

## EXEMPTION ANALYSIS

### A. Project Description

The Mangini Ranch Phase 2 Project (Project) encompasses two properties recently known as “Folsom Real Estate South” and “Carpenter East.” The Project seeks approval of a Large Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map to create various large lots for future sale, lease and/or financing, and includes zoning for a total of 901 residences (441 units on single-family zone land and 460 units on multi-family zoned land) on a 118.7-acre site in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan in Folsom, California. In addition, the Project contains 27.1 acres of open space. The Project also seeks approval of a Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for the development of 545 residences (441 units on Single Family High Density zoned land and 104 units on Multi-Family Low Density zoned land). The Project (consisting of the combination of the Folsom Real Estate South and Carpenter East properties) includes requests for two Minor Administrative Amendments to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) to strategically match the applicant’s land use and design objectives to the needs of the current Folsom housing market. The first proposed amendment involves minor modifications to land use boundaries and internal street circulation. No changes are proposed to the acreage of Measure W open space. An internal connecting street is proposed to be relocated to provide better connectivity across Alder Creek Parkway and improve elementary school access. A roundabout is proposed to be removed at the request of the school district. The east boundary of the school site has been modified at the request of the FCUSD to better facilitate ingress/egress for the school site. The second proposed amendment includes a request that 12 of the entitled 51 single-family units from Mangini Ranch Phase 1 that are no longer planned to be built in Phase 1 be transferred to the Phase 2 site. This increase in development on the site would not represent an increase of development not previously considered in the EIR/EIS since this increase in acreage and development potential is offset by equal reductions in development that will be realized at the Mangini Ranch Phase 1 site.

### B. Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan

In 2011, the City of Folsom, together with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, prepared a joint environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS), which was certified prior to the adoption of the FPASP. In 2012, the City certified an Addendum to the EIR/EIS which analyzed an alternative water supply for the FPASP. Although this addendum was prepared and adopted by the City after the certification of the FPASP EIR/EIS, it gives the Plan Area a more feasible water supply and did not create any new significant or substantially more severe impacts. In 2014, the City approved the South of 50 Backbone Infrastructure Project and adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). In 2015, the City approved the Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment to the FPASP and certified an Addendum to the EIR/EIS, which included property proposed for development in the Project and amended various land uses in a portion of the Plan Area to better suit the needs of the current and future development climate of the City.

All of the proposed uses envisioned in the Project are permitted uses as shown on Table 4.3 of the FPASP. (See also FPASP DEIR, Table 3A.10-4.)

### C. CEQA Exemption

The City finds that the Project proposal is entirely consistent with the FPASP (see Exhibit I), and that there has been no “substantially changed condition(s)” (i.e. substantial changes in the project or circumstances, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a different environmental impact significance conclusion. Thus, the project is exempt from CEQA under Government Code section 65457 and Guidelines section 15182 as a residential project undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with a specific plan.

The large lot map includes parcels for non-residential uses (school and parks) that were previously approved in the FPASP. This fact does not preclude the application of the exemption in Government Code section 65457 and Guidelines section 15182 because these parcels are not proposed for development at this time.

The analysis in this document incorporates by reference the FPASP EIR/EIS, the associated Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, the 2012 Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND, the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, the July 25, 2014 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Record of Decision (ROD) for the FPASP, including the Mangini and Carpenter Projects (Exhibit B), and the May 22, 2014 ROD for the Backbone Infrastructure (Exhibit C).

The Army Corps concluded in the ROD for the Carpenter and Mangini Projects that supplemental EISs or Environmental Assessments were not warranted because the amended applications for those projects would reduce the acreage of waters of the U.S. that would be permanently affected and these reductions were not substantial. (Exh. B, p. 2.)

The environmental documents for the FPASP include mitigation measures imposed to mitigate plan-level environmental impacts and that apply to the proposed project. The Applicant will agree, as part of the conditions of approval for the proposed project, to comply with each of those mitigation measures. Moreover, for those mitigation measures with a financial component that applies plan-wide, the approved Public Facilities Financing Plan and Amended and Restated Development Agreement bind the Applicant to a fair share contribution for funding those mitigation measures.

### D. Environmental Resources

The City finds that, for the following resource categories, the Project’s potential impacts were fully analyzed and mitigated to the extent feasible in the FPASP EIR/EIS, the 2012 Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, the Backbone Infrastructure MND, and/or the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and do not require additional site-specific analysis: Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality,<sup>1</sup> Land Use and Planning, Mineral

---

<sup>1</sup> In compliance with one of the requirements of the FPASP EIR/EIS mitigation measures, Section 401 water quality certifications were obtained from the Central Valley RWQCB for the **Mangini Ranch Phase 2** CEQA Exemption Analysis

Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, and Recreation. Additionally, the FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis attached as Exhibit I provides exhaustive analysis that supports the determination that the Project is undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with the FPASP, including the Project's consistency with policies relevant to potential impacts in these categories.

In addition to the analysis of the Project's consistency with the FPASP in Exhibit I, site-specific studies have been prepared and provided to the City pursuant to the requirements set forth in the mitigation measures and conditions of approval adopted for the FPASP for subsequent development projects. (See Exhibits D [Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment], E [Biological Resources Assessment], F [Letter Report on Cultural Resources], G [Noise Study], H [Traffic Evaluation], and M [Water Demand Comparison].) These studies document the conclusion that the Project would not have any new significant or substantially more severe impacts (CEQA Guidelines, § 15162) for the following resource categories: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities.

## 1. Air Quality

In addition to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS (FEIR, pp. 1-22 to 1-34; DEIR, p. 3A.2-63), the 2012 Addendum (Addendum, pp. 3-5 to 3-6), the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND (MND, pp. 46 to 57), the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS (Addendum, pp. 4-6 to 4-17), and Exhibit I (Exh. I, p. 23), the August 2017 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis, and the November 20, 2017 Revision by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (attached as Exhibit D), concluded that Phase 2 of the Mangini Ranch development: (1) "complies with the requirements of the [FPASP] EIR/EIS and would not result in an increase in the severity of construction-related air quality impacts" (Exh. D, p. 10); (2) "would not result in an increase in the severity of operational-related air quality impacts compared with the Specific Plan EIR/EIS" (Exh. D, p. 11); and (3) would not result in an increase in the severity of air quality impacts related to air toxics, naturally occurring asbestos, carbon monoxide hotspots, or odors (Exh. D, pp. 11 to 14). The Mangini Ranch Phase 2 development's operational emissions would not exceed Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's significance thresholds. Mangini Ranch Phase 2 is consistent with the FPASP, and the mitigation measures in the MMRP for the FPASP EIR are applicable to and will be implemented for the Mangini Ranch Phase 2 development. Therefore, ECORP's analysis concluded that there would not be any new or substantially more severe significant air quality impacts compared with the significance determination contained in the FPASP EIR/EIS and the Backbone Infrastructure MND. (Exh. D, p. 15; see also November 20, 2017 Revision, p. 9.)

## 2. Biological Resources

In addition to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS (FEIR, pp. 1-38 to 1-63; DEIR, p. 3A.3-94), the 2012 Addendum (Addendum, pp. 3-7), the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND (MND, pp. 58 to 93), the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS (Addendum, pp. 4-18 to 4-30), and Exhibit I (Exh. I, pp. 15-20), the September 26, 2017

---

Folsom Real Estate South and Carpenter East properties, covering the Southern and Northern portions of the Project site, respectively. (See Exhibits J & K.)

Biological Resources Mitigation Measure Compliance Report by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (attached as Exhibit E) summarizes the general biological resources within the Project Site and assesses the suitability of the Project Site to support special-status species and sensitive habitat types. The impacts analyzed in the Biological Resources Report are of the same type, scope, and scale as those impacts addressed in the FPASP EIR, the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND, and the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS. (Exh. E, p. 20.) In other words, the Biological Resources Report did not find any new impacts, any effects that are peculiar to the project or project site, or any substantially more severe impacts than those analyzed in the FPASP EIR. The Biological Resources Report provides recommendations for how to implement the FPASP EIR's mitigation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts to special-status species and sensitive habitat types. These recommendations are consistent with the mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR and simply add new details about the timing of surveys required in the previously adopted mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the Streambed Alteration Agreement issued by the Department of Fish and Wildlife. (See Exh. E, pp. 4-16.) If any of the required surveys uncovers the presence of a special status species, the Biological Resources Report provides additional guidance on the consultations and mitigation measures that will be implemented. (Exh. E., pp. 4-16.)

Additionally, On April 2, 2014, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued its Biological Opinion (Exhibit L) for the Folsom Plan Area project, which consists of nine individual developments each with separate Corps 404 permit applications. One of these projects is the City's Backbone Infrastructure project, and another is the Folsom South project that encompasses Mangini Ranch Phase 2. (Exh. L, pp. 6, 9.)

### 3. Cultural Resources

In addition to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS (FEIR, pp. 1-81 to 1-86; DEIR, p. 3A.5-25), the 2012 Addendum (Addendum, pp. 3-8 to 3-9), the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND (MND, pp. 94 to 106), the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS (Addendum, pp. 4-31 to 4-39), and Exhibit I (Exh. I, p. 20), the September 20, 2017 Letter Report on cultural resources by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (attached as Exhibit F) assembles the various cultural resources permit conditions and mitigation measures for the project and reconciles them with the activities and studies carried out to date towards compliance with the same. (Exh. F, pp. 1-2.) Based on the reconciliation and analysis, ECORP made recommendations to the City for map conditions that are intended to be consistent and coordinated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in order to satisfy the overall requirements of the EIR. (See Exh. F, pp. 2-6.) ECORP concluded that the Project would have no new significant or substantially more severe impacts to cultural resources compared to the FPASP EIR/EIS, and its tiering documents (including the Backbone Infrastructure Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and the Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum). (Exh. F, p. 1.)

### 4. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

In addition to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS (FEIR, pp. 1-70 to 1-79; DEIR, pp. 3A.4-23, 3A.4-30), the 2012 Addendum (Addendum, pp. 3-8), the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND

(MND, pp. 117 to 119), the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS (Addendum, pp. 4-44 to 4-52), and Exhibit I (Exh. I, pp. 28-30), the August 2017 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis, and the November 20, 2017 Revision by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (attached as Exhibit D) found that Phase 2 of the Mangini Ranch development “complies with the requirements of the EIR/EIS and would not result in an increase in the severity of operational GHG emission-related impacts.” (Exh. D, p. 30). In particular, ECORP found that the Project’s “service population ratio of 4.30 does not exceed the project-level emission threshold of 4.5 metric tons per service population, which is derived from the AB 32 reduction target for 2020. Development in 2020 would not impede progress toward the reduction targets of AB 32.” (Exh. D, p. 30.) Similarly, the November 20, 2017 Revision found that the updated “service population ratio of 4.15 does not exceed the project-level emission threshold of 4.5 metric tons per service population, which is derived from the AB 32 reduction target for 2020. Development in 2020 would not impede progress toward the reduction targets of AB 32.” (Exh. D, November 20, 2017 Revision, p. 15.) Moreover, the analysis found that the Project “is consistent with the MTP/SCS” and, while development of the Project will produce GHG emissions, the Project “will not obstruct the achievement of the MTP/SCS emission reduction targets.” (Exh. D, p. 30.) The land use mix in the Mangini Ranch Phase 2 project is consistent with the FPASP, and the mitigation measures in the MMRP for the FPASP EIR are applicable to and will be implemented for the Mangini Ranch Phase 2 development. Therefore, ECORP’s analysis concludes that there would not be any new or substantially more severe climate change and GHG emission impacts compared with the significance determination contained in the FPASP EIR/EIS and the Backbone Infrastructure MND. (Exh. D, p. 31.)

## 5. Noise

In addition to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS (FEIR, pp. 1-127 to 1-132; DEIR, pp. 3A.11-51 to -52), the 2012 Addendum (Addendum, pp. 3-14), the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND, (MND, pp. 139 to 147) the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS (Addendum, pp. 4-66 to 4-74), and Exhibit I (Exh. I, p. 24), the August 23, 2017 Noise Study completed by Bollard Acoustical Consultants (attached as Exhibit G) found that, consistent with the noise impact analysis in the FPASP EIR, a portion of the Mangini Ranch Phase 2 project site will be exposed to future traffic noise levels in excess of the City of Folsom 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard. The impacts analyzed in the Noise Study are of the same type, scope, and scale as those impacts addressed in the FPASP EIR. In other words, the Noise Study did not find any new impacts, any effects that are peculiar to the project or project site, or any substantially more severe impacts than those analyzed in the FPASP EIR. The Noise Study provides recommendations for how to implement the FPASP EIR’s mitigation measures to achieve compliance with the City’s exterior and interior noise standards. These recommendations are consistent with the mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR and simply add new details about noise barriers (e.g., required height and materials) and windows (e.g., second-floor bedroom windows need minimum STC rating of 30) required in the previously adopted mitigation measures. (See Exh. G, p. 20.) Additionally, Bollard concluded that construction noise impacts at offsite locations are predicted to be insignificant because there are no existing residences or other noise-sensitive land uses in the immediate vicinity. (Exh. G, pp. 18-19.)

## 6. Transportation and Traffic

In addition to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS (FEIR, pp. 1-142 to 1-175; DEIR, p. 3A.15-157), the 2012 Addendum (Addendum, p. 3-16), the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS (Addendum, pp. 4-80 to 4-90), and Exhibit I (Exh. I, pp. 9-13), the September 5, 2017 Transportation Impact Study (Revised December 1, 2017) completed by T. Kear (attached as Exhibit H) assessed the Project's transportation impacts and concluded that, with the previously approved mitigation, the project does not create any new significant impacts under Existing with Project Conditions or EPPAP with Project Conditions when compared to the FPASP EIR/EIS and the Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum. T. Kear determined that the need to implement previously identified traffic improvements at five intersections would be triggered by the development of Mangini Ranch Phase 2. (See Exh. H, pp. 64-82.) The impacts to these intersections and the recommended improvements were all previously considered by the City as part of the approvals for the FPASP EIR/EIS and later Addenda. Additionally, all arterial and freeway study segments were found to operate at acceptable levels-of-service both with and without the project under all study scenarios. Lastly, the Study concluded that "the project does not create any new significant deficiencies under Existing with Project Conditions or EPPAP with Project Conditions." (Exh. H, p. 85.)

## 7. Utilities

In addition to the analysis in the FPASP EIR/EIS (FEIR, pp. 1-177 to 1-182; DEIR, pp. 3A.16-33 to -43), the 2012 Addendum (Addendum, p. 3-17), the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS (Addendum, pp. 4-91 to 4-95), and Exhibit I (Exh. I, pp. 26-28, 30-31), the September 27, 2017 Water Demand Comparison, prepared by MacKay & Somps, analyzed the difference in demand between the Project and the land uses approved in the FPASP. The approved land uses in the FPASP require a total of 214.9 acre feet per year (AFY). The Project's water demand is slightly higher, requiring a total of 216.5 AFY. MacKay & Somps determined that the slight (1.6 AFY) increase was due to the transfer of 12 development units from Mangini Ranch Phase 1, and that the corresponding water supply from Phase 1 for those units can be used in the Project area. (Exhibit M, p. 1.)

## E. Conclusion

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR/EIS, the 2012 Addendum, the 2014 Backbone Infrastructure MND, and the 2015 Westland/Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Addendum to the FPASP EIR/EIS as discussed above, Mangini Ranch Phase 2 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe impacts (CEQA Guidelines, § 15162). Additionally, the Project is undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with the policies of the FPASP. Thus, the project is exempt from CEQA under Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182 as a residential project undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with a specific plan.