

1 INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

This document is a joint environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS) prepared for the Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan project (the “Proposed Project” for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] and the “Proposed Action” for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]). This EIR/EIS has been prepared by both the City of Folsom (City), as lead agency under CEQA, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Sacramento District, as Federal lead agency under NEPA. The EIR/EIS is a joint document intended to comply with both CEQA and NEPA. See California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 (State CEQA Guidelines), Section 15222 (“Preparation of Joint Documents”); and Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 40, Sections 1502.25, 1506.2, and 1506.4 (authority for combining federal and state environmental documents). See also 33 CFR Part 230 (USACE NEPA regulations) and 33 CFR Part 325, Appendix B (“NEPA Implementation Procedures for the [USACE] Regulatory Program”).

In its initial form, an EIR/EIS is composed primarily of a draft document known as a draft EIR/EIS (DEIR/DEIS), and the lead agencies’ written responses to public and public-agency comments on the draft document. This DEIR/DEIS evaluates the potential adverse impacts on the human and natural environment resulting from implementation of the proposed Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan project (proposed project). In this document, “Proposed Project” refers to the Proposed Project Alternative, and “project” refers to one or all of the project alternatives. The DEIR/DEIS proposes mitigation measures and alternatives that may reduce or avoid the significance of such adverse impacts. Following public review of the DEIR/DEIS, a final EIR/EIS (FEIR/FEIS) will be prepared, in which the joint lead agencies will provide responses to comments relating to the analysis provided in the DEIR/DEIS.

This EIR/EIS has been prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with implementing a specific plan. A specific plan is a legislative development plan prepared in accordance with California planning statutes found in Government Code Section 65450 et seq. and the City’s Municipal Code Chapter 17.37. The goal of the specific plan is to establish a development framework for land use, resource protection, circulation, public utilities and services, design, and implementation. The project includes adoption of the specific plan itself and implementation of the associated development proposal. This DEIR/DEIS has been prepared under the direction of the City and USACE and in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA identified above.

This introductory chapter of the DEIR/DEIS provides information on the following:

- ▶ a brief synopsis of the land use portion of the project requiring environmental analysis (the “Land” project description follows in Chapter 2, “Alternatives”);
- ▶ a brief synopsis of the off-site water supply and conveyance portion of the project requiring environmental analysis (the “Water” project description follows in Chapter 2, “Alternatives”);
- ▶ history and planning context of the project;
- ▶ project purpose and need and project objectives for the “Land” and “Water” portions of the project;
- ▶ type, purpose, and intended uses of the DEIR/DEIS;
- ▶ scope and focus of the DEIR/DEIS;
- ▶ agency roles and responsibilities and required permits and approvals;
- ▶ organization of the DEIR/DEIS;
- ▶ documents relied on in the DEIR/DEIS; and
- ▶ standard terminology and acronyms.

1.1 PROJECT REQUIRING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The project requiring environmental analysis includes two components; a land use component, and an analysis of the off-site water supply facilities required to support the proposed land uses. Because the project purpose, objectives, and alternatives are different for the “Land” and “Water” portions of the project, they are presented separately in this EIR/EIS.

1.1.1 LAND

The project applicant(s) of the “Land” portion of the project—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 roadway and infrastructure improvements (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. The “Specific Plan Area,” or SPA, described throughout this EIR/EIS includes the entire area proposed for annexation, including U.S. 50 highway right-of-way and 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 Alternative includes 10,210 residential units at various densities on approximately 1,477 acres; approximately 363 acres are designated for commercial and industrial use, including a regional shopping center; public/quasi-public uses; elementary, middle, and high schools on approximately 179 acres; approximately 122 acres of community and neighborhood parks; stormwater detention basins; approximately 1,053 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.

1.1.2 WATER

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 SPA would require not more than 5,600 acre-feet¹ of water per year (AFY). To provide a reliable water supply for the project, the City is proposing the permanent assignment of not more than 8,000 AFY² of Central Valley Project (CVP) contract water from the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company (NCMWC), diverting this water supply from the Sacramento River at the Freeport Regional Water Project (Freeport Project), and conveying this water to the SPA through new potable water infrastructure.

In addition, the project would include the City purchasing from Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) a portion of its dedicated capacity within the Freeport Project, which would serve as the point of diversion (POD) on the Sacramento River and partial conveyance pathway for not more than 5,600 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 the SCWA and the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD) pipeline splits (or bifurcation point). The City would then construct new water supply conveyance infrastructure from the bifurcation point to the SPA.

Ten conveyance alternatives are analyzed in this EIR/EIS at an equal level of detail, as required under NEPA. These ten conveyance alternatives are described in more detail in Chapter 2, “Alternatives.” Overall, each of the ten “Water” action alternatives would involve the following actions in conjunction with the City taking assignment for up to 8,000 AFY of CVP surface water from NCMWC:

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 and August delivery schedules 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 Offsite 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 in this EIR/EIS 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., water treatment plants [WTP] and associated storage facilities) to cover the range of feasible alternatives available to the City.

1.1.3 PROJECT GEOGRAPHIES

The project undergoing environmental analysis in this EIR/EIS includes “Land” and “Water” components. Different portions of the project would occur in and would affect different geographical areas. The following geographic area descriptions are used in this EIR/EIS:

- ▶ **Specific Plan Area** – This refers to the area which would be annexed by the City of Folsom as part of the project. Most “On-site” analyses in the “Land” portion of the EIR/EIS address conditions in the SPA. The Specific Plan actually defines the future land uses for a slightly smaller area, excluding the U.S. Highway 50 right-of-way.
- ▶ **Off-site Improvements** – This refers to the location of certain off-site improvements required to support the proposed land use changes, including a proposed detention basin west of Prairie City Road, roadway and interchange improvements along U.S. 50 (at Prairie City Road, Oak Avenue, Rowberry Drive, Scott Road, and Empire Ranch Road); a sewer line extension across U.S. 50 to an existing pump station along Iron Point Road; and sewer and roadway extensions into El Dorado Hills.
- ▶ **“Water” Study Area** – This refers to the regional area studied for the various water supply facilities and operations required under the alternatives in the “Water” portion of the EIR/EIS. The “Water” Study Area encompasses areas in east-central portions of Sacramento County where new potable water supply facilities would be constructed under a variety of alternative configurations, the Freeport Project facilities, the NCMWC service area, and the portions of the lower Sacramento River.
- ▶ **General Plan Amendment Area** – This refers to the area within the current City of Folsom where the density ranges of general plan land use designations would be changed by the project.

Please refer to Exhibit 2.1 for an illustration of these areas and their relationship to one another.

1.2 PROJECT HISTORY AND PLANNING CONTEXT

In 2001, the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) designated the undeveloped land south of U.S. Highway 50 between Prairie City Road, White Rock Road, and the El Dorado County line as part of the City’s sphere of influence. The City entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sacramento County prior to approval of the SPA application by Sacramento LAFCo. The intent of the MOU is to serve as a guide for sound regional long-range planning efforts relative to the annexation of the SPA. The MOU outlines a comprehensive planning process for the project site, including public participation with various stakeholders and the general public. It also addresses a number of issues including water supply, transportation, air quality, schools, and open space that were later incorporated into language found in Measure W and subsequently the City Charter

(described in more detail below). The MOU led to LAFCo Resolution 1196, approving the City's sphere of influence amendment.

LAFCo Resolution 1196 requires that the planning process for the project site include:

- ▶ **City General Plan Revisions.** Revise and update the City's general plan in accordance with California State law.
- ▶ **City General Plan Housing Element.** Obtain a certification of substantial compliance from the California Department of Housing and Community Development consistent with California Government Code section 65585(d) or (h). The City shall establish in its approved Housing Element that it has or will meet its regional share housing needs for all income levels for the second and third Housing Element revisions, as defined in California Government Code section 65588.
- ▶ **Land Use Designations.** Adopt appropriate land use designations for all property within the adopted Sphere of Influence area.
- ▶ **Pre-zoning.** Pre-zone the property consistent with California Government Code Section 56375 and the Folsom General Plan.
- ▶ **Comprehensive Planning.** Develop comprehensive planning of the project site that demonstrates well planned, orderly development that avoids the premature conversion of open space.
- ▶ **Master Service Agreement.** In any application to annex the property, the City is to submit a Master Services Element that identifies a program for implementation and financing for major infrastructure and services components needed to support the proposed distribution, location, extent, and intensity of proposed land uses. The Master Services Element must identify a water supply source and the process for securing sufficient water supplies to serve the annexed area.
- ▶ **Local Roadway Improvements.** Prepare a plan for necessary improvements to each jurisdiction's roadway network to accommodate increased traffic from the project site in cooperation with Sacramento and El Dorado Counties. This plan must include a list of improvements, responsible jurisdiction, phasing plan, and clearly defined financing mechanism. Implementation of this plan must result in service levels on local roadways consistent with each jurisdiction's general plan.
- ▶ **Regional Roadway Improvements.** The City, in cooperation with Caltrans, Sacramento County, El Dorado County, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), must identify traffic and transportation measures that are needed to mitigate potential impacts on regional transportation facilities from proposed development within the project site. The City must also identify a funding mechanism to construct the traffic and transportation measures necessary to fully mitigate impacts from the project site, and a timeline for the construction of improvements. As soon as reasonably possible, these improvements should be programmed into the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.
- ▶ **Transit Master Plan.** Prepare a Transit Master Plan consistent with the City's General Plan. The master plan must identify bus transit routes, bus turnouts, pedestrian shelters, bus transfer stations, alignments for rail service, and the location of rail service stations.
- ▶ **Bikeway Master Plan.** Prepare a Bikeway Master Plan consistent with the City's General Plan. The master plan must identify bikeway and pedestrian facilities on the project site consistent with the goals and policies of the City's general plan and incorporate bikeway designs for Prairie City Road and White Rock Road to be equivalent, or better, than those in the Sacramento City/County Bikeway Master Plan.

- ▶ **Drainage Master Plan.** Conduct hydraulic and hydrologic modeling of that portion of Alder Creek which transverses the project site. A Drainage Master Plan must be prepared and address flood hazards, identify flood protection measures, and document no net increase in downstream floodwater surface elevations.
- ▶ **Habitat Mitigation Strategy.** Document of the City’s multi-species habitat mitigation strategy (Habitat Conservation Plan [HCP]) for the project site. The strategy must address mitigation of impacts on habitat and biological resources that meets Federal and State regulatory requirements. The City may fulfill these requirements through participation in South Sacramento County HCP process.
- ▶ **Surface and Groundwater Contamination.** Document that on-site surface contamination has been remediated to Federal and State regulatory standards, and that groundwater contamination has been remediated or is being remediated effectively prior to annexation of any property owned by Aerojet General Corporation.
- ▶ **Water Supply.** Demonstrate that the City has a sufficient water supply to serve existing customers, future customers within the existing service area, and all proposed uses within the project site in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Water Forum Agreement. This demonstration must be sufficient for LAFCo to determine water availability per California Government Code section 56668(k).
- ▶ **Wastewater Facilities.** Demonstrate the timely availability of wastewater transmission and treatment capacity to serve existing customers, future customers within the existing service area, and all proposed uses within the project site.
- ▶ **Special Districts.** Meet and confer with the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District, and any other special districts regarding impacts on these districts, including fiscal and operational impacts and loss of property tax revenue. With respect to EID, the City must not request any detachment from the EID service area.
- ▶ **School Mitigation.** Incorporate feasible school mitigation requirements into development agreements.
- ▶ **Mitigation Monitoring.** Comply with the mitigation measures identified in environmental review for expansion of sphere of influence boundary and adopted pursuant to CEQA by LAFCo Resolution LAFC 1193, including:
 - Establish necessary roadway improvements and financing mechanisms;
 - Implement requirements to reduce air quality emissions by 35%;
 - Prepare an Air Quality Plan;
 - Complete tree surveys and implement tree protection measures;
 - Complete biological surveys and adopt avoidance and mitigation policies;
 - Minimize incompatibility impacts on historic landscapes;
 - Implement hazardous materials plans;
 - Investigate and remediate railroad right-of-way, mining, and radio/transfer sites;
 - Define the Alder Creek 100-year floodplain; and
 - Identify secure sufficient water supplies.

In November 2004, following a series of visioning workshops, the City’s Measure W (City Ordinance No. 1022) passed with support from 69% of the City voters. With the passage of Measure W, the City Charter was amended to require the Folsom City Council to take certain actions prior to LAFCo approval of annexation. These actions are related to each of the issue areas described below:

- ▶ **Water Supply.** Identify and secure the sources of water supply to serve the SPA without reducing the existing water supply currently serving users to the north of U.S. 50, and at no cost to existing City residents.

- ▶ **Transportation.** Adopt an Infrastructure Funding and Phasing Plan for the construction of roadways and transportation improvements that are necessary to reduce traffic impacts resulting from development of the SPA. The timing of the construction of the transportation improvements shall be tied to the anticipated rate of growth and associated traffic impacts. Existing City residents shall not be required to pay fees for the construction of any new transportation improvements required to serve the SPA.
- ▶ **Open Space.** Maintain 30% of the SPA as natural open space to preserve oak woodlands and sensitive habitat areas. Natural open space cannot include active park sites, residential yard areas, golf courses, parking lots, or their associated landscaping.
- ▶ **Schools.** Submit a plan to the Folsom Cordova Unified School District for the funding and construction of all necessary school facilities for the SPA so that City residents north of U.S. 50 are not required to pay for the construction of new school facilities serving the SPA and existing schools are not overcrowded by development of the SPA.
- ▶ **Development Plan.** Adopt a General Plan Amendment to serve as the blueprint for development within the SPA. The General Plan Amendment will only be adopted after the completion and certification of an environmental impact report.
- ▶ **Public Notice.** Every registered voter in the City must be mailed a notice of time, place, and date of the public meetings and hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council. The notice must include a summary of the SPA proposal with the full proposal and associated environmental review available for public review at the City Clerk's office, at all Folsom public libraries, and on the City's Web site.
- ▶ **Implementation.** All existing City plans, policies, ordinances, and other legislative acts must be amended as necessary, as soon as possible, and in the time and manner required by state law, including CEQA, to ensure consistency between the Charter Amendment and those plans, policies, and other provisions.

In 2004, the City launched a visioning process to seek community input about the future plans for the City's sphere of influence area. Approximately 200 residents of the City and nearby El Dorado County attended a series of meetings facilitated by a professional planning consultant. At those meetings, the participants addressed a range of issues including land use, open space, transportation, and financing. Their recommendations resulted in a series of five possible development scenarios, which were reviewed by the Folsom City Council at its January 25, 2005 meeting. Since that time, the land use plan for the SPA has continued to undergo refinements, and has evolved into the Proposed Project Alternative shown in Exhibit 2-3 in Chapter 2, "Alternatives." The Proposed Project Alternative, along with four alternative land use development plans and a No Project Alternative (development under the existing Sacramento County land use and zoning designations), are evaluated in an equal level of detail, as required under NEPA in this EIR/EIS.

1.3 PROJECT PURPOSE, NEED, AND OBJECTIVES

The Proposed Project Alternative has been formulated to achieve the purpose, objectives, and needs summarized below. State CEQA Guidelines CCR Section 15124(b) requires that the project description contain a clear statement of the project objectives, including the underlying purpose of the project. NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1502.13) require that an EIS contain a statement of the purpose and need that "briefly specif[ies] the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives, including the proposed action." The statement of objectives is important under CEQA in helping the City (State lead agency under CEQA), and the statement of purpose and need is important under NEPA in helping USACE (Federal lead agency under NEPA), to develop a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project Alternative for evaluation in the EIR/EIS.

1.3.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The City and USACE each view the project purpose from the purview of their responsibilities. The City is interested in the orderly development of lands within its planning boundaries/sphere of influence and ensuring that that the City has adequate water supplies for trust development. USACE's interest extends to its permit authority with respect to regulation of waters of the U.S., including wetlands.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED: CITY OF FOLSOM CONSIDERATIONS

The purpose of the Folsom South of Highway 50 Specific Plan project is to provide a mixed-use, master-planned community within an area south of U.S. 50 that would be annexed to the City of Folsom, and also to secure a reliable water supply consistent with the requirements of Measure W and objectives of the Water Forum Agreement and the necessary off-site conveyance infrastructure to facilitate the planned development of the SP. In accordance with local and regional plans, including the City's General Plan and SACOG Blueprint and Smart Growth Principles, the project would expand the City's current sphere of influence south of U.S. 50 in a manner that would foster orderly urban development and discourage leapfrog development and urban sprawl. The project would provide both jobs and housing and would generate a positive fiscal impact for the City.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED: U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The project purpose, as considered by USACE, is to construct a large scale, mixed-use development, with associated infrastructure, within eastern Sacramento County.

1.3.2 PROJECT NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES

LAND

Outlined below are the main project needs and objectives defined by the project applicant(s) for the Proposed Project. These objectives are specific to the "Land" portion of the project, and are important for the selection and consideration of CEQA alternatives.

1. Be consistent with the City of Folsom's General Plan and implement SACOG Smart Growth Principles.
2. Expand the City's boundaries based on the ultimate boundaries of development that the City can reasonably control and service, and do so in a manner that would foster orderly urban development and discourage leapfrog development and urban sprawl.
3. Annex those parcels of land adjacent to the City limit and within the City's Sphere of Influence whose development could have significant visual, traffic, public service, and environmental impacts on the City so that the City may influence the ultimate development of those parcels.
4. Provide a large-scale mixed-use and mixed-density residential housing development within the City of Folsom, south of U.S. 50.
5. Develop several distinct neighborhoods within the project site, connected by a substantial open space area and recreational trail network.
6. Provide neighborhood- and regional-serving retail areas within the project site.
7. Provide a mix of housing types within the project site to diversify the City's housing stock.
8. Provide a combined high school/middle school and the appropriate elementary schools on-site sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

9. Provide the appropriate number and size of on-site community and neighborhood parks sufficient to meet the needs of the project.
10. Generate positive fiscal impacts for the City through development within the project site.

WATER

The project objectives for the “Water” portion of the project include the following:

1. Secure a sufficient and reliable water supply consistent with the requirements of Measure W and objectives of the Water Forum Agreement to support planned development within the SPA, which the City estimates to be 5,600 acre-feet per year.
2. Construct the necessary water supply delivery and treatment infrastructure to ensure the safe and reliable delivery of up to 5,600 acre-feet per year to the SPA.

1.4 INTENDED USES AND TYPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1.4.1 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

According to the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15064[f][1]), preparation of an EIR is required whenever a project may result in a significant environmental impact. An EIR is an informational document used to inform public agency decision makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while substantially lessening or avoiding any of the significant environmental impacts. Public agencies are required to consider the information presented in the EIR when determining whether to approve a project.

CEQA requires that state and local government agencies consider the environmental effects of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects (California Public Resources Code [California PRC] Section 21000 et seq.). CEQA also requires that each public agency avoid or mitigate to less-than-significant levels, wherever feasible, the significant environmental effects of projects it approves or implements. If a project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less-than-significant levels, the project can still be approved, but the lead agency’s decision makers must issue a “statement of overriding considerations” explaining in writing the specific economic, social, or other considerations that they believe make those significant effects acceptable.

1.4.2 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

NEPA provides an interdisciplinary framework for Federal agencies to develop information that will help them to take environmental factors into account in their decisionmaking (42 United States Code [USC] 4321, 40 CFR 1500.1). According to NEPA, an EIS is required whenever a proposed major Federal action (e.g., a proposal for legislation or an activity financed, assisted, conducted, or approved by a Federal agency) would result in significant effects on the quality of the human environment.

Much of the development contemplated by the proposed specific plan is dependent upon Federal action because such development would require Federal permits for one or more of the following activities: (i) discharges of fill material into waters of the U.S., (ii) activities affecting plant or animal species protected by the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 USC 1531 et seq.), (iii) activities affecting cultural resources that are listed or are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Place (NRHP) for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA) (16 USC 470). The “Water” portion of the project requires the Federal Bureau of Reclamation’s (Reclamation’s) approval of an assignment of a CVP water

supply from NCMWC to the City. An EIS is an informational document used by Federal agencies in making decisions. An EIS is intended to provide full and open disclosure of environmental consequences prior to agency action; an interdisciplinary approach to project evaluation; objective consideration of all reasonable alternatives; application of measures to avoid or reduce adverse impacts; and an avenue for public and agency participation in decision-making (40 CFR 1502.1). NEPA defines mitigation as avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing, or compensating for significant effects of the proposed action (40 CFR 1508.20).

NEPA requires that a lead agency “include (in an EIS) appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives” (40 CFR 1502.14[f]). An EIS shall also include discussions of “means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts (if not fully covered under Section 1502.14[f]).” In preparing a record of decision under 40 CFR 1505.2, a lead agency is required to “[s]tate *whether* all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not. A monitoring and enforcement program shall be adopted and summarized where applicable for *any* mitigation.” (Italics added.)

Individual project development phases may require further environmental analysis and additional agency approvals when tentative maps or other future discretionary applications are submitted after adoption of the specific plan, particularly if site-specific issues peculiar to certain parcels were not addressed at the broader program level of analysis found in this EIR/EIS. See Section 1.4.3 below and Section 2.3.1 in Chapter 2, “Alternatives.”

1.4.3 PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This EIR/EIS includes a program-level, or “first-tier,” analysis for the project, consistent with California PRC Sections 21083.3, 21093, and 21094; Title 14 CCR Sections 15152 and 15168; and 40 CFR 1500.4(i), 1502.4(b), and 1502.20, among others. A program EIR addresses a series of related actions characterized as one large project.

This program-level or “programmatic” analysis evaluates the requested actions as they relate to the proposed land use designations for the overall specific plan (refer to Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” for further detail on the overall project).

The program-level analysis considers the broad environmental effects of the overall specific plan. This program EIR/EIS also identifies performance standards (e.g., setbacks, measures to protect biological and other sensitive resources) and mitigation measures that would apply to all subsequent, future project development phases under the specific plan (as conditions of approval). These performance standards will be incorporated into the Folsom Specific Plan to avoid or reduce impacts to the degree feasible. In addition, the program-level analysis addresses the cumulative impacts of development of the project and analyzes a reasonable range of alternative land use maps at an equal level of detail. A No Project Alternative is also analyzed as required by CEQA and NEPA (same as the No Action Alternative), as well as a No Federal Action (no USACE Department of the Army Clean Water Act [CWA] Section 404 permit) Alternative as required by USACE NEPA regulations.

In addition to the programmatic analysis described above, this EIR/EIS also includes an additional detailed level of analysis of specific topic areas that is beyond the program level. Those issues that contain this additional level of detailed analysis are: Aesthetics; Cultural Resources; Environmental Justice; Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; and Land Use Planning and Agricultural Resources. Where this additional detailed analysis has been conducted, a statement that impacts under the additional level of detailed analysis would be same as those under the program level analysis is included at the beginning of each topic area.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT COMPLIANCE FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PHASES

Development of the SPA is expected to occur in multiple phases (See Section 2.3.1, “Project Phasing” in Chapter 2, “Alternatives”). To move forward with a specific phase, the project applicant(s) intend to submit a tentative subdivision map/improvement plan for each project development phase. At that time, the City will require compliance with the Folsom Specific Plan performance standards and mitigation measures set forth in this EIR/EIS and incorporated into the Folsom Specific Plan for each tentative subdivision map/improvement plan as conditions of approval. Those future phases may require further environmental review. CEQA includes a number of different but complementary means for streamlining environmental review consistent with an approved general plan, specific plan, or zoning action. More than one of these provisions might apply to future entitlements within the adopted SPA. (See California PRC Section 21083.3 [streamlined review for projects consistent with general plans, community plans, or zoning actions for which an EIR was prepared]; 14 CCR Section 15183 [same]; California PRC Sections 21093 and 21094 [tiering]; 14 CCR Section 15152 [same]; California Government Code Section 65457 [CEQA exemption for residential projects within a specific plan for which an EIR was prepared]; and 14 CCR Section 15182 [same].) The extent of environmental review, if any, for future development entitlements will depend on a number of factors, including the streamlining provision of CEQA that seems most applicable to a particular proposed entitlement; consistency of the proposed development with the adopted specific plan; and the extent to which the programmatic analysis, performance standards, and mitigation measures have anticipated and accounted for the site-specific impacts of the requested entitlements.

1.5 SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and NEPA, the discussion of potential effects on the environment in this EIR/EIS is focused on those impacts that the City and USACE have determined may be potentially significant.

On September 12, 2008, the City issued a notice of preparation (NOP) (Appendix B) to inform agencies and the general public that a joint EIR/EIS was being prepared, and invited comments on the scope and content of the document and participation at a public scoping meeting. The NOP was published in the State Clearinghouse and was mailed to approximately 15 state agencies. It was also posted on the City’s website. The NOP was circulated for 45 days as mandated by CEQA. The public-comment period for the NOP closed on October 27, 2008.

On September 12, 2008, USACE issued a notice of intent (NOI) (Appendix B) to inform agencies and the general public that a joint EIR/EIS was being prepared and invited comments on the scope and content of the document. At that time USACE announced that it had developed a public-involvement program allowing opportunities for public participation and involvement in the NEPA process. The NOI also provided information on the date and time of the public scoping meeting. The NOI was published in the *Federal Register*, Vol. 73, No. 178, on September 12, 2008. There is no mandated time limit to receive written comments in response to the NOI under NEPA.

The City and USACE jointly held a public scoping meeting to solicit input from the community and public agencies to be considered in project design, alternatives selection, and on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS. The meeting was held on September 25, 2008 at 5:00 p.m. at the Folsom Public Library in Folsom, California. Fourteen people, including individuals and representatives from the public and private sectors, attended the meeting.

Appendix B of this EIR/EIS contains a table listing the substantive comments received on the NOP/NOI. Copies of the comment letters follow the table in Appendix B.

This EIR/EIS includes an evaluation of 17 environmental issue areas and other CEQA- and NEPA-mandated issues (e.g., cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts) for the “Land” analysis. The 17 environmental issue areas for the “Land” analysis are as follows:

- ▶ aesthetics;
- ▶ air quality;
- ▶ biological resources;
- ▶ climate change;
- ▶ cultural resources;
- ▶ environmental justice (required under NEPA);
- ▶ geology, soils, minerals, and paleontological resources;
- ▶ hazards and hazardous materials;
- ▶ hydrology and water quality;
- ▶ land use planning and agricultural resources;
- ▶ noise;
- ▶ parks and recreation;
- ▶ population, employment, and housing (socioeconomics under NEPA);
- ▶ public services;
- ▶ traffic and transportation;
- ▶ water supply; and
- ▶ utilities and service systems.

For several topic areas under the “Land” portion of the analysis, significant and potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level after implementation of mitigation measures required in this EIR/EIS. These topic areas include cultural resources; environmental justice; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; parks and recreation; population, employment, and housing; and public services.

For the “Water” analysis, 15 environmental issue areas were analyzed. The environmental issue areas for the “Water” analysis are as follows:

- ▶ aesthetics;
- ▶ air quality;
- ▶ biological resources;
- ▶ climate change;
- ▶ cultural resources;
- ▶ environmental justice (required under NEPA);
- ▶ geology, soils, and paleontological resources;
- ▶ groundwater;
- ▶ hazards and hazardous materials;
- ▶ hydrology and water quality;
- ▶ land use planning and agricultural resources;
- ▶ noise;
- ▶ parks and recreation;
- ▶ traffic and transportation; and
- ▶ utilities and service systems.

For several topic areas under the “Water” portion of the analysis, significant and potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level after implementation of mitigation measures required in this EIR/EIS. These topic areas include biological resources; cultural resources; environmental justice; geology, soils, and paleontological resources; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and agricultural resources; noise; parks and recreation; traffic and transportation; and utilities and service systems. CEQA and NEPA allow a lead agency to limit a discussion of the environmental effects in an EIR/EIS when the effects are not considered potentially significant. For the “Land” and “Water” analyses, there were topic areas that were not expected to have any significant project-specific or cumulative impacts when compared to existing conditions, and for which no further analysis was conducted for this EIR/EIS, as discussed further in Chapter 2, “alternatives.” Chapter 3, “Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures,” provides a brief explanation as to the City’s reasoning for not carrying these resource topics forward into the environmental analysis of the “Land” and “Water” portions of the project.

1.6 AGENCY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

USACE will use this EIS/EIR in exercising its regulatory authority under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. It also may be used as an informational document by Federal cooperating agencies, such as Reclamation, that could have permitting or approval authority for aspects of the project.

This EIS/EIR will be used by the City of Folsom and CEQA responsible and trustee agencies to ensure that they have met the requirements of CEQA before deciding whether to approve or permit project elements over which they have jurisdiction. It may also be used by other state and local agencies, which may have an interest in resources that could be affected by the project, or that have jurisdiction over portions of the project.

1.6.1 LEAD AGENCIES

The City of Folsom is the State lead agency for the project under CEQA, and USACE, Sacramento District, is the Federal lead agency under NEPA. The City has the principal responsibility for approving and carrying out the project and for ensuring that the requirements of CEQA have been met. USACE has the principal responsibility for making Clean Water Act Section 404 permit decisions and ensuring that the requirements of NEPA have been met. The EIR/EIS may also be used by other Federal, state, regional, and local agencies, which may have an interest in resources that could be affected by the project, or that have jurisdiction over portions of the project.

The following are the entitlements requested from the City for the project:

- ▶ certification of the EIR/EIS and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program,
- ▶ amendment of the Folsom General Plan,
- ▶ amendment of the Folsom Zoning Ordinance,
- ▶ adoption of the Folsom Specific Plan,
- ▶ adoption of a Public Facilities Financing Plan,
- ▶ approval of large-lot tentative maps,
- ▶ application to LAFCo for annexation of the project site to the City of Folsom, and
- ▶ possible approval of development agreements between the City and project applicant(s).

The project applicant(s) are requesting these approvals to accommodate proposed development on lands they control (i.e., lands owned). However, some approvals would apply to all lands in the SPA. It is anticipated that the City will also rely on this EIR/EIS for approval of other future discretionary entitlements and permits (e.g., small-lot tentative subdivision maps, design review approvals, use permits). The City will rely on this document to the degree that it adequately addresses the impacts of future development on the site (i.e., for specific issue areas where more detailed analysis was conducted). The City is the project proponent and lead agency for implementation of the water supplies and off-site water facilities necessary to satisfy the water demands of the SPA. The City will rely on this document to the degree that it adequately addresses the impacts of the specific manner in which those supplies and facilities are implemented. Depending on the final locations of specific facilities, the City may need to conduct supplemental environmental analysis of the specific issues presented.

The Proposed Action represents a Federal action because it would require one or more of the following Federal permits and authorizations:

- ▶ Department of the Army permit under Section 404 of the CWA for discharges of dredge or fill material into waters of the U.S.,
- ▶ ESA Section 7 consultation leading to issuance of a Biological Opinion and possible incidental-take statement for activities affecting endangered species,
- ▶ NHPA Section 106 consultation leading to the preparation of a Programmatic Agreement and/or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for activities affecting a cultural resource listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP, and

- ▶ Reclamation approval of the assignment of NCMWC's entitlement of up to 8,000 AFY of CVP surface water to the City.

1.6.2 TRUSTEE, RESPONSIBLE, AND COOPERATING AGENCIES

Under CEQA, a trustee agency is a state agency that has jurisdiction by law over natural resources that are held in trust for the people of the State of California. One trustee agency, the California Department of Fish and Game, meets that definition with respect to resources potentially affected by the project.

Under CEQA, a responsible agency is an agency other than the lead agency that has legal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project or elements of a project (California PRC Section 21069).

Under NEPA, a cooperating agency is any Federal agency other than the lead agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in an action requiring an EIS. Reclamation is serving as a cooperating agency under NEPA because it would use this EIS/EIR in determining whether to approve the assignment of 8,000 AFY of water to the City of Folsom.

Responsible and cooperating agencies are encouraged to actively participate in the CEQA and NEPA processes of the lead agencies, review the CEQA and NEPA documents of the lead agencies, and use the documents when making decisions on the project. In 2008, USACE sent letters to various Federal, state, and regional agencies requesting their participation as a Federal cooperating agency under NEPA. At the time of this writing, only Reclamation has responded to USACE requesting to serve as a Federal cooperating agency.

Several agencies other than the City and USACE have jurisdiction over the implementation of the elements of the project, as identified below.

FEDERAL AGENCIES

- ▶ U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Cooperating Agency)
- ▶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- ▶ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- ▶ National Marine Fisheries Service

STATE TRUSTEE AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

- ▶ California Air Resources Board
- ▶ California Department of Education
- ▶ California Department of Fish and Game
- ▶ California Department of Health Services
- ▶ California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- ▶ California Department of Transportation
- ▶ State Water Resources Control Board
- ▶ Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- ▶ Native American Heritage Commission
- ▶ State Historic Preservation Officer

REGIONAL AND LOCAL RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

- ▶ Natomas Central Mutual Water Company
- ▶ Folsom Cordova Unified School District
- ▶ County of Sacramento
- ▶ Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission
- ▶ El Dorado Irrigation District
- ▶ El Dorado Hills Fire Department

- ▶ County of El Dorado
- ▶ Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District
- ▶ Sacramento County Water Agency
- ▶ City of Rancho Cordova
- ▶ Sacramento County Municipal Services Agency

1.6.3 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS, PERMITS, AUTHORIZATIONS, AND APPROVALS FOR “LAND” AND “WATER”

The following list identifies permits and other approval actions and authorizations needed from Federal, state, regional, and local agencies for which this EIR/EIS may be used during these agencies’ decision-making processes. The following may be under the purview of regulatory agencies other than the lead agencies.

FEDERAL ACTIONS/PERMITS

- ▶ **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:** Department of the Army permit under Section 404 of the CWA for discharges of dredge or fill material into waters of the U.S. Consultation for impacts on cultural resources pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Consultation for impacts on Federally listed species pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA.
- ▶ **U.S. Bureau of Reclamation:** approval of Assignment of 8,000 AFY from NCMWC to City of Folsom, Water Service Contract Amendment for Change in Water Supply Delivery Schedule from Agriculture to M&I, and approval of an Encroachment Permit for Folsom South Canal Crossing.
- ▶ **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency:** reviewing the EIS, filing, and noticing; concurrence with Section 404 CWA permit.
- ▶ **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:** ESA consultation and issuance of incidental-take authorization for the take of Federally listed endangered and threatened species.
- ▶ **National Marine Fisheries Service:** ESA consultation and issuance of incidental-take authorization for the take of Federally listed endangered and threatened species.

STATE ACTIONS/PERMITS

- ▶ **California Department of Education:** approval of new school sites for which state funding is sought.
- ▶ **California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento Valley—Central Sierra Region:** California Endangered Species Act (CESA) consultation and issuance of take authorization (if needed) (California Fish and Game Code Section 2081), streambed alteration agreement (California Fish and Game Code Section 1602), and protection of raptors (California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5).
- ▶ **California Department of Transportation:** encroachment permits.
- ▶ **Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 5):** National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater permit (NOI to proceed under General Construction Permit) for disturbance of more than 1 acre; discharge permit for stormwater; general order for dewatering; and Section 401 CWA certification or waste discharge requirements; Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification; NPDES permit coverage for hydrostatic testing of pipeline (coverage expected under General Order for Low Threat Discharges to Surface Water)
- ▶ **State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO):** approval of a Programmatic Agreement and/or MOU for Section 106 compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

- ▶ **California Department of Public Health:** approval of an amendment to the City's Public Water System Permit.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL ACTIONS/PERMITS

- ▶ **Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission:** approval of annexation to the City of Folsom.
- ▶ **Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District:** authority to construct (for devices that emit air pollutants), health risk assessment, and Air Quality Management Plan consistency determination.
- ▶ **Sacramento County Water Agency:** approval for dedicated capacity in SCWA's Freeport Project Pipeline Facility,
- ▶ **Sacramento County:** approval of roadway encroachment permit for pipeline construction, tree removal permit (if needed), rezoning, use permit, and parcel map application for new WTP, approval of grading permit.
- ▶ **City of Rancho Cordova:** roadway encroachment permit for pipeline construction, tree removal permit (if needed), rezoning, use permit, and parcel map application for new Folsom Boulevard WTP.

1.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND ADDITIONAL STEPS IN THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT/NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT REVIEW PROCESS

This DEIR/DEIS 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 and approvals is provided to decision makers for the lead agencies, NEPA cooperating 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. 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.

Under CEQA, written comments on the DEIR must be postmarked no later than August 16, 2010. The review period under NEPA will end on September 7, 2010; however, the USACE will continue to accept comments on the DEIS until the ROD is issued. Comments should be sent to the following addresses:

Gail Furness de Pardo
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
E-mail: gdepardo@folsom.ca.us

Lisa Gibson
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, 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 meeting/hearing; comments on the DEIR/DEIS will be accepted throughout the meeting/hearing and will be recorded at the public comment table. Written 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 FEIR/FEIS.

1.8 ORGANIZATION OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The content and format of this EIR/EIS are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, the requirements of NEPA, the NEPA regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), and USACE NEPA regulations, as well as Appendix B to those regulations (NEPA implementation). The EIR/EIS is organized into the following chapters so that the reader can easily obtain information about the project and its specific environmental issues.

- ▶ The **cover sheet** identifies lead and any cooperating agencies, contact information for the lead agency contact person, the title of the project and its location, a brief description of the project, a brief abstract, and comment submission information.
- ▶ The **Executive Summary** presents an overview of the project and alternatives and associated environmental impacts/consequences; a listing of environmental impacts/consequences and mitigation measures; and impact conclusions regarding growth inducement, irreversible environmental changes, and known areas of controversy and issues to be resolved.
- ▶ **Chapter 1, “Introduction and Statement of Purpose and Need,”** explains the CEQA and NEPA processes; lists the lead, cooperating, responsible, and trustee agencies that may have discretionary authority over the project; specifies the underlying project purpose, need, and objectives to which the lead agencies are responding in considering the Proposed Project and project alternatives (both the “Land” and “Water” components); outlines the organization of the document; and provides information on public participation.
- ▶ **Chapter 2, “Alternatives,”** presents the Proposed Project Alternative and the alternatives to the Proposed Project for the “Land” portion of the project, and the Preferred Off-site Water Facilities Alternative and other alternatives for the “Water” portion of the project. This chapter contains the project description and describes the project characteristics and components, supporting on- and off-site infrastructure and roadway improvements, and required entitlements for each land use alternative. This chapter also describes the proposed Folsom Specific Plan and identifies the performance standards that will be incorporated into the specific plan and to which subsequent, tentative maps and improvement plans would be required to adhere to when submitted. This chapter provides a description of each alternative in comparison with the Proposed Project Alternative, and describes alternatives considered but eliminated from further consideration.
- ▶ **Chapter 3, “Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures,”** is divided into “A” and “B” sections which describe the setting, impacts and mitigation measures for the “Land” and “Water” portions of the project, respectively. The introduction to Chapter 3 explains the approach to the affected environment (i.e., environmental setting), presents the assumptions used in the environmental analysis, and provides definitions of the types of environmental effects. Each of the remaining sections in Chapter 3 is devoted to a particular issue area and describes the baseline, or existing conditions, and the regulatory setting, then provides an analysis of impacts at an equal level of detail for all project alternatives and mitigation measures that would avoid or eliminate significant impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level, where feasible and available.
- ▶ **Chapter 4, “Other Statutory Requirements,”** includes the list of cumulative projects/context for the assessment of cumulative impacts, growth-inducing effects, irreversible or ir retrievable commitment of

resources, relationship between short-term uses of the environment and maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the Proposed Project and alternatives under consideration (“Land” and “Water”).

- ▶ **Chapter 5, “References and Organizations and Persons Consulted,”** provides a bibliography of sources cited in the EIR/EIS and identifies the names and affiliations of persons who provided information used in preparing the document and provides information about public involvement.
- ▶ **Chapter 6, “Report Preparers,”** lists individuals who were involved in preparing this EIR/EIS.
- ▶ **Chapter 7, “Index,”** contains the NEPA-required index for easy reference of topics and issues.
- ▶ **Technical appendices** contain the background information that supports the EIR/EIS.

1.9 DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

This EIR/EIS incorporates by reference several previously prepared environmental documents and technical reports. The documents are identified below along with a brief discussion as to how they relate to the Off-site Water Facilities.

- ▶ **Freeport Regional Water Project EIR/EIS – (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 20020321320.** SCWA and EBMUD prepared an EIR/EIS in 2002 for the implementation of the Freeport Regional Water Project (Freeport Project), which included the construction and operation of a water supply project to meet regional water supply needs. The main objectives of the Freeport Project were to: (1) support acquisition of additional surface water entitlements for SCWA to promote efficient conjunctive use of groundwater in its Zone 40 service area, (2) construct facilities to enable delivery of existing and anticipated surface water entitlements to SCWA’s Zone 40 and EBMUD’s respective service areas, and (3) improve EBMUD system reliability and operational flexibility during droughts, catastrophic events, and scheduled major maintenance at Pardee Dam Reservoir.

This EIR/EIS incorporates by reference the previously certified EIR/EIS and supplemental permit documentation prepared for the Freeport Project. That previously certified EIR/EIS analyzes the potential physical environmental effects of constructing and operating the Freeport Project, which is currently nearing completion. The Freeport Project major facilities include: an intake structure/pumping plant on the Sacramento River near Freeport; a raw water pipeline in Sacramento and San Joaquin counties; and SCWA’s Vineyard Surface Water Treatment Plant (Vineyard SWTP) in central Sacramento County. SCWA’s use of the Freeport Project is also considered in Reclamation’s Operations Criteria and Plan for the Long-Term Operation of the CVP/State Water Project (SWP) (Reclamation 2008) and the supporting Biological Opinion (BO) issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (USFWS 2009)

This EIR/EIS incorporates by reference the Freeport Project EIR/EIS analysis of these water conveyance and intake facilities and does not revisit issues associated with the construction or operation of the existing Freeport Project facilities. A description of the potential Offsite Water Facility Alternatives the City is proposing to integrate into the existing Freeport Project is provided in Chapter 2, “Alternatives” of this EIR/EIS. The complete Freeport Project EIR/EIS may be downloaded from:
<http://www.freeportproject.org/nodes/project/environmental.php>.

- ▶ **Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan EIR (SCH No. 2002122068) and Zone 40 Water System Infrastructure Plan.** SCWA prepared an EIR for the 2002 Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan, which identifies future water demands within the Zone 40 Service Area and the water supply facilities necessary to accommodate projected demand. The Water Supply Master Plan provides policy direction at a programmatic level with the associated EIR broadly evaluating the construction and operation of new surface, groundwater, and recycled water supply facilities required for production, treatment, storage, and conveyance to areas within Zone 40. This EIR/EIS incorporates by reference the analysis of groundwater impacts resulting from

the implementation of the Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan along with the potential indirect impacts to the Cosumnes River.

SCWA's Water System Infrastructure Plan provides more project level detail required for the implementation of SCWA's preferred alternative and fills in the gaps of associated smaller infrastructure requirements. This includes describing facility construction and phasing, including operational requirements from existing conditions through ultimate build-out of the Zone 40 water system.

These two documents are available for download at:
<http://www.msa.saccounty.net/waterresources/files/Files.asp>.

- ▶ **White Rock Road Widening Project, Phases A, B, and C, EIR – (SCH No. 2007122088).** This EIR was prepared for the White Rock Road Widening Project to analyze and the potential environmental effects of widening the existing roadway and related improvements between Rancho Cordova and the Sacramento/El Dorado County line. Several of the Offsite Water Facility conveyance alignments follow the future planned alignment for White Rock Road, northeast of its intersection with Grant Line Road. This EIR/EIS acknowledges the potential that the Offsite Water Facility could be constructed concurrently with the White Rock Road widening project for this section of the corresponding conveyance alternatives. The complete widening project EIR may be downloaded from: <http://www.dera.saccounty.net/>.
- ▶ **Easton Project EIR – (SCH No. 2005062128).** The Easton Project, approved by the County of Sacramento, includes the build out of two communities, Glenborough at Easton and Easton Place, on approximately 1,390 acres stretching from Hazel Avenue on the west to Prairie City Road on the east. These communities would consist of a range of mixed commercial/office, a transit-oriented village, and open space and park uses. Alternative alignments of the offsite water facility considered in this EIR/EIS would follow the Easton Valley Parkway alignment, which is proposed as the main thoroughfare through Easton Project. This EIR/EIS acknowledges the potential that the Offsite Water Facility could be constructed concurrently with the construction of Easton Valley Parkway for this section of the corresponding conveyance alternative. The complete Easton Project EIR may be downloaded from: <http://www.dera.saccounty.net/>.
- ▶ **Zone 40 Central Surface and Groundwater Treatment Plant, Pipelines and Corporation Yard Negative Declaration – (SCH No 2004092050).** SCWA prepared this environmental document to assess the environmental effects of constructing the 78-acre Vineyard SWTP, an associated corporation yard, groundwater treatment facilities, and a treated water pipeline along portions of Florin and Excelsior Roads to serve SCWA's Northern Service Area. This treated water pipeline is commonly referred to as the Northern Service Area pipeline and is integrated into Offsite Water Facility Alternative 2B. Construction of these combined facilities was scheduled to begin in 2007 and ended in mid-2010. Offsite Water Facility alternatives evaluated in this EIR/EIS include the potential connection to facilities analyzed in this environmental document. The Zone 40 document may be reviewed at SCWA's main office during normal business hours.
- ▶ **Sacramento County General Plan Update Draft EIR – (SCH No. 2007082086).** Sacramento County is currently in the process of updating its General Plan and released a draft EIR for the General Plan Update in August of 2009. Major changes contemplated in the General Plan Update include four growth strategies: infill development, buildout of planned communities, revitalization of commercial corridors and, new growth areas. In conjunction with the new growth areas identified, the County is also proposing to expand the Urban Policy Area (UPA), which identifies specific areas within the unincorporated County where growth will occur.
- ▶ According to the draft EIR, the total anticipated increase in water demand between the No Project Scenario and the General Plan Update is 31,633 AFY, but does not factor in future demands from the Cities of Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and Folsom. Based on this increase in projected water use, the draft EIR concludes that additional water supplies would be needed and, if these demands were supplied entirely by groundwater, this would result in an exceedance of the Central Sacramento Groundwater Basin's sustainable yield of 273,000 AFY. This EIR/EIS assumes that these new demands would be met solely by groundwater under future cumulative conditions and incorporates by the reference the supporting analysis of potential

groundwater impacts along with the required mitigation. This document may be downloaded from: <http://www.dera.saccounty.net/PublicNotices/SQLView/ProjectDetails/tabid/71/Default.aspx?ProjectID=31418>.

1.10 STANDARD TERMINOLOGY, ACRONYMS, AND ABBREVIATIONS

1.10.1 STANDARD TERMINOLOGY

The following standard terminology is used in this EIR/EIS to refer to elements of the project (both “Land” and “Water” components):

- ▶ **Specific plan** refers to the Folsom Specific Plan.
- ▶ **Project** refers to the Folsom South of U.S. 50 project, including the combined project site, the area upon which the related off-site improvements are to be located, the area of the General Plan Amendment, and the Off-Site Water Facilities Study Area. Use of “project” can refer to one or all of the alternatives.
- ▶ **Proposed Project** refers specifically to the Proposed Project Alternative for the “Land” analysis.
- ▶ **Preferred Alternative** refers specifically to the Preferred Off-Site Water Facility Alternative for the “Water” analysis.

1.10.2 ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The following acronyms and abbreviations are used in this EIR/EIS.

Table 1-1 Acronyms and Other Abbreviations	
Term	Definition
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
µg/L	micrograms per liter
2020 Master Plan	<i>Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant 2020 Master Plan</i>
2020 Master Plant EIR	<i>Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant 2020 Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report</i>
AB	Assembly Bill
AC	Asbestos Cement
ACM	asbestos-containing material
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT	Average daily traffic
AEP	annual exceedance probability
AFY	Acre-feet per year
ALERT	Automated Local Evaluation in Real Time
Alquist-Priolo Act	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act
ALUP	Airport Land Use Plan
APE	area of potential effects

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
APN	Assessor Parcel Number
ARB	California Air Resources Board
Area 40	Aerojet Superfund site
AST	Above-ground Storage Tank
ATCM	Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure
ATV	all-terrain vehicle
AWWA	American Water Works Association
<i>B. sphaericus</i>	<i>Bacillus sphaericus</i>
B. P.	Before Present
BACT	Best Available Control Technology
Basin Plan	water-quality control plan
BAT	best available technology
BCT	best conventional pollutant technology
BMO	Basin Management Objective
BMP	best management practice
BSC	California Building Standards Commission
<i>Bti</i>	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis</i>
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA	State of California Occupational Safety and Health Administration's
Cal-Am	Cal-American Water Company
California PRC	California Public Resources Code
CALFED	California Bay-Delta Authority
CALSIMII	California Simulation Model II
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Clean Air Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CAWP	Central Amador Water Project
CBC	California Building Standards Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CD	Centralized Development

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
CDE	California Department of Education
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CDP	census designated place
CDPH	California Department of Public Health
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
Cfs	cubic feet per second
CGS	California Geological Survey
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CIP	capital improvement program
City	City of Folsom
City General Plan	<i>City of Folsom General Plan</i>
CIWMA	California Integrated Waste Management Act
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
CLOMR	Conditional Letters of Map Revision
CMU	Concrete Masonry Unit
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
COC	Constituents of Concern
County	Sacramento County
CPP	Cosumnes Power Plant
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CSC	California Species of Special Concern
CSCGMP	Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan
CSD-1	County Sanitation District No. 1
CSMP	Corridor System Management Plan
CTR	California Toxics Rule
CVFPB	Central Valley Flood Protection Board

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
CVP	Central Valley Project
CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement Act
CWA	Federal Clean Water Act
dBA	A-weighted Decibel
DBE	Design Basis Earthquake
DBH	diameter at breast height
DBP	disinfection by-products
DDT	dichloro diphenyl trichloroethane
DEIR	draft environmental impact report
DEIS	draft environmental impact statement
Delta	Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game
DHS	California Department of Health Services
DKS	DKS Associates
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DOF	California Department of Finance
DPC	Delta Protection Commission
DPM	Diesel particulate matter
DPROS	Department of Regional Parks, Recreation and Open Space
DSOD	Division of Safety of Dams
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
du/ac	dwelling units per acre
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
DWSAP	Drinking Water Supply Assessment Program
EA	environmental assessment
EBMUD	East Bay Municipal Utility District
ECORP	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
EDC	endocrine disrupting compound
EDCAQMD	El Dorado County Air Quality Management District
EDU	equivalent dwelling unit
EID	El Dorado Irrigation District
EIR	environmental impact report
EIS	environmental impact statement
ELF	extremely low frequency

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
EMF	electromagnetic field
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
ESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
ESWTR	Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
EWA	Environmental Water Account
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FCUSD	Folsom Cordova Unified School District
FEIR	final environmental impact report
FEIS	final environmental impact statement
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FIS	Flood Insurance Study
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FOE	Finding of Effect
FONSI	findings of no significant impact
FR	Federal Register
FRA	USDOT Federal Railroad Administration
FRWA	Freeport Regional Water Authority
FS	Feasibility Study
FSC	Folsom South Canal
g	gravity
G	gauss
GenCorp	Aerojet General Corporation
GET	Groundwater Extraction and Treatment
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GO	General Obligation
Gpd	gallons per day
Gpm	gallons per minute
GSWC	Golden State Water Company
H2S	Hydrogen Sulfate

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
HA	Hydrologic Area
HAA	Haloacetic Acids
HABS	Historic American Building Survey
HAER	Historic American Engineering Record
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutant
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HMMP	Hazardous Materials Management Plan
HMP	Hydromodification Management Plan
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
HP	horsepower
HPTP	historic property treatment plan
Hz	hertz
I-80	Interstate 80
ICBO	International Conference of Building Officials
IPCC	International Panel on Climate Change
IRWMP	Integrate Regional Water Management Plan
ISO	Insurance Services Office
ITA	Indian Trust Assets
IWS	Initial Water Supply
kV	kilovolt
kWh	Kilowatt hour
LAFCo	Local Agency Formation Commission
LAR	lower American River
lb/day	pounds per day
LEDPA	Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative
L _{eq}	Equivalent Sound Level
LID	Low Impact Development
LIM	Land Inventory and Monitoring
LOMR	Letters of Map Revision
LOS	level of service
LRT	light-rail transit

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tanks
M&I	Municipal and Industrial
MAF	Million Acre Feet
Master Plan	City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Master Plan
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
MEI	Maximally Exposed Individual
MEP	maximum extent practicable
MF	Micro-Filtration
mG	milligauss
MG	million gallons
Mgd	million gallons per day
MHMP	Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MMP	mitigation and monitoring plan
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
motocross	MX
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRP	monitoring and reporting program
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
msl	mean sea level
MTCO _{2e} /yr	Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent per Year
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
MTP2035	Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035
MUN	Municipal and domestic supply
MVA	megavolt amperes
MW	megawatt
MWh	Megawatt hour
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System
NCIC	North Central Information Center

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
NCMWC	Natomas Central Mutual Water Company
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan
NCWA	Northern California Water Agency
NDMA	n-nitrosodimethylamine
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program
NEHRPA	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Act
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAP	National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NFA	No Federal Action
NHC	Northwest Hydraulics Consultants
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NIEHS	National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
NIH	National Institute of Health
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO ₃	Nitrate
NOA	naturally occurring asbestos
NOI	notice of intent
NOP	notice of preparation
NO _x	oxides of nitrogen
NP	No Project
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priority List
NPS	National Park Service
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NRPA	National Recreation and Park Association
NSA	Northern Service Area
NTR	National Toxics Rule
NTU	Neotrophic Unit
O&M plan	operations and management plan
OCAP	Operations Criteria and Plan
OEHHA	California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OES	Governor's Office of Emergency Services
OHV	Off-Highway Vehicle

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
OHV Park	State Vehicular Recreation Area
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OU	Operable Unit
PA	programmatic agreement
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
Parkway	American River Parkway
pc/mi/ln	passenger cars per mile per lane
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PCE	tetrachloroethene
pCi/l	pico-curies per liter
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
PHG	Public Health Goal
PM ₁₀	Respirable Particulate Matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns
Porter-Cologne Act	Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1969
PP	Proposed Project
ppb	parts per billion
PPCP	Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products
ppm	parts per million
PSR	Project Study Report
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RD	Reclamation District
REC	recognized environmental condition
Reclamation	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
RHNP	Regional Housing Needs Plan
RI	Remedial Investigations
RIM	Resource Impact Minimization
ROD	record of decision
ROG	reactive organic gases
ROW	right-of-way
RT	Sacramento Regional Transit
RWD	reports of waste discharge

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
RWSP	Replacement Water Supply Project
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SASD	Sacramento Area Sewer District
SB	Senate Bill
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
SCS	Soil Conservation Service
SCWA	Sacramento County Water Agency
SDWA	Safe Water Drinking Act
SFID	School Facilities Improvement District
SFPD	School Facilities Planning Division
SGA	Sacramento Groundwater Authority
SHPO	state historic preservation officer
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SMFD	Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District
SMFD	Sacramento Metropolitan Fire Department
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
SPRR	Southern Pacific Railroad
SQIP	Stormwater Quality Improvement Plan
SR	State Route
SRA	State Recreation Area
SRCS	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
SRWP	Sacramento River Watershed Program
SRWTP	Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant
SSQP	Stormwater Quality Partnership
State CEQA Guidelines	California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SVRA	State Vehicular Recreation Area
SWMP	Storm Water Management Plan
SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SWTP	Surface Water Treatment Plant

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TCE	trichloroethylene
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
THM	Trihalomethane
TIA	transportation impact analysis
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TSMP	Toxic Substances Monitoring Program
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
U.S. 50	U.S. Highway 50
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UCD	University of California at Davis
UCMP	University of California Museum of Paleontology
UIC	Underground Injection Control Program
UPA	Urban Policy Area
URBEMIS	Urban Emissions Model
USA	Underground Service Alert
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USB	Urban Service Boundary
USC	United States Code
USDA	U. S. Department of Agriculture
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	Underground Storage Tank
UV	Ultra-violet light
V/C	Volume-to-capacity
VOC	volatile organic compound
vphpl	vehicles per hour per lane
WDR	waste discharge requirement
WFA	Water Forum Agreement

**Table 1-1
Acronyms and Other Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
WSMP	Water Supply Master Plan
WTP	Water Treatment Plant
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant