. During project construction, oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, paints, solvents, and other hazardous materials may be used, but they would be used according to local, State, and federal regulations. With these regulations in place, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

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?

Less than significant impact. No hazardous materials sites are located at the project site based on review of the EnviroStor (DTSC 2023), Geotracker (SWRCB 2023), and USEPA Superfund Priority List (USEPA 2023b).

The site, identified as Creekview Profession, is listed on the NPDES database under regulatory measure type of construction. The listing was issued on July 29, 2008, and the status was listed as ‘returned’. NPDES listing typically documents stormwater regulations, and it appears that the construction did not occur. Based on the nature of the listing, Creekview Profession does not represent a Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC) to the site. The remaining facilities listed in the database report do not appear to represent RECs to the site at this time based upon regulatory status, apparent topographic gradient, and/or distance from the site (Terracon Consultants Inc. 2022).

During the site reconnaissance survey, Terracon observed a small quantity of municipal waste consisting of food wrappers, bottles, and other plastic items along the southwestern and southeastern portion of the site. Staining, noxious odors, or evidence of hazardous materials were not observed. Additionally,

soil stockpiles were observed on the southwestern portion of the site. The stockpiles possibly came from construction work done in the adjoining shopping center or Medical Center. Staining, noxious odors or evidence of hazardous materials were not observed during site reconnaissance. The observed municipal waste and soil stockpiles do not represent a REC to the site (Terracon Consultants Inc. 2022).

The northeastern adjoining property consists of Harley Harmon (1621 Creekside Drive). The southeastern adjoining property consists of an Urgent Care Center and Parking lot (1600 Creekside Drive) with Pediatric Medical Associates Parking lot (1580 Creekside Drive). The southwestern adjoining property consists of a Peet's Coffee and T-Mobile (1290 E Bidwell Street), multi-commercial building (1300 E Bidwell Street), Kids Care Dental & Orthodontics (1310 E Bidwell Street), and First Citizens Bank (1320 E Bidwell Street). The northwestern adjoining property consists of a pedestrian/bicycle trail followed by Humbug Creek. RECs were not observed with the adjoining properties (Terracon Consultants Inc. 2022).

RECs or Controlled RECs (CREC) were not identified in connection with the site. As such, no additional investigation is warranted at this time. Additionally, the site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

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 9 miles east 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 2020a). The proposed project is located in evacuation plan area #22-Mercy Hospital, which identifies a portion of Creekside Drive along the project site frontage as a neighborhood evacuation route and a minor evacuation route. The evacuation plan area also identifies Blue Ravine Road and East Bidwell Street as major evacuation routes. The proposed project would not modify any pre-designated emergency evacuation route or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. The project site would include a main vehicle access driveway and an emergency vehicle access driveway. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout the project site to meet the Fire Department standards for fire truck maneuvering, location of fire truck 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 an urbanized area in the City of Folsom and is provided urban levels of fire protection by the City. The proposed project would include an emergency vehicle access driveway along the frontage of the project site, along Creekside Drive, and would be

maintained to meet the Fire Department standards for fire truck maneuvering, location of fire truck to fight a fire, rescue access to the units, and fire hose access to all sides of the buildings. All curbs adjacent to the fire lane would be painted red for emergency fire services. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss due to wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A Preliminary Drainage Study was prepared by Baker-Williams Engineering Group on June 29, 2023 and is included as Appendix I to this IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

The 7.71-acre polygonal shaped project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. Elevations in the project site range from 290 feet to 335 feet amsl. Humbug Creek is located directly north of the project site, and Willow Creek Bike Trail is located in the northeastern edge of the project site. The existing terrain is very erratic and undulated from former dredging operations resulting in large mounds and deep depressions throughout the site.

Commercial and retail development, multi-family apartment communities, assisted living facilities, and medical buildings are located south of the site. Further south past the medical buildings include single-family residences. Commercial and retail development are located west of the site. Commercial development, retail development, and open space are located north of the site. Further north past the commercial development includes single-family residences. Medical buildings, health and wellness businesses, and multi-family apartment communities are located east of the site.

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 06067C0117H effective 8/16/2012 (FEMA 2023). The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain; however, it is located direction south of Humbug Creek, which is located within FEMA Flood Hazard AE, Regulatory Floodway.

Regulatory Setting

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

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

Standard construction conditions required by the City include:

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

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

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

Additionally, the City enforces the following requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code as presented in Table 15.

Table 15
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 2021a

Impact Analysis

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 Sacramento County storm drainage requirements including water quality are specified in the Sacramento Region Storm Drainage Water Quality Design Manual. This manual specifies the regional area where water quality, low impact development (LID) and hydromodification calculations are required. The proposed project is located within the region that is exempt from hydromodification calculations. However, the project would drain to bio-retention areas that are intended to comply with the Sacramento Region Water Quality Design Manual. The project site is separated into three water quality sheds draining to bio-retention areas; however, there are adequate additional areas onsite and potential design modifications to the bio-retention areas for expansion. The additional bio-retention areas would be included in the project construction document phase. If necessary or required, a water quality device (Contech, CDS Unit) could be provided. The CDS unit would also act as a trash capture device for the southernly shed. Additional trash capture devices would be installed as needed prior to draining offsite. As outlined in the Stormwater Quality Design Manual, the proposed LID requirements would be met with project implementation.

Modifications to the onsite drainage resulting in on-or off-site erosion, pollutants, flooding, and/or otherwise substantially degrading water quality would be a potentially significant impact. The proposed project would be required to comply with various State and local water quality standards which would ensure the proposed project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge permits, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As the project would disturb greater than one acre, the proposed project would be subject to NPDES permit conditions which include the preparation of a SWPPP for implementation during construction. As described above, 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.

The project drainage has been analyzed as outlined in the current Sacramento County improvement standards using the SacCalc hydraulic Calculator HEC-1 method for 10-year and 100-year flows. The post project drainage calculations would utilize standard runoff for 80 percent impervious area for multi-family developed land use. There is a portion of the existing bike trail about 120 feet to the north of the culvert that was surveyed for crown elevation at the current lowest part of the bike trail. The lower part of the trail would serve as the overland release (OLR) for the open space and the project. The calculations in the Preliminary Drainage Report showed that the design parameters are in accordance with FEMA floodplain elevation requirements and the storm runoff for 10-year and 100-year storm events, per the Sacramento County Improvement Standards as adopted by the City. The post project flows have no significant impact on adjacent developed parcels, and the existing OLR at the existing bike trail would also serve the OLR requirements for the project.

Further, prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the applicant would be required to submit to the City a drainage plan that shows how project BMP capture storm water runoff during project operations. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that water quality standards and discharge requirements are not violated, and water quality is protected. Impacts would be less than significant for questions a), c), and e).

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

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the use of groundwater supplies because domestic water in the City is provided solely from surface water sources from the Folsom Reservoir. While development of the proposed project would increase the percentage of impervious surface on the site that could affect groundwater recharge, the site is not previously known to be important to groundwater recharge. Further, because the proposed project would not rely on groundwater for domestic water and irrigation purposes, and because 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; however, the site borders FEMA Flood Hazard Zone AE, Regulatory Floodway, to the north (FEMA 2023). 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 body of water is the American River, which is approximately 1.4 miles northwest, and Folsom Lake, which is approximately 2-mile northeast of the project site. Humbug Creek borders the project site 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.

The City of Folsom is located approximately 95 miles from the Pacific Ocean, at elevations ranging from approximately 140 to 828 feet amsl. Because of this, there would be no possibility of inundation by tsunami. The City is located adjacent to Folsom Lake, a reservoir of the American River impounded by a main dam on the river channel and wing dikes. Areas of the City adjacent to the wing dikes could be adversely affected by a seiche as a result of an earthquake, either through sloshing within a full reservoir or by a massive landslide or earth movement into the lake. Although historic seismic activity has been minor, the potential for strong ground shaking is present and the possibility exists of a strong earthquake occurring when lake levels are high. This could create a large enough wave to overtop or breach the wing dikes although this is considered to be a remote possibility.

Mudslides and other forms of mass wasting occur on steep slopes in areas having susceptible soils or geology, typically as a result of an earthquake or high rainfall event. However, City grading standards, including requirements to evaluate slope stability and implement slope stabilizing measures as necessary, would prevent this potential effect. In summary, there would be no potentially significant impact from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow and no mitigation would be necessary.

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 project site is designated in the General Plan as PO, which provides low-intensity business and professional offices that are compatible with higher-intensity residential uses. The project site is also subject to the General Plan's EBC Mixed Use Overlay, which allows for a mixture of commercial and residential uses including multifamily housing. .

The zoning designation of the site is in the BP District. According to the Folsom City Municipal Code, the BP zoning district generally permits office building and related uses such as banks, doctor's offices, general business office, and general uses. The purpose of a BP zoning district is to provide an area for business and professional office and compatible related uses. This zoning district is intended to promote a harmonious development of business and professional office areas with adjacent commercial or residential development. Four-story buildings are allowed in the BP zoning district with approval of a minor CUP. While the BP zoning does not itself allow for residential uses either by right or with a conditional use permit, California Government Code section 65589.5(j)(4) states that "a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective general plan standards and criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the general plan". Because the EBC General Plan overlay allows for multifamily housing, a rezone would not be required in this case to develop the proposed multifamily housing project.

Entitlement requests for this project include a PD Permit and a CUP. The purpose of the PD Permit is to allow for greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. With the PD Permit, the project's site plan, elevations, and overall project design would be evaluated, and specific development standards would be defined. The CUP is required to allow development of buildings that exceed two stories and 35 feet in height.

Impact Analysis

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The proposed project would develop a vacant, undeveloped lot, surrounded by commercial development, retail development, residential development, and medical buildings. The construction would not barricade or reduce access to East Bidwell Street, Blue Ravine Road, or Creekside Drive. The main vehicle access driveway and emergency vehicle access driveway would be located along the frontage of the project site, along Creekside Drive. As the site is currently vacant, the proposed project would not divide an established community. No impact would occur.

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the site. The project site is currently zoned BP. As noted above, while residential use is not allowed by right in the BP zone, no rezone is required due to residential use being allowed by right in the EBC General Plan overlay. A PD Permit would be required for site design, architecture, and landscaping of a multi-family rental housing community on the project site. A CUP would be required for buildings that exceed two storis and 35 feet in height. The maximum building height for Buildings A-D would be four stories and 52 feet, 6-inches to the top of the roof ridge and therefore, a CUP would be required.

The density of the proposed project has a FAR of 0.62. The PO land use designation only allows for a 0.2-0.5 FAR; however, the EBC Mixed Use Overlay allows for a 0.5-1.5 FAR. As the project site is designated as PO subject to EBC Mixed Use Overlay, the FAR would be consistent with the range of FAR densities permitted. Additionally, the EBC Mixed Use Overlay allows for 20-30 dwelling units per acre. The proposed project would include 188 units on a 7.71-acre, which totals approximately 24 units per acre. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the maximum permitted dwelling units per acre. The proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation and, therefore, 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 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*, no known mineral resources are mapped in the project area (DOC 2023c).

Impact Analysis

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 (DOC 2023c). 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 impact would result, 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A Noise and Vibration Assessment was prepared by HELIX on September 7, 2023. The assessment is summarized below and is included as Appendix J to the IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include open space to the north; medical offices, Mercy Hospital of Folsom, and Creekside Drive to the east; medical offices, commercial uses, and East Bidwell Street to the south; and open space and commercial uses to the west. Noise sources in the project vicinity are dominated by traffic noise from Creekside Drive, East Bidwell Street, and other nearby roadways. Additional noise sources in the area include typical suburban residential noise sources (e.g., landscape maintenance equipment; building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning [HVAC] systems; dogs) and occasional noise from operation of the hospital located east of the project site.

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 NSLU to the project site is the Mercy Hospital approximately 300 feet east of the project site. The nearest residential land uses to the project site include an assisted living facility approximately 530 feet to the south across East Bidwell Street and multi-family apartments located approximately 1,000 feet to the northeast.

Noise Survey

A noise survey was conducted at the project site on May 31, 2023, which included two short-term ambient noise measurements. Measurement M1 was conducted in the eastern portion of the project site along Creekside Drive, approximately 40 feet from the roadway centerline. Measurement M2 was conducted in the central portion of the project site. The measured noise levels are shown in Table 16, *Noise Measurement Results*.

Table 16
NOISE MEASUREMENT RESULTS

M1	
Date	May 31, 2023
Time	11:20 a.m. – 11:35 p.m.
Location	Along Creekside Drive, at eastern side of project site.
Noise Level	66.0 dBA L_{EQ}
Notes	Noise primarily from vehicular traffic on Creekside Drive.
M2	
Date	May 31, 2023
Time	11:40 a.m. – 11:50 a.m.
Location	Center of the project site, approximately 320 feet from Creekside Drive centerline and 510 feet from East Bidwell Street centerline.
Noise Level	45.5 dBA L_{EQ}
Notes	Noise primarily from vehicular traffic on Creekside Drive.

A 15-minute traffic count was conducted during measurement M1 to estimate the breakdown of heavy trucks (three or more axles), medium trucks (double tires/two axles), buses, and automobiles along Creekside Drive. Traffic counts for the timed measurement and the one-hour equivalent volume are shown in Table 17, Recorded Traffic Volume and Vehicle Mix.

Table 17
RECORDED TRAFFIC VOLUME AND VEHICLE MIX

Measurement	Roadway	Traffic	Autos	MT[1]	HT[2]
M1	Creekside Drive	15-minute count	166	5	0
		One-hour equivalent	664	20	0
		Percent	97.1%	2.9%	0%

[1] Medium Trucks (double tires/two axles)
[2] Heavy Trucks (three or more axles)

Regulatory Setting

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 uses or other NSLUs. Policy SN 6.1.2 and Table SN-1 from the General Plan provide noise compatibility standards for transportation noise at various land uses. For the project's proposed multi-family housing land use, the standards for noise due to transportation are 65 CNEL for outdoor activity areas and 45 CNEL for interior use areas. For other land uses that may be affected by project-generated traffic noise, the exterior noise compatibility limits are 60 CNEL for single-family residential uses and 70 CNEL for medical and commercial uses (City 2021b).

Policy SN 6.1.2 and Table SN-2 from the General Plan Safety and Noise Element provide noise standards for stationary noise sources. During the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., stationary noise sources should not exceed an hourly noise level of 55 dBA L_{EQ} or a maximum noise level of 70 dBA L_{MAX}. During the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. stationary noise sources should not exceed an hourly noise level of 45 dBA L_{EQ} or a maximum noise level of 65 dBA L_{MAX} (City 2021b).

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 vibration-sensitive uses based on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria (provided in Table SN-3 of the General Plan). For residential land uses the vibration impact levels are 72 VdB for frequent events (more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day), 75 VdB for occasional events (between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day), and 80 VdB for infrequent events (fewer than 30 vibration events of the same source per day; City 2021b). For the purposes of vibration impact analysis, residential land uses are defined as any land uses where people sleep, including hospitals (FTA 2018).

City of Folsom Municipal Code

For stationary noise sources, the City has adopted a Noise Ordinance as Chapter 8.42 of the Folsom Municipal Code. 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}). In accordance with Section 8.42.040 of the Noise Ordinance, noise levels generated on the project site (other than noise from HVAC systems) for 30 or more minutes in any hour may not 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. when measured at an off-site residence, school, church, hospital, or public library. Per Section 8.42.070 of the Folsom Municipal Code, exterior noise levels from HVAC equipment shall not exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} at off-site NSLUs.

Municipal Code Section 8.42.060 exempts construction noise from these standards provided that construction does not occur before 7:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday.

Methodology and Assumptions

Noise Modeling Software

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

Traffic noise levels were evaluated using the USDOT Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5 (USDOT 2004). TNM does not account for buildings, structures, or terrain. Modeling of the exterior noise environment for the project was accomplished using the Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA) model version 2022. CadnaA is a modeling program that allows for the input of project related information, such as noise source data, barriers, structures, and topography to create a detailed model and predict outdoor noise impacts. CadnaA traffic noise prediction is based on the data and methodology used in TNM.

The traffic noise levels in this analysis are calculated utilizing peak-hour traffic, resulting in a one-hour L_{EQ} output. The model-calculated one-hour L_{EQ} noise output is approximately equivalent to the CNEL and used interchangeably for the purposes of this analysis (Caltrans 2013).

Construction Assumptions

Construction equipment assumed to be required for the project was generated for the project's air quality assessment with input from the project applicant (Appendix B). The following construction noise analysis is based on the construction equipment assumptions provided by the air quality assessment. General project construction activities would include site preparation, grading, underground utility installation, and physical building construction. The air quality modeling assumed that to haul the 10,000 CY of soil exported for site grading, 50 one-way trips per day over the four-week grading period would be required. This daily traffic level associated with soil export is anticipated to be the highest daily haul traffic level associated with project construction.

Traffic Generation

According to the project's TIS, the project is anticipated to generate 854 daily trips, including 71 during the AM peak hour and 76 during the PM peak hour (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2023). The TIS included an intersection analysis with peak hour traffic volumes at intersections in the project vicinity. The PM peak hour traffic volumes for segments with project-generated traffic are shown in Table 18, *PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes*. The cumulative condition in the TIS used the City's General Plan travel demand model to estimate traffic volumes in 2028. Based on the site survey and typical traffic mixes, traffic was assumed to comprise 96 percent cars, 3 percent medium trucks and buses, and 1 percent heavy trucks.

Table 18
PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Roadway Segment	Project Trips	Existing (2023)	Existing (2023) + Project	Cumulative Year (2028) + Project
Blue Ravine Road				
North of East Bidwell Street	6	1,765	1,771	1,809
South of East Bidwell Street	19	1,769	1,788	1,790
East Bidwell Street				
West of Blue Ravine Road	19	2,826	2,845	3,005
Blue Ravine Road to Creekside Drive	44	3,044	3,088	3,232
Creekside Drive to Oak Ave Parkway	27	2,518	2,545	2,733
East of Oak Ave Parkway	19	3,406	3,425	3,757
Creekside Drive				
North of Project Driveway	5	751	756	789
Project Driveway to East Bidwell Street	71	751	822	855
Oak Ave Parkway				
South of East Bidwell Street	8	1,106	1,114	1,508

Source: T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2023

Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning

The project would use one residential-sized HVAC unit for each apartment, with the air conditioning condenser located on the rooftop of the building. Specific details on planned HVAC units were not available at the time of this analysis. A typical system for apartments in multi-story buildings would be a Carrier model 38BRC-024-34 2-ton split system for, which has a sound rating of 76 dBA S_{WL} (Carrier 2005). The manufacturer's noise data for the HVAC units is provided below in Table 19, *HVAC Condenser Noise Data*.

Table 19
HVAC CONDENSER NOISE DATA (S_{WL} dBA)

125 Hz	250 Hz	500 Hz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	8 kHz	Overall Noise Level
55.5	62.5	68.0	70.0	67.0	61.5	58.5	76.0

Source: Carrier 2005
S_{WL} = sound power level; dBA = A-weighted decibel; Hz = Hertz; kHz = kilohertz

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 result in:

1. 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 City of Folsom General Plan or noise ordinance;

2. Generation of 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, exposure of 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 by the project site HVAC systems would exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} at 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 the City General Plan or would increase noise levels by 1.5 CNEL or more in areas with existing ambient noise levels exceeding the noise compatibility limits.

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

Impact Analysis

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

In accordance with the Folsom Municipal Code Section 8.42.060, construction noise occurring from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, or between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday, is exempt from other noise level limits in the City's Noise Ordinance.

The nearest NSLU to the project site area is the Mercy Hospital of Folsom. Heavy earthmoving equipment would have the potential to operate as close as 300 feet from the hospital property line, including rubber-tired dozers and graders. Modeling shows that the combined one-hour noise from a dozer and grader would result in 67 dBA L_{EQ} at the hospital. Because construction equipment would be mobile as it moves across the project site, the noise level experienced by the neighboring land uses would vary throughout the day.

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 potentially significant noise impact. Mitigation measure NOI-01 would prohibit construction activities outside the above daytime hours.

Operational Noise

The project would introduce new vehicle trips to roadways in the project area and would install HVAC systems on the project site. The project's exterior and interior areas would be exposed to traffic noise

from nearby roadways. Impacts related to operational noise would be considered significant if the project would result in noise levels conflicting with General Plan policies or the Folsom Municipal Code.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

The City General Plan Safety and Noise Element aims for transportation noise levels to achieve compliance with the land use compatibility criteria provided in General Plan Table SN-1. For land uses in the project area, the exterior noise compatibility limits are 60 CNEL for single-family residential uses, 65 CNEL for multi-family uses, and 70 CNEL for medical and commercial uses (City 2021b).

As described above, modeling of traffic for this report was accomplished using TNM and peak hour traffic levels. According to the TIS, the project is expected to generate approximately 854 daily trips and 76 trips during the PM peak hour (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2023). Modeling in TNM does not account for intervening terrain or structures. Table 20, *Off-Site Traffic Noise Levels*, provides the traffic noise levels under existing (2023) and existing (2023) plus project scenarios at land uses along the affected roadways.

Table 20
OFF-SITE TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS

Roadway Segment	Distance to Nearest Land Use (Land Use Type)	CNEL at Distance (Existing)	CNEL at Distance (Existing + Project)	Change from Existing (CNEL)
Blue Ravine Road				
North of East Bidwell Street	55 feet (Residential)	68.4	68.4	<0.1
South of East Bidwell Street	70 feet (Residential)	67.1	67.1	<0.1
East Bidwell Street				
West of Blue Ravine Road	70 feet (Commercial)	67.6	67.6	<0.1
Blue Ravine Road to Creekside Drive	75 feet (Commercial)	69.1	69.1	<0.1
Creekside Drive to Oak Ave Parkway	75 feet (Residential)	69.7	69.7	<0.1
East of Oak Ave Parkway	75 feet (Residential)	71.0	71.0	<0.1
Creekside Drive				
North of Project Driveway	50 feet (Residential)	63.7	63.7	<0.1
Project Driveway to East Bidwell Street	80 feet (Residential)	61.2	61.6	+0.4
Oak Ave Parkway				
South of East Bidwell Street	80 feet (Residential)	65.8	65.8	<0.1

Source: USDOT 2004; T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2023

[1] A direct impact to off-site uses would occur if the project would result in conflicts with the General Plan land use compatibility criteria or, where the criteria are already exceeded, a perceptible change in traffic noise levels.

CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level

As shown in Table 20, the greatest increase in noise levels would be an increase of 0.4 CNEL, which would occur the segment of Creekside Drive south of the project site. 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. While the land use compatibility levels are exceeded for many of the land uses along roadways in the project area, the project-generated traffic would not result in perceptible increases in traffic noise and impacts would be less than significant.

Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Noise

Per the City General Plan, impacts related to the generation of noise on the project site would be significant if noise levels generated by the project site HVAC systems would exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} residential property boundaries.

The primary potential noise sources on the project site would be roof-top mounted HVAC systems, as described in the Methodology and Assumptions section, above. HVAC systems were analyzed using the CadnaA software. Modeling assumed one hour of continuous operation of all equipment. Receiver locations representative of the highest noise level location and height for each NSLU were modeled in CadnaA. The modeled 1-hour (L_{EQ}) noise levels at the nearby NSLUs are compared with the City standard in Table 21, *Operational HVAC Noise*. As shown in Table 21, noise from the project's HVAC systems would not exceed the City's HVAC noise standard of 50 dBA L_{EQ} and impacts from project HVAC noise would be less than significant.

Table 21
OPERATIONAL HVAC NOISE

Receptor	Description	Modeled Receptor Height (feet)	Modeled Noise (dBA L_{EQ})	HVAC Standard (dBA L_{EQ})	Exceed Standards?
H1	Mercy Hospital of Folsom	25	28	50	No
R1	Brookdale Folsom – Assisted Living Facility	15	26	50	No

Source: CadnaA; Folsom Municipal Code Section 8.42.040

HVAC = Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning; dBA = A-weighted decibel; L_{EQ} = one-hour average noise level

On-Site Exterior Noise

The City General Plan Safety and Noise Element has established an exterior noise standard of 65 CNEL for multi-family residential outdoor activity areas, including patios or other common areas where people typically congregate (City 2021b). For the proposed project, the courtyard, pool, and sport court areas would be considered outdoor activity areas.

Modeling of the exterior noise environment on the project site was accomplished using CadnaA and future (2028) plus project traffic volumes. The proposed project buildings were the only buildings added to the model. Noise receivers were placed within each of these outdoor activity areas at a height of five feet.

Exterior traffic noise levels at these locations were calculated to be 35.2 CNEL within the courtyard, 45.3 CNEL at the pool, and 51.1 CNEL at the sport court. These noise levels would not exceed the City's exterior noise standard of 65 CNEL and impacts would be less than significant.

Interior Noise

In addition to an exterior noise standard, the City General Plan Safety and Noise Element establishes an interior noise standard of 45 CNEL for multi-family residential units in accordance with statewide requirements (City 2021b). Noise receivers were added at the building façades in CadnaA. The calculated noise levels at each floor of the proposed residential buildings are shown in Table 22, *On-site Project Estimated Exterior Noise Levels.*

Table 22
ON-SITE PROJECT ESTIMATED EXTERIOR NOISE LEVELS

Floor	Receiver (CNEL)					
	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6
First	48.2	50.8	53.3	56.3	54.7	51.2
Second	49.9	52.8	55.6	58.2	56.3	51.5
Third	50.9	54.7	57.3	59.4	57.5	52.6
Fourth	51.5	56.0	58.3	60.3	58.3	53.2

Source: CadnaA version 2022
CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level

Standard building design and construction using current building codes provides approximately 20 dBA of exterior to interior noise reduction with windows and doors closed. Therefore, buildings with exterior noise levels exceeding 65 dBA could result in interior noise levels in excess of the 45 CNEL standard. As shown in Table 22, noise levels at the building facades would not exceed 65 CNEL and interior noise levels would not be anticipated to exceed the City standard of 45 CNEL. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact Conclusion

If project construction activities were to occur outside of the weekday hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. or the weekend hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., construction noise generated by the project would not be exempt from the City's noise standards and would exceed the nighttime exterior noise standard of 45 dBA, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure NOI-01 would restrict construction hours and reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The addition of permanent project-generated traffic vicinity on roadways would not result in a perceptible increase in off-site ambient noise levels. The project would not expose future project residents to interior or exterior noise levels that exceed compatibility guidelines in the General Plan.

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 impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure NOI-01: Construction Hours/Scheduling

The City shall specify on all grading, and construction permits that construction activities for all phases of construction, including servicing of construction equipment shall only be permitted during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. 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. In accordance with the City General Plan, excessive ground-borne vibration would occur if vibration levels exceeded 72 VdB for frequent events (more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day), 75 VdB for occasional events (between 30 and 70 vibration events of the

same source per day), or 80 VdB for infrequent events (fewer than 30 vibration events of the same source per day).

As discussed previously, construction equipment used on the project site could be used within 300 feet of the hospital to the east. A hospital is considered a residential land use for the purposes of the FTA vibration criteria. The construction equipment with the highest vibration potential that is anticipated to be required for project construction is a large bulldozer, which generates 87 VdB at 25 feet (FTA 2018). At a distance of 300 feet, a large bulldozer would generate 55 VdB.[1] This would not exceed the General Plan criteria and would not result in building damage or human annoyance. Once operational, the project would not be a source of groundborne vibration. Therefore, the project would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. The closest airports to the project site are the Cameron Park Airport, approximately 8.5 miles to the east, and Mather Airport, approximately 10.2 miles to the southwest. The project site is not located within the airport influence area or noise contours for the Cameron Park Airport (El Dorado County 2012) The project site is within Review Area 2 for Mather Airport, which requires notification to be provided to future tenants of the airport; however, the project site is outside of the noise contours for Mather Airport (SCAG 2022). Therefore, although the project site may be subject to occasional overflight activity, its location outside of the 60 CNEL noise contour for nearby airports indicates project residents would not be exposed to excessive noise and impacts would be less than significant.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

[1] Equipment Vibration Level = L_{VREF} - 30log(D/25), where L_{VREF} is the vibration level at 25 feet and D is distance from equipment to the receptor in feet; formula from FTA 2018.

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).

Impact Analysis

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 188, one-, two-, and three-bedroom units arranged in four, four-story buildings. Existing infrastructure and roads in the project vicinity would not need to be expanded or extended as a result of the project.

The proposed project would accommodate the demand for housing and would not induce substantial growth in the City of Folsom. Although it is anticipated that the majority of individuals relocating to the apartment community would be from the area, it is possible that the apartment complex could draw in a maximum of 703 new residents. The population generated by the project is within the projected increase in population from planned growth as projected in the City's Housing Element (City 2018a). Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

No impact. The proposed project would include the development of a multi-family rental housing community on a currently undeveloped and vacant site. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 35 is nearest to the project site and is located at 535 Glenn Drive, approximately 0.8-mile west of the project site. The Fire Department responds to over 6,000 requests for service annually with an average of 16.4 per day (City 2018b). The City of Folsom Police Department is located at 46 Natoma Street, approximately one mile northwest of the project site.

The project site is located within the Folsom Cordova Unified School District and is within the attendance area for Blanche Sprentz Elementary School, Folsom Middle School, and Folsom Lake High School. There are several parks near the project site, including Livermore Community Park, Willow Bend Park, Folsom City Lions Park, and Levy Park.

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

Impact Analysis

a) Fire protection?

Less than significant impact. The project site is within an urbanized area of Folsom that is already served by fire protection services. The proposed project would include an emergency vehicle access driveway along the frontage of the project site, Creekside Drive, and would include internal drive aisles that would allow access to Buildings A-D, the clubhouse/leasing office, and all outdoor amenities. The driveway and drive aisles would be maintained to meet the Fire Department standards for fire truck maneuvering, location of fire truck to fight a fire, rescue access to the units, and fire hose access to all sides of the buildings. All curbs adjacent to the fire lane would be painted red for emergency fire services. The proposed project would not significantly increase fire service demands or render the current service level to be inadequate, and the impact would be less than significant.

b) Police protection?

Less than significant impact. The project site is within an urbanized area of Folsom that is already served by fire protection services. The project would be required to pay the City's Capital Improvement New Construction Fee (Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80) to fund police services and facilities. The project includes features that reduce opportunities for crime such as adequate lighting throughout the project site (refer to Section 11.1 *Aesthetics* for more detail on lighting). Additionally, there would be on-site management services, visibility of common areas from adjacent units, and no dead-end low-visibility areas. Potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project would therefore be less than significant.

c) Schools?

Less than significant impact. The proposed multi-family rental housing community has the potential to house students in grades K-12; however, pursuant to Government Section 65995.1, the project would be required to pay development impact fees to the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. Therefore, the impact from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

d) Parks?

Less than significant impact. The 188-unit project would accommodate residents who would create additional demand for park and recreation facilities. The nearest park is Livermore Community Park, located at 6004 Riley Street, approximately 0.8-mile south from the project site. Since the park is not adjacent to the proposed apartment community, a substantial increase in usage of the park is not anticipated. The proposed project would include on-site indoor and outdoor recreational amenities to serve residents that would reduce the need for park demand. Community amenities would include a 5,900-square foot clubhouse/leasing office on the eastern side of the project site. The clubhouse would include lounge areas, large screen television, meeting space, resident computer stations, fitness room, restrooms, and leasing office. Outdoor amenities feature a swimming pool, lounge, and shade structures adjacent to the clubhouse. The northern end of the project site would include an outdoor patio with seating, covered outdoor kitchen with barbeque counter, sink, tables, and a television. To the west of the outdoor patio would include a dog run, and to the east of the outdoor patio would include a multi-sport court for sports such as basketball.

Additionally, the project would be required to pay park impact fees to mitigate the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities. The impact from the proposed project would be less than significant.

e) Other public facilities?

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

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 Folsom Parks and Recreation Department provides and maintains a full range of recreational activities and park facilities for the community. There are several parks near the project site, including Livermore Community Park, Willow Bend Park, Folsom City Lions Park, and Levy Park. The nearest park to the project site is Livermore Community Park, located at 6004 Riley Street, approximately 0.8-mile south from the project site.

Impact Analysis

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

Less than significant impact. Some additional use of community parks and trails is anticipated from an increase in multi-family rental units, however, on-site recreational facilities at the apartment complex would reduce park and trail demand. The project would be required to pay park impact fees to mitigate the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities. The impacts to existing parks would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. Community amenities would include a 5,900-square foot clubhouse/ leasing office with lounge areas, large screen television, meeting space, resident computer stations, fitness room, restrooms, and leasing office. Outdoor amenities feature a swimming pool, lounge, and shade structures adjacent to the clubhouse. At the northern end of the project site, there would be an outdoor patio with seating, covered outdoor kitchen with barbeque counter, sink, tables, and a television. To the left of this would be a dog run and to the right of this would be a multi-sport court for sports such as basketball. On-site facilities and existing neighborhood parks are anticipated to adequately serve the recreation demands of project residents. The amenities associated with the

proposed project are analyzed in this IS/MND. The impact 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A TIS was prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. on June 19, 2023. A Memorandum was prepared by T. Kear Transportation & Management on September 19, 2023, to address the change in number of dwelling units. The TIS and Memorandum are summarized below and are included as Appendix K to the IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

Study Scenarios

Four scenarios were identified for inclusion in the TIS through consultation with City of Folsom staff. The TIS determines the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour level-of-service (LOS) at study intersections under the following scenarios:

- Existing 2023 without project condition;
- Existing 2023 with project condition;
- Existing Plus Approved projects (EPAP) 2028 without project condition; and
- EPAP 2028 with project condition.

Project Area Roadways

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

Creekside Drive is a two-lane minor collector, connecting Oak Avenue Parkway to East Bidwell Street, and extending westward into the apartment and commercial areas west of East Bidwell Street. Fronting the project site Creekside Drive has a two-way left turn median, bike lanes, curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

East Bidwell Street is a major arterial which runs through the City of Folsom from White Rock Road to Riley Street. Within the project vicinity it generally runs in a northwest/southeast direction, and there are bike lanes, curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Oak Avenue Parkway is a north-south major arterial that extends from Willow Creek Drive to Iron Point Road. It is a four-lane urban arterial road between Willow Creek Drive and Blue Ravine Road. It is a six-lane urban arterial road with a raised median between Blue Ravine Road and Riley Street. It is a four-lane urban arterial road between Riley Street and Iron Point Road.

Blue Ravine Road is an east-west major arterial connecting from the business park west of Folsom Boulevard until it turns into Green Valley Road on the northeast side of East Natoma Street. In the project vicinity it is four-lanes with a two-way left turn median, bike lanes, curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Study Intersections

There are four study intersection that were selected through consultation with staff; knowledge of the Project area; and, in accordance with published City of Folsom Guidance to evaluate locations that are anticipated to receive fifty or more peak hour project trips. The four study intersections are outlined in Table 23 *Study Intersections and Control*, below.

Table 23
STUDY INTERSECTIONS AND CONTROL

Intersection	Control
East Bidwell Street / Blue Ravine Road	Signal
East Bidwell Street / Creekside Drive	Signal
East Bidwell Street / Oak Avenue Parkway	Signal
Creekside Drive / Project Driveway	Two-Way Stop Control (TWST)

Standards of Significance

LOS impacts of the proposed project were determined based on the methods described above and identified as either “worsened” or “not worsened “ in the following thresholds:

City of Folsom

Policy M 4.13 of the City of Folsom General Plan (adopted August 28, 2018) calls for the City to:

> *Strive to achieve at least traffic Level-of-Service “D” (or better) for local streets and roadways throughout the City. In designing transportation improvements, the City will prioritize the use of smart technologies and innovative solutions that maximize efficiency and safety while minimizing the physical footprint. During the course of plan buildout, it may occur that temporarily higher levels-of-service result where roadway improvements have not been adequately phased as development proceeds. However, this situation will be minimized based on annual traffic studies and monitoring programs. City Staff will report to the City Council at regular intervals via the Capital Improvement Program process for the Council to prioritize projects integral to achieving level-of-service D or better.*

Consistent with historical practice within the City of Folsom, the General Plan EIR also includes a criterion addressing potential impacts at locations that operate at LOS E or F under no-project conditions. Under that standard, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would:

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

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact is considered potentially significant if implementation of the project would result in any of the following:

- Cause an intersection in Folsom that currently operates (or is projected to operate) at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E, or worse;

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

In addition, 95th percentile queue lengths are considered along with LOS. The computed 95th percentile queue length is the length of queue that is anticipated to be exceeded once out of every twenty signal cycles. When queues exceed the available storage length in a turn pocket and spill out to block adjacent travel lanes it invalidates LOS calculations. The intersection effectively operates at an unacceptable LOS. For this analysis, a project related LOS deficiency from queueing is assumed to occur when:

- Project traffic is anticipated to cause the 95th percentile right-turn and/or left-turn queue length to exceed available storage lengths in a turn bay.

- The 95th percentile right-turn and/or left-turn queue exceeds the available storage length prior to the addition of project traffic, and the project is anticipated to add one or more car lengths to that 95th percentile queue length.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Transit Facilities

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

- Inhibit the use of bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities;

- Eliminate existing bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities; or

- Prevent the implementation of planned bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities

Safety

Where safety issues are documented through reported crash data in the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) database 7, an impact is considered significant if implementation of the project would:

- Add traffic to intersection movements or segments with documented crash history attributable to roadway geometric constraints. A single accident on its own does not constitute an impact, rather the accident rate would need to be greater than statewide averages reported by Caltrans for similar roads. Where statewide data are not applicable, the nature and propensity of data on different crash types is considered. While not an exhaustive list, such constraints include 95th

percentile queues exceeding available storage lengths, left turns from blocked driveways near intersections, striking fixed objects and similar situations. Driving under the influence or striking objects in the road that likely fell from a vehicle are not considered to be preventable and are not considered relevant to determining project related safety impacts under most circumstances.

- Construct potentially unsafe pedestrian or bicycle facilities. For example, the addition of crosswalks where fatalities have occurred in crosswalks or replacing a bike lane with a shared vehicle bicycle lane (also known as a "sharrow").

Analysis Tools

Level-of-Service

Control delays and LOS for study intersections were calculated using the Synchro 11 analysis software (Version 11.1, build 1, revision 6). Synchro implements the methodologies of the 6th Edition of the Highway Capacity Manual to model traffic controls and vehicle delays.

The software requires data on road characteristics (geometric), traffic counts, and the signal timing data for each analysis intersection. In general, default parameters were used, except in locations where specific field data are available. Heavy vehicle percentages of 2 percent were assumed during the peak hour.

Vehicle Miles Traveled

To support jurisdictions' SB 743 implementation, 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 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 a 15 percent reduction compared to regional (or any appropriate sub-area) averages. 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 percent reduction in residential VMT relative to the SACOG region. Yellow, orange, pink and red hexes have less than a 15 percent VMT reduction.

Existing 2023 Conditions

The LOS results were compared to the 95th percentile queue lengths at the study intersections under Existing Conditions, as shown in Table 24, *Existing 2023 Intersection Peak Hour Delay and LOS* and Table 25, *Existing 2023 Intersection Peak Hour 95% Queue Lengths.* The 95th percentile queue length is the length of queue that is anticipated to be exceeded 5 percent of the time, or one out of every 20 cycles of the traffic signal.

Three of the four study intersections exceed the General Plan LOS standard and/or have calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage prior to the addition of project traffic:

- East Bidwell Street/Blue Ravine Road has calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the NE bound right-turn during the AM and PM peak hours and the NW bound left-turn during the PM peak hour. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection.

- East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive operates at LOS E during the AM peak hour. Additionally, the calculated 95th percentile queue length for the SE bound left-turn is anticipated to exceed available storge during both the AM and PM peak hours. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection.

- East Bidwell Street/Oak Avenue Parkway has calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the SW bound left-turn during the AM and PM peak hours and the NW bound right-turn during the PM peak hour.

These locations are highlighted with gray fill and bold text in Table 24 and Table 25.

Table 24
EXISTING 2023 INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR DELAY AND LOS

Intersection	Existing	No Project
	AM Delay/LOS	PM Delay/LOS
East Bidwell St/Blue Ravine Rd	35.8/D	36.5/D
East Bidwell St/Creekside Dr	35.6/D	44.7/D
East Bidwell St/Oak Avenue Pkwy	41.4/D	35.8/D
Creekside Dr/Project Driveway	n/a	n/a

LOS = Level of Service

Table 25
EXISTING 2023 INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR 95% QUEUE LENGTHS

			Existing No Project 95% Queue	
Street	**Movement**	**Bay Length (feet)**	**AM (feet)**	**PM (feet)**
1. East Bidwell St/ Blue Ravine Rd				
East Bidwell St	SE Left	180	86	152
	SE Right	155	70	98
	NW Left	190	138	**197**
	NW Right	100	88	61
Blue Ravine Rd	NE Left	210	85	104
	NE Right	125	**134**	**148**
	SW Left	250	134	161
	SW Right	n/a	54	65

			Existing No Project 95% Queue	
Street	**Movement**	**Bay Length (feet)**	**AM (feet)**	**PM (feet)**
2. East Bidwell St/ Creekside Dr				
East Bidwell St	SE Left	340	**411**	262
	SE Through & SE through-Right	n/a	547	694
	SE right	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NW Left	125	68	0
	NW Through	n/a	451	613
	NW Right	n/a	99	96
Creekside Dr	NE Left	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NE Through-Left	n/a	156	185
	NE Right	40	0	0
	SW Left	220	71	108
	SW Right	220	68	88
3. East Bidwell St/ Oak Avenue Pkwy				
East Bidwell St	SE Left	200	83	98
	SE Right	190	0	2
	NW Left	230	62	86
	NW Right	190	62	**231**
Oak Avenue Pkwy	NE Left	200	78	57
	NE Right	200	55	129
	SW Left	200	**350**	**269**
	SW Right	200	52	23
4. Creekside Dr/ Project Driveway				
Driveway	SE approach	n/a	n/a	n/a
Creekside Dr	NE Left	TWLT	n/a	n/a
	SW Right	n/a	n/a	n/a

Trip Generation

Traffic generated by the proposed project was based on Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition (2021), and is provided in Table 26, *Project Trip Generation* below.

Table 26
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

					Peak Street			Peak Generator		
Description	**LU**	**Quantity**	**Metric**	**Daily**	**AM T**	**AM In**	**AM Out**	**PM T**	**PM In**	**PM Out**
Multifamily (Mid-rise)	ITE #221	188 DU	Bases for rate	Avg rate	Fitted	Curve		Fitted	Curve	
			Rate	4.54	0.38	23%	77%	0.40	60%	40%
			Trips	854	71	16	55	76	46	30

Source: ITE (2021) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Ed, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington DC.
LU=Land Use; Peak Street= Peak Hour of Adjacent Street; Peak Generator=Peak Hour of Generator; T=Total

Trip Distribution

Trip distribution was based on observed traffic counts and select zone analysis within the travel demand model, and nearby projects.

Existing 2023 with Project Conditions

Peak hour traffic associated with the project was added to the Existing 2023 turning volumes at each intersection. Delay and LOS were determined at the study intersections and segments. Table 27, *Existing 2023 Intersection Delay and LOS, With and Without Project* and Table 28, *Existing 2023 Intersection Peak Hour 95% Queue Lengths, With and Without Project* present a summary of the LOS and queuing calculations at the study intersections.

All study intersections operate within the General Plan LOS standard. Three of the four study intersections exceeded the General Plan LOS standard and/or had calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage prior to the addition of project traffic:

- East Bidwell Street/Blue Ravine Road has calculated 95$_{th}$ percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the NE bound right-turn during the AM and PM peak hours and the NW bound left-turn during the PM peak hour. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection.

- East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive operates at LOS E during the AM peak hour. Additionally, the calculated 95$_{th}$ percentile queue length for the SE bound left-turn is anticipated to exceed available storge during both the AM and PM peak hours. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection.

- East Bidwell Street/Oak Avenue Parkway has calculated 95$_{th}$ percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the SW bound left-turn during the AM and PM peak hours and the NW bound right-turn during the PM peak hour.

These locations are highlighted with gray fill and bold text in Table 27 and Table 28. LOS and queueing was not found to be potentially worsened by project traffic at any of those intersections.

Table 27
EXISTING 2023 INTERSECTION DELAY AND LOS, WITH AND WITHOUT PROJECT

Intersection	Existing No Project		Existing + Project	
	AM Delay/LOS	PM Delay/LOS	AM Delay/LOS	PM Delay/LOS
East Bidwell St/Blue Ravine Rd	35.8/D	36.5/D	36.0/D	36.9/D
East Bidwell St/Creekside Dr	35.6/D	44.7/D	38.2/D	48.9/D
East Bidwell St/Oak Avenue Pkwy	41.4/D	35.8/D	41.3/D (1)	35.8/D
Creekside Dr/Project driveway	n/a	n/a	10.4/B (SE Approach)	11.7/B (SE Approach)

(1) Actuation setting reduces delay on SE Bidwell approach by approximately 0.1 second.
LOS = Level of Service

Table 28
EXISTING 2023 INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR 95% QUEUE LENGTHS, WITH AND WITHOUT PROJECT

			Existing No Project 95% Queue		Existing + Project 95% Queue	
Street	**Movement**	**Bay Length (feet)**	**AM (feet)**	**PM (feet)**	**AM (feet)**	**PM (feet)**
1. East Bidwell St/ Blue Ravine Rd						
East Bidwell St	SE Left	180	86	152	86	152
	SE Right	155	70	98	70	99
	NW Left	190	138	**197**	147	**201**
	NW Right	100	88	61	90	64
Blue Ravine Rd	NE Left	210	85	104	85	104
	NE Right	125	**134**	**148**	**140**	**153**
	SW Left	250	134	161	134	163
	SW Right	n/a	54	65	54	65
2. East Bidwell St/ Creekside Dr						
East Bidwell St	SE Left	340	**411**	262	**432**	304
	SE Through & SE Through-Right	n/a	547	694	548	694
	SE Right	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NW Left	125	68	0	67	76
	NW Through	n/a	451	613	452	613
	NW Right	n/a	99	96	103	113
Creekside Dr	NE Left	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NE Through-Left	n/a	156	185	156	185
	NE Right	40	0	0	0	0
	SW Left	220	71	108	86	114
	SW Right	220	68	88	74	90
3. East Bidwell St/ Oak Ave Pkwy						
East Bidwell St	SE Left	200	83	98	83	96
	SE Right	190	0	2	1	3
	NW Left	230	62	86	62	86
	NW Right	190	62	**231**	62	**231**
Oak Avenue Pkwy	NE Left	200	78	57	79	60
	NE Right	200	55	129	55	129
	SW Left	200	**350**	**269**	**350**	**269**
	SW Right	200	52	23	52	23
4. Creekside Dr/ Project Driveway						
Driveway	SE approach	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.5	5
Creekside Dr	NE Left	TWLT	n/a	n/a	0	2.5
	SW Right	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0

Existing Plus Approved Projects 2028 Conditions

EPAP 2028 Growth Increment

Five-year traffic forecasts were developed using two different methodologies, and the higher (more conservative) volume projections were used for this analysis. The approaches are summarized here:

- The first method was based on the traffic anticipated from approved projects that have not been fully built and/or occupied as of spring 2023.

- The second method used the City of Folsom General Plan travel demand model to estimate growth through 2028.

The second method resulted in higher traffic volumes and was therefore used as the basis for EPAP 2028 Condition analysis.

EPAP 2028 Conditions

The EPAP Conditions analysis utilizes lane configurations and signal timing plans from the Existing Conditions. Table 29, *EPAP 2028 Intersection Delay and LOS* and Table 30, *EPAP 2028 Intersection Peak Hour 95% Queue Lengths* present a summary of LOS results for the study intersections under EPAP 2028 Conditions.

Results closely mirror those from the Existing 2023 scenario. Three of the four study intersections exceed the General Plan LOS standard and/or have calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage prior to the addition of project traffic:

- East Bidwell Street/Blue Ravine Road has calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the NE bound right-turn during the AM and PM peak hours and the NW bound left-turn during the PM peak hour. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection under Existing 2023 Conditions.

- East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive operates at LOS E during the AM peak hour. Additionally, the calculated 95th percentile queue length for the SE bound left-turn is anticipated to exceed available storge during both the AM and PM peak hours. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection under Existing 2023 Conditions.

- East Bidwell Street/Oak Avenue Parkway has calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the SW bound left-turn during the AM and PM peak hours. The NW bound right-turn and the NE Bound right turn 95th percentile queue lengths exceed available storage lengths during the PM peak hour.

These locations are highlighted with gray fill and bold text in Table 29 and Table 30.

Table 29
EPAP 2028 INTERSECTION DELAY AND LOS

Intersection	EPAP No Project	
	AM Delay/LOS	PM Delay/LOS
East Bidwell St/Blue Ravine Rd	35.2/D (1)	36.6/D (1)
East Bidwell St/Creekside Dr	37.0/D	44.9/D
East Bidwell St/Oak Avenue Pkwy	42.4/D	--
Creekside Dr/Project Driveway	n/a	n/a

(1) Increased volume on East Bidwell St approaches which have lower delay than Blue Ravine Road reduces average delay relative to 2023.

EPAP = Existing Plus Approved Projects; LOS = Level of Service

Table 30
EPAP 2028 INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR 95% QUEUE LENGTHS

			EPAP No Project 95% Queue	
Street	Movement	Bay Length (feet)	AM (feet)	PM (feet)
1. East Bidwell St/ Blue Ravine Rd				
East Bidwell St	SE Left	180	86	159
	SE Right	155	77	98
	NW Left	190	140	**197**
	NW Right	100	87	59
Blue Ravine Rd	NE Left	210	89	106
	NE Right	125	**146**	**148**
	SW Left	250	141	165
	SW Right	n/a	58	66
2. East Bidwell St/ Creekside Dr				
East Bidwell St	SE Left	340	**431**	259
	SE Through & SE Through-Right	n/a	594	734
	SE Right	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NW Left	125	72	82
	NW Through	n/a	505	701
	NW Right	n/a	121	112
Creekside Dr	NE Left	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NE Through-Left	n/a	159	187
	NE Right	40	0	0
	SW Left	220	80	121
	SW Right	220	72	88

			EPAP No Project 95% Queue	
Street	**Movement**	**Bay Length (feet)**	**AM (feet)**	**PM (feet)**
3. East Bidwell St/ Oak Avenue Pkwy				
East Bidwell St	SE Left	200	88	104
	SE Right	190	1	7
	NW Left	230	84	119
	NW Right	190	90	**327**
Oak Avenue Pkwy	NE Left	200	98	66
	NE Right	200	53	**209**
	SW Left	200	**350**	**296**
	SW Right	200	54	31
4. Creekside Dr/ Project Driveway				
Driveway	SE approach	n/a	n/a	n/a
Creekside Dr	NE Left	TWLT	n/a	n/a
	SW Right	n/a	n/a	n/a

EPAP = Existing Plus Approved Projects

EPAP 2028 with Project Condition

Peak hour traffic associated with the project was added to anticipated EPAP 2028 turning volumes at each intersection. Delay and LOS were then determined at the study intersections. Table 31, *EPAP 2028 Intersection Delay and LOS, With and Without Project* and Table 32, *EPAP 2028 Intersection Peak Hour 95% Queue Lengths, With and Without Project* present a summary of the LOS and queueing results for the study intersections.

Results closely mirror those from the Existing 2023 with project scenario. Three of the four study intersections exceeded the General Plan LOS standard and/or had calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage prior to the addition of project traffic:

- East Bidwell Street/Blue Ravine Road has calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the NE bound right-turn during the AM and PM peak hours and the NW bound left-turn during the PM peak hour. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection under Existing 2023 Conditions.

- East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive operates at LOS E during the AM peak hour. Additionally, the calculated 95th percentile queue length for the SE bound left-turn is anticipated to exceed available storge during both the AM and PM peak hours. Queueing issues are observable in the field at this intersection under Existing 2023 Conditions.

- East Bidwell Street/Oak Avenue Parkway has calculated 95th percentile queue lengths that exceed available storage lengths on the SW bound left-turn during the AM and PM peak hours. The NW bound right-turn and the NE Bound right turn 95th percentile queue lengths exceed available storage lengths during the PM peak hour.

These locations are highlighted with gray fill and bold text in Table 31 and Table 32.

Table 31
EPAP 2028 INTERSECTION DELAY AND LOS, WITH AND WITHOUT PROJECT

Intersection	EPAP No Project		EPAP + Project	
	AM Delay/LOS	PM Delay/LOS	AM Delay/LOS	PM Delay/LOS
East Bidwell St/Blue Ravine Rd	35.2/D (1)	36.6/D (1)	35.3/D	37.1/D
East Bidwell St/Creekside Dr	37.0/D	44.9/D	40.0/D	48.9/D
East Bidwell St/Oak Avenue Pkwy	42.4/D	39.1/D	42.3/D (2)	39.1/D
Creekside Dr/Project driveway	n/a	n/a	10.7/B (SE Approach)	11.9/B (SE Approach)

(1) Increased volume on East Bidwell St approaches which have lower delay than Blue Ravine Rd reduces average delay relative to 2023.
(2) Actuation setting reduces delay on SE Bidwell approach by approximately 0.1 seconds.
EPAP = Existing Plus Approved Projects; LOS = Level of Service

Table 32
EPAP 2028 INTERSECTION PEAK HOUR 95% QUEUE LENGTHS, WITH AND WITHOUT PROJECT

			EPAP No Project 95% Queue		EPAP + Project 95% Queue	
Street	Movement	Bay Length (feet)	AM (feet)	PM (feet)	AM (feet)	PM (feet)
1. East Bidwell St/ Blue Ravine Rd						
East Bidwell St	SE Left	180	86	159	86	159
	SE Right	155	77	98	77	99
	NW Left	190	140	**197**	149	**202**
	NW Right	100	87	59	89	62
Blue Ravine Rd	NE Left	210	89	106	89	106
	NE Right	125	**146**	**148**	**151**	**153**
	SW Left	250	141	165	141	167
	SW Right	n/a	58	66	58	66
2. East Bidwell St/ Creekside Dr						
East Bidwell St	SE Left	340	**431**	259	**451**	298
	SE Through & SE Through-Right	n/a	594	734	594	733
	SE Right	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NW Left	125	72	82	71	81
	NW Through	n/a	505	701	506	703
	NW Right	n/a	121	112	125	129
Creekside Dr	NE Left	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	NE Through-Left	n/a	159	187	159	187
	NE Right	40	0	0	0	0
	SW Left	220	80	121	94	129
	SW Right	220	72	88	77	90

			EPAP No Project 95% Queue		EPAP + Project 95% Queue	
Street	**Movement**	**Bay Length (feet)**	**AM (feet)**	**PM (feet)**	**AM (feet)**	**PM (feet)**
3. East Bidwell St/ Oak Ave Pkwy						
East Bidwell St	SE Left	200	88	104	87	104
	SE Right	190	1	7	4	9
	NW Left	230	84	119	84	119
	NW Right	190	90	**327**	91	**327**
Oak Avenue Pkwy	NE Left	200	98	66	100	69
	NE Right	200	53	**209**	53	**209**
	SW Left	200	**350**	**296**	**350**	**296**
	SW Right	200	54	31	54	31
4. Creekside Dr/ Project Driveway						
Driveway	SE approach	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.5	5
Creekside Dr	NE Left	TWLT	n/a	n/a	0	2.5
	SW Right	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0

EPAP = Existing Plus Approved Projects

Impact Analysis

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. The proposed project would include a total of 334 parking spaces located in asphalt paved areas along the inside perimeter of the project site. The parking supply includes 232 surface parking spaces, 40 garage parking spaces, and 56 carport spaces for a total ratio of 1.78 spaces/unit. The project requires 1.5 parking spaces/unit under Folsom Zoning Code Section 17.17.100, for a total of 282 required parking spaces. The project would exceed the total required number of parking spaces required under Folsom Zoning Code Section 17.17.100.

Primary pedestrian access to the project site would be from accessible pedestrian pathways located around the northern, southern, and eastern sides of the project site. Two pedestrian gates would be located adjacent to the dog run, along the Willow Creek Bike Trail; two pedestrian gates would be located at the entrance of the site, along Creekside Drive; and an existing pedestrian staircase would be located in the northeastern corner of the project site.

In addition, a series of bicycle racks would be installed to provide short-term bicycle parking areas. The Folsom Municipal Code requires one bicycle parking space for every five residential units. With 188 residential units, the project requires approximately 38 bicycle parking spaces. A total of five bike racks areas would accommodate a total of 20 short-term bicycle parking spaces. The project would also include 20 long-term bicycle parking spaces, a bicycle café, and indoor bicycle lockers within Building D. The total provided short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces would total 40 bicycle parking spaces, which exceeds the requirement of 38 bicycle parking spaces per the Folsom Municipal Code.

As part of the proposed project, the bus stop would be relocated along the frontage of the project site, on the western side of Creekside Drive. The bus stop would include an ADA accessible pad and bus stop signage. Additionally, a sidewalk would be placed between the relocated bus stop and the existing bus stop across Creekside Drive.

Therefore, the proposed 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. Under State Law (SB 743), VMT became the primary CEQA threshold of significance for transportation impacts on July 1, 2020. Automobile delay is measured by LOS and other similar metrics generally no longer constitute a significant environmental Impact. Note that safety issues related to crash history, bicycle safety, pedestrian safety, and transit operations are still relevant to CEQA. Folsom General Plan policy NCR 3.1.3 addressed VMT as shown below:

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

Without specific General Plan guidance for VMT thresholds, this analysis uses qualitative screening against the Governors' Office of Planning and Research (OPR) guidance of a 15 percent per capita VMT reduction. OPR published guidance recommending a CEQA threshold for transportation impacts of land use projects of a 15 percent VMT reduction per capita, relative to either city or regional averages, based on the California's Climate Scoping Plan. Qualitative assessment of VMT reduction is acceptable to screen projects.

To support jurisdictions' SB 743 implementation, SACOG developed thresholds and screening maps for residential projects, 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 percent of reduction compared to regional (or any appropriate sub-area) 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 residents living in the HEX and divided by the total population in the HEX. Green hexagons denote areas where residential VMT is 50 percent to 85 percent of the regional average and yellow hexagons denote areas where residential VMT is 85 percent to 100 percent of the regional average.

The project is located within one of the green hexagons with average residential VMT of 17 miles per capita (per day). The project is anticipated to generate less than 82 percent of the regional per capita residential daily VMT of 20.82 miles. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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. The project is not anticipated to cause new or worsen existing deficiencies. However, the City requests as a Conditional of Approval that the project remove the bulb out on the corner of East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive and widen East Bidwell Street to make operational

improvements to the turn onto East Bidwell Street from Creekside Drive which provides project access. The proposed optional improvements are as follows:

- Restripe the existing NW bound East Bidwell right turn lane to a through lane;
- Add a 150 feet NW bound right turn pocket with 60 feet taper (total length 210 feet);
- Widen East Bidwell to add a class II B buffered bike lane from the end of the existing NW bound class II bike lane to the intersection;
- Relocate signal mast and controller on downstream corner;
- Remove bulb-out on the upstream corner and relocate signal mast;
- Restripe NW bound class II bike lane from East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive intersection to the Humbug Creek bicycle trail as a class II B buffered bike lane located adjacent to the curb.

The entirety of this requested improvement may not be feasible within the available right-of-way, and a subset of the requested improvements may be acceptable if done to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, and subject to the City's determination that a subset of these improvements would be safe and consistent with design guidance. With implementation of the Condition of Approval, the impact would be less than significant.

Crash History

Two crash history reviews were conducted using data available from the SWITRS database.

Method One—Comparison to Statewide Accident Rates:

Where sufficient data is available, crash history analysis is done by comparing site specific accident rates to multi-year statewide averages for similar roadways published by Caltrans. There were 15 accidents (total), 15 injury accidents, and zero fatal accidents, in the data set spanning five years from 2017 to 2021 over the 0.247-mile segment of East Bidwell Street between Blue Ravine Road and Creekside Drive. Estimated annual average vehicle miles of travel on that segment for the same 5-year period is 4,935,923 miles of travel per year. This equates to an accident rate of 0.61 accidents per million vehicle miles (of travel). Caltrans' statewide averages are 1.25 (total) accidents per million vehicle miles, 0.53 injury + fatal accidents per million vehicle miles, and .0.02 fatal accidents per million vehicle miles.

The vast majority of accidents on that segment of East Bidwell Street were rear-end collisions, indicative of queueing concerns, including the spillback of left-turn queues in the corresponding turn pockets. The project is anticipated to increase those left turn queues by less than one vehicle length which is consistent with the thresholds. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Method Two—Review of Specific Crashes on Lower Volume Roads Near the Project:

Along Creekside Drive there is a limited number of accidents in the SWITRS database, even when the query was extended beyond five years. Specifically, two collisions were identified: (1) A broadside between a left turning vehicle exiting the medical center parking lot across the street from the proposed project with a southwest bound vehicle on Creekside Drive. (2) A fatal vehicle-pedestrian collision in the crosswalk located on Creekside Drive approximately 850 feet to the east-northeast of the project

driveway. Following the accident, the City installed a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) at the crosswalk in question.

The broadside collision is not in itself an indication that an unsafe situation is present at this location. However, the driveway in question is on the inside of a curve and visibility could have been a factor. The project is not anticipated to add traffic to the driveway in question, and the project driveway will be on the outside of the curve. Therefore, no impact would occur.

The history of a fatal vehicle-pedestrian collision within a crosswalk is a concern. New mid-block crosswalks on Creekside Drive are not advised and pedestrians/transit riders should be directed to the signalized crossing at the East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive intersection. Because the project does not propose a mid-block crossing and the Sacramento Regional Transit is responsible for the bus stop, no impact is anticipated.

Entry Gate Queues

The project proposes two entry gates off the main driveway, with guest/office parking located outside of the entry gates. The throat depth between the sidewalk and nearest gate is adequate to store two vehicles. Anticipated vehicle arrivals were estimated based on the trip generation estimates assuming arrival rates based on a cumulative Poisson distribution. If the entry gates are to be kept closed during the AM or PM peak hours, storage for two or more vehicles should be provided outside of each gate. The site plans match this requirement and therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

Minimum Required Throat-Depth

The minimum required throat depth (MRTD) is a function of the characteristics of the roadway being accessed and the number of apartments in the complex. Creekside Drive is classified as a minor collector in the General Plan and is constructed with a 60-foot right-of-way width. Apartment complex with more than 160 units, accessing a road with a 60-foot right-of-way, have a MRTD is 50 feet. As shown on the site plan, the throat depths for the primary driveway exceeds fifty feet. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

Right-Turn Deceleration/Acceleration Lanes and Tapers for Driveways

City standards require a 60-foot right turn taper in conditions with ten or more peak hour right turns into a driveway, and a 150-foot pocket plus 60-foot taper, with fifty or more peak hour right turns. The project driveway is not anticipated to have ten or more right turning vehicles into the project during the AM or PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Therefore, with a Conditional of Approval to remove the bulb out on the corner of East Bidwell Street/Creekside Drive and widen East Bidwell Street to make operational improvements to the turn onto East Bidwell Street from Creekside Drive, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than significant impact. The project's internal drive isles have 25-foot inner/50-foot outer minimum turning radii to accommodate fire department access. In addition to the primary access, separate emergency vehicle access is also provided. Therefore, it is anticipated that emergency vehicle access would be adequate. The impact would be less than significant.

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 TCR Memorandum (Memo) was prepared by HELIX on September 7, 2023. The TCR Memo is summarized below and is included as Appendix L to the IS/MND.

Environmental Setting

CEQA, as amended in 2014 by 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. Section 21073 of the PRC defines California Native American tribes as "a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of the Statutes of 2004." This includes both federally and non-federally recognized tribes. For the City, these include the following tribes that previously submitted general request letters, requesting such noticing:

- Wilton Rancheria (letter dated January 13, 2020);
- Ione Band of Miwok Indians (letter dated March 2, 2016); and,
- United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (letter dated November 23, 2015, and updated per UAIC via email on September 29, 2021).

UAIC is a federally recognized Tribe comprised of both Miwok and Maidu (Nisenan) Tribal members who are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The Tribe has deep spiritual, cultural, and physical ties to their ancestral land and are contemporary stewards of their culture and landscapes. The Tribal community represents a continuity and endurance of their ancestors by maintaining their connection to their history and culture. It is the Tribe's goal to ensure the preservation and continuance of their cultural heritage for current and future generations.

The purpose of consultation is to identify 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 an 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.

On May 9, 2023, the City sent project notification letters to the three California Native American tribes named above, which had previously submitted general consultation request letters pursuant to 21080.3.1(d) of the PRC. Each tribe was provided a brief description of the project and its location, the contact information for the City's authorized representative, and a notification that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation.

Consultation opened on May 9, 2023 and both the UAIC and Wilton Rancheria engaged in consultation. On June 21, 2023, HELIX and the City held a meeting with Wilton Rancheria representative Ms. Venesa Kremer. A field visit with UAIC and the City was held and UAIC determined no TCRs were located on the project site. Both UAIC and Wilton Rancheria concluded that the project site does not include any known TCRs, and therefore consultation with Wilton Rancheria concluded on September 5, 2023, and

consultation with UAIC concluded on September 20, 2023. The overall summary of consultation with UAIC and Wilton Rancheria is included in Appendix L.

Impact Analysis

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

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

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. Information about potential impacts to TCRs was drawn from information provided by consulting and culturally affiliated tribes, the ethnographic context, and the results of a search of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC. UAIC and Wilton Rancheria engaged in the consultation process. UAIC conducted background search for the identification of Tribal Cultural Resources for this project, which included a review of pertinent literature, historic maps, and a records search using UAIC's Tribal Historic Information System (THRIS). UAIC's THRIS database is composed of UAIC's areas of oral history, ethnographic history, and places of cultural and religious significance, including UAIC Sacred Lands that are submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The THRIS resources shown in this region also include previously recorded indigenous resources identified through the California Historic Resources Information System Center (CHRIS) as well as historic resources and survey data.

Both Tribes concluded that the project site does not include any known TCRs. However, there exists a potential for the discovery of previously unknown TCRs during project construction. If TCRs are encountered, the project activity could result in a significant impact to those resources. Based on the consultation record summarized above and included in Appendix L, the City concludes that there would be a less than significant impact on TCRs with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Unanticipated Discovery of TCRs

If any suspected TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 50 feet of the find, or an agreed upon distance based on the project area and nature 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.

When avoidance is infeasible, preservation in place is the preferred option for mitigation of TCRs under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort shall be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign, if feasible. Culturally appropriate treatment may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, or returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. Permanent curation of TCRs will not take place unless approved in writing by UAIC or by the California Native American Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area.

The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the CEQA lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize impacts to the resource, including, but not limited to, facilitating the appropriate tribal treatment of the find, as necessary. Treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a TCR may include Tribal Monitoring, culturally appropriate recovery of cultural objects, and reburial of cultural objects or cultural soil.

Work at the discovery location cannot resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the discovery under the requirements of CEQA, including AB 52, have been satisfied.

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 SMUD for electricity, PG&E underground gas lines, AT&T underground telephone lines, City of Folsom for solid waste disposal, and City of Folsom water and sewer facilities. The City of Folsom employs a design process that includes coordination with potentially affected utilities as part of project development. Identifying and accommodating existing utilities is part of the design process, and utilities are considered when finalizing public project plans. The City of Folsom coordinates with the appropriate utility companies to plan and implement any needed accommodation of existing utilities, including water and sewer utility 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.

Impact Analysis

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).

Water service would be extended into the project site from Creekside Drive by connecting to an existing eight-inch water stub located in the southeastern corner of the project site. The water stub would connect to an existing 12-inch water main located on the eastern side of Creekside Drive near the northeastern corner of the project site. As sufficient supplies are available for buildout 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 the drought. Standards and regulations issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that came into effect June 1, 2015, require the City to reduce water consumption by 32 percent. In response, the City developed a water reduction plan to reduce water consumption, and conserve water in the City.

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

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 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 Overflow (SSO) to the SWRCB's online SSO database.

Sewer service would be served by constructing a sewer manhole over an existing eight-inch sewer main along the project frontage, west of the sidewalk along Creekside Drive. The new manhole would be located in the southeastern corner of the project site. Drainage systems would be directed toward the southwestern corner of the project site where there is an existing 24-inch diameter culvert that crosses under the existing bike trail towards Humbug Creek.

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 a less than significant 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.

Under existing conditions, runoff would drain to the southwest corner of the project site to an existing 24-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipeline that was installed under the existing bike trail and drain directly

to Humbug Creek. The existing condition currently allows runoff to drain to Creekside Drive and onto the existing southerly commercial project. The proposed project would modify conditions so that no storm runoff would be conveyed toward the existing southern commercial project. Only minor landscaped runoff would flow toward Creekside Drive. All proposed buildings and parking would be collected and directed toward the existing drain outfall in the southwestern corner of the project site. The proposed project drainage would be directed toward three bio-retention areas for water quality purposes. There is a portion of existing runoff that enters the site from the City owned parcel; however, the proposed grading is intended to include a small swale to control the open space runoff from entering the site. The proposed drainage swale would be directed toward the southwestern corner of the site. The on-site storm drainage would conform to City standards. Environmental impacts from these stormwater features would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

Electricity, Gas, and Telephone

Primary and secondary electric lines, gas lines, and telephone/cable lines are proposed within the project. These proposed utility lines would connect with existing utilities in the same vicinity of the project site, on Creekside Drive. Existing downward-facing lighting poles are located along Creekside Drive. Through the City's coordination with utility providers including SMUD for electricity, PG&E for underground gas lines, AT&T for underground telephone lines, utility providers are able to accommodate the proposed project.

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

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

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

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

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

XX. Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2023).

Impact Analysis

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 (CAL FIRE 2023).

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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, and tribal cultural resources. See Sections 11.IV, 11.V, 11.VII, 11.VIII, 11.XIII, and 11.XVIII of this IS/MND 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 IS/MND. Key areas of concern are discussed in detail below.

Evaluation of cumulative biological resources impacts: No special-status plant species were observed during the 2023 protocol-level special-status plant surveys of the Study Area; however, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Project construction would affect disturbed annual grassland and Valley oak woodland near and adjacent to Humbug Creek. If present at the time of construction, western pond turtle nests in these areas could be destroyed and/or individual turtles moving through these areas could be injured or killed during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The Study Area provides potential nesting habitat for a number of special-status bird species as well as migratory species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Special-status species that could potentially be affected by loss of nesting habitat as a result of construction include Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and bald eagle. If present in the development area at the time of construction, the nests of these species could be destroyed. Suitable nesting habitats within the Study Area for other special-status species such as tricolored blackbird, are associated with areas outside of the development footprint, but nesting activity could be disturbed by construction activity. Migratory songbirds could nest throughout the development area, and construction activity could destroy active nests if they are present in the work area(s). Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Trees throughout the Study Area are habitat for various special-status bats species. If special-status bats were roosting in trees to be removed by Project construction, they could be injured or killed during the removal. Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would be implemented to ensure a Worker Environmental Awareness Training is prepared and administered to project construction crews.

Valley oak woodland is designated as Sensitive Natural Community by CDFW. The project proposes to impact all 1.9 acres of this community directly and permanently within the Study Area. Mitigation Measure BIO-6 would be implemented to reduce impacts to the Valley oak woodland Sensitive Natural Community to a less than significant level.

An aquatic resources delineation has been conducted throughout the Study Area in accordance with USACE protocol. A total of approximately 0.017-acre of aquatic resources were delineated within the Study Area. These aquatic resources are comprised of three small seasonal wetlands. All of the approximately 0.017 acre of seasonal wetlands mapped within the Study Area will be impacted by the project. The project would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-7 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Based upon our understanding of the Project, it would require the removal of 101 Protected Trees with a combined DSH of 1,066 inches. Of those 101 Protected Trees, four (26 DSH inches) are rated as Dead or Dying, and the Tree Ordinance does not require mitigation for removal of those trees. An additional 38 trees (356 DSH inches) are rated as having Major Structure or Health Problems, and although mitigation is required for their removal, the mitigation ratio is only 0.5:1. The remaining 60 trees (696 DSH inches) are rated fair or better and would require full mitigation for removal. However, in addition to the mitigation reduction for poor condition, the Tree Ordinance also allows for mitigation

reduction of 50 percent for any trees within the buildable area of a residential parcel. Mitigation Measure BIO-8 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-8, 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: The cultural resource investigation for the proposed project included a records search of the Northern California Information Center (NCIC) database, desktop archival research including historical map and aerial image analysis, Native American outreach, and an intensive pedestrian survey of the Project Area. The records search at the NCIC identified fifteen previously conducted cultural investigations in the vicinity of the APE, four of which included an examination of the currently proposed Project Area. Of particular interest were Report #006703 and #009890 as their associated cultural investigations covered project areas strikingly similar to the currently proposed APE. Through their records searches, native American outreach efforts, and pedestrian surveys of the area, these reports concluded that the only cultural resources lying within the currently proposed APE consisted of waste rock piles/tailings associated with the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H). Furthermore, both reports recommended that the waste rock/tailings debris piles do not contribute to the significance per CRHR or NRHP eligibility of the Folsom Mining District and as such do not require further consideration for the purposes of project development. The NCIC records search also revealed that the rock piles/tailings associated with the Folsom Mining District are the only previously recorded cultural resources that lie within the APE. As a result of these records search findings, HELIX made it a priority to confirm the findings of Report #006703 and #009890 during the 2023 intensive pedestrian survey of the APE.

As a result of HELIX's cultural investigation of the currently proposed APE, HELIX is inclined to agree with the findings of Report #006703 and #009890, in that the only cultural resources that appear to be located within the APE are waste rock/tailings piles associated with the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308h), and that furthermore, due to the lack of additional features or datable artifacts or artifact scatters in association with these waste rock/tailings piles, these piles do not contribute to the significance per CRHR or NRHP eligibility of the Folsom Mining District and as such do not require further consideration for the purposes of the currently proposed project.

HELIX recommends that there would be no effect on historic properties, including archaeological and built-environment resources, as a result of project implementation. No additional studies, archaeological work, or construction monitoring are recommended. However, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would be implemented in the event that activities that might disturb the project area's ground surface over the course of the project encounter previously unrecorded cultural resources beneath the ground surface.

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: One sample of near-surface soil was submitted to Sunland Analytical Lab of Rancho Cordova, California, for testing to determine pH, minimum resistivity, chloride, and sulfate concentrations, and minimum resistivity to help evaluate the potential for corrosive attack upon buried concrete. The results of the corrosivity testing revealed a soil pH of 4.27

and a minimum resistivity of 1530 ohm-centimeters. The California Department of Transportation Corrosion and Structural Concrete Field Investigation Branch, 2021 Corrosion Guidelines (Version 3.2), considers a site to be corrosive to foundation elements if one or more of the following conditions exists for the representative soil and/or water samples taken: has a chloride concentration greater than or equal to 500 ppm, sulfate concentration greater than or equal to 1500 ppm, or the pH is 5.5 or less (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2022). Based on this criterion, the on-site soil is considered corrosive to steel reinforcement properly embedded within Portland cement concrete for the samples tested. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce the impact of corrosive soils on the project.

The Geotechnical Engineering Report by Wallace Kuhl & Associates prepared recommendations for site clearing and preparation, site grading, engineered fill construction, final subgrade preparation, fill and excavation slop construction, utility trench backfill, foundation design, interior floor slab support, floor slab moisture penetration resistance, perimeter block walls and retaining walls, exterior flatwork, site drainage, pavement design, and geotechnical engineering observation and testing during earth (See Appendix G for more detail on site recommendations). With the implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2, outlined below, the impacts relating to unstable soils in the project area would be less than significant.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and GEO-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 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 Measure GHG-01 through GHG-05. With implementation of this mitigation measure and compliance with SMAQMD's recommendations, the 2022 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: If project construction activities were to occur outside of the weekday hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. or the weekend hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., construction noise generated by the project would not be exempt from the City's noise standards and would exceed the nighttime exterior noise standard of 45 dBA, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure NOI-1 would restrict construction hours and reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to noise.

Evaluation of cumulative tribal cultural resources impacts: Consultation opened on May 9, 2023 and both the UAIC and Wilton Rancheria engaged in consultation. Both Tribes concluded that the project site does not include any known TCRs. However, there exists a potential for the discovery of previously unknown TCRs during project construction. If TCRs are encountered, the project activity could result in a

significant impact to those resources. Based on the consultation record summarized above and included in Appendix L, the City concludes that there would be a less than significant impact on TCRs with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1. Thus, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources.

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

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

12.0 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 M.

13.0 Preparers

City of Folsom

Desmond Parrington, Planning Manager
Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.

Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Project Manager
Julia Pano, Environmental Planner
Anviti Singh, Environmental Planner
Benjamin Siegel, Senior Archaeologist
Jentin Joe, Field Archaeologist
Greg Davis, Senior Reviewing Biologist
Joanne Dramko, Senior Air Quality/Noise Specialist
Shelby Bocks, Air Quality Specialist
Lika Loechler, GIS Specialist

14.0 References

Brainerd, C. 2015, May 6. News Release: City of Folsom Releases Water Reduction Plan. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/civica/press/display.asp?layout=1&Entry=271. Accessed March 22, 2023.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2022. User's Guide for CalEEMod Version 2022.1.0. Available at: http://www.caleemod.com/.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2023. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health.

2022. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2022-scoping-plan-documents.

2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. Available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/california-air-resources-board-air-quality-and-land-use-handbook-a-community-health-perspective.pdf.

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2023a. California Important Farmland Finder. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/. Accessed March 22, 2023.

2023b. Earthquake Hazards Zone Application (EQ Zapp) Map. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/. Accessed March 23, 2022.

2023c. Mineral Lands Classification. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc. Accessed March 22, 2023.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2018. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities.* State of California Natural Resource Agency Department of Fish and Wildlife. Dated 20 March 2018. Website: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2023. Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Available at: https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/. Accessed March 22, 2023.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2023. List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. Available at: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways. Accessed on March 23, 2023.

2013. Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. September.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2021a. 2020 Total System Electric Generation. Available at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2019-total-system-electric-generation. Accessed March 23, 2023.

2021b. Supply and Demand of Natural Gas in California. Available at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/californias-natural-gas-market/supply-and-demand-natural-gas-california. Accessed March 23, 2023.

2021c. California Gasoline Data, Facts, and Statistics. Available at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/california-gasoline-data-facts-and-statistics. Accessed March 23, 2023.

2021d. Diesel Fuel Data, Facts, and Statistics. Available at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/diesel-fuel-data-facts-and-statistics. Accessed March 23, 2023.

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 Emergency Management Agency. 2009. Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, Benicia Quadrangle, July 31, 2009. Available at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Publications/Tsunami-Maps/Tsunami_Inundation_Benicia_Quad_ContraCosta.pdf. Accessed March 23, 2023.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2001. *CNPS botanical survey guidelines*. Pages 38-40 *in* California Native Plant Society's *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California* (D.P. Tibor, editor). Sixth edition. Special Publication No. 1, California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, 387 pp.

California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). 2023. *RareFind 5*. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Dated June 2023.

Carrier. 2005. Product Data 38BRC (60 Hz) 12 SEER Air Conditioner. Available at: https://www.shareddocs.com/hvac/docs/1009/Public/02/38BRC-14PD.pdf.

City of Folsom (City). 2021a. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist. Updated March 24. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/158/637522677783670000.

2021b. 2035 General Plan Safety and Noise Element. Amended August 24.

2020a. Evacuation Plan. and available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/2229/637478591337570000. Accessed March 22, 2023.

2018a. Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. Amended May 2020.

2018b. City of Folsom Fire Department webpage. and available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/government/fire.

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2023. EnviroStor. Accessed March 22, 2023. Available at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/

El Dorado, County of. 2012. El Dorado County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: Cameron Airpark Airport; Georgetown Airport; Placerville Airport. June 28.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2023. National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer. Accessed March 23, 2033 and available at: https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd

Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. September.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX). 2023a. Creekside Apartments Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment. September 8.

2023b. Creekside Apartments Project Cultural Resource Letter Report. September 8.

2023c. Creekside Apartments Project Noise and Vibration Assessment. September 7.

2023d. Tribal Cultural Resources Memorandum for the Creekside Apartments Project. September 22.

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/.

Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). 2023. Web Soil Survey. Available at: https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/. Accessed March 23, 2022.

NETROnline. 2023. Historic Aerials. Available at: https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer. Accessed May 4, 2023.

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.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2022. Mather Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. August.

2019. 2020 MTP/SCS. Available at: https://www.sacog.org/2020-metropolitan-transportation-plansustainable-communities-strategy.

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

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2023. Accessed March 22, 2023. Available at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.

Terracon Consultants, Inc. 2022. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA). Included as Appendix H.

T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. 2023. Creekside Apartments Transportation Impact Study. Included as Appendix K.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2018. QuickFacts, Folsom City, California, population estimates, July 1, 2019 (V2019). Available at: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/folsomcitycalifornia. Accessed March 21, 2023.

U.S. Department of the Interior, USFWS. 2022. *California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, California. December 2022.

2000. *Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories for Federally Listed, Proposed and Candidate Plants*. Dated January 2000

U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). 2008. Roadway Construction Noise Model. Version 1.1. December 8.

2004. Traffic Noise Model. Version 2.5. February.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2023a. Learn About Asbestos. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/asbestos/learn-about-asbestos.

2023b. Superfund National Priorities List. Available at: https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=33cebcdfdd1b4c3a8b51d416956c41f1. Accessed March 22, 2023.

Wallace Kuhl & Associates. 2022. Geotechnical Engineering Report. Included as Appendix G.

This page intentionally left blank