Avenida Senior Living Project

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for:

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

Prepared by:

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

June 2020 | COF-31

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
APN	Assessors Parcel Number
BMP	Best Management Practices
BRA	Biological Resources Assessment
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CARB	California Air Resources Control Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CH_4	Methane
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
cy	Cubic Yards
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EBC	East Bidwell Corridor
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPAP	Existing plus Approved Project
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Area
FPASP	Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan
GHG	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
GWh	Gigawatt hours
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
ISMND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
LOS	Level of Service
MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MPH	Miles per Hour
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCIC	North Center Information Center
NOX	Nitrogen Oxides
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
N_2O	Nitrous Oxide

OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
O_3	Ozone
PACE	Property Assessed Clean Energy
PD	Planned Development
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PM	Particulate Matter
PRC	Public Resources Code
RCC	Regional Commercial Center
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RS	Redesignation Substitution
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
sf	Square foot/feet
SF_6	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
SSO	Sanitary Sewer Overflows
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
TCB	Tricolored Blackbird
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resources
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey

This page intentionally left blank

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Avenida Senior Living, Inc. (project applicant) proposes the Avenida Senior Living project (proposed project), a 154-unit, market-rate senior (age-restricted) apartment community on an estimated 6.9-acre site at the northeast corner of Healthy Way and Serpa Way in the City of Folsom.

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

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

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

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The proposed project is comprised of Assessor Parcel Number [APN] 072-2270-006 and falls within the plan area for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan (SP 95-1). The Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan area encompasses approximately 570 acres between East Bidwell Street and the Empire Ranch Specific Plan area and is bounded by Folsom Lake College to the north and U.S. Highway 50 to the south. An EIR for the Specific Plan was certified by the City Council in September 1994.

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

- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis, performed by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (March 2020).
- Avenida Folsom Senior Living Transportation Impact Study, prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. (May 2020).
- Avenida Folsom Senior Living – Preliminary Drainage Study Memo, TSD Engineering, Inc. (February 2020).

- Biological Resources Assessment, prepared by Madrone Ecological Consultants (June 2020).
- Cultural Resources Assessment for Avenida Senior Living, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning (March 2020).
- Geotechnical Engineering Study Update for Broadstone Crossing Parcel 6, prepared by Youngdahl Consulting Group (April 2019).
- Noise Analysis, performed by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (March 2020).
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for 115 Healthy Way, prepared by Youngdahl Consulting Group (May 2019).
- Tribal Consultation Record for Compliance with Assembly Bill 52 and CEQA for Avenida Senior Living Project, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (April 2020).

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Project Location

The site is located at 115 Healthy Way, east of Serpa Way, south of Iron Point Road and north of Healthy Way in the City of Folsom (City) in Sacramento County, California. Known as Broadstone Crossing Parcel 6, the site is approximately 6.9-acres (gross), 4.9-acres (net), and is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 072-2270-006. The site is located within Section 9, Township 9 North, Range 8 East (Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute "Clarksville Quadrangle"). Refer to **Figure 1** for the project location and **Figure 2** for the APNs and parcel boundaries on an aerial photograph; all referenced figures are located in **Appendix A**. The property is owned by Elliott Homes, Inc.

3.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

3.2.1. Physical Landscape

The site is irregularly shaped, unoccupied, and consists of a previously graded building pad with approximately 35-foot fill slopes on the west and southwest boundaries. In late 2002, the mass grading of a larger area, including the site, occurred as part of the Broadstone Crossing Development project. Additional fill construction occurred in 2007 with the creation of an earthen berm on the north edge of the property, adjacent to the open space. A concrete-paved area in the southeast portion of the site was used to accommodate portable trailers associated with the construction of the LifeTime Fitness facility. For erosion control, the fill slopes and relatively flat pad were vegetated with nonnative grasses. Underground improvements include irrigation and utilities at the southeast corner of the property.

An open space area is south of Iron Point Road and wraps around the north and east property lines. Serpa Way is west, Green Acres Nursery & Supply, and Costco Wholesale are west and southwest, respectively. LifeTime Fitness Athletic Club is south across Healthy Way and Highway 50 is south of Costco. Additional commercial, office, hotel, and residential uses are nearby.

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

Table 1. Neighboring Land Uses

Direction	Land Use
North	Open space, Single Family residential development
East	Open space, Multifamily Medium Density residential development
South	Healthy Way, Regional Commercial Center/commercial development (LifeTime Fitness Athletic Club)
West	Serpa Way, Regional Commercial Center/commercial development (Green Acres Nursery & Supply)

3.2.2. General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning

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

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

The zoning designation of the site is C-2 PD (Commercial, Planned Development District). In the C-2 (Central Business) zone, the proposed senior multi-family project is considered a Senior Citizens Residential Complex and is a conditionally-permitted use with a conditional use permit to the Planning Commission (Zoning Code 17.22.030E).

The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). The purpose of the PD Permit is to allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. With the PD Permit, the project's site plan, elevations, and overall project design will be evaluated, and specific development standards defined.

3.3 Project Characteristics

The proposed project is a 154-unit, market-rate senior multi-family apartment community with a mix of one and two-bedroom residential units in an estimated 201,798 square foot (sf), four-story building. The project site includes surface parking lots arranged around the building to accommodate 168 vehicles, landscaping, and indoor and outdoor amenities (**Table 2**). The net and gross densities of the proposed project are 24.5 and 22.3 units per acre, respectively.

Table 2. Summary of Project Features

Project Feature	Units/Spaces	Square Feet
Buildings		
One multi-family apartment building	154 units	201,798
Parking		
Parking spaces in off-street parking areas	168 spaces	--
Total Parking Spaces/Square Footage	**168**	**201,798**

The proposed building would be E-shaped and would extend around two large courtyards that include recreation amenities and landscaping. On the south elevation, a grand porte-cochere would identify the building entry and two-story lobby. Apartment units are planned on each of the four levels of the building and would be accessible from hallway corridors.

The pool courtyard is designed with a swimming pool, sun lounge area, and an outdoor fire ring seating area. Seasonal recreation activities would be available, including a spa, and patio area with an outdoor kitchen. The courtyard would include palms in the sun lounge area, two raised planter and seat walls adjacent to the pool, and shade structures.

On the east side of the building, the garden courtyard would feature an informal garden and natural landscape with a curvilinear circuit walkway, gazebo, ornamental fountain, and accent landscape plantings. The garden courtyard space would be used by residents for various activities, including relaxation, dog walking, and garden walks. The courtyard walkway would connect to the walking route planned on the perimeter of the site. The courtyards have a southern exposure to provide for natural sunlight.

3.3.1. Residential and Community Buildings

Residential units are planned in a mix of unit types: 93 one-bedroom (60 percent of units) and 61 two-bedroom (40 percent of units) for a total of 154 units. Apartment home floor plans would consist of one-bedroom/one-bath (679 to 836 sf), two-bedroom/two-bath (1,070 to 1,301 sf). All units would be accessible from interior hallways and include a full kitchen, living space, storage closets, bedrooms, bathrooms, and outdoor patio/balcony. Some unit floor plans include a den. Common area interior features include a leasing lobby, library, fitness and yoga studios, bistro, great room, club room, private dining room, creative arts studio, meeting space, and laundry facilities. Please refer to **Figure 3** for an overall site plan of the proposed development.

3.3.2. Parking and Circulation

Primary vehicle access to the site would be from a driveway off an unsignalized intersection on Healthy Way. From Healthy Way, an access drive would extend and loop through the site to access parking areas. Accessible pathways are planned around the building to provide a walking path for residents.

The project includes 168 parking spaces in off-street parking areas surrounding the building. The parking supply consists of 100 uncovered and 63 carport-covered parking spaces, including six Americans with

Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible spaces. The ratio of parking provided is approximately 1.09 spaces per unit. The parking supply includes 18 electric vehicle charging station spaces.

The Folsom Municipal Code does not address specific parking standards for senior residential uses. The Design Guidelines for Multi-Family Development (1998) require multi-family apartment projects to provide 1.5 parking spaces for a one-bedroom unit, 1.75 parking spaces for a two-bedroom unit, and 0.2 guest parking spaces for each apartment. Applying the parking recommendations of the Design Guidelines for Multi-Family Development, the proposed project would require 278 spaces, which exceeds the 168 spaces in the project.

The proposed parking supply of 168 spaces is ample and appropriate because the project is age-restricted to seniors over 55 years of age. Residents of age-restricted residential communities drive less and have a lower rate of vehicle ownership than those of conventional (family) multi-family communities. The reduced parking demand of age-restricted communities is also the result of reduced household sizes occupied by residents who no longer drive vehicles.

The project's proposed parking ratio is comparable to other age-restricted multi-family projects in the City and region. The parking ratio for the project (1.09 spaces per unit) is higher than the parking ratio for Avenida's comparable age-restricted multi-family projects nationwide (0.86 spaces per unit).

The Folsom Municipal Code requires one bicycle parking space for every five units that equates to 31 bicycle parking spaces required for the project. The project provides 32 bicycle parking spaces in four eight-space racks located on the north, south, east sides of the building.

3.3.3. Utilities

Proposed utilities include domestic water, sanitary sewer line, fire service line and fire water main, primary and secondary electric lines, gas line, and telephone/cable. Domestic water would tie-in with existing public domestic water on Healthy Way. Water located on-site would be privately owned and maintained. A sanitary sewer line would connect to existing public sewer lines on Healthy Way. Sanitary sewer located on-site would be privately owned and maintained. The fire service line and fire water main would also connect from Healthy Way. A joint trench along the south boundary of the site would include primary and secondary electric lines, gas line, and telephone/cable. The on-site storm drain would conform to City of Folsom standards. Water quality basins are proposed within the project site.

3.3.4. Trash/Recycling

Two indoor trash rooms on the north side of the building (ground level) would house three-yard trash dumpsters, and three-yard recycling dumpsters. On each level of the building, there are two common trash rooms where residents would dispose of trash and recycling. In trash rooms on the upper levels, separate chutes for trash and recycling chutes would empty refuse into dumpsters on the ground level. Large or bulky items that do not fit in the trash chute may be left in the trash rooms, and Avenida maintenance staff would break them down and deliver to the ground floor trash rooms.

Concrete aprons located directly outside of the trash rooms would accommodate the turning movement of refuse vehicles. On the days of collection, trash and recycling dumpsters would be rolled out of the ground level trash rooms onto the concrete aprons. After collection, dumpsters would be moved back to the trash rooms. Avenida maintenance staff would move bins in and out of the building on the same days as refuse collection. Landscape contractors would haul green waste (organic) from the site.

3.3.5. Fencing and Signage

A four-foot tubular steel fence is planned at the tops of the slopes on the west, north, and southwest edges of the parking areas. A six-foot tubular steel fence is planned around the pool, and a six-foot chain-link fence is planned around the pickleball court.

Monument signage planned in the landscaped area north of the intersection of Serpa Way and Healthy Way and at the project entry on Healthy Way would be incorporated into architectural features of the building.

3.3.6. Landscaping

Outdoor features include a pool, spa, outdoor lounge seating, pickleball recreation area, landscaped courtyards, gardens, perimeter walking path, and gazebos. A path on the site perimeter would provide residents with a looped walking route with viewpoints, gazebos, and benches.

The proposed landscape would feature California-native and low water-use ornamental plant selections. Natives would be emphasized next to the natural open space to complement the existing habitat and large trees would create shade in parking areas and on the access driveway. Landscaped areas are planned at the project entry on Healthy Way, adjacent to the building, retaining walls, and around outdoor gathering spaces.

Landscaping on the west and south slopes of the site, adjacent to Serpa Way and Healthy Way, respectively, features trees rather than turf. At the bottom of the slope at street level, a monument sign would be incorporated into an adjoining accent wall that wraps around and tapers on the Healthy Way frontage. In the southwest corner of the parking lot, a jewel-box gazebo with seating would provide a lookout point with views over the Sacramento Valley. The landscaping is consistent with the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

3.3.7. Sustainable Features

The project design incorporates sustainable features that are consistent with General Plan Goal LU 9.1 and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). CALGreen includes green building standards for mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and HVAC systems. The project provides electric vehicle parking spaces and charging stations consistent with CALGreen.

The position of the building in a north-south orientation maximizes passive solar access and natural lighting within the two courtyards and for south-facing units. Cool paving materials would be used for hardscapes throughout the site, including the courtyards, concrete refuse pads, pedestrian paths, adjacent to the pickleball court, and the driveway entry treatment.

3.4 Construction and Phasing

The site would be graded in a single phase and would move 6,500 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 5,000 cy of fill, with a net import of 1,500 cy of material. The project would be graded and constructed in a single phase and would take approximately 18-20 months to complete. Construction would include minor demolition of an existing parking lot with curb and gutter, grading, utilities, foundations, and slab-on-grade activities. Vertical construction would consist of a Type V four-story, wood-framed structure with elements of stucco, siding, and architectural details.

3.5 City Regulation of Urban Development

3.5.1. General Plan

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

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

3.5.2. Zoning Ordinance

The zoning designation of the site is C-2 PD (Commercial, Planned Development District) (**Table 3**). In the C-2 (Central Business) zone, the proposed senior multi-family project is considered a Senior Citizens Residential Complex and is a conditionally-permitted use, requiring a conditional use permit approval by the Planning Commission (Zoning Code 17.22.030E).

The Planned Development District (PD) component of the zoning designation requires a Planned Development Permit Review (PD Permit) entitlement for design review purposes (Zoning Code 17.38.050). The purpose of the PD Permit is to allow greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of land use regulations. With the PD Permit, the project's site plan, elevations, and overall project design would be evaluated, and specific development standards defined. Except for building height and rear yard setback, additional development standards would be established with the PD Permit (Zoning Code 17.38.090) based on the design of the project.

The project is consistent with applicable development standards for the C-2 zoning district (Zoning Code 17.22.050).

Table 3. City of Folsom Development Standards for C-2 Zoning District

	Development Standard	Project
Lot Area	N/A	N/A
Lot Width	N/A	N/A
Building Coverage	N/A	N/A
Front Yard Setback	N/A	N/A
Rear Yard Setback	12 feet	93 feet
Side Yard Setback	N/A	N/A
Building Height Limit	Four stories	Four stories, 50 feet

3.5.3. Specific Plan Designation

The site is within the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan (SP-95-1) (BSP) area and is designated C-2 (Community Commercial). Within the BSP, apartments, senior apartments, and senior housing are not permitted uses within the C-2 designation.

A text amendment to the BSP is proposed to add Senior Citizens Residential Complex as a conditionally permitted use within the C-2 designation with a conditional use permit. The Senior Citizens Residential Complex is the category name that would include senior multi-family residential (apartments). The text amendment would modify the text of the BSP only; no change would occur to the C-2 zoning designation. With the specific plan amendment adding Senior Citizen Residential Complex as a conditionally-permitted use, the proposed project would be consistent with the BSP with a conditional use permit.

3.6 Other City Regulation of Urban Development

3.6.1. 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 April 23, 2015. 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. It also requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control erosion and siltation of receiving waters.

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

3.6.2. 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 4**, and hereby incorporated by reference into the Project Description as though fully set forth herein. Copies of these documents may be reviewed at the City of Folsom, Office of the City Clerk, 50 East Natoma Street, Folsom, California 95630.

Table 4. 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.

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
9.35	Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances	Establishes standards for the construction and monitoring of facilities used for the underground storage of hazardous substances and establishes a procedure for issuance of permits for the use of these facilities.
12.16	Tree Preservation	Regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees.
13.26	Water Conservation	Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.
14.19	Energy Code	Adopts the California Energy Code, 2010 Edition, published as Part 6, Title 24, C.C.R. to require energy efficiency standards for structures.
14.20	Green Building Standards Code	Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2010 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4 and A5, published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices.
14.29	Grading Code	Requires a grading permit prior to the initiation of any grading, excavation, fill or dredging; establishes standards, conditions, and requirements for grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage, and revegetation.
14.32	Flood Damage Prevention	Restricts or prohibits uses that cause water or erosion hazards, or that result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights; requires that uses vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage; controls the modification of floodways; regulates activities that may increase flood damage or that could divert floodwaters.

Source: City of Folsom 2018.

4.0 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project objectives are to:

- Provide an age-restricted housing community for seniors in the City of Folsom.
- Contribute residential units to the City's multi-family housing stock and assist the City in meeting a portion of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) obligation.
- Develop an infill site served by existing streets, sidewalks, and utilities.
- Improve vehicle miles travelled by providing senior housing at an infill location proximate to existing commercial uses.

5.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS

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

- Specific Plan Amendment to amend the Broadstone Specific Plan to include Senior Citizens Residential Complex as a conditionally permitted use in the C-2 zone;
- Conditional Use Permit for a Senior Citizen Residential Complex in the C-2 zone; and,
- Planned Development Permit for a Senior Citizen Residential Complex (154-unit multi-family residential project) in the C-2 zone.

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

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

6.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

6.1 City of Folsom General Plan

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

6.2 Tiering

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

7.1 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. AESTHETICS

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

Environmental Setting

The project site is currently unoccupied and graded with a flat building pad. An existing paved parking area is in the project site with a driveway connecting to Healthy Way. The project site is bounded by open space to the north, open space and multi-family residential development to the east, Healthy Way and commercial development (Life Time Fitness) to the south, and Serpa Way and commercial development (Green Acres Nursery & Supply) to the west. The regional setting is characterized by commercial shopping to the west, US Highway 50 to the south, and residential to the north and east.

The proposed project includes the construction of one hundred fifty-four new senior multi-family apartment units within one E-shaped, 201,798 sf building. The proposed apartment building would be four-stories tall.

The preliminary landscape plan includes a pool courtyard and a garden courtyard at the apartment building. Trees of various sizes would be planted in the parking lot areas surrounding the apartment building. The west side of the project site would include hillside olive orchard-style plantings. Additionally, a gazebo overlook would be placed at the southwest corner and the front, south-facing elevation of the building would include a covered (porte-cochere) entrance.

Existing trees and vegetation outside of the project grading limits to the north and east would not be removed. The project would blend proposed landscaping in with the existing surrounding landscaping.

Evaluation of Aesthetics

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

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

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

No impact. The project site contains a graded building pad, small parking lot, and planted ornamental trees along Healthy Way. Potential removal of the trees would be mitigated through provisions in a tree permit, if required. No potential scenic resources are noted at the project site. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is the segment of US Highway 50 from Placerville to Echo Summit , approximately 18 miles east. The proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources, such as trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

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

Less than significant impact. Areas along U.S. Highway 50 are rapidly urbanizing and westbound motorists could potentially have views of the project site. Views from the highway, however, would be fleeting and largely obstructed by the Green Acres Garden Supply and LifeTime Fitness buildings.

The project site would also be visible from the north by residences and motorists along Iron Point Road. Although the proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the site and the surrounding area, the proposed project is consistent with the land uses for the site included in the Specific Plans and the General Plan. Renderings of the proposed project are included in **Appendix B**.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the City's Hillside Development Guidelines which include key design principles and issues applicable to the proposed project such as grading and drainage, landscaping, architecture and site design (including building materials and colors), fencing and walls, and lighting. Further, the project would be required to comply with the goals and policies of the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan Design Guidelines. 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 includes a combination of free-standing parking lot lights, recessed carport lights, walkway lights, and building-attached lights. To minimize potential lighting-related impacts, free-standing parking lot lights and recessed carport lights will be screened, shielded, and directed downward to minimize glare towards the surrounding properties. New lighting associated with the development of the proposed project would be subject to City standard practices regarding night lighting that would be made a condition of approval of the Planned Development Permit. The proposed apartment buildings and other project features would comply with design standards outlined in the Folsom Municipal Code. The exterior of the proposed apartment buildings would not be made of reflective materials that would introduce a new source of glare, and existing City standards would limit light spillover and intensity. Mitigation outlined in the Biological Resources section of this ISMND require the use of horizontal bird safety film on exterior window surfaces on the north building elevation to deter birds from the windows. The bird safety film reduces window reflectivity. Therefore, impacts would be a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is necessary.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

Environmental Setting

No agricultural activities or timber management occur on the project site or in adjacent areas and the project site is not designated for agricultural or timberland uses. The California Important Farmlands Map prepared for Sacramento County by the California Resources Agency classifies the project site as Grazing Land, and immediately adjacent areas are Urban and Built-Up Land (California Department of Conservation 2016). Other land is defined by the California Resources Agency as “land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock.” 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 10 acres (Natural Resources Agency 2006).

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey report generated for the project site (NRCS 2020) indicates that the soil unit at the site, Auburn-Argonaut-Rock outcrop complex, 8 to 30 percent slopes, is not Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, or Unique Farmland.

Evaluation of Agriculture and Forestry Resources

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

No impact. The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance (Farmland), as indicated in the Sacramento County Important Farmland 2016 Map (California Department of Conservation 2016). 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 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))?

No impact. The project site is not zoned or designated as farmland, and the surrounding land uses are primarily residential developments. 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?

OR

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?	☐	☐	■	☐

Environmental Setting

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

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

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The EPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for

seven air pollution constituents. As permitted by the Clean Air Act, California has adopted more stringent air emissions standards (CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air constituents. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for any state standard. An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A "nonattainment" designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once. The air quality attainment status of the SVAB, including the City, is shown in **Table 5**.

Table 5. Sacramento Valley Air Basin – Attainment Status

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

Sources: CARB 2020a; EPA 2020.

The Sacramento County/Sacramento Metropolitan Area portion of the SVAB is currently in nonattainment for federal and/or state ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ standards. Concentrations of all other pollutants meet state and federal standards.

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

Air Quality Monitoring

CARB's air quality monitoring network provides information on ambient concentrations of air pollutants in the SVAB. SMAQMD operates a monitoring station in the City, where the air quality data for ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ were obtained. Other data are reported from one additional location in Sacramento County. **Table 6** compares a three-year summary of the highest annual criteria air pollutant emissions collected at these monitoring stations with applicable CAAQS, which are more stringent than the corresponding NAAQS. The concentrations of the pollutants ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} are expected to be fairly representative of the project site, due to the regional nature of these pollutants.

Table 6. Summary of Annual Air Quality Data for Folsom Area Air Quality Monitoring Stations

POLLUTANT	2016	2017	2018
Ozone (O_3) 1-hour: Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street			
Maximum Concentration (ppm)	0.111	0.107	0.105
Days Exceeding State Standard (1-hr avg. 0.09 ppm)	6	4	5
Ozone (O_3) 8-hour: Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street			
Maximum Concentration (ppm)	0.094	0.086	0.093
Days Exceeding State Standard (8-hr avg. 0.070 ppm)	23	17	18
Days Exceeding National Standard (8-hr avg. 0.075 ppm)	13	7	9
PM_{10}: Monitoring location: Sacramento – Branch Center Road 2			
Maximum State 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m3)	44.0	81.0	212.0
Days Exceeding State Standard (Daily Standard 50 µg/m^3)	0	3	4
Maximum National 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m3)	45.0	79.0	200.0
Days Exceeding Federal Standard (Daily Standard 150 µg/m^3)	0	0	1
$PM_{2.5}$: Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street			
Maximum National 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m^3)	25.7	33.2	104.5
Days Exceeding National 2006 Standard (Daily Standard 35 µg/m^3)	0	0	9

Source: CARB 2020.

As indicated in **Table 6**, ozone standards have been exceeded in Folsom over the past three years. PM_{10} standards were exceeded in 2017 and 2018. $PM_{2.5}$ standards were exceeded in 2018.

Air Quality Attainment Planning

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

- **8-Hour O3.** The Sacramento region was classified by the EPA as a "serious" nonattainment area on June 15, 2004 for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, with an attainment deadline of June 15, 2013. Emission reductions needed to achieve the air quality standard were identified using an air quality modeling analysis. An evaluation of proposed control measures and associated ROG and NO_X emission reductions concluded that no set of feasible controls were available to provide the needed emission reductions before the attainment deadline year. Given the magnitude of the shortfall in emission reductions, and the schedule for implementing new control measures, the earliest possible attainment demonstration year for the Sacramento region was determined to be the "severe" area deadline of 2019. Section 181(b)(3) of the Clean Air Act permits a state to request that the EPA reclassify a nonattainment area to a higher classification and extend the time allowed for attainment. This process is appropriate for areas that must rely on longer-term strategies to achieve the emission reductions needed for attainment. The EPA approved this request on May 5, 2010. In 2013, the region developed an Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan. This plan was approved and effective March 2, 2015 and addresses how the region would attain the 1997 8-hour standard. A follow-

up Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan was developed and approved by the SMAQMD Board on August 24, 2017. This plan demonstrates attainment of the 2008 8-hour federal standard by an attainment year of 2024. The plan was approved by CARB on November 16, 2017 and will be forwarded to the EPA.

- **1-Hour O3.** On May 9, 2011, EPA proposed to determine that California is no longer required to implement or submit a CAA Section 185 fee program for 1-hour ozone as a revision to the SIP for the Sacramento Metro 1-hour ozone nonattainment area. EPA has also taken an "interim final" action to stop sanctions from applying to the Sacramento Metro Area. On September 28, 2017, SMAQMD approved a Redesignation Substitution (RS) Request that demonstrates that the region met the EPA's requirements to be redesignated as attainment for the revoked 1979 1-hour federal standard. The request has been forwarded to the EPA by CARB. Once approved, the RS Request will redesignate the region to attainment and remove the previous CAA obligations associated with that standard.

- **PM_{10}.** In March 2002, the EPA officially determined that Sacramento County had attained the PM_{10} standards. In November 2010, the SMAQMD formally requested that the EPA redesignate Sacramento County from nonattainment to attainment for PM_{10}. The EPA approved this request effective October 28, 2013. The SMAQMD additionally adopted a PM_{10} Maintenance Plan. The first Maintenance Plan showed maintenance from 2012 through 2022. A Second Maintenance Plan will be prepared and submitted by SMAQMD to demonstrate maintenance for ten additional years, through 2032.

- **$PM_{2.5}$.** The Sacramento $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment area designation met the $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS by December 31, 2011. On May 9, 2012, CARB submitted a request that EPA find the Sacramento region in attainment for the 2006 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS. EPA issued a proposed rule for Determination of Attainment for the Sacramento Nonattainment Area on October 26, 2012 and a final rule for Determination of Attainment on July 15, 2013. EPA used the updated 2010-2012 ambient air quality data for determination and the final rule became effective on August 14, 2013 (SMAQMD 2017) (EPA 2013). On May 10, 2017, the EPA found the area attained the 2006 24-hour NAAQS by the attainment date of December 31, 2015 based on monitoring data for 2013-2015. The 2013 Maintenance Plan and will be updated and submitted in the future based on the clean data finding made by the EPA.

- **CO.** The region is currently designated attainment for 1-hour and 8-hour CO standards. The Maintenance Plan developed for CO in 1996 was revised in 2004 to extend the 1996 CO Maintenance Plan demonstration to 2018.

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 (2009, revised), and are discussed under the checklist questions below.

Evaluation of Air Quality

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

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

> *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. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

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 (NO_X and ROG) and particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}). The project's emissions of these criteria pollutants during construction and operation are evaluated below.

Construction Emissions

Regional Emissions

SMAQMD's Guide includes a construction screening level to determine if a project would exceed the NO_X threshold of significance. However, because the proposed project includes cut-and-fill operations, the NO_X construction screening level is not recommended for use. As such, the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 was used to quantify project-generated construction emissions. Construction emissions would be generated by vehicle engine exhaust from off-road construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips.

The SMAQMD does not have a recommended threshold for construction-generated ROG; therefore, the maximum daily emissions of NO_X are analyzed below. As shown in **Table 7**, the proposed project would generate emissions of the ozone precursor NO_X that would be below the SMAQMD threshold. Impacts related to construction-generated NO_X emissions would be less than significant.

Table 7. Estimated Project Construction NOx Emissions

CONSTRUCTION YEAR	**NO_X (lbs./day)**
2023	28
2024	17
SMAQMD Threshold	*85*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**

Source of emissions: CalEEMod output (Appendix C)
Source of threshold: SMAQMD 2017.

Local Emissions

The SMAQMD utilizes the same screening level as the NO_X emission screening level to assist a project proponent or lead agency in determining if PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from constructing a project in Sacramento County will exceed the SMAQMD's construction significance thresholds. As with the NO_X screening presented above, because the proposed project includes cut-and-fill operations, the PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ construction screening level is not recommended for use. As such, CalEEMod modeling was performed by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. to quantify project-generated construction emissions as discussed previously. CalEEMod results are included in **Appendix C**.

The maximum daily emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are shown below. As shown in **Table 8**, the proposed project would generate emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ that would be below the SMAQMD thresholds. Impacts related to construction generated PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be less than significant.

Table 8. Estimated Project Construction PM Emissions

CONSTRUCTION YEAR	PM_{10} (lbs./day)	$PM_{2.5}$ (lbs./day)
2023	10	6
2024	2	1
SMAQMD Threshold	*80*	*82*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**

Source of emissions: CalEEMod output (Appendix C).
Source of threshold: SMAQMD 2017.

Operational Emissions

Regional Emissions

SMAQMD provides screening levels to identify when additional analysis is necessary to determine potential significance for operational ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. The operational screening levels represent the development size at which the operational emissions thresholds of significance would not be exceeded. The proposed project would qualify as the CalEEMod land use of mid-rise apartment under the general land use category of residential. According to the screening thresholds, if a proposed mid-rise apartment project is less than 740 dwelling units, then the project would not have the potential to exceed SMAQMD's recommended mass emission thresholds for NO_X or ROG during operation. The PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ screening level is 1,485 dwelling units. The proposed project would be 154 dwelling units (93 one-bedroom units and 61 two-bedroom units) which is substantially less than the screening thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would generate less than significant quantities of operational ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, and project-specific modeling for operational emissions is not required.

Local Emissions

The primary pollutant of localized concern is mobile-source CO. Local mobile-source CO emissions near roadway intersections are a direct function of traffic volume, speed, and delay. Long-distance transport of CO is extremely limited because it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. Under specific meteorological conditions and traffic conditions, CO concentrations at receptors located near roadway intersections may reach unhealthy levels, when combined with background CO levels, creating a CO "hotspot".

The SMAQMD's two-tiered screening criteria identify when a project has the potential to contribute to a CO hotspot and if CO dispersion modeling is necessary. According to the first screening tier, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality for local CO if:

1. Traffic generated by the proposed project will not result in deterioration of intersection level of service (LOS) to LOS E or F; and,
2. The project will not contribute additional traffic to an intersection that already operates at LOS E or F.

As detailed in the project's Transportation Impact Study (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc.), the proposed project would not result in the deterioration of any intersection to LOS E or F. The project would, however, contribute additional traffic to an intersection that already operates at LOS E or F (Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street). Under SMAQMD criteria, if the first tier of SMAQMD is exceeded, then the second tier screening criteria is examined. Under the second screening tier, a project would result in a less-than-significant CO impact if the project would not cause an affected intersection to experience more than 31,600 vehicles per hour. Based on the project's Transportation Impact Study, the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersection would not experience more than 31,600 vehicles per hour. Therefore, the project would not result in a CO hotspot, and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact.

<u>Off-site Receptors</u>

Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project include multi-family residences approximately 300 feet east of the project site and single-family residences approximately 500 feet north of the project site. During project construction, diesel particulate matter emissions would be released from on-site heavy construction equipment. As shown in **Table 8**, above, emissions of PM_{10} (which includes equipment emissions of diesel particulate matter) during construction would be well below the SMAQMD threshold. Considering the low mass of diesel particulate emissions, distance to the nearest sensitive receptors, the relatively short duration of construction, and highly dispersive properties of diesel particulate matter, project construction-related impacts to off-site sensitive receptors would be less than significant. As discussed above, the project's operational emissions of NO_X, ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would be below SMAQMD thresholds and the project would not result in a CO hotspot. Therefore, project operation-related impacts to off-site sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

On-site Receptors

CARB siting recommendations within the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook* suggest a detailed health risk assessment should be conducted for proposed sensitive receptors within 500 feet of a freeway (CARB 2005). While the project would develop a land use associated with sensitive receptors, the closest portion of the project site would be located approximately 600 feet from U.S. Highway 50; therefore, a detailed health risk assessment is not required and impacts to project residents from pollutant concentrations associated with U.S. Highway 50 would be less than significant.

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

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

As a residential development, operation of the project would not result in odors affecting a substantial number of people. Odors related to food preparation from the project's on-site bistro would not be substantial enough to be considered a nuisance due to the dilution of the odors over the distance to nearby sensitive receptors. 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. Operational odor impacts 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?	☐	☐	☐	■

The discussion below is based in part on a biological resources assessment letter report prepared by Madrone Ecological Consulting, LLC. (Madrone Ecological Consulting, LLC. 2020), attached to this Initial Study as **Appendix D**.

Environmental Setting

Madrone Ecological Consulting conducted a biological survey of the project area on 07 February 2020. During the survey, the entire project area was surveyed by meandering transects on foot and the biologists assessed the suitability of habitats on-site to support special-status species. Vegetation communities were classified in accordance with the Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition (Sawyer, Keeler-Wolf and Evens 2009) (MCV), and plant taxonomy was based on the nomenclature in the Jepson Manual, Second Edition (Baldwin et al. 2012) as accessed through the online Jepson Flora

Project (eds.)(2020). Mr. Brown conducted follow-up observation surveys of the existing tricolored blackbird (TCB) colony located just northeast of the project area on 10 March and 10 April 2020. During the surveys, Mr. Brown observed the location of the nesting colony and typical foraging flight patterns. Additionally, Mr. Brown surveyed the site for suitability of nesting, breeding, and foraging habitat for the species. Ms. VonderOhe visited the site on 12 June 2020 to observe the colony and status of construction surrounding the nesting colony.

The project area is predominantly composed of previously graded, highly disturbed, flat terrain with sparse vegetation consisting of non-native ruderal and European annual grass species dominated by filaree (*Erodium botrys*), soft-chess brome (*Bromus diandrus*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), stinkwort (*Dittrichia graveolens*), medusa head grass (*Elymus caput-medusae*), short-podded mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*). The project area is generally rocky and lacks fertile topsoil needed to support a traditional annual grassland. The flat graded portion of the project area appears from historic aerial photographs to be mowed annually for fire prevention. Due to these factors, the project area can be classified as disturbed land cover.

A linear ditch located outside of and immediately north of the project site gathers sheet flow precipitation runoff and conveys it to two shallow water quality/detention basins. When these basins fill, water then is released into the open space parcel immediately north of the project site through a steel culvert and armored outfall and overland flow. The ditch and basins were created during the grading of the site as water quality features to prevent sediment from running off the site into the adjacent open space parcel. These engineered features are created either on fill in historical uplands and/or are deemed non-jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and/or waters of the State. These features will not be impacted by the project and will remain intact to prevent sediment from entering into the adjacent open space.

The open space to the north contains a moderate- to high-gradient ephemeral stream. This stream generally flows from east to west, is level with the eastern project boundary, and drops to approximately 30 feet below the elevation of the western project boundary. No portion of this stream is located on the project site, and as such, will not be impacted by the project. Immediately north of the stream is a seep that supports a large Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*) bramble between 0.5 and 1-acre in size. This bramble supports a nesting colony of the California-threatened tricolored blackbird.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service has mapped one soil unit within the project area: (110) Auburn-Argonaut-Rock outcrop complex, 8 to 30 percent slopes.

Table 9 provides a list of special-status species that were evaluated, including their listing status, habitat associations, and their potential to occur in the project area. The following select set of criteria was used for each species' potential for occurrence on the site:

- Present: Species was observed on the site during field surveys.
- Moderate: The site is within the known range of the species and limited suitable habitat exists.
- Low: The site is within the known range of the species and there is marginally suitable habitat or the species was not observed during protocol-level surveys conducted on-site.

Table 9. Special-Status Species with Potential to Occur

Scientific Name (Common Name)	Federal Status	State Status	Habitat Requirements	Potential to Occur
Agelaius tricolor Tricolored blackbird	--	CT, CSC	Colonial nester in cattails, bulrush, or blackberries associated with marsh habitats.	**Present**. Observed in blackberry bramble located northeast of the study area in designated TCB open space. Species observed foraging in study area, however no nesting habitat exists on project site.
Athene cunicularia Burrowing owl	--	CSC	Nests in abandoned ground squirrel burrows, culverts, and debris piles associated with open grassland habitats.	**Low**. No ground squirrel burrows were observed and very limited debris piles within the study area that could provide surrogate burrows. The highly maintained nature of the site reduces the potential presence of this species.
Eromophila alpestris actia California horned lark	--	CSC	Forages and breeds in open grasslands and fields.	**Present**. Observed foraging within the study area and may nest within study area.
Elanus leucurus White-tailed kite	--	CFP	Open grasslands, field, and meadows used for foraging; isolated trees in	**Moderate**. The study area represents low quality foraging habitat for the species, and the trees and shrubs adjacent to the study area provide suitable nesting habitat.
Lanius ludovicianus Loggerhead shrike	--	CSC	Occurs in open areas with sparse trees, shrubs, and other perches.	**Low**. The study area supports suitable foraging habitat for loggerhead shrike. There is no suitable nesting habitat within the study area.

Source: Madrone Ecological Consultants, Inc. (2020)
Notes: CT= CDFW threatened, CSC= CDFW species of concern, CFP= CDFW fully protected.

Tricolored Blackbird

Tricolored blackbird (TCB) is state listed as threatened; in addition, TCB is listed by CDFW as a species of special concern. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) contains 14 active and inactive TCB breeding locations within 5-miles of the project area, in addition to the adjacent colony. Of these locations, 12 are located in the open grasslands south of White Rock Road, and the habitat appears to have been extirpated for the remaining two north of US Highway 50.

The adjacent nesting colony of TCB frequently utilizes a large Himalayan blackberry bramble northeast of the project area in the adjacent open space parcel. This bramble is located approximately 100-feet off the project area at approximately the same elevation. In 2018, a declaration of covenants and restrictions was recorded over a portion of the adjacent open space to protect the ability of the nesting colony to utilize the site in perpetuity. This nesting colony has been monitored since at least 2011 when

approximately 1,000 TCB were observed. Subsequent observations from 2013-2016 observed between 0 and 3,500 TCB. At the beginning of the nesting season in 2020, Madrone Ecological Consulting observed approximately 800 TCB at the colony location. Most commonly it appears the nesting colony is between 1,000 and 1,500 TCB. This represents less than one percent of the statewide population. Approximately 200 TCB were observed landing on the western portion of the study area during the site visit for brief moments and potentially feeding on seeds. Due to the possibility of itinerant breeding, this nesting location may be a first or second breeding location for the TCB that nest there. This means that the TCB that nest adjacent to the project area may nest again after they leave. Although unlikely, outside of the nesting season an occasional TCB may be present in the adjacent open space, but the majority of the TCB congregate in the agricultural lands of the Central Valley as the grain crops ripen as an abundant food source (Madrone Ecological Consulting 2020).

Construction near the nesting colony has occurred on and off since the area was originally graded for development between 2002 and 2003. LifeTime Fitness, which is located immediately adjacent to the project area to the south and east, was constructed in 2016 when the CNDDB indicates the number of TCB seen at the colony during the nesting season was approximately 1,000. This is consistent with the numbers that Madrone Ecological Consulting observed in 2020. Additionally, phase one of the Pique Apartments project, located immediately adjacent to the nesting colony on the north side of the open space, was under construction starting in 2018; phase two, closest to the colony, is currently under construction. Over nearly a decade of construction of project proximate to the colony, the number of TCB individuals present at the nesting colony during nesting season has remained consistent and the birds continue to return to nest.

TCB within the colony do not have access to high-quality forage immediately adjacent to the colony. As such, historically and perhaps even prior to development of the colony, the TCB regularly fly several miles to obtain appropriate forage. In particular, TCB within the nesting colony fly to the annual grasslands south of US Highway 50 to obtain the insect forage they require for nesting. South of US Highway 50, nesting habitat is found in riparian habitat and blackberry brambles along Alder Creek and grasslands provide foraging habitat for TCB. In the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP), impacts to grasslands and TCB nesting colonies have been addressed in the FPASP EIR (2010). Mitigation Measure 3A.3-2e of the FPASP EIR addresses avoidance and minimization measures for TCB nesting colonies that reduce impacts to less than significant. The FPASP EIR also includes measures to mitigate the loss of grassland habitat within the FPASP that provides foraging habitat for TCB.

Additional undeveloped grasslands are present within 3-miles of the nesting colony that currently represent appropriate foraging opportunities. Accordingly, the proposed project will not impact the colony's foraging habitat because no such habitat is located within the project area and because TCB currently forage off-site and in some instances 3-miles or more away from the project area.

Burrowing Owl

Burrowing owl is not listed pursuant to either the California or federal Endangered Species Acts; however, it is designated as a species of special concern by the CDFW. They typically inhabit dry open rolling hills, grasslands, desert floors, and open bare ground with gullies and arroyos. This species typically uses burrows created by fossorial mammals, most notably the California ground squirrel, but may also use man-made structures such as culverts; cement, asphalt, or wood debris piles; or openings beneath cement or asphalt pavement. The breeding season extends from approximately February 1 through August 31 (Madrone Ecological Consulting).

There is a low potential for burrowing owl to be present with in the project area, although potential burrowing owl nesting habitat is not noted within the project area. The project area does not provide suitable foraging as it does not contain a suitable prey base (vole and other rodent populations). However, burrowing owls may nest in the adjacent open space parcel to the north and east of the site. There are two documented occurrences of burrowing owl within 5-miles of the project area.

White-Tailed Kite

White-tailed kite is not federally or state listed, but is a CDFW fully protected species. There are four documented occurrences of white-tailed kite within 5-miles of the project area. The project area does not contain a suitable prey base (vole and other rodent populations) for the species and represents low quality potential foraging habitat for white-tailed kite. However, the species may forage and nest within the adjacent open space parcel north and east of the project area. There is a moderate potential for white-tailed kite to be present within the project area.

Loggerhead Shrike

The loggerhead shrike is not listed and protected pursuant to either the California or federal Endangered Species Acts; but is a CDFW species of special concern. There are no documented occurrences of loggerhead shrike within 5-miles of the project area. However, the species may forage and nest within the adjacent open space parcel north and east of the project area. There is a low potential for loggerhead shrike to be present within the project area.

Evaluation of Biological Resources

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

Tricolored Blackbird

Impacts to the TCB nesting colony may occur during the nesting season as a result of construction from noise, vibration, dust, lighting, collision with equipment (individual birds), and increased human activity which may lead to nest failure, nest abandonment, and the death of TCB. Impacts to TCB may occur after the project is operational by individual birds flying into the north-facing windows of the building. Occupancy of the project could result in impacts to nesting TCB from noise, dust, human presence, trash/food containers, domestic cats, and/or night lighting. This is a potentially significant impact for which **Mitigation Measures BIO-01 through BIO-10** have been prescribed, as outlined below. With implementation of the prescribed mitigation, potential impacts related to substantial adverse effect to habitat and/or sensitive species are reduced to a level **less than significant**.

The flight path through the project area by TCB from the nesting colony may be modified with construction of the project but would not be precluded. In addition, there are other flight paths available to nesting TCB including southeast along the ephemeral drainage where the nesting colony resides, and between the LifeTime Fitness and the project area. Moreover, the TCB can continue to fly over the buildings as needed to travel to foraging habitat. This is a potentially significant impact for which **Mitigation Measures BIO-11 through BIO-19** have been prescribed, as outlined below. With

implementation of the prescribed mitigation, potential impacts related to TCB are reduced to a level **less than significant**.

Burrowing Owl

The project area does not contain suitable nesting or foraging habitat for the species. However, the species may inhabit the adjacent open space parcel. Impacts to burrowing owl may occur during construction from noise, vibration, and increased human activity which may lead to nest failure and abandonment and the death of burrowing owl chicks in the open space. This is a potentially significant impact for which **Mitigation Measures BIO-20 through BIO-22** have been prescribed, as outlined below. With implementation of the prescribed mitigation, potential impacts related to burrowing owl are reduced to a level **less than significant**.

White-Tailed Kite

The project area does not contain suitable nesting or foraging habitat for the species. However, the species may inhabit the adjacent open space parcel. Impacts to white-tailed kite may occur during construction from noise, vibration, and increased human activity which may lead to nest failure and abandonment and the death of white-tailed kite chicks. This is a potentially significant impact for which **Mitigation Measures BIO-23 and BIO-24** have been prescribed, as outlined below. With implementation of the prescribed mitigation, potential impacts related to white-tailed kite are reduced to a level **less than significant**.

Loggerhead Shrike

The project area does not contain suitable nesting habitat for the species. However, the species may inhabit the adjacent open space parcel. Impacts to loggerhead shrike may occur during construction from noise, vibration, and increased human activity which may lead to nest failure and abandonment and the death of loggerhead shrike chicks. This is a potentially significant impact for which **Mitigation Measures BIO-23 and BIO-24** have been prescribed, as outlined below. With implementation of the prescribed mitigation, potential impacts related to loggerhead shrike are reduced to a level **less than significant**.

Nesting Songbirds

Ground nesting songbirds including killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*), western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*), savanna sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis*), mourning dove (*Zanaida macroura*), and horned lark (*Eromophila alpestris*), among others have the potential to nest within the project area. The initial grading of the project may cause direct mortality to songbirds and/or their nests. This is a potentially significant impact for which **Mitigation Measures BIO-23 and BIO-24** have been prescribed, as outlined below. With implementation of the prescribed mitigation, potential impacts related to nesting songbirds are reduced to a level **less than significant**.

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

Less than significant impact. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not affect any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. The project site does not support Water of the US

or Waters of the State; an ephemeral stream is located in the adjacent open space to the north, or which a portion is protected by a conservation easement and will not be impacted by the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project will have no effect on the adjacent open space or resources contained therein.

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

No impact. The project area is previously disturbed and does not contain any state or federally protected wetlands. No impact would occur either due to project construction or operation.

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. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or interfere with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or nursery sites. The project site does not support wildlife habitat nor would implementation of the proposed project interfere with movement by wildlife. As shown in Figure 2 of the biological resources evaluation (Appendix D), movement corridors for TCB from the adjacent nesting colony to foraging habitat located south of US Highway 50 are available even with project implementation. Implementation of the proposed project would not preclude the TCB flight corridors between the nesting colony and foraging habitat south of U.S. Highway 50.

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

No impact. The project area is previously disturbed and does not contain any natural vegetation communities and/or trees. No impact would occur either due to project construction or operation.

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.

Mitigation Measures

Tricolored Blackbird

BIO-01 Avian Protection Plan: Prior to the start of construction, an avian protection plan shall be developed and submitted to the City of Folsom outlining the protective measures to be taken during construction, long-term operational measures, monitoring plan, adaptive management actions, and reporting requirements. These protective measures shall include for example, installation of a visual and sound barrier between the project and the nesting colony and having all trash containers stored inside the planned building

during the operation of the facility. The monitoring plan shall describe monitoring methods, reporting, and procedures required of monitor in response to observations on the site. The avian protection plan shall also include performance standards associated with each protective measure such as making repairs to the visual/sound barrier if needed within 24 hours or having an employee tasked with routinely ensuring trash receptacles are within the building except during trash collection periods.

BIO-02 Worker Environmental Awareness Training: Before any ground-disturbing or vegetation-removal activities, a Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT) shall be prepared and administered to the construction workers. The WEAT shall include the following: discussion of the state Endangered Species Act, CEQA mitigation measures; consequences and penalties for violation or noncompliance with these laws and regulations; identification of special-status wildlife including tricolored blackbird; and the contact person (biological monitor) in the event of the discovery of a special-status wildlife species within the project area. The WEAT shall 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 shall sign a form stating that they attended the training, understand the information presented and shall comply with the regulations discussed. Workers shall be familiarized with “avoidance areas” from which workers shall be restricted to minimize the potential for inadvertent impacts to the tricolored blackbird nesting colony.

BIO-03 Environmentally Sensitive Area Fence for Noise Barrier: Prior to the start of construction, the contractor shall install an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fence along the portion of the northern Project boundary. See Figure 2 in Appendix D for the location of the ESA fence. The ESA fence shall be eight feet in height and constructed of solid plywood or oriented strand board and shall be designed to withstand moderate to strong winds. The fence shall be in place from March 1 through July 31 during each year of construction. The ESA fence shall serve three purposes:

- Delineate the project boundary and prevent workers from entering the open space near the nesting colony;
- Minimize construction-related noise from impacting the nesting colony by providing a solid rather than open fence; and,
- Create a visual barrier for the tricolored blackbirds to cause them to fly up and over the project activities or choose a different route when they leave the colony to forage.

BIO-04 Pre-Nesting Season Surveys: Two weeks prior and one week prior to the defined start of the nesting season (March 1), a qualified biologist shall visit the tricolored blackbird nesting colony to in order to detect unanticipated early nesting activity. If the qualified biologist documents nesting activities are occurring during either survey, mitigation measures that apply as of March 1 would be implemented. If tricolored birds are present, but not exhibiting nesting behavior then nesting season mitigation measures would not apply until nesting behavior is observed or March 1, whichever is sooner.

BIO-05 Determination of No Nesting Activity: If construction activities are underway prior to the tricolored blackbird nesting season, but will continue after March 1, a qualified biologist shall survey the nesting location once between March 1 and March 15. If nesting is found during any of the surveys, then mitigation measures that apply as of March 1 would be implemented. If the surveys are negative, the qualified biologist shall conduct follow up surveys every 48 hours until April 15. If no nests have been established by April 15, the biologist shall coordinate with CDFW to determine if nesting is likely to occur. If the nesting location is determined, in coordination with CDFW, to be inactive for the year, construction may proceed as allowed outside the nesting season.

BIO-06 Limits on Grading During the Nesting Season: No rough grading will occur during the nesting season (March 1 to July 31) unless the biological monitor has determined in coordination with CDFW that the tricolored blackbirds are not nesting during that year or the biological monitor has determined that the tricolored blackbirds have not begun or have completed nesting and left the nesting site.

BIO-07 Continuous Biological Monitoring for Work During the Nesting Season: From March 1st to July 31st continuous monitoring by a qualified biological monitor shall occur. Continuous biological monitoring is defined as having a biological monitor present at all times when work is taking place within the Project Area. No monitoring is required on days when no work is occurring.

During each visit, the biological monitor shall record basic survey data including date, biologist name, time of survey, weather conditions, approximate number of birds observed at the nesting colony, general behavior characteristics (time and approximate number of foraging group departures and arrivals), construction activity description, and a discussion of any disturbances and or recommendations for the prevention of construction-related disturbances to the nesting colony. Monitoring reports shall be submitted weekly to the Project Proponent, the City of Folsom, and CDFW.

Continuous biological monitoring shall not be required 1) between August 1st and February 28th, 2) if nesting is determined in coordination with CDFW to have been skipped for the year, 3) when it is determined by a qualified biologist that the nesting colony is no longer active, 4) when construction has moved into Month 6 activities as outlined under Periodic Biological Monitoring, or 5) when it is determined by a qualified biologist that all of the young of the year birds are no longer dependent on their nest or parents..

BIO-08 Periodic Biological Monitoring During Construction Month 6 Activities and Beyond: Construction activities in Month 6 and later include work on apartment building itself, consisting of framing, utility installation, siding, roofing, painting, finish work, work to complete the grounds of the Project, including the installation of hardscaping, landscaping irrigation, permanent fencing, and pavement striping. If these activities take place during March 1 to July 31, a qualified biological monitor shall conduct monitoring visits three times per week. The monitoring site visits shall be timed during the peak activity of the species (dawn to 10 am). During each visit, the biological monitor shall record basic survey data including date, biologist name, time of survey, weather conditions, approximate number of birds observed at the nesting colony, general

behavior characteristics (time and number of foraging group departures and arrivals), construction activity description, and a discussion of any disturbances and or recommendations for the prevention of construction-related disturbances to the nesting colony. Monitoring reports shall be submitted weekly to the Project Proponent, the City of Folsom, and CDFW.

Periodic biological monitoring shall not be required 1) between August 1 and February 28, 2) if nesting is determined in coordination with CDFW to have been skipped for the year, 3) when it is determined by a qualified biologist that the nesting colony is no longer active, or 4) when it is determined by a qualified biologist that all of the young of the year birds are no longer dependent on their nest or parents.

BIO-09 Restricted Speed Limit During Construction: A speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be enforced throughout the construction duration of the project to avoid collisions with tricolored blackbirds.

BIO-10 Manage Outdoor Food: Eating areas for construction workers shall be restricted to the inside of construction trailers and a designated area adjacent to Healthy Way. All food-related material and trash shall be secured in trash receptacles to prevent attracting potential predators and providing an onsite food source for the blackbird. Mobile food vendors shall be prohibited on the site.

BIO-11 Bird Safety Film: To minimize potential future bird mortality due to window collisions, install horizontal bird safety film (SOLYX film or similar product) on exterior window surfaces on the north building elevation. Applicant shall routinely inspect the bird safety film and replace the film as needed, approximately every 5-7 years.

BIO-12 Barrier on North Property Line: On the north property line of the project, a four-foot tubular steel open fence shall be designed and installed to create a barrier between the Project and the adjacent open space area to prevent humans and dogs from entering the open space and the tricolored blackbird nesting colony.

BIO-13 Educational Signage: signage informing and sensitizing the public to the tricolored blackbird colony shall be posted on the fence.

BIO-14 Contain Lighting Onsite: All project lighting shall be directed downward and away from the tricolored blackbird nesting colony and shall be designed to minimize overspill into the area between the project boundary and the tricolored blackbird nesting colony.

BIO-15 Staff and Resident Awareness Information: Information about the presence of the tricolored blackbird colony and measures to reduce impacts and coexist with the birds shall be provided to staff and residents. The information shall address:

- Information about the colony;
- Keeping house cats indoors;
- Keeping the facility outdoors clean of all trash and food debris;
- Securing all trash receptacles to prevent attracting potential predators and providing food sources to the blackbird;
- Prohibitions on bird feeding;

- Restrictions on loud outdoor events during nesting season (March 1 through July 31);
- Prohibition of staff and resident access to adjacent open space parcel; and,
- Speed limit restrictions.

BIO-16 Restrict Speed Limit During Operations: The speed limit on the site shall be limited to 15 miles per hour to avoid collisions with tricolored blackbirds.

BIO-17 Manage Outdoor Food and Trash: All outdoor eating areas shall include trash receptacles and trash shall be secured in trash receptacles to prevent attracting potential predators and providing an onsite food source for the blackbird. Mobile food vendors shall be prohibited on the site.

BIO-18 Store Trash Dumpsters Indoors: Refuse (trash, recycling, organic waste) dumpsters for the project shall be stored in indoor trash rooms rather than in outdoor trash enclosures. Dumpsters shall be moved from the trash rooms outdoors one day per week for refuse collection. Following collection, the dumpsters shall be promptly returned to the indoor trash rooms.

BIO-19 Restrict Domestic Cats to Indoors: Domestic cats belonging to tenants shall be restricted to indoors. Tenant leases shall require that cats be kept indoors.

Burrowing Owl

BIO-20 Prior to the start of construction, a take avoidance pre-construction survey shall be conducted for burrowing owl. The survey shall follow the CDFG 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (Staff Report). If no active burrowing owl burrows are identified during the take avoidance pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is required. If active burrowing owl burrows are identified during the pre-construction survey, Mitigation Measures BIO-21 or BIO-22 shall apply.

BIO-21 During Breeding Season: If the start of construction occurs during the burrowing owl breeding season (February 1 through August 31) and the qualified biologist finds evidence of burrowing owls nesting within the study area or the 500-foot survey buffer specified by the Staff Report, all project-related activities shall avoid nest sites during the remainder of the breeding season or while the active burrow remains occupied by adults with young or young (nest occupation includes individuals or family groups foraging on or near the site following fledging). A qualified biologist in coordination with the City shall establish a no-disturbance buffer around the active burrow. The buffer distance shall be determined based upon the location of the burrow in relation to construction activity and may be reduced in coordination with the City if visual and noise-attenuation barriers are installed in conjunction with biological monitoring. Construction and other project-related activities may occur outside of the buffer zone. Construction and other project-related activities may be allowed inside of the non-disturbance buffer during the breeding season if the biological monitor determines that those activities do not disturb the owls and the project activities are monitored daily by a qualified biological monitor.

If monitoring by a qualified biologist indicates that the nest is abandoned prior to the end of nesting season and the burrow is no longer in use, the non-disturbance buffer zone may be removed if approved by the City. After receiving approval from CDFW, the qualified biologist may excavate the burrow in accordance with the latest CDFW guidelines for burrowing owl to prevent reoccupation.

BIO-22 During Non-Breeding Season: If the start of construction occurs during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) and the qualified biologist finds evidence of burrowing owls residing within the study area or the 500-foot survey buffer specified by the Staff Report, the qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate non-disturbance buffer around the occupied burrow(s) in coordination with the City. Construction activities outside of this buffer shall be allowed.

If construction activities require that the occupied burrow be disturbed, then exclusion of the owl(s) is allowed if the following criteria are met:

- A burrowing owl exclusion plan shall be developed for the project and approved by the CDFW. This plan shall include the results of the preconstruction surveys and proposed methods for the installation and monitoring of one-way doors and the exclusion of burrowing owls;
- Upon approval by the CDFW, a qualified biologist shall install one-way door at the entrance of each occupied burrow. The project shall then be monitored twice daily for 48 hours to ensure that the owls have vacated the burrow. After the burrows have been vacated at the end of the 48-hour monitoring period, the one-way doors shall be removed, and the burrow shall be hand-excavated to its terminus and completely backfilled. The project area and survey buffer shall be monitored daily for one week to ensure that the burrowing owls have not returned prior to construction.

<u>Nesting Migratory Birds, Including Raptors and Songbirds</u>

BIO-23 If ground disturbance, vegetation thinning, or other construction activities are proposed during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 – August 31), a preconstruction survey for nesting raptors and migratory bird nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 15 days prior to the beginning of construction activities in order to identify active nests. This survey shall be conducted within the proposed construction area and all accessible areas within 500 feet of the construction area.

BIO-24 If active nests are found, a qualified biologist in coordination with the City shall establish a no-disturbance buffer around the active nest. The buffer distance shall be determined based upon the bird species and the location of the nest in relation to construction activity and may be reduced if visual and noise-attenuation barriers are installed. Construction and other project-related activities may occur outside of the buffer zone. Construction and other project-related activities may be allowed inside of the non-disturbance buffer during the nesting season if the monitoring biologist determines that those activities do not disturb the nesting birds, and the project activities are monitored continuously by a qualified biological monitor. The no-disturbance buffer shall remain in place until the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. The perimeter of the

buffer area shall be staked in the field by the contractor. No construction activities or personnel shall enter the buffer area, except with approval of the biological monitor. If no active nests are found during the preconstruction survey, no further mitigation shall be required. If a lapse in construction work of 15 days or longer occurs during the nesting season, additional nest surveys shall be required before construction may be reinitiated.

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?	☐	■	☐	☐

The discussion below is based in part on a cultural resources assessment letter report prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX 2020), attached to this Initial Study as **Appendix E**.

Environmental Setting

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

> (A) is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and,
>
> (B) Meets any of the following criteria: 1) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; 2) is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; 3) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or 4) has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. The City of Folsom Standard Construction Specifications were developed and approved by the City of Folsom in May 2004 and updated in April 2015. They include Article 11 - Cultural Resources, which provides direction on actions to

be taken in the event that materials are discovered that may ultimately be identified as a historical or archaeological resource, or human remains (City of Folsom 2015).

Cultural Background

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

Southern Maidu

At the time of European contact, the Southern Maidu tribe of California Native Americans, previously referred to as the Nisenan, occupied the project vicinity. The Southern Maidu occupied the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers and the lower drainages of the Feather River, bounded by the west bank of the Sacramento River to the west, the crest of the Sierra Nevada to the east, a few miles south of the American River to the south. The northern boundary is not well established due to the Southern Maidu's linguistic similarity with neighboring groups but extended somewhere between the Feather and Yuba rivers (HELIX 2020).

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

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

Historic Background

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

Spanish Period

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

Mexican Period

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

European Expansion

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

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

City of Folsom

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

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

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

Cultural Resources Records Search

On March 3, 2020, an archival records search in support of the proposed project was conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, located at California State University, Sacramento. The records search addressed the project site and a 0.25-mile radius around the project site. Sources of information included previous survey and cultural resources files; the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility; the OHP Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File; historical topographic maps; and historical aerial photographs.

The records search identified 27 studies that have previously been conducted within 0.25-mile of the project site (**Table 10**). Of these, three reports (003830, 009185, 004481) addressed all or part of the proposed project site.

Table 10. Previous Archaeological Studies Conducted within the Study Area

Report	Year	Author(s)	Affiliation	Title
003830	1997	Windmiller, Ric, Louis A. Payen, and Pamela Payen	Consulting Archaeologist	Evaluation of Cultural Resources Broadstone Unit 3 Folsom Sacramento County, California
004481	1991	Lindstrom, Susan	Archaeological Consultant	A Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Broadstone 3 Project Involving 570 Acres Near Folsom, California, Sacramento County
009185	1991	Deborah A. Jones, Marianne Babal, Stephen D. Mikesell, and Stephen R. Wee	Far Western Anthropological Research Group and Jackson Research Projects	A Cultural Resources Study for the Folsom East Area Facilities Plan and Portions of the Sewer and Water Line System.

Source: HELIX 2020.

Native American Consultation

On March 5, 2020, HELIX requested that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conduct a search of their Sacred Lands File for the presence of Native American sacred sites or human remains in the vicinity of the proposed project site. A written response received from the NAHC on March 12, 2020, stated that the Sacred Lands File failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

On March 20, 2020 HELIX sent letters to 10 Native American contacts that were recommended by the NAHC as potential sources of information related to cultural resources in the vicinity of the project area:

- Grayson Coney, Tsi Akim Maidu
- Rhonda Morningstar Pope, Chairperson, Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians
- Sara Setchwaelo, Chairperson, Ione Band of Miwok Indians
- Cosme Valdez, Chairperson, Nashville Enterprise Miwok-Maidu-Nishinam Tribe
- Regina Cuellar, Chairperson, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
- Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
- Ralph Hatch, Cultural Preservation Department, Miwok
- Antonio Ruiz, Officer, Wilton Rancheria
- Raymond Hitchcock, Chairperson, Wilton Rancheria
- Clyde Prout, Chairperson, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe

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

Archaeological Survey Results

On February 28, 2020, HELIX Staff Archaeologist, Jentin Joe, conducted a pedestrian survey to characterize any prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources located within the project site. The survey consisted of a pedestrian evaluation of the estimated 6.9-acre project site walked in parallel transects spaced at 10-meter intervals. During the survey the ground surface was examined for the presence of historic-era artifacts (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics), prehistoric artifacts (e.g., flaked stone

tools, tool-making debris), and other features that might represent human activity that took place more than 50 years ago.

The project site was fully surveyed for both archaeological and architectural resources. Survey conditions were good, with sparse vegetation allowing good ground surface visibility. The project site was previously graded in 2002 and 2007; during the 2007 grading activity an earthen berm on the north edge of the property was apparently constructed. The ground surface has been heavily disturbed by vehicle and construction activities as evidenced by vehicle tracks visible throughout the project site. The area is sparsely littered with construction materials, plastic fragments, and glass fragments. The soil on site consists primarily of a light-brown sand.

The archaeological survey determined that no archaeological resources are present on the surface of the project site. All observed cultural materials appear to be less than 50 years old, or are non-diagnostic fragments that cannot be attributed to a specific date range.

Evaluation of Cultural Resources

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

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No historical or archaeological resources pursuant to §15064.5 were identified during the archival records search, Native American coordination, or pedestrian survey. The disturbed nature of the project site suggests that the potential for encountering buried cultural resources during grading or excavation is low. However, it is possible subsurface construction activities, such as trenching and grading, could potentially uncover previously undiscovered historical or archaeological resources. This would be a potentially significant impact. However, if historical or archaeological resources are discovered, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-01** would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level for questions a) and b).

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

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

Mitigation Measures

CUL-01 Inadvertent Discoveries In the event that cultural resources are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities should be halted in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. If the site cannot be avoided during the remainder of construction, an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards should then be retained to evaluate the find's significance under the

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and should be discussed in consultation with the City.

CUL-02 Treatment of Human Remains. Although there is no evidence to suggest the presence of human remains, the discovery of human remains is always a possibility during a project. If such an event did occur, the specific procedures outlined by the NAHC, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, will be followed:

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

2. The project owner or their authorized representative will contact the County Coroner.

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

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

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

VI. ENERGY

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

Environmental Setting

California's electricity needs are satisfied by a variety of entities, including investor-owned utilities, publicly owned utilities, electric service providers and community choice aggregators. In 2017, the California power mix totaled 292,039 gigawatt hours (GWh). In-state generation accounted for 206,336 GWh, or 71 percent, of the state's power mix. The remaining electricity came from out-of-state imports (CEC 2018). **Table 11** provides a summary of California's electricity sources as of 2017.

Table 11. California Electricity Sources 2017

Fuel Type	Percent of California Power
Coal	4.13
Large Hydro	14.72
Natural Gas	33.67
Nuclear	9.08
Oil	0.01
Other (Petroleum Coke/Waste Heat)	0.14
Renewables	29.0

Source: CEC 2018.

Natural gas provides the largest portion of the total in-state capacity and electricity generation in California, with nearly 50 percent of the natural gas burned in California used for electricity generation in 2017. Much of the remainder was consumed in the residential, industrial, and commercial sectors for uses such as cooking, space heating, and as an alternative transportation fuel. In 2012, total natural gas demand in California for industrial, residential, commercial, and electric power generation was 2,313 billion cubic feet per year, up from 2,196 billion cubic feet per year in 2010 (CEC 2018).

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. In 2015, 15.1 billion gallons of

gasoline were sold in California (CEC 2018). 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 2018).

Evaluation of Energy

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

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

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

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

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

Operation of the proposed project would increase the consumption of energy related to electricity, natural gas, water, and wastewater. However, implementation of low impact design, energy efficient, and sustainable features would also reduce the energy usage. The project design incorporates sustainable features that are consistent with General Plan Goal LU 9.1 and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). CALGreen includes green building standards for mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and HVAC systems. The project proposes installation of 18 electric vehicle parking spaces and charging stations consistent with CALGreen provisions for electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

The position of the building in a north-south orientation maximizes passive solar access and natural lighting within the two courtyards and for south-facing units. Cool paving materials would be used for hardscapes throughout the site, including the courtyards, concrete refuse pads, pedestrian paths, adjacent to the pickleball court, and the driveway entry treatment.

Additionally, the Folsom Municipal Code requires one bicycle parking space for every five units that

equates to 31 bicycle parking spaces required for the project. The project provides 32 bicycle parking spaces in four, eight-space racks located on the north, south, east sides of the building.

Finally, adequate energy facilities are already located within and adjacent to the site serving the existing uses. Thus, the incremental increase associated with implementation of the project would not require the construction of new energy facilities or sources of energy that would not otherwise be needed to serve the region. It is anticipated that these services would be provided from existing utilities on site, or from extensions from existing facilities immediately abutting the site. Therefore, energy impacts from project operation would be less than significant.

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

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	■	☐
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	■	☐
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	■	☐
	iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	■	☐
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	■	☐
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	■	☐
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	■	☐
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	■
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	■	☐

The Geology and Soils section of this document is based on the project-specific Geotechnical Engineering Study Update (2019a) prepared by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. The environmental setting discussion below is largely based upon this geotechnical update, which is included as **Appendix F**.

Environmental Setting

The project site is situated on the east edge of Sacramento County, located within the foothills of the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California. This province consists mostly of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. Tectonic building of the range occurred since the late Triassic period with the onset of active plate subduction along the continental margin. Continuing during much of the Jurassic period,

island arc, atolls, and other remnants of land collided with the continental land mass and resulted in the uplift of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. Extensive mountain formation caused by subduction, granitic intrusive activity and uplift continued on into the Cretaceous period. Concurrently, large volumes of material were eroded off the mountain terrain and carried to deep marine basins, which now comprise the Great Valley sedimentary beds to the west. During the late Tertiary period, the marine sediments were buried by extensive lava flows, ash flows, and volcanic mud flows form eruptions of andesitic volcanoes high in the Sierra Nevada. Volcanic flows were channeled down the Tertiary streams that coursed westward. The volcanic deposits were resistant over long periods to erosion and exist presently as ridge forming outcrops in the foothills.

Faults in the province, which generally strike northwest and dip eastward, were typically generated by either collision or subduction along the tectonic plate margin last active in the Quaternary age (approximately 600 thousand to 1.6 million years before present) and are represented in the vicinity today by the Mormon Island Shear Zone to the east and the Bear Mountains and Melones Fault Zones to the east (Loyd, 1984). The Mormon Island Shear Zone straddles the El Dorado County-Sacramento County immediately east of the site (Tierra Engineering Consultants 1983). The Bear Mountains Fault Zone has two traces in the Sierra foothills. The west branch of this fault zone is mapped approximately 2.5 kilometers to the east of the site, and the east branch is mapped approximately 16 kilometers to the east of the site. The Melones Fault Zone is located about 23 kilometers east of the site. The nearest active faults are the Dunnigan Hills Fault 65 kilometers to the northwest and Cleveland Fault 88 kilometers north. Other active and potentially active faults within a 100 kilometer radius, as well as their estimated empirical ground motion potentials are listed in the **Table 12**.

The site is located at the base of the Sierra Foothills region of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. The site is predominantly underlain by undifferentiated metavolcanics rocks of the Copper Hill Formation (Jch) formed during the Jurassic Period. The metavolcanics bedrock is characterized by a greenish gray color, predominantly fine grained and is usually observed to contain various degrees of fracturing and weathering.

The onsite soils are derived mainly from the weathering of the underlying bedrock and consist primarily of sandy silts and silty sands with abundant outcrops of boulders and cobbles. The closest faults to the site are the Mormon Island Shear Zone, approximately 1.3 miles to the east, and the west branch of the Bear Mountains Fault Zone, approximately 2.5 miles to the east-northeast.

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

Subsurface Conditions

Subsurface explorations by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc., were conducted on April 25 to 26, 2002, and included two test pits at the project site. Test pits encountered sandy silt materials in a stiff and slightly moist condition from the surface to depths of 1 to 3 feet. Underlying the surface materials were sandy clay materials in a very stiff and slightly moist condition from the surface to depths of 2 to 5 feet. Weathered metavolcanics bedrock was encountered to the maximum depth (25 feet) explored in each pit. The bedrock generally graded less weathered with increased depth.

Table 12. Active Faults

Fault Zone/Activity Level	Lower Level Earthquake Moment Magnitude (Mw)	Upper Level Earthquake Moment Magnitude (Mw)	Distance to Site (km)	Direction form Site (Compass)
Dunnigan Hills (H)	6.5	7.0	65	NW
North Tahoe (H)	6.25	6.5	99	E
Bear Mountain Fault Zone (Q)				
- West Branch	6.25	6.5	2.5	E-NE
- East Branch	6.25	6.5	16	E
Melones Fault Zone (Q)	6.25	6.5	23	E
Mormon Island Shear Zone (LQ)	6.25	6.5	1.3	E
Midland (Q)	6.25	7.0	67	W-SW
Coast Range S. B. (Q)	6.5	7.0	83	W
Antioch (Q)	6.25	6.8	96	SW
Eastern Frontal Sierra Nevada (Q)	6.5	7.5	96	E

Source: Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. 2019a.
[Q] = Quaternary/Potentially Active
[LQ] = Late Quaternary/Potentially Active
[H] = Holocene/Active
Recency of Movement: [H]<10,000 Years Before Present; [LQ]<700,000 Years Before Present; [Q]<1,500,000 Years Before Present.

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

Evaluation of Geology and Soils

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no known active faults crossing the property, and the project site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone (Department of Conservation, California Geological

Survey 2020). Therefore, ground rupture is unlikely at the subject property, and impacts would be less than significant.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. The site-specific geotechnical studies (Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. 2019a) recommended the project site be classified as Site Class C in accordance with the 2016 California Building Code (Class A requires least earthquake resistant design and Class F the most earthquake resistant design). Seismic design parameters based on the 2016 California Building Code and site investigations were recommended in the geotechnical studies for use in structural design. Conformance to the current building code recommendations would minimize potential ground shaking impacts to a less-than-significant level.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv. Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the relatively shallow depth to bedrock and relatively low seismicity of the area, the potential for damage due to site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface rupture were considered negligible in the site-specific studies (Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. 2019a). Therefore, liquefaction and landslides are unlikely at the subject property and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The 2016 CBC and the City's Grading Code and standard conditions for project approval contain requirements to minimize or avoid potential effects from water 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 State of California Department of Conservation's "Erosion and Control Handbook." The erosion control plan would identify protective measures to be implemented during excavation, temporary stockpiling, disposal, and revegetation activities. Further, because the project would result in one or more acre of ground disturbance, the project applicant would be required to obtain a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and a NPDES permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Use of the permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP for approval by the SWRCB. The plan would contain best management practices to reduce potential impacts to water quality during construction of the project. Compliance with the City's regulations, the 2016 CBC requirements, and implementation of the SWPPP would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion from water to less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil shear strength and sudden increase in porewater pressure caused by shear strains, which could result from an earthquake. Research has shown that saturated, loose to medium-dense sands with a silt content less than about 25 percent located within the top 40 feet are most susceptible to liquefaction and surface rupture or lateral

spreading. Slope instability can occur as a result of seismic ground motions and/or in combination with weak soils and saturated conditions.

As also discussed under "a" ii and iii, the potential for damage due to site liquefaction, slope instability, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, collapse, and surface ruptures were considered negligible due to the relatively shallow depth to bedrock and relatively low seismicity of the area. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impact regarding unstable geological units or soils.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Intermittent or isolated pockets of highly expansive clay soils may be present on top of the weathered bedrock. In concentrated amounts, such clays could cause distress to concrete slab-on-grade floors and foundations if present in the upper three feet of the structural improvement areas.

The geotechnical exploration provided construction recommendations to mix expansive clays, if encountered, with less expansive on site materials (silts, sands, and gravels), expansive clays should not be present in concentration within five feet of the building envelope, either vertically or laterally, and property disposition of clays on site should be documented. Following the recommendations of the geotechnical studies would minimize potential impacts from project construction on expansive and potentially expansive soil, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

Less than significant impact. As the project site has been previously mass graded and there are no known paleontological prone soils identified on the project site, there would be a less than significant impact to paleontological resources.

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?	☐	☐	■	☐

Environmental Setting

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

GHGs, as defined under California's Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). General discussions on climate change often include water vapor, ozone, and aerosols in the GHG category. Water vapor and atmospheric ozone are not gases that are formed directly in the construction or operation of development projects, nor can they be controlled in these projects. Aerosols are not gases. While these elements have a role in climate change, they are not considered by either regulatory bodies, such as CARB, or climate change groups, such as the Climate Registry, as gases to be reported or analyzed for control. Therefore, no further discussion of water vapor, ozone, or aerosols is provided.

GHGs vary widely in the power of their climatic effects; therefore, climate scientists have established a unit called global warming potential (GWP). The GWP of a gas is a measure of both potency and lifespan in the atmosphere as compared to CO_2. For example, since CH_4 and N_2O are approximately 25 and 298 times more powerful than CO_2, respectively, in their ability to trap heat in the atmosphere, they have GWPs of 25 and 298, respectively (CO_2 has a GWP of 1). Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) is a quantity that enables all GHG emissions to be considered as a group despite their varying GWP. The GWP of each GHG is multiplied by the prevalence of that gas to produce CO_2e. The atmospheric lifetime and GWP of selected GHGs are summarized in **Table 13**.

Table 13. Global Warming Potentials and Atmospheric Lifetimes

GREENHOUSE GAS	ATMOSPHERIC LIFETIME (years)	GLOBAL WARMING POTENTIAL (100-year time horizon)
Carbon Dioxide (CO_2)	50.0–200.0	1
Methane (CH_4)	12.0	25
Nitrous Oxide (N_2O)	114.0	298
HFC-134a	14	1,430
PFC: Tetrafluoromethane (CF_4)	50,000.0	7,390
PFC: Hexafluoroethane (C_2F_6)	10,000.0	12,200
Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF_6)	3,200.0	22,800
Carbon Dioxide (CO_2)	50.0–200.0	1
Methane (CH_4)	12.0	25
Nitrous Oxide (N_2O)	114.0	298
HFC-134a	14	1,430

Source: IPCC 2007.
HFC: hydrofluorocarbons; PFC: perfluorocarbons.

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

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

In order to help avert these potential consequences, AB 32 established a State goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, which is a reduction of approximately 16 percent from forecasted emission levels, with further reductions to follow. In addition, AB 32 required CARB develop a Scoping Plan to help the state achieve the targeted GHG reductions. In 2015, Executive Order (EO) B-30-15 established California GHG emission reduction targets of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The EO aligns California's GHG emission reduction targets with those of leading international governments, including the 28 nation European Union. California met the target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in AB 32. As a follow-up to AB 32 and in response to EO-B-30-15, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was passed by the California legislature in 2016 to codify the EO's California GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

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

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

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

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 GHG emissions threshold be used to determine the significance of project emissions. The GHG emissions threshold and various assessment recommendations are contained in SMAQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (2009, revised), and are discussed under the checklist questions below.

Evaluation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

Less than Significant Impact.

Construction

Construction GHG emissions are generated by vehicle engine exhaust from construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips. Construction GHG emissions were calculated by using CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2. The results are output in metric tons of CO_2e (MT CO_2e) for each year of construction. The estimated construction GHG emissions for the project are shown in **Table 14**. The proposed project would generate less than significant levels of the GHGs.

Table 14. Estimated Annual GHG Emissions from Project Construction

YEAR	EMISSIONS (MT CO_2e)
2023	328
2024	457
SMAQMD Threshold	*1,100*
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**

Source of emissions: CalEEMod output (Appendix C).
MT CO_2e: metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

Operation

Operational GHG emissions for the proposed project are estimated by including purchased electricity; natural gas use for space and water heating; the electricity embodied in water consumption; the energy associated with solid waste disposal; and mobile source emissions. CalEEMod incorporates local energy emission factors and mitigation measures based on the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's (CAPCOA's) publication *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* (CAPCOA 2010) and the California Climate Action Registry *General Reporting Protocol* (CCAR 2009). The results of the calculations are shown in **Table 15**. As shown therein, the total operational GHG emissions at buildout of the proposed project are estimated at 857 MT CO_2e per year, which is less than the SMAQMD threshold of significance. Therefore, the project's impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Table 15. Estimated Annual GHG Emissions from Project Operation

SOURCE	EMISSIONS (MT CO_2e)
Area	3
Energy	264
Mobile	544
Waste	27
Water	20
Total	858
SMAQMD Threshold	*1,100*
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**

Source of emissions: CalEEMod output (Appendix C)
Note: Values rounded to the nearest whole number. The total presented is the sum of the unrounded values; as such, totals may not add up exactly due to rounding.
MT CO_2e: metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent

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

Less than Significant Impact. In accordance with SMAQMD's Guide (SMAQMD 2009, revised), project emissions should be evaluated with respect to consistency with the following plans that have been adopted to reduce GHG emissions:

1. The 2017 Scoping Plan; and,

2. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

The SMAQMD's recommended thresholds and mitigation measures were developed to show consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan. The 2017 Scoping Plan was developed to achieve the state-mandated goal of SB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by the end of 2030. As shown in response to Question VIII(a) above, project generated emissions would be below the SMAQMD significance threshold. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and SB 32.

The MTP/SCS relies on information from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), including projected growth in the County. The SACOG growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and by the County. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by SACOG would be consistent with the MTP/SCS. The project is a senior housing facility that does not extend infrastructure to previously undeveloped areas, nor is the project of a magnitude, either in terms of employment (e.g., construction and leasing/operations) or number of available units, that would cause significant numbers of people to relocate to the area solely for the purpose of being close to the site. Based on these considerations, the project would not induce population growth in the community that exceeds the levels anticipated in plans adopted by the County. Therefore, the project would not exceed SACOG's population, housing, or employment projections. The proposed project is consistent with the MTP/SCS.

Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG, and on that basis, would result in a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

Environmental Setting

The information presented in this section and the conclusions drawn are based upon the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. 2019b) report provided to the City by the project applicant and located in **Appendix F**. The project site consists of a graded level building pad with a roughly 14,000-square-foot paved parking lot at the southeast corner. The project site has no known past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites.

The school located nearest to the project site is Russell Ranch Elementary School, 375 Dry Creek Road, Folsom, CA, approximately 0.75 miles northwest of the site.

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the EPA's EnviroMapper online tool (EPA 2020); California Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStor online tool (DTSC 2020); and the EPA's Superfund National Priorities List (EPA 2018b). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, no hazardous waste sites are at the project site.

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

Evaluation of Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

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?

No Impact. No hazardous waste sites, Recognized Environmental Conditions, Controlled Environmental Conditions, Historic Recognized Environmental Conditions were identified in the site-specific Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Youngdahl Consulting Group 2019). The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted per American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Designation E1527-13 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process (Phase I Standards) and included review of regulatory records and site reconnaissance. 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 demolition and construction, oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, paints, solvents, and other hazardous materials may be used. If spilled, these substances could pose a risk to the environment and to human health.

Following construction, household hazardous materials such as various cleansers, paints, solvents, pesticides, 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 Safety and Noise Element of the General Plan. The preventative policies protect the health and welfare of residents of Folsom through management and regulation of hazardous materials. Consequently, use of the listed materials above for their intended purpose would not pose a significant risk to the public or environment, and impacts would be less than significant for questions a) and b).

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

Less than significant impact. The nearest school is Russell Ranch Elementary, 375 Dry Creek Road, Folsom, CA, located approximately 0.75 miles northwest of the site. The proposed project would have

no impact on emitting or handling 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?

No Impact. The site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Moreover, no hazardous materials sites are located at the project site based on a review of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Youngdahl Consultants 2020), review of *EnviroStor* (DTSC 2020), *Geotracker* (State Water Resources Control Board 2020), or *EnviroMapper* (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2020). Therefore, project implementation would have no impact on hazards to the public or environment.

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

No Impact. The nearest public or public use airport is Mather Airport, approximately 12 miles southwest 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 2020). The proposed project is located in evacuation plan area #32-Costco Hill, which identifies Iron Point Road as a minor evacuation route and East Bidwell Boulevard and White Rock Road 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. 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. Additionally, on-site fire water would connect to the City of Folsom water supply on Serpa Way and Healthy Way. The site is designed such that a clear fire lane/fire truck access would loop around the apartment building. 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?	☐	☐	■	☐

The information presented in this section of this document is based on the project-specific Preliminary Drainage Study (2020) prepared by TSD Engineering, Inc. The environmental setting discussion below is largely based upon this drainage and stormwater study, which is included as **Appendix G**.

Environmental Setting

The majority of the project site is graded with a level building pad while the west side consists of a slope towards the west and Serpa Way. Precipitation is the only apparent source of water for the project site. The natural drainage and open space north and east of the project site receives storm water from Iron Point Road.

The on-site storm drain system for the proposed project would conform to City of Folsom standards and include design features consistent with the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions. The proposed drainage system would connect to an existing storm drain manhole and drainage outfall at the northern limits of the project. The storm drain manhole and outfall currently capture and convey sheet flow from the undeveloped site and outfalls into the natural drainage and open space north of the project (TSD Engineering 2020). Stormwater from the impervious areas of the site would be conveyed to five proposed water quality basins. Other areas along the northeast edge and at the west slope would be landscaped and allowed to flow offsite, as in pre-development conditions. The project would incorporate standard BMPs to maintain existing water quality in accordance with City regulations.

Construction of the proposed project would disturb more than one acre of soil and would conform to the California General Construction Permit, and a SWPPP would be prepared for the proposed project.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps were reviewed for the project's proximity to a 100-year floodplain. The proposed project is on FEMA panel 06067C0140H effective 8/16/2012. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

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

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

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

Standard construction conditions required by the City include:

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

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

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

Additionally, the City enforces the following requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code as presented in **Table 16**.

Table 16. 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 2020.

Evaluation of Hydrology and Water Quality

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

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?

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

Less than significant impact with mitigation. The project site is highly modified and consists of a graded building pad. A natural drainage flows just north and east of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would alter the existing drainage patterns on the project site. The currently undeveloped site would be replaced with impervious surfaces from the building, parking lot, and sidewalks or walking paths. A storm drain system would be constructed for the proposed project. The natural drainage in the southern portion of the project site would be partially filled and altered.

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

Drainage plans have been prepared for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan area. The overall storm water drainage systems included in those plans serve the project site. Construction on the site would be subject to NPDES permit conditions (including the implementation of BMPs) and all of the City's standard conditions and Code requirements. Operation of these requirements, which would be unchanged with approval of the project, would ensure that no adverse effects due to stormwater generation or contamination would take place. **Mitigation Measures HYD-01 through HYD-03**, incorporated into the mitigation for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan, would be implemented to reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

HYD-01 Prior to approval of improvement plans, the applicant shall submit detailed drainage plans for evaluations by the City. Approved plans shall be implemented prior to project occupancy. The drainage plans shall include measures to minimize the total amount of additional surface runoff and to limit the flows released to off-site receiving waters to existing pre-development levels in accordance with the requirements of the Folsom City Public Works Department.

HYD-02 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit erosion control plans and other monitoring programs for the construction and operational phases of the proposed project for review by the City. The plan shall include Best Management Practices (BMP)

to minimize and control the level of pollutants in stormwater runoff, and in runoff released to off-site receiving waters. These BMPs may include, for example, disconnected pavement, disconnected roof drains, landscaped areas, bio retention areas, and water quality basins. Specific techniques may be based on geotechnical reports or the Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook of the California Department of Conservation, and shall comply with current City standards, including the Sacramento Region Stormwater Quality Design Manual.

HYD-03 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall obtain coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Order 2009-0009-DWQ), including preparation and submittal of a project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) at the time the Notice of Intent (NOI) is filed. The project applicant shall also prepare and submit erosion and sediment control and engineering plans and specifications for pollution prevention and control to the City of Folsom.

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, potential impacts related to on-or off-site erosion, pollutants, flooding, and/or otherwise substantial degradation of water quality would be reduced to less than significant.

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, because domestic water in Folsom is provided solely by a surface water source (Folsom Lake). While the proposed project would result in additional impervious surfaces on the site, the proposed project includes landscaping and detention basins within and around the development. Storm water generated at the project site would flow to the detention basins and retained on-site. The other landscaped areas also provide pervious surfaces; therefore, the proposed development would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. The proposed project would not result in a substantial decrease in groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No significant impact would occur and mitigation is unwarranted.

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

Less than significant impact. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain and is not subject to flood hazard. The project site is also approximately 70 miles northeast of the nearest tsunami inundation area near Benicia, CA (California Emergency Management Agency 2009). The nearest lake is Folsom Lake, which is approximately 3.5 miles north and at a lower elevation of approximately 430 feet above sea level compared to the project site, which is at approximately 560 feet above sea level. Based on the site's location away from the 100-year floodplain, distance from tsunami inundation area, and distance to Folsom Lake and higher elevation compared to the lake, the project site is not subject to release of pollutants due to inundation.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	■	☐
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 Community Commercial (C-2) and is within the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan (SP-95-1) (BSP). The proposed project is considered a Senior Citizens Residential Complex, which is not a permitted use in the BSP A Specific Plan Amendment is proposed to amend the text of the BSP to add Senior Citizens Residential Complex as a conditionally-permitted use within the C-2 designation. With the specific plan amendment, the proposed project would be consistent with the BSP, with a conditional use permit.

Evaluation of Land Use and Planning

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The proposed project would develop a largely vacant lot surrounded by residential and commercial uses. As a result of the project, no barriers or reduction of access on Serpa Way and Healthy Way would take place and no divisions of the surrounding 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?

Less than significant impact. The proposed multi-family use is consistent with the existing General Plan designations, which are Regional Commercial Center (RCC) and East Bidwell Corridor Overlay (EBC Overlay). The EBC Overlay allows multi-family housing, a density range of 20-30 units per acre, and a floor area ratio of 0.5 to 1.5.

The zoning designation of the site is C-2 PD (Commercial, Planned Development District) and the site is within the BSP area which designates the site as C-2 (Community Commercial). Within the BSP C-2 designation, apartments, senior apartments, and senior housing are not permitted uses. As part of the proposed project, a text amendment to the BSP is proposed to add the Senior Citizens Residential Complex land use category as a conditionally permitted use. The text amendment would modify the BSP only and would not affect the C-2 zoning designation. With the specific plan amendment adding the

Senior Citizen Residential Complex land use category as a conditionally permitted use, the proposed project would be consistent with the BSP, with a conditional use permit. The project includes a request for a conditional use permit for a Senior Citizen Residential Complex in the C-2 zone.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

Environmental Setting

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

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

Evaluation of Mineral Resources

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

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

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

XIII. NOISE

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

Environmental Setting

The existing noise environment in the vicinity of the project site is dominated by vehicular traffic on US Highway 50, Iron Point Road, and Serpa Way. Other noise sources include ambient urban sounds associated with the commercial developments to the west and south of the project site.

Ambient noise measurements were conducted by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. on March 12, 2020 at three on-site locations and one off-site location along Iron Point Road. Measurements were conducted to assess the existing ambient noise environment. The ambient measurements are shown in **Table 17**.

Table 17: Ambient Noise Measurement Results

Measurement	Location	dBA L_{EQ}	Measurement Length	Traffic Count
M1	West boundary of site along Serpa Way	61.1	15 minutes	208 automobiles, 2 medium trucks
M2	Southern boundary of site along Healthy Way	55.9	10 minutes	N/A
M3	Central portion of site	48.7	10 minutes	N/A
M4	South side of Iron Point Road	56.1	15 minutes	132 automobiles, 5 medium trucks

Noise-sensitive land uses are land uses that may be subject to stress and/or interference from excessive noise, including residences, hospitals, schools, hotels, resorts, libraries, sensitive wildlife habitat, or

similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute of the environment. Noise receptors (receivers) are individual locations that may be affected by noise. Noise-sensitive land uses in the project vicinity include single-family residences to the north across Iron Point Road and multi-family residences to the east.

All noise level or sound level values presented herein are expressed in terms of decibels (dB), with A-weighting (dBA) to approximate the hearing sensitivity of humans. Time-averaged noise levels are expressed by the symbol L_{EQ}, with a specified duration. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is a 24-hour average, where noise levels during the evening hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. have an added 5 dBA weighting, and noise levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. have an added 10 dBA weighting.

Noise Element

The Noise Element of the City of Folsom General Plan regulates noise emissions from public roadway traffic on new development of residential or other noise sensitive land uses. The Noise Element states that noise from traffic on public roadways shall not exceed 60 CNEL for outdoor use areas and 45 CNEL for interior use areas.

Noise Ordinance

For stationary noise sources, the City has adopted a Noise Ordinance as Section 8.42 of the FMC (City of Folsom 2020). The Noise Ordinance establishes hourly noise level performance standards that are most commonly quantified in terms of the one-hour average noise level (L_{EQ}). Using the limits specified in Section 8.42.040 of the Noise Ordinance, noise levels generated by the project would be significant if they exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA L_{EQ} from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. at off-site residential property boundaries. Noise from the project's air conditioning systems would be significant if exterior noise levels exceed 50 dBA, per Section 8.42.070 of the FMC.

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

Evaluation of Noise

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

Less than Significant Impact.

On-site Noise Impacts

Exposure to Traffic Noise

The project would be subject to noise from traffic along US Highway 50 (located approximately 600 feet from the project site's southern boundary), Iron Point Road (located approximately 360 from the project site's northern boundary, and Serpa Way (located along the project site's western boundary). Healthy Way (located along the project site's southern boundary) accommodates low traffic volumes at low speeds and would not generate substantial noise at the project site. Traffic volumes along US Highway 50 are provided by the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans') Traffic Census Program (Caltrans 2020a). Traffic volumes along Iron Point Road and Serpa Way are provided by the Transportation Impact Study prepared for the proposed project (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2020). The Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5 was used to calculate noise levels from traffic along these roadways at the project site. The TNM calculation did not incorporate topography or intervening structures between the roadways and the project site; therefore, the modeled noise levels don't consider attenuating features such as topography or off-site buildings, and represent conservative estimates of noise levels to be experienced at the project site.

A significant direct impact would occur if traffic-related noise levels exceed 60 CNEL at the proposed project's designated outdoor use areas. Because these use areas are planned to be located within the proposed building's exterior facades, noise levels were conservatively modeled at the project's facades nearest each roadway. Noise levels from US Highway 50 at the project's southern façade are modeled to be 53.3 CNEL. Noise levels from Iron Point Road at the project's northern façade are modeled to be 49.9 CNEL. Noise levels from Serpa Way at the project's western façade are modeled to be 50.2 CNEL. Noise levels at the project site's exterior use areas would therefore comply with the City's exterior noise threshold.

A significant direct impact would also occur if the project's interior use areas would be exposed to noise levels greater than 45 CNEL from roadway traffic. A 45 CNEL interior limit would be achieved if exterior locations are exposed to a noise level of 60 CNEL or less, based on a typical attenuation of 15 dB by standard residential building construction. Because noise levels at the project's facades are modeled to be below 60 CNEL from roadway traffic, interior noise levels would comply with the 45 CNEL standard.

Both exterior and interior noise levels meet or fall below the respective thresholds established by the City. Therefore, this impact is **less than significant** and no mitigation is required**.**

Off-site Noise Impacts

Project-generated Construction Noise

Construction of the proposed project would involve demolition of existing pavements, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Construction-generated noise levels would depend on the type and duration of construction activity, equipment used, distance between the noise sources and receivers, and intervening structures or topography. Construction would generate elevated noise levels that may be audible at commercial and residential uses in the vicinity of the project site. Section 8.420.060 of the FMC exempts construction noise from noise level limits 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. Because project construction is anticipated to occur within

allowable construction hours, noise generated by this construction would be exempt from the noise level limits under Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 8 (Noise), and the project's compliance with these municipal regulations demonstrates that impacts associated with project-generated construction noise are assessed as **less than significant**. No mitigation is required.

Project-generated Operational Noise

The project includes the installation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units on the roof of the proposed project building. The units would be located behind a parapet wall of equal or greater height to the HVAC unit, which would provide some noise attenuation. Specific manufacturer information is not available for the HVAC units at this time. Modeling assumed the use of Carrier 16-ton packaged HVAC units (50PG03-16) with a manufacturer's Sound Power Rating of 84.0 dBA, which is typical for projects of similar size. The total floor area is provided as approximately 201,798 square feet, and normal HVAC planning assumes one ton of HVAC for every 350 square feet of habitable space. This equals approximately 577 tons of HVAC or 36 16-ton HVAC units. The simultaneous use of 36 16-ton HVAC units, with the inclusion of a parapet, would result in a noise level of 39.9 dBA L_{EQ} at the nearest property line (an approximate distance of 250 feet). Therefore, noise levels from HVAC units would not exceed the City's 50-dBA exterior noise limit for air conditioning systems or the more stringent 45-dBA L_{EQ} nighttime property line limit. impacts would be **less than significant** and mitigation measures are not required.

Project-generated Traffic Noise

The project is expected to generate approximately 594 daily trips (T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2020). A significant increase in traffic noise would occur if project-generated traffic caused greater than a 3 CNEL increase, which is considered a perceptible increase. TNM version 2.5 was used to calculate traffic noise levels for Baseline 2020 and Baseline 2020 + Project conditions at NSLUs located along roadways that would accommodate project-generated traffic. The off-site roadway modeling represents a conservative analysis that does not consider topography or attenuation provided by existing structures. The results of the analysis for the CNEL at the nearest NSLUs are shown in **Table 18**. As shown in the table, noise levels would increase by less than 1 CNEL. Therefore, impacts from project-generated traffic at off-site NSLUs would be **less than significant**.

Table 18. Existing Plus Project Traffic Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	Distance to NSLU	CNEL at NSLU		Change
		Baseline 2020	Baseline 2020 + Project	
Iron Point Road				
East of Serpa Way	120 feet	61.0	61.0	0.0
Cavitt Drive to Serpa Way	90 feet	64.7	64.8	0.1
Cavitt Drive				
North of Iron Point Road	75 feet	53.9	53.9	0.0
Serpa Way				
North of Iron Point Road	45 feet	55.5	55.6	0.1

Source: T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2020.
NSLU = noise sensitive land use
CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level

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

Less than significant impact. An on-site source of vibration during project construction would be a vibratory roller (primarily used to achieve soil compaction as part of the foundation and paving construction), which is expected to be used within approximately 350 feet of the nearest occupied off-site residence. The City does not state specific standards in the General Plan or Municipal Code for vibration; therefore, standards from the Caltrans' Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans 2020b) are used. A vibratory roller creates approximately 0.21 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet. At a distance of 350 feet, a vibratory roller would create a PPV of 0.01 in/sec.[1] This would be below the distinctly perceptible vibration annoyance potential criteria of 0.04 in/sec PPV as provided in by Caltrans for continuous/frequent intermittent sources. Impacts associated with construction-generated vibration 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 2-miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No impact. Since the project site is not located in an area for which an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan has been prepared, and no public or private airfields are within 2-miles of the project area, the residents of the proposed project or people working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive levels of noise due to aircraft overflight. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation would be necessary.

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Environmental Setting

Folsom's estimated population in 2018 was 79,022 people (U.S. Census Bureau 2018). The population is projected to increase to 97,485 by 2035 (City of Folsom 2020). The proposed project would construct 154 apartment units within one new apartment building.

Evaluation of Population and Housing

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

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of 154 apartment units. Existing infrastructure and roads in the area would not need to be expanded or extended as a result of the project.

The proposed project would accommodate the demand for housing and would not induce substantial growth in the City of Folsom. Although it is anticipated that the majority of individuals relocating to the apartment community would be from the area, it is possible that the apartments could draw in between 154 to 405 new residents (assuming 2.63 people per unit, based on projected household size in 2035 [City of Folsom 2008:18]). This would be within the projected increase in population and housing stock needs from planned growth as projected in the City's 2013 Housing Element. Therefore, impacts from project implementation would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

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

No impact. The project site is currently vacant with only a parking lot on the property. Therefore, there would be no impact on displacement of existing people or housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Environmental Setting

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

The City of Folsom Fire Department provides fire protection services. There are five fire stations providing fire/rescue and emergency medical services within the City of. Station 37 is nearest to the project site and is located at 70 Clarksville Road, approximately 0.3-mile east of the project site. The Fire Department responds to over 6,000 requests for service annually with an average of 16.4 per day (City of Folsom 2018c). The City of Folsom Police Department is located at 46 Natoma Street, approximately 1.7-miles southeast of the project site.

The project site is located within the Folsom Cordova Unified School District and is within the attendance area for Russell Ranch Elementary School, Sutter Middle School, and Vista del Lago High School. There are several parks near the project site, including the Peter Bertelsen Memorial Park, Handy Family Park, and Nisenan Community 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.

Evaluation of Public Services

a) Fire protection?

Less than significant impact. On-site fire water would connect to the City of Folsom water supply on Serpa Way and Healthy Way and would include two, double detector check valves (one on each end of the looped system), providing fire water to the proposed hydrants, exterior Fire Department Connection assemblies, and fire riser rooms. 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. The proposed project would not significantly increase fire service demands or render the current service level to be inadequate, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Police protection?

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

c) Schools?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is age-restricted to residents aged 55 years and older and will not generate students in grades K-12 or create demand for school facilities. Pursuant to Government Section 65995.1, the project would be required to pay development impact fees to the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. No new school facilities would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

d) Parks?

Less than significant impact. The 154-unit project will accommodate approximately 277 residents which will create additional demand for park and recreation facilities. The nearest park is Handy Family Park, 1560 Cavitt Drive, approximately 0.5 miles northwest. A drive or walk to the park is approximately 0.8 miles from the project site via Serpa Way, Iron Point Road, and Cavitt Drive. Since the park is not adjacent to the proposed apartment building, a substantial increase in usage of the park is not anticipated.

The project includes on-site indoor and outdoor recreational amenities to serve residents that would reduce the need for park demand. The project would be required to pay park fees to mitigate the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities. The potential impacts to existing parks would be less than significant. Section XVI Recreation of this ISMND includes additional information. Potential impacts from the proposed project parks would be less than significant.

e) Other public facilities?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is in an area served by adequate police, fire, and emergency services. The apartment complex includes on-site recreational features, such as a walking path, pool area, and garden area, and a public park is within less than a mile away. There is no anticipated need for other public facilities. 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 for question e.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	■	☐

Environmental Setting

The nearest park is Handy Family Park, 1560 Cavitt Drive. A drive or walk to the park is approximately 0.8-miles from the project site via Serpa Way, Iron Point Road, and Cavitt Drive. The proposed project would provide some on-site recreational facilities to residents, including a walking path, pool area, and garden area.

Evaluation of Recreation

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

Less than significant impact. Some additional use at Handy Family Park is anticipated, however, the increase would not be substantial because the park is not adjacent or across the street from the proposed project building. The proposed project includes on-site indoor and outdoor recreational amenities to serve residents that would reduce the need for park demand. The project would be required to pay park fees to mitigate the project's impact on existing park facilities and fund new park and recreation facilities; potential impacts to existing parks would be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project includes indoor and outdoor resort-inspired amenities. Interior amenities include a library, fitness and yoga studios, bistro, great room, club room, private dining room, creative arts studio, meeting space, and laundry facilities and outdoor amenities include a pool, spa, outdoor lounge seating, pickleball recreation area, landscaped courtyards, gardens, a perimeter walking path, and gazebos. A path on the site perimeter will provide residents with a looped walking route with viewpoints, gazebos, and benches. On-site facilities and existing neighborhood parks are anticipated to adequately serve residents of the project. Potential impacts on recreational facilities would be less than significant.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

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

The discussion below is based on a transportation impact study prepared by T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management, Inc. (T. Kear 2020), attached to this Initial Study as **Appendix H**.

Environmental Setting

Study Scenarios

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

1. Existing 2020 without project condition (without Saratoga Way extension);
2. Baseline 2020 without project condition (with Saratoga Way extension);
3. Baseline 2020 with project condition;
4. Existing Plus Approved Projects (EPAP) 2025 without project condition;
5. EPAP 2025 with project condition;
6. Cumulative 2035 without project condition; and,
7. Cumulative 2035 with project condition.

Existing 2020 Condition with Project

Analysis of the existing condition reflects the traffic volumes and roadway geometry at the time the study began. This scenario quantifies performance measures for the existing condition and serves as a known reference point for those familiar with the study area. The Saratoga Way extension, connecting Iron Point Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard, opened after the March 5, 2020 traffic counts were collected and will be fully operational before the project begins construction. Therefore, only existing 2020 without project conditions are analyzed. The Baseline 2020 Condition reflects traffic with Saratoga Way extension, both with and without the project.

Baseline 2020 Condition, and, Baseline 2020 with Project Condition

The Baseline 2020 Condition reflects existing traffic volumes, re-assigned to the road network to account for the anticipated effect of the Saratoga Way extension opening in April 2020. Saratoga Way provides parallel capacity to relieve traffic on US Highway 50 between the East Bidwell Street and El Dorado Hills Boulevard interchanges. These scenarios, with and without the Project, identify project related impacts anticipated to occur if the project opened in 2020.

EPAP 2025 Condition, and, EPAP 2025 with Project Condition

Existing Plus Approved Project (EPAP) scenarios, with and without the project, analyze conditions with the addition of traffic from approved and reasonably foreseeable projects that affect study intersections and segments. These scenarios are intended to reflect anticipated traffic approximately five years into the future, when the project could reasonably be anticipated to be constructed. This "phasing analysis" is intended to assist the City in phasing of improvements at study intersections which may be necessary to accommodate traffic from all approved and anticipated tentative maps over the next five years.

Cumulative 2035 Condition, and, Cumulative 2035 with Project Condition

Cumulative scenarios, with and without the project, analyze conditions at the "horizon year" of the City's adopted General Plan and reflect traffic from market rate absorption of the General Plan's land uses through 2035.

Roadway System

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

- East Bidwell Street runs through the City from White Rock Road to Riley Street. East Bidwell Street becomes Scott Road south of US 50. Near the project area, East Bidwell Street is a six-lane arterial roadway with bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections. The speed limit on East Bidwell Street north of US 50 is 45 miles per hour (mph).

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

- Cavitt Drive is a north-south two-lane collector that runs northward from Costco to Folsom Lake College. Within the vicinity of the project, Cavitt Drive has bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections.

- Serpa Way is a north-south two-lane local road that runs northward from Costco to Broadstone Parkway. Within the vicinity of the project, Serpa Way has bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Turn pockets are provided at intersections.

- Healthy Way is a short east-west two-lane local road that runs between Serpa Way and the project driveway/Lifetime Fitness driveway. Within the vicinity of the project, Healthy Way has bike lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter.

Study Intersections

The traffic impact study analyzed the following five study intersections:

1. Healthy Way/Project Driveway (all-way stop control);
2. Serpa Way/Healthy Way (all-way stop control);
3. Iron Point Road/Serpa Way (signal);
4. Iron Point Road/Cavitt Drive (signal); and,
5. Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street (signal).

Level of Service Methodology

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

Under State Law (SB 743), vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will become the CEQA threshold of significance for transportation impacts on July 1, 2020. Without specific General Plan guidance for VMT thresholds, however, this analysis uses a qualitative screening against State guidance of a 15 percent per capita VMT reduction. For purposes of the proposed project, both LOS and VMT analyses were conducted and have been presented below.

Control delay and level-of-service for study intersections were calculated using the Synchro/SimTraffic 11, and PTV Vistro5 analysis software (Version 2020 SP 0-3). Both software packages model vehicle delay and optimizing traffic signal timings and implement the methodologies of the 6th Ed. of the Highway Capacity Manual for signalized and unsignalized intersections. Vistro also evaluates traffic signal warrants. Both programs require data on road characteristics (geometric), traffic counts, and the signal timing data for each analysis intersection. In general, default parameters were used, except for locations where specific field data were available. Heavy vehicle percentages of 2 percent were assumed during the peak-hour (observer counts were generally 1 percent or less). Peak-hour factors were based on observed counts.

Based on guidance from City staff, the following procedures described below for intersection and segment traffic operations analysis were selected for this study. LOS impacts of the proposed project were determined based on the methods described above and identified as either "significant" or "less than significant" in the following thresholds:

Policy M 4.13 of the City of Folsom General Plan calls for the City to:

> *Strive to achieve at least traffic LOS "D" (or better) for local streets and roadways throughout the city. In designing transportation improvements, the City will prioritize use of smart technologies and innovative solutions that maximize efficiencies and safety*

> *while minimizing the physical footprint. During the course of Plan buildout, it may occur that temporally higher 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 LOS 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.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Transit Facilities

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

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

Existing and 2020 Baseline Conditions Intersection and Segment Level-of-Service

Table 19 presents a summary of LOS results for the study intersections under Existing Conditions and 2020 Baseline Conditions. The results indicate that Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersection exceeds the LOS standard prior to the addition of project traffic. Locations anticipated to exceed the LOS standard are shown in bold font.

Baseline 2020 Condition with and without Project

Peak-hour traffic associated with the Project was added to the anticipated Baseline 2020 turning volumes at each intersection. **Table 20** presents a summary of LOS results for the study intersections. The results indicate that LOS at the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersection is anticipated to improves from LOS "F" to "D" in the morning and LOS "F" to "E" in the afternoon. Locations anticipated to exceed the LOS standard are shown in a bold font.

Table 19. Existing 2020 Intersection Delay and Level-of-Service

Location	Control	2020 Existing AM	2020 Existing PM
1. Healthy Way / Project Driveway	AWSC	8.3/A	9.7/A
2. Serpa Way / Healthy Way	AWSC	9.8/A	15.9/C
3. Iron Point Road / Serpa Way	Signal	18.0/B	21.0/C
4. Iron Point Road / Cavitt Drive	Signal	12.2/B	19.0/B
5. Iron Point Road / E. Bidwell Street	Signal	**119.3/F**	**119.9/F**

Source: T. Kear 2020.

Table 20. Baseline 2020 Intersection Delay and Level-of-Service

Location	Control	2020 Baseline AM	2020 Baseline PM
1. Healthy Way / Project Driveway	AWSC	8.3/A	9.7/A
2. Serpa Way / Healthy Way	AWSC	9.8/A	16.4/C
3. Iron Point Road / Serpa Way	Signal	17.5/B	22.6/C
4. Iron Point Road / Cavitt Drive	Signal	11.5/B	17.0/B
5. Iron Point Road / E. Bidwell Street	Signal	54.8/D	**68.3/E**

Source: T. Kear 2020.
Bold denotes deficient LOS.
Note (1) Synchro reported 54.1/D. Without project was used as floor.

Assessment of the Proposed Project

Traffic generated by the proposed project was based on Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017), and is provided in **Table 21**.

Table 21. Project Trip Generation

Description	ITE Land Use	Quantity	Metric	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
					Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Senior Adult Housing – Attached	252	154 Dwelling Units	Rate	3.86	0.33	47%	53%	0.33	53%	47%
			Trip	594	51	24	27	51	27	24

Source: T. Kear 2020.

Trip Distribution

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

- 4% to/from the south on Serpa Way;
- 22% to/from the south on East Bidwell Street;
- 20% to/from the west on Iron Point Road;
- 25% to/from the north on East Bidwell Street;
- 1% to/from the north on Cavitt Drive;

- 4% to/from the north on Serpa Way; and,
- 24% to/from the east on Iron Point Road.

Baseline 2020 with Project Conditions

Peak-hour traffic associated with the project was added to the anticipated Baseline 2020 turning volumes at each intersection. Delay and LOS were determined at the study intersections. **Table 22** presents a summary of the LOS results for the study intersections. The results indicate that the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersections continues to exceed the City's LOS threshold during the afternoon, though the additional 0.2 seconds of delay added by project traffic is not considered to be a potentially significant impact. Intersections that do not achieve LOS thresholds are shown in a bold font.

Table 22. Baseline 2020 Intersection Delay and Level-of-Service, with and without Project

Location	Control	2020 Baseline AM	2020 Baseline PM	2020 Baseline W/Project AM	2020 Baseline W/Project PM
1. Healthy Way / Project Driveway	AWSC	8.3/A	9.7/A	8.3/A	9.6/A
2. Serpa Way / Healthy Way	AWSC	9.8/A	16.4/C	10.3/B	18.2/C
3. Iron Point Road / Serpa Way	Signal	17.5/B	22.6/C	17.8/B	23.6/C
4. Iron Point Road / Cavitt Drive	Signal	11.5/B	17.0/C	11.5/B	17.0/B
5. Iron Point Road / E. Bidwell Street	Signal	54.8/D	**68.3/E**	54.8/D (Note 1)	**68.5/E**

Source: T. Kear 2020.
Bold denotes deficient level-of-service.
Note (1) Synchro reported 70.0/F. Without project was used as floor.

Existing Plus Approved Projects (EPAP) 2025 Condition with and without Project

This section presents Existing Condition traffic plus traffic from planned and approved projects that are reasonably expected to be constructed by the time the project is constructed, corresponding to five years' worth of growth. Five-year traffic forecasts were developed using two different methodologies, and the higher (more conservative) volume projections were used for this analysis.

The first method was based on the traffic anticipated from approved projects that have not been fully built as of March 2020. A list of 31 recent project applications was reviewed with City staff. Twelve projects were identified with the potential to impact study intersections as listed below.

- The Pique Apartments at Iron Point Road: 50% of 327 dwelling units remaining.
- Broadstone Crossing Parcel 1: 22,230 square feet of restaurant remaining
- Talavera Apartments (304 dwelling units, now leasing)
- Folsom Ranch residential (Mangini Phase 1 Subdivision, Mangini Phase 2 Subdivision, Broadstone Estates Subdivision, Folsom Heights Subdivision, Russell Ranch Subdivision, Enclave Subdivision, White Rock Springs Ranch and Carr Trust Subdivision, Toll Brothers at Folsom Ranch Subdivision): approximately 500 dwelling units per year or 2,500 dwelling units over five years.
- Folsom Ranch commercial (Shops at Folsom Ranch): 27,900 square feet of commercial space (including retail, restaurants, and fuel station

The second method was based on five years of estimated growth from the travel demand model. Travel demand model growth was estimated based on linearly interpolating the travel demand model outputs, applying the local calibration factors, and applying the NCHRP 255 adjustment. The anticipated growth from the travel demand model was large enough to accommodate the anticipated growth from the twelve identified projects.

EPAP Conditions analysis utilizes lane configurations and signal timing plans from the Existing Conditions. **Table 23** presents a summary of level-of-service results for the study intersections under EPAP 2025 Conditions. The results indicate that Delay and LOS at the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersection is anticipated to continue to be deficient during the afternoon, prior to the addition of project traffic, this location is shown in a bold font.

Table 23. EPAP 2025 Intersection Delay and Level-of-Service, with and without Project

Location	Control	2025 EPAP AM	2025 EPAP PM	2025 EPAP W/Project AM	2025 EPAP W/Project PM
1. Healthy Way / Project Driveway	AWSC	8.3/A	9.7/A	8.3/A	9.6/A
2. Serpa Way / Healthy Way	AWSC	9.8/A	16.4/C	10.3/B	18.2/C
3. Iron Point Road / Serpa Way	Signal	17.7/8	23.0/C	18.1/B	23.9/C
4. Iron Point Road / Cavitt Drive	Signal	14.9/B	23.6/C	14.9/B	23.6/C
5. Iron Point Road / E. Bidwell Street	Signal	71.1/E	**99.7/F**	71.1/E (Note 1)	**100.0/F**

Source: T. Kear 2020.
Bold denotes deficient level-of-service.
Note (1) Synchro reported 70.0/F. Without project was used as floor.

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Transit Facilities
All road segments in the study area include Class 2 bikeways (bike lanes). There are existing and planned Class 1 trails along Iron Point Road, as well as a Class 1 trail connecting under US Highway 50 paralleling the rail line located to the east of East Bidwell Street.

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

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

Level-of-Service Impacts
One intersection (#5 Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street) operates worse than the Folsom LOS "D" General Plan policy under all study scenarios both with and without the addition of project traffic. Traffic from the project is projected to increase delay at this location by less than five seconds which is considered a less than significant impact. All positional intersection LOS impacts are considered less-than-significant.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

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

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

The Governors' Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published guidance (OPR Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, OPR, 2018 and 2019) 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.

Under State Law (SB 743) VMT is the only CEQA threshold of significance for transportation impacts effective July 1, 2020. This analysis evaluates impacts to both LOS and VMT.

Evaluation of Transportation

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

Less than significant impact. The project does not conflict with the City's policies addressing LOS. One intersection (#5 Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street) operates worse than the Folsom LOS "D" General Plan policy under all study scenarios, both with and without the addition of project traffic. Traffic from the project is anticipated to increase delay at this location by less than five seconds, which is considered a less than significant impact. In addition, all positional intersection LOS impacts are considered less than significant.

The project would not inhibit the use of bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities; eliminate existing bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities; nor would it prevent the implementation of planned bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities. Existing Class 2 bike lanes on Healthy Way would not be removed and planned Class 1 trails on Iron Point Road and east of East Bidwell Street would not be affected.

The project would have a less than significant impact on program plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system.

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

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

The CEQA Guidelines state that "lead agencies may elect to be governed by these provisions of this section immediately. Beginning July 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide. Thus, local agencies have an opt-in period until July 1, 2020 to implement the updated guidelines now that they have been formally adopted. The City has yet to formally adopt any CEQA significance thresholds related to VMT. This analysis uses a qualitative screening against OPR's guidance of a 15 percent per capita VMT reduction.

The project is age restricted senior multi-family housing. Age restricted housing has a daily trip generation rate that is approximately 32 percent below that of non-age restricted (conventional family) multi-family housing and approximately 61 percent below that of single-family housing. In addition to generating fewer trips, age-restricted housing generates shorter trips than traditional housing because there are fewer commute trips. Commute trips are typically the longest trips made by households. In addition, the project is proposed adjacent to commercial land uses which will potentially reduce the number of trips necessary for commercial goods and services.

Under the existing zoning of C-2 PD (Commercial, Planned Development District), the site could be developed with retail, commercial, and/or office uses that, depending on project design, would have a higher trip generation than the age-restricted multi-family residential uses proposed with the project.

The project's per capita VMT is anticipated to be at least 32 percent below the City and regional average per capita VMT for multi-family residential uses and 61 percent below that of single-family housing. Based on OPR's guidance, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on per capita VMT. In addition to generating fewer trips, age-restricted housing generates shorter trips than traditional housing because there are fewer commute trips. Commute trips are typically the longest trips made by households. Also, the project is proposed adjacent to commercial land uses which will potentially reduce the number of trips necessary for commercial goods. Therefore, the project's per capita VMT is anticipated to be at least 32 percent below the City and regional average per capita VMT. Based on the OPR's guidance, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on per capita VMT.

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

No impact. Access to the project site would be provided by a driveway from Healthy Way. The driveway would not introduce any sharp curves or dangerous intersections or be incompatible with the existing road network. The driveway throat depth is fifty feet (50') and meets the City's standard for apartment complexes between 81-160 units. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than significant impact. The project's drive aisles have a 25-foot inner/50-foot outer minimum turning radii to accommodate fire department access and turning movements. Emergency vehicle access is available to the site from Healthy Way. Emergency vehicle access is adequate. There would be a less than significant impact on emergency access.

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.	☐	■	☐	☐

The discussion below is based on a tribal cultural resources memorandum prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (ECORP 2020), attached to this Initial Study as **Appendix I**.

Environmental Setting

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

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

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

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

a) included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; and/or,

b) included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; and/or,

c) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Because 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.

Within 14 days of initiating CEQA review for the project, on March 18, 2020, the City sent project notification letters to the three California Native American tribes named above, which had previously submitted general consultation request letters pursuant to 21080.3.1(d) of the Public Resources Code (PRC). Each tribe was provided a brief description of the project and its location, the contact information for the City's authorized representative, and a notification that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation. The 30- day response period concluded on April 17, 2020.

As a result of the initial notification letters, two tribes responded to the opportunity to consult on the project: Wilton Rancheria and the UAIC, as described below. The Ione Band of Miwok Indians did not respond within the 30-day response window, therefore, no consultation was required or carried out with the Ione Band of Miwok Indians under CEQA.

On April 7, 2020, Wilton Rancheria responded to the City's initial letter by email requesting consultation on the project and the opportunity to discuss the topics listed in California PRC section 21080.3.2(a), including the type of environmental review to be conducted, project alternatives, significant effects, and mitigation measures for any direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts the project may cause to TCRs. The tribe provided their recommended mitigation measures for TCRs and stated that they wish to discuss design options that would avoid impacts to TCRs, pre-project surveys, and TCR identification and evaluation as well as culturally appropriate treatment. The letter also served as a formal request to allow a Wilton Rancheria representative to observe and participate in cultural resource surveys, and to view the documentation and results of all existing cultural resources assessments and records searches.

On April 9, 2020, within 30 days of receiving the response, the City initiated consultation with Wilton Rancheria. The City invited the tribe to a consultation teleconference on April 17, 2020. To facilitate that consultation meeting, the City provided a copy of the cultural resources assessment, as requested. The tribe did not respond to the City's email and the April 17, 2020 teleconference was not attended by any tribal representatives. Thus, having offered the tribe an opportunity to participate in the meeting, the City issued a response to the tribe indicating that in the absence of the tribe's participation, they will be continuing with the project and adopting a mitigation measure for inadvertent discoveries of TCRs for their environmental document. On April 20, 2020, the City concluded consultation with Wilton Rancheria pursuant to PRC Section 21082.3(d)(2), 21080.3.2(b)(1), and 21082.3(d)(1).

On April 15, 2020, UAIC responded to the City's initial letter by email, declining consultation on the project and stated that there are no known TCRs in the project area and that there is the potential for unrecorded or buried TCRs to occur. The tribe also requested a copy of the environmental document and suggested that it provide mitigation measures for inadvertent discoveries and avoidance. On April 20, 2020, the City responded to UAIC to request that the tribe provide any suggested mitigation measures for the City to consider, provided information on how the tribe can review the CEQA document upon release, and closed consultation.

Evaluation of Tribal Cultural Resources

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

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

No impact. Based on the records search at the NCIC and other efforts discussed in Section V., Cultural Resources, no resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources or local register or historical resources were identified. The project would have no impact.

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

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

Mitigation Measures

TCR-01 If potentially significant TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction

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

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 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 coordinates with the appropriate utility companies to plan and implement any needed accommodation of existing utilities, including water, sewer, telephone, gas, electricity, and cable television lines. Based on the results of an initial request for comments from the utility providers, all utility services can accommodate the proposed project.

Evaluation of Utilities and Service Systems

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

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

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

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

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 2016, City of Folsom 2018 General Plan EIR). 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 2018 General Plan EIR). The proposed project would provide housing for less than 500 residents, and would not result in a substantial increase in water demand. Because sufficient supplies are available for build out of land uses in the General Plan (including development at the proposed project site) no additional facilities would need to be constructed or expanded and impacts would be less than significant.

Water Conservation Efforts

The City actively implements water conservation actions in response to 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 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 the City of Elk Grove.

In compliance with the 2006 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, the City of Folsom adopted a Sewer System Management Plan on July 28, 2009 which was updated and adopted on August 26, 2014. The plan outlines how the municipality operates and maintains the collection system, and the reporting of all Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) to the SWRCB's online SSO database. Because the City has sufficient capacity to accommodate any additional demand that could result from implementation of the proposed project, and because the City is in compliance with statutes and regulations related to wastewater collection and treatment, there would be no impact and mitigation would not be necessary.

Stormwater

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

Stormwater drains would be installed throughout the site, and drainage at the parking lot would be designed to prevent flooding or ponding. The on-site storm drain would conform to City standards. Four water quality basins are proposed within the project site. Environmental impacts from these stormwater features would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

Electricity, Gas, and Telephone

Based on the City's coordination with existing utilities on the project site include SMUD for electricity, PG&E underground gas lines, AT&T underground telephone lines, all utility providers are able to accommodate the proposed project. The project would connect to existing utility lines off Serpa Way or Healthy Way and would not require expansion of additional facilities.

Based on the details above, the project would have **less than significant** impact regarding water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities and water supplies. 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 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. 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 in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2020).

Evaluation of Wildfire

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

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

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

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

No impact. 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 (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2020).

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?	☐	☐	■	☐
fb)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?	☐	☐	■	☐
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	■	☐

Evaluation of Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The preceding analysis indicates that the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology/water quality, and tribal cultural resources. See Sections 9.IV, 9.V, 9.X, and 9.XVIII of this Initial Study for discussion of the proposed project's potential impacts on these environmental issue areas. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those Sections, and 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. While the project would indirectly contribute to cumulative impacts associated with increased urban development in the City and region, these impacts have previously been evaluated by the City and considered in development of the City's General Plan as set forth in this Initial Study. Key areas of concern are discussed in detail below.

Evaluation of cumulative biological resources impacts: Implementation of the proposed project, with continued growth within Folsom and implementation of the Folsom South of US Highway 50 Specific Plan, would contribute to continued loss of habitat for biological resources by converting undeveloped areas to developed uses. The project site is disturbed, and no special status species have the potential to occur in the project site. However, the project site contains potentially suitable nesting habitat for common bird species protected under the MBTA and/or Fish and Game Code. Cumulative impacts to nesting birds may result in an overall effect on the viability of certain species. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-01 through BIO-24**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

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

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

Drainage plans have been prepared for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan area. The overall storm water drainage systems included in those plans serve the project site. Construction on the site would be subject to NPDES permit conditions (including the implementation of BMPs) and the City's standard conditions and Code requirements. Operation of these requirements, which would be unchanged with approval of the project, would ensure that no adverse effects due to stormwater generation or contamination would take place. **Mitigation Measures HYD-01 through HYD-03** would be implemented, and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality.

Evaluation of cumulative transportation impacts: Cumulative traffic forecasts were derived by adding 2020 to 2035 growth from the Folsom General Plan travel demand model to observed traffic volumes and then applying the NCHRP 255 adjustment process. EPAP 2025 north-south traffic at intersections 1-4 was used as a floor to be conservative. Several key road network improvements are assumed to be open by 2035, including the Empire Ranch interchange, Oak Avenue Parkway interchange, and the Rowberry undercrossing.

Table 24 presents a summary of LOS results for the study intersections under EPAP 2025 Conditions with and without project. The results indicate that without the project, Delay and LOS at the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street improves from the opening of additional interchanges that take traffic off of the East Bidwell Street interchange. However, the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersection is anticipated to continue to operate deficiently during the afternoon, prior to the addition of project traffic.

Table 24. Cumulative 2035 Intersection Delay and Level-of-Service, with and without Project

Location	Control	2035 Cumulative AM	2035 Cumulative PM	2035 Cumulative W/Project AM	2035 Cumulative W/Project PM
1. Healthy Way / Project Driveway	AWSC	8.3/A	9.7/A	8.3/A	9.6/A
2. Serpa Way / Healthy Way	AWSC	9.8/A	16.4/C	10.3/B	18.2/C
3. Iron Point Road / Serpa Way	Signal	18.3/B	23.8/C	18.5/B	24.7/C
4. Iron Point Road / Cavitt Drive	Signal	20.0/C	35.4/D	20.0/C	35.5/D
5. Iron Point Road / E. Bidwell St	Signal	40.4/D	**78.0/E**	40.6/D	**79.1/E**

Source: T. Kear 2020.
Bold denotes deficient level-of-service.

To analyze conditions with the project, peak-hour traffic associated with the project was added to anticipated Cumulative 2035 turning volumes at each intersection. Delay and LOS were then determined at the study intersections. The results indicate that the Iron Point Road/East Bidwell Street intersections continues to exceed the City's LOS threshold during the afternoon, though the additional 1.1 seconds of delay added by project traffic is not considered to be a potentially significant cumulative impact.

The project's per capita VMT is anticipated to be at least 32 percent below the City and regional average per capita VMT for multi-family residential uses and 61 percent below that of single-family housing. Based on OPR's guidance, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on per capita VMT. In addition to generating fewer trips, age-restricted housing generates shorter trips than traditional housing because there are fewer commute trips. Commute trips are typically the longest trips made by households. Also, the project is proposed adjacent to commercial land uses which will potentially reduce the number of trips necessary for commercial goods. Therefore, the project's per capita VMT is anticipated to be at least 32 percent below the City and regional average per capita VMT. Based on the OPR's guidance, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on per capita VMT and is not considered to be a potentially significant cumulative impact.

Evaluation of cumulative tribal cultural resources impacts: The City of Folsom sent project notification letters to three California Native American tribes. Although there is no evidence of TCRs occurring or having the potential to occur on the project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. With

implementation of **Mitigation Measures TCR-01**, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially significant cumulative impacts would be avoided. Thus, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources.

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

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

9.0 REFERENCES

Baldwin et al. 2012. Jepson Manual, Second Edition, as accessed through the online Jepson Flora Project.

Brainerd, C. 2015, May 6. News Release: City of Folsom Releases Water Reduction Plan. Accessed on November 10, 2015 at https://www.folsom.ca.us/civica/press/display.asp?layout=1&Entry=271.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2010. Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures: A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures.

California Air Resources Board. 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan.

____ 2020a. State Area Designations and Maps. Accessed on April 23, 2020 at https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations.

____ 2020b. Air Quality Data and Statistics. Accessed on April 23, 2020 at https://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/index.html.

____ 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. April.

California Climate Action Registry. 2009. General Reporting Protocol, Version 3.1.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2020. FHSZ Viewer. Available at: https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/. Accessed March 16, 2020.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2020a. Traffic Census Program. Available from: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/census.

____ 2020b. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual.

California Department of Transportation. 2020. 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 March 8, 2020.

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/Tsunami/Maps/Tsunami_Inundation_Benicia_Quad_ContraCosta.pdf. Accessed March 9, 2020.

California Energy Commission. 2018. California Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory – 2018 Edition. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm.

California Geological Survey. 2020. EQZ App, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/. Accessed March 17, 2020.

City of Folsom. 2010. Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report.

____. 2018. City of Folsom Fire Department webpage. Accessed August 23, 2018 and available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/fire/about_us/default.asp.

____. 2020. Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. Adopted August 28.

____. 2020. Evacuation Plan. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=38277. Accessed March 18, 2020.

____. 2020. Folsom Municipal Code. Available from: http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom/. Accessed March 9, 2020.

Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 1984. Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California, Open-File Report 84-50SAC. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc. Accessed March 9, 2020.

Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2020. EnviroStor. Available at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/ Accessed March 18, 2020.

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

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. 2020. Cultural Resources Assessment for Avenida Senior Living.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* January.

____ 2009. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County. December. Revised April 2020.

Loyd, R.C., 1984. Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle, Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Open-File Report 84-50.

Madrone Ecological Consulting, LLC. 2020. Biological Resources Assessment: Avenida Folsom Senior Living.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2017. Federal Planning. Accessed on April 23, 2020 at http://www.airquality.org/air-quality-health/air-quality-plans/federal-planning.

____ 2009. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County. December. Revised April 2020.

Sawyer, Keeler-Wolf and Evens. 2009. Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2020. Available at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/. Accessed March 18, 2020.

T. Kear Transportation Planning and Management, Inc. 2020. Draft Avenida Folsom Transportation Impact Study.

TSD Engineering. 2020. Technical Memo – Post Construction Stormwater, RE: Avenida Folsom Senior Living – Preliminary Drainage Study.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2020. EnviroMapper. Available at: https://geopub.epa.gov/myem/efmap/. Accessed March 18, 2020.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2020. Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants (Green Book). Accessed on April 23, 2020 at https://www.epa.gov/green-book.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2018. QuickFacts, Folsom City, California, population estimates, July 1, 2018 (V2018). Available at: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/folsomcitycalifornia. Accessed March 9, 2020.

Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. 2019a. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, 115 Healthy Way, Sacramento County APN 072-2270-006, Folsom, California 95630.

Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. 2019b. Geotechnical Engineering Study Update for Broadstone Crossing Parcel 6, Folsom, CA.

10.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

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

11.0 INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

City of Folsom
Steve Banks, Principal Planner

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Project Manager
Cherry Zamora, Environmental Planner
Daniel Van Essen, Geographic Information Systems
Stephen Stringer, Senior Biologist
Stephanie McLaughlin, Staff Biologist
Clarus Backes, Senior Archaeologist
Jentin Joe, Staff Archaeologist
Victor Ortiz, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Lead
Hunter Stapp, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Specialist
Jason Runyan, Noise Specialist

This page intentionally left blank.