EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This executive summary highlights the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan project, as required by Section 15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines) and 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1502.12 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As stated in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15123(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "[a]n EIR shall contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical." As stated in NEPA Section 1502.12, "each environmental impact statement shall contain a summary which adequately and accurately summarizes the statement. The summary shall stress the major conclusions, areas of controversy (including issues raised by agencies and the public), and the issues to be resolved (including the choice among alternatives)." As required by the State CEQA Guidelines and NEPA regulations, this executive summary includes (1) a summary description of the proposed project, (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (Table ES-1), (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated, and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult Chapter 2, "Alternatives"; Chapter 3, "Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures"; and Chapter 4, "Other Statutory Requirements."

ES.2 LEAD AND COOPERATING AGENCIES

This document is a joint draft environmental impact report/draft environmental impact statement (DEIR/DEIS) prepared for the Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan project (the "proposed action" for purposes of NEPA and the "proposed project" for purposes of CEQA, hereinafter referred to as "the project").

The City of Folsom (City) is the lead agency for the project under CEQA, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Sacramento District, is the Federal lead agency under NEPA. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) is a Cooperating Agency under NEPA.

ES.3 TYPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This EIR/EIS contains an analysis at a program level. For some issue areas, sufficient data were available for a more detailed level of analysis. Where this analysis was performed, the topic section begins with a statement that impacts would be the same for individual phases of development as for the project as a whole.

ES.4 REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS

The following entitlements are requested from the City and USACE for the Proposed Project. Additional approvals, permits, and authorizations are listed in Chapter 1, "Introduction and Statement of Purpose and Need."

City of Folsom

Adoption of the Proposed Project, as well as action alternatives under consideration, requires approval of the following City entitlements:

- certification of the EIR/EIS and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP),
- amendment of the Folsom General Plan,
- adoption of a Public Facilities Financing Plan,

- adoption of the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan,
- possible approval of development agreements between the City and project applicant(s),
- approval of large-lot tentative maps, and
- pre-zoning of the project site.

Future City entitlement approvals may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- use permits,
- approval of tentative parcel and subdivision maps,
- design review,
- lot line adjustments,
- engineering improvement plans,
- planned development permits,
- grading plans, and
- Development Agreement between the City and future project applicant(s).

In addition to the City approvals listed above, approval by the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) would also be required.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The project applicant(s) are also seeking a Federal permit from USACE pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) for the discharge of fill material into waters of the United States. The evaluation of the proposed project requires the USACE ensure compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and other applicable laws.

In addition to the authorizations and approvals requested from the City and USACE, permits and other approval actions from the following Federal, state, regional, and local agencies may be required:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- California Department of Education
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Transportation
- California Department of Public Health
- California State Historic Preservation Office
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 5)
- Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission
- County of Sacramento
- City of Rancho Cordova
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

ES.5 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

ES.5.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site includes the Specific Plan Area (SPA), and a Water Facilities Study Area. The SPA is located in eastern Sacramento County, south of U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50), east of Prairie City Road, North of White Rock Road, and west of the El Dorado County Line (see Exhibits 2-1 and 2-2). The Water Facilities Study Area includes the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company (NCMWC) service area, portions of the Sacramento River,

and pipeline alignments and water treatment plant (WTP) locations which extend from the community of Freeport through central and eastern Sacramento County to the SPA.

ES.5.2 ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECT

The project applicant(s)—the South Folsom Property Owners Group—are requesting annexation into the City of Folsom, and approval of various discretionary entitlements in support of a specific plan for a mixed-use development and supporting on- and off-site roadways and infrastructure (project). The specific plan covers an area in eastern Sacramento County, south of U.S. 50, and adjacent to the existing Folsom city limits. The specific plan supports a combination of employment-generating uses, retail and supporting services, recreational uses, and a broad range of residential uses and associated infrastructure and roads on approximately 3,510-acres that is located entirely within the City's sphere of influence, but currently under jurisdiction of Sacramento County. The project site, however, encompasses a larger area: it includes the entire area proposed for annexation, including U.S. 50 right-of-way and proposed interchange areas, for a total of approximately 3,584 acres. The project site is located south of U.S. 50, north of White Rock Road, east of Prairie City Road (a small area extends west of Prairie City Road at the southwest corner of the project site), and west of the Sacramento/El Dorado County line (see Exhibits 2-1 and 2-2 in Chapter 2, "Alternatives").

The Proposed Project includes 10,210 residential units at various densities on a total of 1,477.2 acres; 362.8 acres designated for commercial and industrial use, including a regional shopping center; public/quasi-public uses; elementary, middle, and high schools on 179.3 acres; 121.7 acres of community and neighborhood parks; stormwater detention basins; 1,053.1 acres of open-space areas and open-space preserves; and major roads with landscaping.

Several off-site infrastructure facilities (intersection expansions to allow access to and from U.S. 50 and the SPA, an overpass of U.S. 50, two roadway connections and sewer pipelines from the Folsom Heights property into El Dorado Hills, a sewer force main connection to the existing City system, a detention basin, and water pipelines and facilities) are proposed to serve project development and are addressed in this DEIR/DEIS.

Based on current water demand assumptions and implementation of reasonable conservation measures in years when water supplies could be subjected to dry-year reductions of up to 25%, the project would require not more than 5,600 acre-feet[1] of water per year (AFY). The City is proposing Off-site Water Facilities that would involve the permanent assignment to the City of the contractual entitlement to Central Valley Project (CVP) contract entitlement water totaling not more than 8,000 AFY[2] from NCMWC, diverting this water supply from the Sacramento River, and conveying this water to the SPA.

In addition, this project would include the City purchasing from Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) dedicated capacity within the Freeport Regional Water Project (Freeport Project), which would serve as the point of diversion (POD) on the Sacramento River and partial conveyance pathway for not more than 6,000 AFY purchased from NCMWC. The City proposes to add the Freeport POD to the assigned CVP water to facilitate the diversion of these supplies at the existing Freeport Project diversion. The City proposes to pump and convey the assigned NCMWC CVP water supply through the Freeport Project diversion facility and conveyance pipeline to the point where SCWA and East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD) pipeline split or the bifurcation point. The City would then construct new water supply conveyance infrastructure from the bifurcation point to the SPA.

Provision of water service to the project would involve the following actions by the City:

- taking an assignment for up to 8,000 AFY of CVP surface water from NCMWC (which is currently delivered in July and August in accordance with NCMWC's irrigation demands);

[1] An acre-foot of water contains 325,851 gallons; one million gallons is about 3 acre-feet.
[2] NCMWC's CVP water contract is subject to a dry-year provision whereby total deliveries can be reduced by up to 25%.

- rescheduling the existing CVP July/August delivery schedule to a year-round municipal and industrial (M&I) schedule;

- entering into an agreement with SCWA to convey the water acquired by the City from NCMWC through the Freeport Project, to facilitate the integration of the Off-site Water Facilities with existing Freeport Project diversion and water conveyance facilities; and

- Constructing conveyance, pump, storage, and treatment facilities, including booster pump station(s), water treatment and storage facilities, and conveyance facilities.

Consistent with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA, the City is evaluating several conveyance alternatives to enable the delivery of not more than 6,000 AFY of CVP water assigned by NCMWC to the SPA. Each alternative includes optional route alignments and/or operational features (e.g., WTPs and associated storage facilities) to cover the range of feasible alternatives available to the City. Exhibits 2-25, 2-27, 2-28, and 2-29 in Chapter 2, "Alternatives," illustrate the potential locations of water supply and conveyance infrastructure to serve the SPA.

Information regarding the location, design, and operation of the various project components is presented in detail in Chapter 2, "Alternatives."

ES.6 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 displays a summary of significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid, eliminate, minimize, or reduce potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance of the impact following implementation of each mitigation measure is identified. Effects that would occur under each alternative development scenario on Table ES-1 are identified as follows: PP (Proposed Project), RIM (Resource Impact Minimization), CD (Centralized Development), RHD (Reduced Hillside Development), NF (No Federal Action), and NP (No Project). For impacts related to the water supply portion of the project, ten numbered alternatives are analyzed. In Table ES-1, the impact and its significance conclusion is followed by the mitigation requirement. For detailed descriptions of project impacts and mitigation measures, please see Sections 3.1 through 3.17 A and B in Chapter 3, "Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures."

ES.7 ALTERNATIVES

The State CEQA Guidelines (CCR Section 15126.6) and the NEPA Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (40 CFR 15012.14) require that an EIR/EIS describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid and/or lessen the environmental effects of the project. Chapter 2, "Alternatives," of this EIR/EIS provides a comparative analysis between the Proposed Project/Action and four "Land" alternatives, as well as comparative analysis between ten "Water" alternatives. The "Land" alternatives describe a range of possible land use plans for the SPA, and the "Water" alternatives describe a range of potential water facility options which could be used to convey the necessary water supply to the SPA. The No Project/No Action Alternative (hereinafter referred to as the "No Project Alternative") as required under CEQA and NEPA and a No USACE Permit Alternative as required by USACE under NEPA is also evaluated in Chapter 2.

ES.7.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Project Alternative, the SPA would not be annexed to the City of Folsom; instead, it would remain under the jurisdiction of Sacramento County. This alternative assumes that existing land uses at the project site (i.e., livestock grazing) would continue, including construction of up to 44 rural residences on 80-acre parcels as permitted under the adopted Sacramento County General Plan designations and zoning. Furthermore, no off-site water facilities would be constructed under this alternative. This analysis uses existing site conditions at the time that the Notice of Preparation/Notice of Intent was published (September 2008) as the "existing conditions"

portion of the "no project" scenario (see State CEQA Guidelines CCR Section 15126.6[e][2]) to allow consideration of a full range of alternatives. Remediation of contaminated soil and groundwater on the Aerojet General Corporation parcel along the western property boundary is a separate action that will continue either with or without project implementation.

ES.7.2 NO USACE PERMIT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is designed to avoid the placement of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, thus eliminating the need for a USACE Section 404 CWA permit. As a result, there would be no direct impacts to waters of the U.S. under this alternative, compared to 46.3 combined acres of fill under the total Proposed Project (i.e., including both land development and off-site water facilities). This alternative would require compliance with Section 10 of ESA. Under this alternative, 1,506.1 acres of the project site would be designated as open space, compared to 1,057 acres under the Proposed Project Alternative. This alternative also would require more expensive/time-consuming, methods of construction for roadways and utilities. Under this alternative, approximately 3,837 fewer residential housing units would be constructed, and approximately 131 fewer acres would be used for commercial/industrial development, than under the Proposed Project. The acreage proposed for park use would be reduced to 84.8 acres under this alternative.

ES.7.3 RESOURCE IMPACT MINIMIZATION ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would include a larger area of high-quality biological habitat in the proposed preserve area than under the Proposed Project Alternative, and would also preserve all of the on-site cultural resources that would be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources and National Register of Historic Places. A Section 404 CWA permit would still be required under this alternative, as it would involve the placement of fill material into 26.47 acres of waters of the U.S., 13.03 fewer acres than would be filled by the Proposed Project Alternative. An additional 375 acres of land across the project site would be designated as open space. A total of approximately 1,429 acres, approximately 40% of the project site, would become a protected wetland preserve. Areas of the project site with higher concentrations of cultural resources, including areas on the northwestern portion of the project site would also remain in open space under this alternative. The total acreage of residential development would be reduced by approximately 205 acres and approximately 2,245 fewer residential units would be constructed. Overall density would decrease (average density across the residentially designated area would be approximately 6 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), compared to 6.65 du/ac under the Proposed Project Alternative). Commercial and industrial development sites would be reduced by approximately 113 acres. Development of park land would be reduced to 105.7 acres. The types of land uses and general on- and off-site infrastructure and roadway improvements would remain the same as under the Proposed Project Alternative.

ES.7.4 CENTRALIZED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would preserve approximately 75% of the eastern part of the project site, which lies within the Sierra Nevada foothills, in its current undeveloped state. Commercial development would still occur along the south side of U.S. 50 within the foothills. It would also entail about 1,000 fewer equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) than the Proposed Project. This alternative would fill 37.06 acres of waters of the U.S., 2.48 acres fewer than would be filled under the Proposed Project Alternative. The Centralized Development Alternative envisions a higher density of residential development on a smaller footprint compared to the Proposed Project Alternative, resulting in more dwelling units per acre. The acreage of commercial and industrial development would be similar in this alternative compared to the Proposed Project Alternative. The acreage proposed for park use is reduced to 118.7 acres in this alternative, including local parks which are included in acreage totals for residential and mixed-use designations. The types of land uses and general on- and off-site infrastructure improvements under the Centralized Development Alternative would remain the same as under the Proposed Project Alternative. A 1,464.4-acre area would be dedicated to open space (approximately 407 acres more than under the Proposed Action Alternative).

ES.7.5 REDUCED HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would reduce the developed area on the eastern portion of the project site, which lies within the Sierra Nevada foothills, leaving more of this area in its current undeveloped state for aesthetic, biological, and cultural resource protection purposes. It would also entail about 1,300 additional EDUs compared to the Proposed Project, with a much higher density of development within the central portion of the project site, thus reducing potential impacts related to traffic and air quality. The Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would fill 42.69 acres of waters of the U.S., 3.19 acres more than would be filled under the Proposed Project Alternative. The Reduced Hillside Development Alternative envisions a greater density of residential development on a slightly smaller footprint compared to the Proposed Project Alternative, resulting in more dwelling units per acre. The total acreage of residential development would be reduced by approximately 64 acres, but the density would be increased. The acreage of commercial and industrial development would be increased by less than 20 acres. The acreage proposed for park use (including local parks which are included in acreage totals for residential and mixed-use designations) is increased to 170.9 acres in this alternative. The types of land uses and general on- and off-site infrastructure and roadway improvements under the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would remain the same as under the Proposed Project. A 1,057-acre area would be dedicated to open space (the same size as under the Proposed Project).

ES.7.6 WATER SUPPLY ALTERNATIVES

The Water Supply alternatives evaluated at an equal level of detail in this EIR/EIS consist of the following (see Chapter 2, "Alternatives" for additional detail):

- No USACE Permit Off-site Water Facility Alternative
- Proposed Off-site Water Facility Alternative PA – Raw Water Conveyance – Grant Line Road Alignment and On-site WTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 1 – Raw Water Conveyance – Grant Line Road Alignment and White Rock WTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 1A – Raw Water Conveyance – Grant Line Road Route Variation Alignment and White Rock WTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 2 – Treated Water Conveyance – Douglas Road Alignment and Vineyard SWTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 2A – Treated Water Conveyance – Douglas Road Route Variation Alignment and Vineyard SWTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 2B – Treated Water Conveyance – North Douglas Tanks Variation Alignment and Vineyard SWTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 3 – Raw Water Conveyance – Douglas Road Alignment and White Rock WTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 3A – Raw Water Conveyance – Douglas Road Route Variation Alignment and White Rock WTP
- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 4 – Raw Water Conveyance to Folsom Boulevard Alignment and Folsom Boulevard WTP

- Off-site Water Facility Alternative 4A – Raw Water Conveyance to Folsom Boulevard – Route Variation Alignment and Folsom Boulevard WTP

ES 7.7 INTEGRATION OF "LAND" AND "WATER" ALTERNATIVES FOR DEVELOPMENT

Under the No Project Alternative, the SPA could be developed with up to 44 rural residences on 80-acre parcels as currently zoned under the Sacramento County General Plan, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed because each rural resident would be responsible for developing his or her on-site well. Therefore, for purposes of this EIR/EIS, the No Project Alternative is evaluated in the 3A "Land" sections.

Under the No USACE Permit Alternative, there would be no placement of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. (including wetlands) from either the "Land" or "Water" portions of the project, thus eliminating the need for a USACE Section 404 CWA permit. In order to achieve "no fill," no development in the SPA would occur within 50 feet of a water of the United States, the water treatment plant (regardless of whether it is located off-site or on-site) would not be constructed within 50 feet of a water of the United States, and the off-site water conveyance pipeline would use trenchless construction methods (e.g., horizontal directional drilling or jack-and-bore) where the pipeline route intersected any water of the United States. Therefore, only the No USACE Permit Off-site Water Facility Alternative could be selected if the No USACE Permit "Land" Alternative were selected for development of the SPA.

Any of the other 10 off-site water alternatives listed above and described in detail in Chapter 2, "Alternatives" could ultimately be implemented for either the Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, or Reduced Hillside Development Alternative. Because the off-site water facilities are different from development of the SPA and would occur in locations that are further removed spatially from the SPA, the impacts of these water facilities are evaluated in the 3B "Water" sections of this EIR/EIS. However, the City and the USACE wish to make clear to the reader that the "project" as a whole consists of both development of the SPA and off-site facilities necessary to provide water in support of the SPA development. Thus, when considering impacts of the "project" as a whole, it is necessary to consider both the 3A and 3B impacts taken together.

ES.7.8 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The State CEQA Guidelines require identification of an environmentally superior alternative from among the proposed project and the alternatives evaluated. If the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior, CEQA requires identification of the "environmentally superior alternative" other than the No Project Alternative from among the proposed project and the alternatives evaluated. Federal NEPA regulations also recommend that an environmentally preferred alternative be identified; however, under NEPA, that alternative does not need to be identified until the final record of decision is issued. Therefore, the discussion in this section of the environmentally superior alternative is intended to satisfy only the State CEQA requirements.

As discussed in detail in Chapter 2, "Alternatives" The No Project Alternative includes (1) no annexation of the SPA to the City, (2) potential development of up to 44 rural residences in the SPA under the existing Sacramento County zoning AG-80, and (3) no construction of any off-site water facilities. Therefore, "no project," from both a "Land" and "Water" perspective, is evaluated as one combined No Project Alternative in the 3A "Land" sections of this DEIR/DEIS. The No Project Alternative would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. This alternative provides the greatest opportunity for avoidance and/or substantial reduction in the significant environmental impacts of the project. However, this alternative would not meet the project purpose and need, nor would it meet any of the project objectives, as identified in Chapter 1 of this DEIR/DEIS.

Other than the No Project Alternative, either the No USACE Permit, Resource Impact Minimization, or Centralized Development Alternatives could be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the "Land" portion of the project.

Off-site Water Facility Alternative 2B would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the "Water" portion of the project.

ES.8 KNOWN AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

CCR Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines and 40 CFR Section 1502.12 of the NEPA regulations require that a summary of an EIR/EIS identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. During the public comment period for the notice of preparation/notice of intent, various comment letters were received regarding the project. Appendix B of the EIR/EIS includes a summary of the public scoping process as well as summaries of the comments received in writing and at the public meetings held on September 25, 2008. In general, areas of potential controversy known to the City, USACE, and the project applicant(s) include biological resources, circulation (traffic and alternative transportation methods), air quality, noise, hydrology and water quality, hazardous materials, water supply, provision of public services, and provision of public utilities. These issues were considered in the preparation of this EIR/EIS and, where appropriate, are addressed in the environmental impact analyses presented in Chapters 3 and 4.

ES.9 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND ADDITIONAL STEPS IN THE CEQA/NEPA REVIEW PROCESS

This EIR/EIS is being distributed to interested agencies, stakeholder organizations, and individuals. This distribution ensures that interested parties have an opportunity to express their views regarding the environmental effects of the project, and to ensure that information pertinent to permits, authorizations, and approvals is provided to decision makers for the lead agencies and CEQA responsible and trustee agencies. This document is available for review by the public during normal business hours at Folsom City Hall, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630 and by appointment at USACE, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2922. The document will also be available on the City's website at http://www.folsom.ca.us/depts/community_development/default.asp and the USACE website at http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/organizations/cespk-co/regulatory/EISs/EIS-index.html. The DEIR is being distributed for a 45-day period that will end on August 16. The DEIS is being distributed for a 60-day review period that will end on September 7, 2010.

For CEQA purposes, written comments to the City of Folsom must be postmarked no later than August 16, 2010. However, the USACE will continue to accept comments for NEPA purposes until the ROD is issued. Written comments should be sent to the following addresses:

Gail Furness de Pardo
City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
email: gdepardo@folsom.ca.us

Lisa Gibson
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch
1325 J Street, Room 1480
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922
E-mail: Lisa.M.Gibson2@ usace.army.mil

If comments are provided via e-mail, please include the project title in the subject line, attach comments in MS Word format, and include the commenter's U.S. Postal Service mailing address.

A joint public meeting/hearing on the DEIR/DEIS will be conducted by the City and USACE on August 2, 2010 from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Folsom Community Center, at 52 Natoma Street in Folsom. The City of Folsom

Planning Commission will also conduct a public hearing on the DEIR and draft specific plan at its regular meeting on Wednesday, August 4, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 50 Natoma Street. It is not necessary to provide testimony during the public hearing; comments on the DEIR/DEIS will be accepted throughout the meeting and will be recorded at the public comment table and via court reporter. Comments may also be submitted throughout the comment period as described above.

Once all comments have been assembled and reviewed, responses will be prepared to address significant environmental issues that have been raised in the comments. The responses will be included in a final EIR/EIS.