

City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Amendments for Increased Residential Capacity Project

Findings and Facts in Support of Findings

State Clearinghouse No. 2023070470

City of Folsom

July 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		II
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
	2.1 Background	2
	2.2 Location	2
	2.3 Project Overview	2
	2.4 City Objectives in Preparing the 2035 General Plan Amendments	3
	2.5 Discretionary Approvals	4
3	ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS	5
4	FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA	7
5	RELATIONSHIP WITH FINDINGS MADE ASSOCIATED WITH CITY OF FOLSOM 2035 GENERAL PLAN EIR AND ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL PLAN	9
6	FINDINGS REGARDING IMPACTS THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT	10
	6.1 Section 3.1: Aesthetics	10
	6.2 Section 3.2: Air Quality	13
	6.3 Section 3.3a: Cultural Resources	18
	6.4 Section 3.3b: Tribal Cultural Resources	20
	6.5 Section 3.4: Energy	21
	6.6 Section 3.5: Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change	23
	6.7 Section 3.6: Land Use and Planning	24
	6.8 Section 3.7: Noise and Vibration	24
	6.9 Population and Housing	28
	6.10 Public Services	29
	6.11 Transportation	31
	6.12 Utilities and Service Systems	33
	6.13 Chapter 4: Cumulative Impacts	35
7	FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES	50
	7.1 Alternatives Considered but Rejected in the SEIR	50
	7.2 Alternatives considered in the SEIR	50

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
AFY	acre-feet per year
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CO	carbon monoxide
EIR	environmental impact report
EIS	environmental impact study
FAR	floor area ratio
Findings	Statement of Findings of Fact
FMC	Folsom Municipal Code
FPASP	Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
General Plan EIR	City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Update Final EIR
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MTP/SCS	Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NOx	nitrogen oxides
project	City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Amendments for Increased Residential Capacity Project
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
ROG	reactive organic gas
SACOG	Sacramento Council of Governments
SB	Senate Bill
SEIR	Subsequent EIR
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
TOD	transit-oriented development
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
VMT	vehicle miles traveled

1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000, et seq. (the "Guidelines") provide that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified that identifies one or more significant effects on the environment caused by the project unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings:

- ▶ Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the environmental impact report (EIR).
- ▶ Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- ▶ Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.¹

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, the City Council of the City of Folsom hereby makes the following environmental findings in connection with the proposed City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Amendments for Increased Residential Capacity Project (project), as more fully described in the Draft Subsequent EIR (SEIR) dated April 2024, SCH No. 2023070470. These findings are based upon written and oral evidence included in the record of these proceedings, comments on the Draft SEIR and the written responses thereto, and reports presented to the Planning Commission and City Council by City staff and the City's environmental consultant.

¹ Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21081; 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15091.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 BACKGROUND

The City adopted the 2021-2029 Housing Element in August of 2021. As part of the Housing Element update the City is required to establish and maintain sufficient multi-family and mixed-use land available to meet the target housing demand at all income levels over an eight-year period. The City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) obligation for the eight-year Housing Element cycle is 6,363 housing units, of which 3,567 units are to be affordable to low- and very low-income households (collectively referred to as the lower-income RHNA). If the City approves a project on a site designated in the Housing Element for the development of lower- or moderate-income housing at a lower residential density or a different income level than identified in the Housing Element sites inventory, the City must make findings that the remaining sites in the inventory have sufficient capacity to satisfy the unmet RHNA or identify replacement sites available to meet the unmet RHNA. This is a requirement of state law and is commonly referred to as the "no net loss" requirement. The City's 2021-2029 Housing Element identified sufficient sites to meet the City's RHNA for all income categories, with a surplus capacity of 490 lower-income units. Given the recent development trends in Folsom, additional capacity is needed to provide the City with a buffer to maintain the lower-income sites inventory as new developments are approved throughout the planning period.

Program H-2 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element directs the City to strategically increase residential densities in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay, the Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG) Transit Priority Areas (Glenn and Iron Point light rail stations), and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) Town Center to address the no net loss requirements.

2.2 LOCATION

The project planning area consists of the East Bidwell Mixed-use Corridor, the Glenn and Iron Point Transit Priority Areas, and the Folsom Plan Area. The East Bidwell Mixed-use Corridor extends from Highway 50 to Coloma Street. The corridor includes a mixed-use overlay designation that is comprised of the Central Commercial District, Creekside District, and College/Broadstone District. The two transit priority areas (Iron Point Station area and Glenn Station area) are located along Folsom Boulevard and provide a connection to Sacramento Regional Transit Light Rail. The Folsom Plan Area is the City's newest community and is located on approximately 3,500 acres south of Highway 50, east of Prairie City Road, North of White Rock Road, and west of the El Dorado County Line in the City of Folsom.

The FPASP was approved by the City Council in 2011 along with a joint EIR/EIS that was certified for City adoption of the FPASP (State Clearinghouse No. 2008092051). The FPASP covers the area within the City limits south of Highway 50 (Folsom Plan Area) and is a comprehensive planned community that will include a mix of residential neighborhoods, office and retail development, a mixed-use town center, and over 1,000 acres of open spaces and trails to serve a variety of needs in the community.

2.3 PROJECT OVERVIEW

To implement Program H-2 of the 2012-2029 Housing Element and increase opportunities for mixed-use and multi-family high density development to support low and moderate-income housing capacity in the City, the project includes amendments to the City's General Plan. Amendments would include increasing the minimum density and maximum floor area ratio (FAR) standards for the East Bidwell Corridor Mixed-Use Overlay designation, and establishing a new Transit-Oriented Development Overlay for the areas surrounding Iron Point and Glenn Stations. Factoring in existing development capacity, the net new capacity in these areas of the City would be approximately 4,164 housing units over the current General Plan.

The project would also result in the potential for an additional 1,882 residential units beyond what is currently allowed in the Folsom Plan Area. To account for increased residential development the project would reduce 251,266 square feet of non-residential development capacity in the Folsom Plan Area. General Plan land use amendments and FPASP amendments would include:

- ▶ Amend the land use and specific plan designations for Site 2 (10.52 acres) (“Site” refers to a proposed property for rezone) from industrial/office park to multi-family high density to allow for development of up to 400 multi-family housing units.
- ▶ Amend the land use and specific plan designations of Site 15 (13.22 acres) from community commercial to multi-family high density to allow for up to 320 multi-family housing units.
- ▶ Amend the land use and specific plan designations for Site 233 (11.54 acres) from general commercial to mixed-use to allow for development of up to 250 multi-family housing units.
- ▶ Amend the land use and specific plan designations for Site 76 (13.22 acres) from multi-family low density to multi-family medium density to allow for up to 230 multi-family housing units.
- ▶ Increase the maximum allowable density to increase the number of dwelling units allocated to the FPASP Town Center from 490 dwelling units to 1,250 dwelling units.
- ▶ Amend the Town Center overlay zone to establish a minimum density of 30 du/ac along with a minimum FAR of 0.2 and a maximum FAR of 2.0.
- ▶ Increase maximum height in the Town Center Overlay Zone from 50 feet to 60 feet to allow up to 6 stories (70 feet) for architectural features such as corner elements.
- ▶ Increase the number of dwelling units allocated to nine additional multi-family designated sites in the FPASP, outside the Town Center, from a total of 1,258 dwelling units to a total of 1,410 dwelling units.
- ▶ Deed-restrict several parcels in the Folsom Plan Area to only allow development of affordable housing, with a target of 890 deed-restricted affordable housing units to help meet the City’s lower income RHNA.

In addition, the project would amend the General Plan Mobility Chapter to include “roundabout prioritization” polices. These policies would require that consideration of future traffic controls should first determine whether roundabout traffic control is feasible, beneficial, and cost effective before considering alternative traffic controls, such as signalization or turn restrictions. Additionally, these policies address modifications to existing traffic controls, which would allow an existing traffic control to become a roundabout. Finally, the project also proposes several new General Plan Implementation Measures related to noise, mobility, and tribal cultural resources, among others.

2.4 CITY OBJECTIVES IN PREPARING THE 2035 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

The primary objectives for the project are as follows:

- ▶ Ensure a buffer to maintain low- and moderate-income housing sites sufficient to meet the City’s RHNA requirements;
- ▶ Implement 2021-2029 Housing Element Program H-2 to facilitate development and increase opportunities for mixed-use and multi-family high density development in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay, SACOG Transit Priority Areas outside the Historic District, and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Town Center;
- ▶ Establish a new Transit Oriented Development overlay designation; and
- ▶ Provide zoning and land use designations and development standards for low- and moderate-income housing sites.

2.5 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

The following summary of actions would occur as part of this project:

- ▶ Certification of the SEIR prepared for the project.
- ▶ Adoption of General Plan and FPASP land use amendments to accomplish the following:
 - Increase minimum density and maximum FAR standards for the East Bidwell Mixed-Use Overlay.
 - Establish a new Transit-Oriented Development Overlay designation and associated development standards.
 - Increase opportunities for multi-family high density development.
 - Increase the residential development capacity of specified sites in the Folsom Plan Area.
 - Increase the number of sites in the Folsom Plan Area for mixed-use and multi-family high density housing.
 - Increase minimum density and maximum FAR standards for the Folsom Plan Area Town Center Overlay.
 - Inclusion of the “roundabout prioritization” policies in the General Plan Mobility Chapter.
- ▶ Adoption of new Zoning Code provisions to accomplish the following:
 - Establish a new East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay designation in the Zoning Code and associated objective development standards.
 - Establish a new Transit Oriented Development Overlay designation and associated objective development standards.

3 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a SEIR on July 24, 2023. It was submitted to the California State Clearinghouse and distributed to interested and affected federal, state, and local agencies; interested parties; and organizations. The NOP was circulated for 30 days, from July 24, 2023 through August 23, 2023. A public scoping meeting was held on August 17, 2023 to provide the opportunity to comment on the scope of the SEIR. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft SEIR. The NOP and all comments received on the NOP are presented in Appendix A of the Draft SEIR.

Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes 2014) requires public agencies to consult with tribes during the CEQA process. A request was made to the California Native American Heritage Commission for a list of applicable tribes, and a notice to three tribes was circulated on July 11, 2023. Anna M. Starkey, United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), responded on July 31, 2023, to engage in consultation with the City about the project. On August 1, 2023, UAIC and the City had a virtual meeting in which they discussed project specifics and tribal involvement in the project. Some documentation such as previous environmental documents and project related information was requested by UAIC, which the City provided on August 17, 2023. On October 13, 2023, the City contacted UAIC to determine if there was any additional input from the tribe about the project so that the environmental document could be finalized. As part of ongoing discussions with the tribe the City added two new implementation measures to the General Plan to address tribal cultural resources. Consultation has since been concluded as of July 5, 2024.

The Draft SEIR includes an analysis of the following issue areas:

- ▶ Aesthetics;
- ▶ Air Quality;
- ▶ Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources;
- ▶ Energy;
- ▶ Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change;
- ▶ Land Use;
- ▶ Noise and Vibration;
- ▶ Population and Housing;
- ▶ Public Services and Recreation;
- ▶ Transportation; and
- ▶ Utilities and Service Systems.

In addition, the Draft SEIR includes an analysis in Chapter 3.0 determining that the project would not result in significant environmental impacts on the resources identified below:

- ▶ Agriculture and Forestry Resources;
- ▶ Biological Resources;
- ▶ Geology and Soils;
- ▶ Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- ▶ Hydrology and Water Quality;
- ▶ Mineral Resources; and
- ▶ Wildfire.

The City published the Draft SEIR for public and agency review on April 22, 2024. A 45-day public review period was provided, ending on June 6, 2024.

The Final SEIR was released in July 2024. The Final SEIR includes comments received on the Draft SEIR; responses to these comments; and revisions to the Draft SEIR, as necessary, in response to these comments or to amplify or clarify material in the Draft SEIR. The Draft and Final SEIR were made available for public review on the internet at www.folsom.ca.us/housingstudy.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 provides the criteria that a lead agency is to consider when deciding whether it is required to recirculate an EIR. Recirculation is required when “significant new information” is added to the EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR is given, but before certification. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5(a).) “Significant new information,” as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a), means information added to an EIR that changes the EIR so as to deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a “substantial adverse environmental effect” or a “feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement.”

Recirculation is not required where “the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5(b).) Recirculation also is not required simply because new information is added to the EIR — indeed, new information is oftentimes added given CEQA’s public/agency comment and response process and CEQA’s post-Draft EIR circulation requirement of proposed responses to comments submitted by public agencies.

In this legal context, the City of Folsom City Council finds that recirculation of the Draft SEIR prior to certification is not required. In addition to providing responses to comments, the Final SEIR includes revisions to expand upon information presented in the Draft SEIR; explain or enhance the evidentiary basis for the Draft SEIR’s findings; update information; and to make clarifications, amplifications, updates, or helpful revisions to the Draft SEIR. The Final SEIR’s revisions, clarifications and/or updates do not result in any new significant impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

In summary, the Final SEIR demonstrates that the project will not result in any new significant impacts or increase the severity of a significant impact, as compared to the analysis presented in the Draft SEIR. The changes reflected in the Final SEIR also do not indicate that meaningful public review of the Draft SEIR was precluded in the first instance. Accordingly, recirculation of the SEIR is not required as revisions to the SEIR are not significant as defined in Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

4 FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

This statement of Findings of Fact (Findings) addresses the environmental effects associated with the General Plan Amendments for Increased Residential Capacity (project). These Findings are made pursuant to CEQA under Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. 15000, et seq (CEQA Guidelines). The potentially significant impacts were identified in the Final SEIR that includes the Draft SEIR.

Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines require that the lead agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation for the rationale for each finding. The City is the lead agency responsible for preparation of the EIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines states, in part, that:

- a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 - 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
 - 2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 - 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

In accordance with Public Resource Code Section 21081 and Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, whenever significant impacts cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered "acceptable." In that case, the decision-making agency may prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines state that:

- a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
- b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

The Final SEIR for the project identified potentially significant effects that could result from project implementation. However, the City finds that the inclusion of mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce all of those effects to less than significant levels.

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City adopts these Findings as part of its certification of the Final SEIR for the project. Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the Public Resources Code, the City of Folsom City Council also finds that the Final SEIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment as the lead agency for the project. As required by CEQA, the City, in adopting these Findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project. The City finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these Findings, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

5 RELATIONSHIP WITH FINDINGS MADE ASSOCIATED WITH CITY OF FOLSOM 2035 GENERAL PLAN EIR AND ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL PLAN

The City certified the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Update Final EIR (General Plan EIR) and adopted the General Plan in August 2018. This action included the adoption of the Folsom General Plan EIR CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations that addressed significant impacts identified in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan was amended in August 2021 for the Housing Element Update. This action did not include adoption of a CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations as no new significant impacts were identified as part of the Folsom Housing Element Update Project.

A portion of the project is located in FPASP south of Highway 50. The City adopted the FPASP and certified the Final EIR/Environmental Impact Study (EIS) (FPASP EIR/EIS) in June 2011. This action included the adoption of the FPASP EIR/EIS CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations that addressed significant impacts identified for the Folsom Plan Area. The 2035 General Plan and its EIR incorporated the FPASP and its policies and impact analysis.

The project would replace existing land uses and policy provisions of the General Plan. The Final SEIR identified that the project would not have environmental effects that would result in a substantial increase in severity of significant environmental impacts identified in the General Plan EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 as disclosed in these Findings.

The City Council readopts the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Update Final EIR CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for impacts where the Final SEIR did not identify any new significant environment effects or a substantial increase in severity of environmental effects disclosed in the General Plan EIR. The Folsom General Plan Update CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations and the FPASP Project CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations are incorporated by reference herein by this reference. They are on file and available from the City Clerk.

6 FINDINGS REGARDING IMPACTS THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT

This section identifies those impacts where the Final SEIR did not identify any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of environmental effects disclosed in the General Plan EIR. This section also identifies those potentially significant impacts that would be reduced to a less-than-significant impact through implementation of mitigation measures.

6.1 SECTION 3.1: AESTHETICS

Impact 3.1-1: Damage to Scenic Resources within a Scenic Corridor

The proposed project would result in increased density and taller residential uses and mixed-use development in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay, the new transit-orientated development (TOD) overlay designation, and Folsom Plan Area. Implementation of the proposed project would result in intensified development in the proposed rezone sites south of Highway 50 that could result in denser and taller development on sites. Denser and taller development would substantially degrade the existing views and the quality of the public views of the Folsom Plan Area from the County-designated scenic corridor, Scott Road. The project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact than was addressed in the General Plan EIR and the FPASP EIR/EIS. Project impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The FMC identifies specific scenic corridors within the city and regulates signage along these routes to minimize additional visual impact. Blue Ravine Road, East Bidwell Street (from Blue Ravine Road east to the city limits), and Folsom Boulevard are designated scenic corridors in the city. Future development in the East Bidwell Mixed Used Overlay and TOD Overlay would result in increased minimum density, maximum FAR standards, and building height, which could occur in the vicinity of the City designated scenic corridors. Future development would have a building height limit of up to four stories or 50 feet (35 feet near single family residential and 60 feet for corner elements only) in the East Bidwell Mixed Used Overlay and a building height limit of up to five stories or up to 60 feet (70 feet for corner elements only) in the new TOD Overlay. Future development would be required to comply with FMC Chapter 17.59 regarding placement of signage to protect views from scenic corridors, which requires approval from the Planning Director for signs visible from a scenic corridor.

Furthermore, future development in the East Bidwell Mixed Used Overlay and the new TOD overlay would generally improve the visual quality of the affected areas by developing vacant, underutilized, or aging properties and creating a more unified visual experience consistent with the surrounding development. Scott Road south of White Rock Road is a County-designated scenic corridor. The proposed rezone sites 11, 15, and 16 in the Folsom Plan Area are visible from the intersection of Scott Road and White Rock Road. Views of the Folsom Plan Area from Scott Road consist of grasslands on rolling hills and scattered oak trees. Development identified in the FPASP would change the existing grassland and oak woodlands to urban land uses. Similar to the findings of the FPASP EIR/EIS, development as part of the project in the Folsom Plan Area would add to the alteration of existing views and the quality of the public views from Scott Road. However, these sites were planned for development and analyzed as such in the FPASP EIR/EIS. The

proposed project would result in denser development on these sites than previously proposed. Impacts would continue to degrade the scenic corridor along Scott Road. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the existing General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.1-6 and 3.1-7).

Impact 3.1-2: Substantially Degrade the Existing Visual character or Quality of Public Views

The project would result in higher density residential uses and mixed-use development in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay, the Glenn Station TOD overlay area, the Iron Point Station TOD overlay area, and Folsom Plan Area. The project would result in development that is similar in character to what was previously evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The project would be subject to the City's General Plan policies, City's Design Guidelines, FPASP Community Design Guidelines, and City Municipal Code requirements that address design compatibility and visual character. However, similar to the findings of the FPASP EIR/EIS future development under the project would substantially change the existing visual character and quality of public views of the Folsom Plan Area from grasslands on rolling hills and narrow valley and oak woodlands to urban land uses. The project, however, would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact than were addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with FMC Chapters 17.06, 17.23, and 17.59.040 and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1 and 3A.1-4.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Implementation of the project would result in increased minimum density, and maximum FAR standards for the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay and establish a new TOD overlay designation for the areas surrounding Iron Point and Glenn Light Rail Stations. Future development would have a building height limit of 50 feet (35 feet near single family residential and 60 feet for corner elements only) in the East Bidwell Mixed Used Overlay and a building height limit of 60 feet (70 feet for corner elements only) in the new TOD overlay designation. The project would also include amendments to the FPASP to increase residential development on the proposed rezone sites within the Folsom Plan Area. Development would occur in the same footprint as analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Implementation of the project would result in the development of higher density residential uses on currently vacant or underutilized parcels within the city that are currently and/or are planned for urban land uses.

Future development in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay and the new TOD overlay designation under the project would be infill development intended to increase the visual quality of the affected areas, create a more unified visual experience, and fill in vacant and undesirable visual areas with new development. Future development in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay and the new TOD overlay would be regulated by FMC Chapter 17.06 (Design Review) and City of Folsom Multifamily Design Guidelines as well as possibly the Folsom Objective Design and Development Standards (if approved by the City Council) to ensure design compatibility with surrounding development. Chapter 17.23 of the Municipal Code requires consideration of public views in design details within the mixed-use zones in the city. Chapter 17.59.040 of the Municipal Code regulates the appearance and lighting of signs that are visible from a City-designed scenic corridors.

Development in the Folsom Plan Area would be required to implement FPASP Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1 and 3A.1-4 to minimize impacts related to visual degradation by maintaining a landscaped corridor adjacent to Highway 50 and locating construction staging areas and material away from sensitive land uses. While uses may intensify within the Folsom Plan Area, only in the Town Center Overlay Zone would the height restrictions increase from a maximum of

50 feet to a maximum of 60 feet with allowances for up to 70 feet for architectural features such as corner elements. Development as part of the project within the Folsom Plan Area would be subject to FPASP requirements to maintain 30 percent open space to preserve existing scenic qualities. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impacts identified in the existing General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.1-7 through 3.1-9).

Impact 3.1-3: Conflict with Applicable Zoning and Other Regulations Governing Scenic Quality

Future development associated with the project would be subject to FMC Chapters 17.06 and 17.23, City of Folsom Multifamily Design Guidelines, and FPASP Community Design Guidelines to address design compatibility with surrounding development. Additionally, development under the project would be subject to Chapter 17.59.040 of FMC to address the appearance and lighting of signs that are visible from a City-designed scenic corridors. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. The project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact than were addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with FMC Chapters 17.06, 17.23, and Chapter 17.59.040.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Future development associated with the project would comply with the FMC Chapter 17.06, which establishes procedures and provides regulations for the design review process for development within the city, Chapter 17.23, which provides design standards for mixed-use zone within the city, and Chapter 17.59.040, which provides regulations for the placement of signage in scenic corridors within the city. Because future development associated with the project would be subject to these regulations, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality (Draft SEIR, pages 3.1-9 and 3.1-10).

Impact 3.1-4: Create a New Source of Substantial Light or Glare

Future development associated with the project would result in light and glare impacts similar to those anticipated for the planned urban land uses as part of the General Plan. The project would be subject to the City's General Plan policies, Municipal Code, and applicable design guidelines that address lighting and glare. Development of the Folsom Plan Area south of Highway 50 has resulted in and is creating additional sources of light and glare, which were evaluated in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Since this project does not increase the footprint of development beyond that in the FPASP no new sources of light and glare would be created apart from the building height increase in the Town Center Overlay Zone. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact than were addressed in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with California Building Code building standards; FMC Chapters 17.59.040, 17.23, and 17.06; General Plan Policy NCR 2.1.3; Implementation Program NCR-6; and implementation of FPASP adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Future development would increase the amount of light and glare through the installation of exterior lighting and reflective window glazing within the project planning area similar to the conditions anticipated for the planned urban land uses for the City under the General Plan. Consistent with the General Plan EIR, compliance with the following would reduce and minimize light and glare impacts:

- ▶ California Building Code building standards, which require minimizing light pollution and nighttime glare;
- ▶ City's Municipal Code Chapter 17.59.040 (Signage in Scenic Corridors), which identifies designated scenic corridors within the city and includes special provisions for the placement and lighting of signage in scenic corridors;
- ▶ City's Municipal Code Chapter 17.23 (MU, Mixed Use Zones), which provides design standards for mixed-use zones, including lighting;
- ▶ lighting recommendations contained in the City's Multifamily Development Design Guidelines and the FPASP Community Design Guidelines;
- ▶ General Plan Policy NCR 2.1.3, which require lighting to be directed downward to minimize overspill and glare onto adjacent properties and reduce vertical glares; and
- ▶ General Plan Implementation Program NCR-6, which requires shielding or screening lighting fixtures, prohibiting the use of unusually high intensity light fixtures, and using appropriate building materials (e.g., low-glare glass, low-glare building glaze, and neutral, earth-toned colored paint and roofing materials). Any future development in the Folsom Plan Area would be required to implement FPASP Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5 to reduce significant impacts associated with new sources of light and glare through compliance with lighting standards and implementation of a lighting plan. In addition, Chapter 17.06 (Design Review) of the City's Municipal Code requires submittal of site plans (e.g., lighting, architectural, and landscaping plans) for design review approval. The design review process for future development as part of the project would ensure that the location, design, intensity of all exterior lighting, and use of low-glare building material would reduce effects to day or nighttime views due to new sources of substantial light and glare in the area. However, even with compliance with General Plan policies, FPASP mitigation, and the FMC, additional lighting and glare from implementation of project buildout would remain significant. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the existing General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.1-10 through 3.1-12).

6.2 SECTION 3.2: AIR QUALITY

Impact 3.2-1: Increase in Construction-Related Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors Associated with the Project

The project would result in an increase of 6,046 additional residential units and a reduction of 251,266 square feet of commercial and industrial land uses in Folsom. The project would not generate construction emissions of any criteria air pollutants or precursors (reactive organic gas [ROG] and nitrogen oxides [NOx]), that would exceed SMAQMD's daily mass emissions thresholds of significance. In addition, future development under the project would be required to adhere to Rule 403 overseen by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), in accordance with General Plan Policy NCR 3.2.6. Development within FPASP would be subject to Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a and 3A.2-1c from the FPASP EIR/EIS. Therefore, the project would not introduce a new or substantially more

severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No new mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy NCR 3.2.6 and implementation of adopted FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a and 3A.2-1c.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

General Plan Policy NCR 3.2.6 requires coordination with SMAQMD to ensure projects incorporate feasible mitigation measures to reduce air pollution from both construction and operations, if not already provided for through project design. In accordance with General Plan policy NCR 3.2.6, future development under the project would be required to comply with SMAQMD Rule 403 that requires implementation of dust control measures to reduce fugitive dust emissions. In addition, projects within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a and 3A.2-1c, which require implementation of Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and require conducting a project level analysis to disclose PM₁₀ emissions. Compliance with existing regulations and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS mitigation measures would ensure that impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.2-12 through 3.2-16).

Impact 3.2-2 Increase in Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors Associated with the Project that Could Contribute to a Violation of Air Quality Standards

The project would result in increased residential development, a reduction in commercial and industrial land uses, and would not propose any new stationary sources of pollution in the project planning area. Although the project would generate greater mass emissions than the land uses in the 2035 General Plan EIR, the project would be more efficient on a per person basis, thus the project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the 2035 General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy NCR 3.1.5 and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIR adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.2-2.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Based on the modeling conducted for the project, implementation of the 2035 General Plan and project would similarly result in criteria pollutant emissions that would exceed SMAQMD thresholds of 65 lb/day of ROG and NO_x, 80 lb/day and 14.6 tpy of PM₁₀, and 82 lb/day and 15 tpy of PM_{2.5}. However, the project would accommodate an additional 15,418 persons in the project planning area, an increase from 38,908 to 54,326 (40 percent increase) as compared to 2035 General Plan projections. While the project would increase emissions overall, as shown in Table 3.2-7 of the SEIR (page 3.2-18). Buildout of the General Plan with the project would result in a decrease in per capita emissions as compared to the 2035 General Plan, as shown in Table 3.2-8 of the SEIR (page 3.2-19). Therefore, while

the project would exceed thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} similar to the 2035 General Plan EIR, the emissions per capita would decrease for each pollutant. In addition, development facilitated by the project would comply with General Plan Policy NCR 3.1.5, which requires an individual development project that would exceed the SMAQMD operational thresholds to incorporate design or operational features that result in at least a 15 percent reduction in emissions.

The project would include amendments to the FPASP to increase residential development on the proposed rezone sites within the Folsom Plan Area. Development in the Folsom Plan Area would result in increased emissions in the project planning area. Therefore, development within the Folsom Plan Area would be subject to FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure 3A.2-2 that requires implementation of measures contained in the Air Quality Mitigation Plan prepared for the FPASP EIR/EIS to reduce operational air pollutant emissions. Because the project would be more efficient on a per capita basis, the project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the 2035 General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.2-16 through 3.2-21).

Impact 3.2-3: Consistency with Air Quality Planning Efforts

Based on the region's existing air quality and attainment status, air quality plans have been prepared to document how the region would achieve attainment of standards for nonattainment pollutants. The project would increase population at a greater rate than vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in Folsom. Therefore, similar to the 2035 General Plan EIR, the project would be consistent with SMAQMD's Ozone Attainment Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). The project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with SMAQMD's Ozone Attainment Plan and the MTP/SCS.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

SMAQMD's Ozone Attainment Plan and MTP/SCS are the regional air quality plans in effect for the City of Folsom. The SMAQMD CEQA Guidelines recommend an assessment of the rate of increase of VMT and population for plan level analysis, such as the project, for determining consistency with SMAQMD's Ozone Attainment Plan and MTP/SCS. If VMT per service population were to decrease as a result of the project implementation, the project would be determined to be consistent with the overall intent of the SMAQMD's Ozone Attainment Plan and MTP/SCS. As shown in Table 3.10-2 of the SEIR (page 3.10-16), implementation of the project would have a reduced VMT per capita of approximately 6.62 when incorporating the trip generation rate reduction and trip distance reduction associated with low-income units. Therefore, implementation of the project would reduce VMT per capita in the project planning area and the project would be consistent with SMAQMD's Ozone Attainment Plan and MTP/SCS. The project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.2-21 and 3.2-22).

Impact 3.2-4: Increase in Local Mobile-Source Emissions of Carbon Monoxide

Impact AQ-4 of the 2035 General Plan EIR concluded that buildout of the 2035 General Plan would not be expected to substantially contribute to emission concentrations that would exceed the ambient air quality standards and as a result, Impact AQ-4 was determined to be less than significant. The project would not substantially increase traffic volumes to a level that would result in a carbon monoxide (CO) hotspot. Therefore, the project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR, and this impact will remain less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

SMAQMD has updated its CEQA guide and screening criteria since the release of the General Plan EIR. SMAQMD no longer has a recommended screening criteria for assessing the potential of a CO hotspot; however, other air districts, such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), have numerical screening criteria available. Based on the transportation analysis prepared for the project, the project would result in a maximum of 1,100 new trips per day at any one intersection, thus the project would not introduce new vehicle trips to an intersection meeting the BAAQMD threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour. Additionally, the project would include a "roundabout prioritization" policy that will assist in reducing vehicular delays and idling near traffic lights, help improve flow of traffic, and improve air quality as a result. A CO hotspot would not result from the project. Moreover, CO emissions have historically decreased due to the advent of catalytic converters and progressively more stringent fuel economy standards. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.2-22 through 3.2-24).

Impact 3.2-5: Increase in Health Risks Associated with Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants

Development under the project would occur over 12 years, making the construction schedule more compact as compared to the General Plan EIR and possibly generating a higher rate of emissions for a shorter period of time. However, the project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with SMAQMD best management practices and General Plan Policies NCR 3.1.3, NCR 3.2.7, and LU 6.1.3; and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Development under the project is assumed to occur over 12 instead of 18 years, while reducing the square footage of commercial and industrial land uses and increasing the residential units in the project planning area. As in the General Plan EIR, no stationary sources in the project planning area would generate substantial TACs that could create a significant impact that would affect nearby existing and future sensitive receptors. With the decreased acreage of commercial land use, no major stationary sources would be added that could generate substantial toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions.

As discussed in Impact 3.2-5 of the SEIR (pages 3.2-24 and 3.2-25), California Air Resources Board (CARB) recommends avoiding siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet from a freeway or high-volume roadway. Highway 50 is classified as a high-volume freeway with over 100,000 vehicle trips a day. Site 60 in the Folsom Plan Area is located within 500 feet of Highway 50 and is designed for residential development in the FPASP. The project would increase the residential

development capacity on Site 60, but does not include new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of Highway 50. Therefore, the project would not conflict with CARB's direction in its 2005 Land Use Handbook.

Implementation of SMAQMD best management practices would result in the reduction of diesel PM exhaust emissions in addition to criteria air pollutant emissions, particularly the measures to minimize engine idling time and maintain construction equipment in proper working condition and according to manufacturer's specifications. Additionally, development under the project would be subject to the Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices for off-road construction equipment, which reduce particulate exhaust emissions by 45 percent and regulate the opacity of exhaust from all off-road diesel-powered equipment. Development within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to adhere to FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure 3A.2-4a to reduce construction TACs. Implementation of these measures would further reduce TACs in the Folsom Plan Area.

The project would be consistent with 2035 General Plan Policies NCR 3.1.3 to reduce the VMT in the project planning area through encouraging other forms of transit such as walking, biking and public transportation; NCR 3.2.7 to reduce construction-generated TAC emissions by requiring reduced-emissions equipment, replacing older engines, and implementing idling-reduction techniques; and LU 6.1.3 to support development of high-density residential units, which would reduce VMT and trip lengths and increase efficiency in each residential unit resulting in reduced operational-generated TAC emissions. Compliance with each of these policies would reduce TAC emissions in the project planning area.

Because the buildout of the project would occur next to existing and future sensitive receptors, it cannot be assured that construction-generated TAC emissions could be reduced to less-than-significant levels for all development as part of the project. Thus, the project would be subject to mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR and FPASP EIR/EIS. The project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.2-24 and 3.2-25).

Impact 3.2-6: Increase in Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Emissions of Odors

Implementation of the project could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of objectionable odors. While the project would not result in major sources of odors, odorous emissions from construction equipment throughout buildout of the project could result in odor impacts. Since the project is not introducing any new stationary sources of odor and construction would occur in the same areas as under the General Plan, the project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond the implementation of FPASP adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a and 3A.2-1f.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project does not include any uses identified by SMAQMD as being associated with odors. The project would not result in a source of operational odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people. The project would reduce commercial and industrial land uses and thus result in less of an odor impact as compared to the General Plan EIR. The project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe operational odor impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

Odorous emissions from construction equipment throughout buildout of the General Plan could affect a substantial number of people. The project planning area is in a residential area, and as more construction is completed, more

people will be living in the project planning area. Over the 12-year buildout of the project, with residencies within the project planning area, many people could be exposed to odor impacts. As stated in the General Plan EIR, it is infeasible to allow new development near existing developments and not have the possibility of odorous emissions that would impact nearby receptors, thus the project would be subject to mitigation measures from the 2035 General Plan EIR in the project planning area. For example, future development within the Folsom Plan Area would implement Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1a to include measure to control air pollutant emissions generated by construction activities and Mitigation Measure 3A.2-1f to implement SMAQMD's Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices during construction. The project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.2-25 through 3.2-27).

6.3 SECTION 3.3A: CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 3.3-1 Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource

The 2035 General Plan EIR Impact CUL-1 determined that implementation of the 2035 General Plan could result in impacts to historical resources and identified that impacts to historical resources would be significant and unavoidable. Similarly, Impact 3A.5-1 of the FPASP EIR/EIS determined that implementation of the FPASP could result in impacts to historical resources and identified that even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1b, effects would remain significant and unavoidable. Because this issue was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and the FPASP EIR/EIS and the proposed footprint of development has not changed from what was in those documents, there would be no additional impacts as a result of implementing the project. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with existing federal and state regulations, and General Plan Policies NCR 1.1.4, NCR 5.1.1, NCR 5.1.2, NCR 5.1.4, and NCR 5.1.5; and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIR adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Future development would be subject to federal (National Historic Preservation Act), state (PRC Section 21000 et. Seq. and California Historical Building Code), and local regulations (General Plan Policies) designed to protect cultural resources. General Plan Policy NCR 1.1.4 encourages new developments to plant native vegetation, including that which is important to Native American lifeways and values, and drought tolerant species and prohibit the use of invasive plants. General Plan Policy NCR 5.1.1 requires historic buildings and sites to be preserved or incorporated into the design of new development, whenever feasible. General Plan Policy NCR 5.1.2 requires the maintenance of an inventory of prehistoric and historic resources, including structures and sites, which would minimize the chance that a historic resource would unknowingly be adversely impacted. General Plan Policy NCR 5.1.4 requires compliance with City, State, and Federal historic laws and regulations to protect and assist in the preservation of historic and archeological resources, which includes carrying out project-level cultural resources surveys, evaluations of significance, determinations of impact, and development of appropriate preservation or mitigation measure. General Plan Policy NCR 5.1.5 encourages obtaining Federal, State, and private funding and incentives for maintaining and rehabilitating historic buildings and sites, which would preserve existing resources.

Future development within the Folsom Plan Area would implement Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b to perform an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources for the California Register of Historic Places and perform treatment where damage

or destruction cannot be avoided. Because this issue was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and the FPASP EIR/EIS and the proposed footprint of development has not changed from what was in those documents, there would be no additional impacts as a result of implementing the project (Draft SEIR, pages 3.3-16 through 3.3-19).

Impact 3.3-2 Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of an Archaeological Resource

The General Plan EIR Impact CUL-2 determined that implementation of the 2035 General Plan could result in significant impacts to archaeological resources and identified that even with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 (General Plan Implementation Program NCR 7), effects would remain significant and unavoidable. Similarly, Impacts 3A.5-1 and 3A.5-2 determined that implementation of the FPASP could also result in impacts to archaeological resources and identified that even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.5A-1b and 3A.5-2 effects would remain significant and unavoidable. Future development associated with project could be located on parcels that contain known or unknown archaeological resources and ground-disturbing activities could result in discovery or damage of yet undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR or the FPASP EIR/EIS.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with state and local regulations and implementation of the FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1b and 3A.5-2.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Future development would be subject to state regulation (PRC Section 21000 et. Seq) that requires local agencies to determine whether projects may have a significant effect on archaeological and historical resources, City regulations (Standard Construction Specifications and Details, General Provisions, Article 11. Cultural Resources) that require contractors to stop work upon the discovery of unknown cultural or historic resources. An archaeologist must then be retained to evaluate the significance of the resource to establish mitigation requirements. General Plan Policies NCR 5.1.2 through NCR 5.1.4 require the maintenance of an inventory of prehistoric and historic resources, call for the nomination of additional buildings and sites to the City of Folsom Cultural Resources Inventory of locally significant cultural resources, and require compliance with City, State, and Federal historic laws and regulations to protect and assist in the preservation of historic and archeological resources, respectively.

Future development within the Folsom Plan Area would implement Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b to perform an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources for the California Register of Historic Places and perform treatment where damage or destruction cannot be avoided and Mitigation Measure 3A.5-2 to conduct construction personnel education, conduct on-site monitoring if required, and stop work if cultural resources are discovered. Because this issue was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and the FPASP EIR/EIS and the proposed footprint of development has not changed from what was in those documents, there would be no additional impacts as a result of implementing the project. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the existing General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.3-19 through 3.3-21).

Impact 3.3-4: Disturb Human Remains

Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Although much of the area north of Highway 50 is built out, the potential for un-marked human interments still exists in Folsom and the surrounding area. Ground-disturbing

construction activities associated with implementation of the project could uncover previously unknown human remains. Development would be subject to the same state and local regulations as development under the General Plan EIR. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the 2035 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measure 3.A5-3.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097. These statutes require that, if human remains are discovered, potentially damaging ground-disturbing activities in the area of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the appropriate County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Following the coroner's findings, the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), and the landowner shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments, if present, are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in Public Resources Code Section 5097.94.

In addition, development within the Folsom Plan Area would be subject to FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3 to suspend ground disturbing activities if human remains are encountered and comply with California Health and Safety Code procedures. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS mitigation measure would ensure that impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.3-23 through 3.3-26).

6.4 SECTION 3.3B: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 3.3-3 Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource

General Plan EIR Impact TCR-1 determined that implementation of the 2035 General Plan could result in significant impacts to archaeological resources and identified that there are no feasible available mitigations that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and effects would remain significant and unavoidable. Future development associated with this project could be located on properties that contain known or unknown tribal cultural resources which could result in damage to or destruction of these resources. However, development within the City and Folsom Plan Area would not occur on any sites beyond those already analyzed in the General Plan EIR and FPASP EIR/EIS. Since potential for impacts to tribal cultural resources remain, the project impacts would be significant. There is no new significant effect and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with state and local regulations and implementation of the new General Plan Implementation Measure NCR 9 and FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a, 3A.5-2, and 3A.5-3.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Future development would be subject to state regulations (Senate Bill [SB] 18 and Assembly Bill [AB] 52). SB 18 requires local governments to contact, refer plans to, and consult with tribal organizations prior to making a decision to adopt or amend a general or specific plan, or when dedicating open space that contains Native American cultural places. AB 52 requires local and state governments to consult with California Native American tribes as part of CEQA review. City regulations (Standard Construction Specifications and Details, General Provisions, Article 11. Cultural Resources) requires contractors to stop work upon the discovery of unknown cultural or historic resources. An archaeologist must then be retained to evaluate the significance of the resource to establish mitigation requirements. General Plan Policy NCR 1.1.4 encourages new developments to plant native vegetation, including that which is important to Native American lifeways and values, and drought tolerant species and prohibit the use of invasive plants. General Plan Policy NCR 5.1.2 through NCR 5.1.4 require the maintenance of an inventory of prehistoric and historic resources, call for the nomination of additional buildings and sites to the City of Folsom Cultural Resources Inventory of locally significant cultural resources, and require compliance with City, State, and Federal historic laws and regulations to protect and assist in the preservation of historic and archeological resources, respectively. Additionally, General Plan Implementation Policy NCR 9 would require management of tribal cultural resources through suspension of work in the vicinity of a tribal cultural resource find, notification of the appropriate oversight agency and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, and appropriate treatment (Final SEIR Section 4). General Plan Implementation Policy NCR 10 would require that tribal cultural resources be kept confidential and not be disclosed in public documents, etc. (Final SEIR Section 4).

Mitigation Measure 3A.5-2 to conduct construction personnel education, conduct on-site monitoring if required, and stop work if cultural resources are discovered, and Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3 to suspend ground-disturbing activities if human remains are encountered and compliance with California Health and Safety Code Procedures. Because this issue was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and the FPASP EIR/EIS and the proposed footprint of development has not changed from what was in those documents, there would be no additional impacts as a result of implementing the project. There is no new significant effect and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.3-21 through 3.3-23).

6.5 SECTION 3.4: ENERGY

Impact 3.4-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy, During Project Construction or Operation

When compared to the General Plan buildout, full buildout of the project would result in the consumption of additional energy supplies during construction in the form of gasoline and diesel fuel consumption. However, the project's energy expenditure would not be considered atypical when compared to other construction projects. When compared to buildout of the General Plan, operations of new land uses associated with the project would result in additional energy consumption, but the project would be required to comply with the most recent iteration of the California Energy Code. As compared to the General Plan EIR, the project would be more energy efficient when considered in the context of the number of residents that the project supports. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact than the General Plan EIR land uses due to its greater energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The energy needs for project construction would occur over a 12-year period and are not anticipated to require additional capacity or substantially increase peak or base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy, as compared to existing conditions. There is no atypical construction-related energy demand associated with the proposed project. Nonrenewable energy would not be consumed in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner when compared to other construction activity in the region. The project is anticipated to require less fuel when compared to the land uses evaluated under the General Plan. Reduced energy consumption would result from project construction as development of medium-to-high density housing is less intense than construction associated with non-residential uses. Energy impacts during construction would be less than significant (SEIR, pages 3.4-8 and 3.4-9).

The project would increase electricity and natural gas consumption relative to existing conditions during operation. The project is anticipated to require more energy in all sectors when compared to the land uses evaluated in the General Plan EIR. This is primarily due to the increase in residential development as part of the project, which would result in an increase in daily trip generation and associated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and energy use per residential unit. However, the project would result in increased population density from additional residential units associated with higher density development rather than single-family residences. Therefore, the energy efficiency per capita for the project would be lower as compared to the General Plan. Energy impacts during operation would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.4-9 and 3.4-10).

Impact 3.4-2: Conflict with or Obstruction of a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency

Although implementation of the project would increase energy demands compared to existing conditions, development would be required to comply with applicable California Energy Code, Folsom General Plan policies and Renewable Portfolio Standard. As a result, implementation of the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with applicable California Energy Code, Folsom General Plan Policies, and Renewable Portfolio Standard.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

New land uses developed as part of the project would comply with the 2022 California Energy Code, which is intended to increase the energy efficiency of new development projects in the state. Through the permitting process, all development proposed under the project would comply with the current and future versions of the State's Title 24 California Building Code, as part of the 2022 California Energy Code.

The project would be required to implement General Plan Policies LU 1.1.13 “Sustainable Building Practices,” and LU 1.1.14 “Promote Resiliency.” Future development associated with the project would adhere to General Plan Policy LU 1.1.13 that requires compliance with the State’s Title 24 California Building Code, which now requires solar installation on all apartments developed as part of the project.

The project is served by Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), an electricity utility. SMUD is required to comply with the future benchmarks of the state’s Renewable Portfolio Standard (i.e., 52 percent renewable by 2027, 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045). Because electricity utilities in the state are required to increase the percentage of renewable energy sources in the electricity they provide, over time electricity consumed as part of the project would increasingly be provided by renewable sources.

Due to the inclusion of energy efficiency and renewable energy measures as part of the project and compliance with state regulations related to energy efficiency and renewable energy and General Plan policies, project implementation would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.4-10 and 3.4-11).

6.6 SECTION 3.5: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Impact 3.5-1: Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Consistency with Reduction Plans and Measures

Construction and operation of the project would result in GHG emissions. Project construction emissions are anticipated to be lower and operational emissions are anticipated to be higher than previously evaluated in the General Plan EIR. However, the proposed project would increase residential density, which results in more VMT and GHG efficiency on a per capita basis, consistent with the goals and objectives of the GHG reduction strategy in the adopted CAP (integrated in to the 2035 General Plan). Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially greater impacts relating to GHG emissions, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project’s effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy SN 7.1.2, Policies NCR 1.1.8, 3.2.1, 3.2.6, and FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.4-1, 3A.4-2a, and 3A.4-2b.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Emissions associated with construction activities from the project are anticipated to be lower than emissions associated with the previously evaluated land uses. Although there would be an increase in the total number of residential units, the decrease in non-residential uses as part of the project would result in less intensive construction and thus reduced emissions. Total mass emissions associated with the project would result in an increase as compared to emissions from the General Plan EIR. However, development associated with the project would result in a denser population in Folsom and the GHG efficiency (i.e., emissions per capita) would be lower under the proposed project as compared to the existing General Plan. Additionally, the project would be consistent with General Plan policies adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and is therefore consistent with the adopted CAP. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially greater impacts relating to GHG emissions. However, even with incorporation of these mitigation measures and policies, the project would result in increased GHG emissions, and the future year GHG reduction targets may not be met (Draft SEIR, pages 3.5-10 through 3.5-12).

6.7 SECTION 3.6: LAND USE AND PLANNING

Impact 3.6-1: Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Implementation of the General Plan would be consistent with existing regional land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project would allow for increased minimum densities on rezone sites that are with multi-family and mixed-use designations. The project would also include land use amendments to the FPASP for the proposed rezone sites within the Folsom Plan Area. These amendments would be in compliance with State law requirements and are intended to help the city meet its share of the RHNA. The project is consistent with General Plan and FPASP policies related to environmental protections associated with land use, including those that address the amount and location of growth, allowed uses, and development densities and intensities. The project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact regarding land use and planning than was identified in the General Plan EIR. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Future development associated with the project, including residential development within the project planning area, would be required to be consistent with the General Plan and the FPASP (for sites located within the Folsom Plan Area) policies and programs adopted to address environmental effects. Future development would be reviewed for consistency with the development standards set forth in FMC and applicable objective design and development standard as part of the design review process. The project would not remove or modify any policies or measures from the General Plan and FPASP that are intended for environmental protection. This impact would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.6-9 and 3.6-10).

6.8 SECTION 3.7: NOISE AND VIBRATION

Impact 3.7-1: Construction Activities Could Result in a Substantial Temporary Increase in Noise Levels at Nearby Noise-Sensitive Land Uses

Construction activities associated with implementation of the project would result in greater construction noise than anticipated in the General Plan EIR. However, implementation of proposed mitigation measures and adopted mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR/EIS would reduce project impacts to less than significant, consistent with the conclusion in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-1. The mitigation measure is feasible and will be adopted and included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: Construction Noise Reduction Measure

Add new Implementation Program SN-17 Construction Noise Reduction:

- ▶ The City shall require that the following measures shall be implemented and specified on subsequent project building plans for development north of Highway 50 within 560 feet of sensitive land uses to ensure construction noise does not exceed 80 dBA L_{eq} at the nearest receptors:
 - To the extent feasible, alternative construction processes that generate lower noise levels shall be selected.
 - Construction equipment staging areas shall be located at the farthest distance feasible from nearby sensitive land uses.
 - For projects with pile driving, with approval and supervision of a qualified structural engineer, pile holes shall be predrilled to minimize the number of pile hammer drives necessary to seat piles, where feasible. Alternative to impact hammers, such as oscillating or rotating pile installation systems shall be used where feasible.
 - Effective pile driving noise control may be achieved by utilizing pile driving shrouds that acoustically shield the pile hammer point of impact, placing resilient padding on top of the pile, and by reducing exhaust noise with sound absorbing mufflers.
 - Post visible signs along the perimeter of the construction site that disclose construction times and duration, as well as a contact number for a noise complaint and enforcement manager.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Adherence to the Folsom Standard Construction Specifications, General Plan policies, FMC, and Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 and FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.11-1 would reduce construction noise and development under project would not result in a substantial temporary increase in noise. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 would reduce construction noise for development north of Highway 50 within 560 feet of sensitive receptors by requiring mufflers that reduce noise levels by at least 5 dBA and effective pile driving noise controls, such as pile driving shrouds, that can reduce noise by up to 30 dBA. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 noise levels from the loudest construction equipment (i.e., pile driving) would be reduced to 71 dBA and below the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) construction noise threshold of 80 dBA L_{eq} . Project impacts would be less than significant with mitigation (Draft SEIR, pages 3.7-15 to 3.7-17).

Impact 3.7-2: Exposure of Persons to or Generation of Excessive Vibration

Construction activities associated with implementation of the project would result in greater construction noise than anticipated in the General Plan EIR. However, implementation of proposed mitigation measures and adopted mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR/EIS would reduce project impacts to less than significant, consistent with the conclusion in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-2. The mitigation measure is feasible and will be adopted and included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

Mitigation Measure 3.7-2: Develop and Implement a Vibration Damage Control Plan

Add new Implementation Program SN-18 Construction Vibration Reduction:

- ▶ The City shall apply this Implementation Program to construction activity involving pile-driving activities located within 96 feet of any building and vibratory rollers located within 26 feet of any building to reduce the potential for structural damage.
- ▶ Require project applicants with projects that involve pile-driving activities located within 96 feet of any building and vibratory rollers located within 26 feet of any building to develop a vibration control plan. The plan shall consider all potential vibration-inducing activities that would occur within the distance parameters described above and include various measures, setback distances, precautions, monitoring programs, and alternative methods to traditional pile-driving or other vibration intensive activities with the potential to result in structural damage. The following vibration control measures (or other equally effective measures approved by the City) shall be included in the plan:
 - To prevent structural damage minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving, vibratory roller) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures shall be established based on the proposed pile-driving activities and locations, once determined.
 - All vibration-inducing activity within the distance parameters described above shall be monitored and documented for ground vibration noise and vibration noise levels at the nearest sensitive land use and associated recorded data submitted to the City of Folsom so as not to exceed the recommended FTA vibration damage levels.
 - Alternatives to traditional pile driving (e.g., sonic pile driving, jetting, cast-in-place or auger cast piles, non-displacement piles, pile cushioning, torque or hydraulic piles) shall be considered and implemented where feasible to reduce vibration levels.
 - Limit pile-driving activities to the daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday.
 - Predrill pile holes to the maximum feasible depth to reduce the number of blows required to seat a pile.
 - Operate all vibration inducing impact equipment as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as reasonably possible.
 - Phase pile-driving and high-impact activities so as not to occur simultaneously with other construction activities, to the extent feasible. The total vibration level produced could be significantly less when each vibration source is operated at separate times.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Adherence to General Plan Policy SN 6.1.8 and implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.7-2 and FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.11-3 would reduce potential vibration damage impacts from construction activities by requiring minimum setbacks to sensitive land uses, monitoring vibration levels during construction, and the use of alternative equipment when appropriate. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 3.7-2 would require alternatives to pile driving, such as auger cast piles that are free of vibration or jetting that can reduce vibration by 45 percent or to 0.64 inches/sec. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-2 vibration from the most vibratory equipment (i.e., pile driving) could be reduced to below FTA's recommended standards with respect to the prevention of structural building damage (0.2 and 0.08 in/sec peak particle velocity) for normal and historical buildings, respectively). Through these measures, potential substantial impacts on sensitive land uses from pile driving, vibratory roller activity, and blasting would be reduced to meet applicable thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation (Draft SEIR, pages 3.7-17 through 3.7-20).

Impact 3.7-3: Traffic Noise

Implementation of the project would result in a net increase in traffic noise ranging from 0 to 3.6 dB L_{dn} on roadway segments within the project planning area. Therefore, project-related traffic noise would not generate a substantial increase in severity beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with FPSAP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 and General Plan Policy SN 6.1.2.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Implementation of the project would result in net noise increases ranging from 0 to 3.6 dBA L_{dn} on roadway segments within the project planning area. The General Plan EIR identified that traffic noise would result in net increases ranging from 0 to 8 dBA. The project would be subject to General Plan Policy SN 6.1.2, requiring mitigation for noise due to traffic on public roadways for new residential development to meet the noise standards. Additionally, the project would be subject to adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 for development in the Folsom Plan Area, and the FMC noise standards as they aim to comprehensively address construction noise sources. There is no new significant traffic noise effect, and the impact is not more severe than identified in the General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 3.7-20 through 3.7-23).

Impact 3.7-4: Expose Existing Sensitive Receptors to New Stationary Noise Sources that Exceed Applicable Noise Standards

All future development associated with the project would be required to comply with the FMC and General Plan policies related to stationary noise standards. However, due to the programmatic nature of the project it cannot be assured that future development as part of the project would not exceed applicable standards. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures and adopted mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR/EIS would reduce project impacts to less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-4. The mitigation measure is feasible and will be adopted and included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 3.7-4: Heating, Ventilation, and Cooling Noise

Add new Implementation Program SN-19 Heating, Ventilation, and Cooling Noise Reduction:

- ▶ The City shall require an acoustical assessment to be prepared as part of subsequent land use development associated with development if an HVAC would be located within 55 feet of a sensitive receptor. The acoustical assessment shall evaluate the potential operational noise impacts attributed to HVAC noise. The acoustical assessment shall be completed by a qualified acoustical consultant that shall verify that the chosen mechanical equipment for individual development projects would not exceed 45 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor, in accordance with City of Folsom noise standards. Where the acoustical analysis determines that noise levels would

exceed applicable City noise standards, noise reduction measures shall be identified and included in the subsequent project. Noise reduction measures may include, but are not limited to:

- Selecting equipment with noise specifications that do not exceed the 45 dBA HVAC noise standard at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor.
- Identifying the equipment's noise screening distance, ensuring that noise levels attenuate to below the 45 dBA HVAC noise standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, and installing the equipment at a distance no less than the screening distance.
- Employing noise dampening techniques such as solid enclosures or parapets walls to block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the noise-sensitive receptors. Blocking the line of sight with a solid barrier or enclosure would reduce noise levels by at least 5 dBA.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Adherence to the General Plan Policy 6.1.2 and implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-4 and FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.11-5 would reduce potentially significant stationary and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors to a less-than-significant level. Screening distances, acoustical shielding methods, and proper selection of HVAC units with low noise emissions would ensure HVAC noise levels would comply with the stationary noise standard of 45 dBA at a receiving sensitive receptor. Individual developments would be required to adhere to the standards set forth in the FMC, General Plan, and mitigation measures of the SEIR. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation (Draft SEIR, pages 3.7-23 and 3.7-24).

6.9 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact 3.8-1: Induce Substantial Population Growth

The project would accommodate up to 6,046 net new housing units, which would accommodate approximately 15,418 people. This growth would exceed the projected population under the General Plan, but would be consistent with the most recently adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element. The project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact regarding population growth than was identified in the General Plan EIR. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would result in a net new capacity of 6,046 housing units in the project planning area, which would accommodate approximately 15,418 people, based on 2.55 persons per dwelling unit. Therefore, the project would result in 15,418 new residents in the city beyond what was projected in the 2018 adopted General Plan. However, the City's Housing Element, as part of the General Plan, calls for creation of new housing opportunities to meet projected residential growth in the city acknowledged as part of the City's RHNA. The project is designed to fulfill Program H-2 of the Housing Element through amending standards to facilitate an increase in the amount of available land for residential and mixed-use development and increase the amount of higher density residential development in certain areas of the City. Although the project would have the potential to exceed the maximum population established in

the General Plan EIR, the population increase potential associated with the project would be consistent with the 2021-2029 Housing Element and thus generally consistent with City and regional growth assumptions. The increased population levels associated with the project would be consistent with regional growth projections for the City and would meet the City's RHNA. The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the city and impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.8-4 and 3.8-5).

6.10 PUBLIC SERVICES

Impact 3.9-1: Require Construction of New Governmental Facilities, Resulting in Adverse Environmental Impacts

Under the project, development would be intensified within the City and may increase demand for public services (including fire and police protection) that could require new or expanded facilities. Expansion of existing governmental facilities or construction of a new facility to meet the needs of the project would involve minor land clearing, grading, installation of utilities, and building construction. Construction activities and duration would be typical of such facilities and would be required to comply with applicable City policies and regulatory requirements to reduce adverse environmental effects. Additionally, new governmental facilities, including fire and police stations, would be constructed within the footprint of development envisioned as part of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, such construction for new government facilities to support the project would not result in adverse effects on the environment. Increased population growth resulting from the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact related to the construction of government facilities than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. This impact would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Development of new public service facilities would include construction activities that are typical of other allowable land use types within the City (e.g., industrial, warehouse, commercial), and would consist of activities such as clearing and grading, utility installation, and construction of new structures. Construction would result in impacts that are similar to those discussed throughout the SEIR, including temporary traffic, noise, and air quality impacts from construction. Generally, public services facilities are small (e.g., on the order of 2.5 acres) and their construction and operation would be required to comply with applicable City policies and regulatory requirements to reduce adverse environmental effects. There is no evidence to suggest that expansion of existing governmental facilities or construction of a new facility would result in unmitigable, adverse effects on the environment. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.9-10 and 3.9-11).

Impact 3.9-2: Require Construction of New Schools, Resulting in Adverse Environmental Impacts

Under the project, development within the City would be intensified and may increase demand for schools that could require new or expanded facilities. Expansion of existing schools or construction of a new school to meet the needs of the project would involve minor land clearing, grading, installation of utilities, and building construction. Construction activities and duration would be typical of such facilities and would be required to comply with applicable City policies and regulatory requirements to reduce adverse environmental effects. Additionally, new

schools would be constructed within the footprint of development envisioned as part of the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, such construction for new schools to support the project would not result in adverse effects on the environment. The increased student population resulting from the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact related to the construction of schools than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would generate approximately 967 new students that would be served by the new schools proposed by the FPASP, which would fulfill the demand generated by the project. Construction of these schools would not result in any substantial physical impacts specific to public services that are not already an inherent part of overall project impacts and would be constructed within the footprint of development proposed in the General Plan. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the existing General Plan EIR. Impacts specific to public facility construction related to school services are less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.9-11 and 3.9-12).

Impact 3.9-3: Require Construction of New Park or Recreation Facilities, Resulting in Adverse Environmental Impacts

Construction of park facilities would be subject to federal and state requirements, City regulations, and 2035 General Plan policies that would ensure that adequate parkland would be provided, and physical deterioration of existing facilities would be reduced. Furthermore, the City's existing and planned parks would sufficiently meet the City's standards for parkland supply as the population grows. This growth would be within the projections assumed under the General Plan. Therefore, increased population growth resulting from the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact related to park and recreational facilities than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy LU 6.1.4.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

An increase of 15,418 persons as part of the project would result in the need for an additional 77 acres of parkland beyond the current 552 acres required under the 2035 General Plan for a grand total of 629 acres of parkland in the City to meet the City standard. As indicated in the *Parks and Recreation Master Plan: 2015 Plan Update*, the City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Department manages a total of 891 acres of parks and open space, consisting of 340 acres of developed parks, 500 acres of open space, and 51 acres of Class I Bike Trial. Therefore, there would be sufficient parkland to support project buildout. Additionally, as part of the project, future tentative subdivision and

tentative parcel maps under the project would be required to dedicate land or pay an in-lieu fee for the development of neighborhood and community parks, pursuant to FMC Chapter 16.32 and Chapter 4.10. Future development would also be subject to General Plan Policy LU 6.1.4 that requires open space in each residential development. FMC Chapter 3.130 establishes and imposes a Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee on new development within the Folsom Plan Area that equitably spreads the burden of public improvements and facilities and distributes the cost of public lands and community parkland to development projects within the Folsom Plan Area. Impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 3.9-13).

6.11 TRANSPORTATION

Impact 3.10-1: Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facility Impacts and Plan Conflicts

Implementation of the project would be subject to and implement General Plan and FPASP objectives and policies relevant to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and services. Additionally, future development under the project would be subject to applicable City guidelines, standards, and specifications related to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings

Future development site designs would be required to incorporate improvements consistent with applicable General Plan policies related to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. For example, General Plan Policy M 1.1.1 encourages all roadway improvements to be developed to serve the needs of all users, including bicyclists, public transit users, children, seniors, persons with disabilities, pedestrians, motorists, and movers of commercial goods. Policies M 1.1.5 and M 1.1.6 call for a connected street network that promotes walkability and bicycle and pedestrian connections to public transit stops. Policy M 3.1.1 encourages all residents to have access to safe and convenient public transit options. Compliance with the applicable General Plan and FPASP objectives and policies would ensure that the increased demand for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities resulting from the project would not exceed the capacity of existing and planned facilities. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities (Draft SEIR, pages 3.10-16 and 3.10-17).

Impact 3.10-2: Vehicle Miles Traveled Impacts

The project would result in development of up to 6,046 additional housing units. Of those units, the project would provide capacity for up to 56 percent or 3,386 low-income units.; However, the City of Folsom conservatively determined that based on the rate of existing affordable housing development within the city, 26 percent of the project's units on average would be low-income units. Therefore, the VMT analysis accounted for the reduction associated with 26 percent affordable units that would result in a reduction in trips and trip length as compared to market-rate housing. Therefore, the project would result in approximately 6.62 residential VMT per capita, which is less than the threshold of 7.51 VMT per capita (i.e., 15 percent below citywide VMT per capita). Additionally, the project would not result in retail development that would be greater than 125,000 square feet. Potential retail development resulting from the project would be considered local serving and would not result in a net increase in VMT. The project VMT impacts related to residential land use and retail land use would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would accommodate local serving retail as defined in the Sacramento County Transportation Analysis Guidelines. Local serving retail is generally associated with shorter trips and, therefore, is screened from detailed analysis and presumed to result in a less than significant impact. Additionally, the VMT analysis determined that the residential uses associated with the project would result in a VMT per capita of 6.62 which is below the citywide threshold of 7.51 VMT per capita (i.e., 15 percent below existing citywide VMT per capita). Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase in VMT. This impact is less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.10-18 and 3.10-19).

Impact 3.10-3: Hazardous Design Feature Impacts

Future development under the project would be constructed in accordance with applicable roadway design and safety guidelines. The project would not increase hazards because of a roadway design feature or incompatible uses and would include a roundabout prioritization policy that would provide opportunities for improved safety. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to transportation hazards.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Future development under the project would be designed in accordance with City standards and specifications which address potential design hazards including sight distance, driveway placement, and signage and striping. In addition, any new interchanges, new and modified ramps, or auxiliary lanes along freeway that would result as part of the project would be subject to approval by Caltrans which would ensure projects would be consistent with Caltrans' standards and not result in transportation hazards. Any new transportation facilities, or improvements to such facilities associated with future development would be required to comply with General Plan policies, including Policy M 1.1.3 to require new and reconstructed facilities to meet the Americans with Disability Act requirements and Policy M 3.1.1 to ensure all residents have access to safe and convenient public transit options. The project would include the addition of a roundabout prioritization policy in the *City of Folsom General Plan*. Roundabouts are a Federal Highway Administration's Proven Safety Countermeasure effective in reducing roadway fatalities and serious injuries. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to transportation hazards (Draft SEIR, pages 3.10-19 and 3.10-20).

Impact 3.10-4: Emergency Access Impacts

Future development under the project would be required to meet all applicable emergency access and design standards to ensure that the project would provide adequate emergency access. In addition, compliance with General

Plan policies would provide emergency access improvements that would enhance emergency access. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Emergency access for future development under the project would be required to meet the fire and emergency access roads design standards per FMC Section 17.57.080 and the Folsom Fire Code Chapter 5, Section 503, "Fire Apparatus Access Roads." In addition, General Plan policies M 1.1.5 and M 4.1.10 require the continuation of the street network between adjacent development projects to allow easier access for emergency vehicles and the continuation of the traffic calming measures implementation in neighborhoods in ways that accommodate emergency access vehicles, respectively. Compliance with the existing regulations and relevant General Plan policies would ensure that future development would be designed to meet all emergency access and design standards. Impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 3.10-20).

6.12 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Impact 3.11-1: Adverse Impacts on Sufficient Water Supply and Treatment

Implementation of the project could generate additional water demand for water supplies from the provision of additional housing. However, the City of Folsom and EID would have sufficient surplus to meet the additional water demand. Therefore, the additional water demand resulting from the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe water supply impact than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would be less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Approximately 4,164 new units would be located in the East Bidwell Corridor and the Transit Priority Areas, which would receive water service from the City of Folsom. The additional 4,164 units would result in increases in water demand of approximately 916 acre-feet per year (AFY). The City of Folsom would have sufficient water supplies to serve the projected 916.08 AFY of water demand resulting from the future development in East Bidwell Corridor and Transit Priority Areas during normal year, single-dry year, and five-year consecutive drought. Implementation of the project would result in an additional 1,882 housing units in the Folsom Plan Area. The additional 1,882 net new housing units in the Folsom Plan Area would result in increases in water demand of approximately 414 AFY. Of the

414 AFY water demand, approximately 359 AFY would be within the City of Folsom's service area and 55 AFY within the El Dorado Irrigation District's service area. Both the City of Folsom and El Dorado Irrigation District would have sufficient water to serve the project. Modeling conducted for the project indicated that the increase in water demand resulting from the project would not result in adverse hydraulic impacts to the City's water distribution system. Impacts would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 3.11-18 through 3.11-20).

Impact 3.11-2: Exceed the Capacity of the Wastewater Treatment Provider or Adverse Effects Associated with Construction of Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Infrastructure

General Plan EIR Impact USS-3 identified less than significant impacts related to wastewater collection, transmission, and treatment. Implementation of the project could generate wastewater as a result of increased housing in the city. The existing wastewater conveyance infrastructure in the City of Folsom would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated additional wastewater. Therefore, the wastewater resulting from the project would result in a new and substantially more severe wastewater impact than was addressed in the General Plan EIR; however, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's effects are less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.11-2a and 3.11-2b. The mitigation measures are feasible and will be adopted and included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 3.11-2a: Implement Localized Improvements in the 33-Inch Shed

Future development in the 33-inch shed in the project area shall be responsible for the cost and preparation of a sewer study and if that study shows that the project increases parcel specific wastewater generation beyond the parcel specific wastewater generation analyzed in the City of Folsom 2017 Capacity Assurance Plan (Ultimate Build-Out Growth Development Scenario), the project shall be responsible for providing fees to analyze and construct localized wastewater improvements to address capacity issues in the sewer shed. Localized capacity improvements, such as upsizing pipes, shall be constructed and completed in accordance with a time schedule defined in the development specific conditions of approval. This shall be a condition of approval for all projects in the 33-inch shed within the project area.

Mitigation Measure 3.11-2b: Develop and Implement a Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan for the 27-Inch Shed

To address capacity concerns in the City's wastewater conveyance system the City shall develop a Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan for the 27-inch Shed prior to approval of development in the project area that exceeds the wastewater generation analyzed in the City of Folsom 2017 Capacity Assurance Plan (Ultimate Build-Out Growth Development Scenario) within the 27-in Shed.

The Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan shall identify the final anticipated extent of pipeline and pump station improvements as well as any phasing improvements tied to residential development timing and/or location in the 27-inch Shed. The Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan shall include mechanisms and improvements for addressing sewer capacity. The Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan shall contain the goals of the plan, a description of proposed upgrades and features that would be implemented, a long-term maintenance and operation strategy, and an approach for implementation of proposed improvements to the wastewater conveyance system. Potential improvements may include, but are not limited to:

- ▶ construction and operation of a new pump station near the intersection of Riley Street and East Bidwell Street,
- ▶ construction and operation of a new 8-inch force main from the pump station to high point at Glenn Drive and Sibley Street in order to divert flows from the 27-inch shed into the 33-inch shed,

- ▶ upsizing existing 8-inch pipelines on Glenn Drive and Sibley Street to 12-inch, and
- ▶ identification of additional localized sewer improvements.

Upon completion of the Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan, the City shall secure any required permits for implementation of identified improvement strategies. Improvements identified in the Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan shall be implemented prior to issuance of grading permits for future development that increases wastewater generation beyond that analyzed in the City of Folsom 2017 Capacity Assurance Plan (Ultimate Build-Out Growth Development Scenario) in the 27-inch Shed.

Future development in the 27-inch shed in the project area shall be responsible for the cost and preparation of a sewer study and if that study shows that the project increases parcel specific wastewater generation beyond the parcel specific wastewater generation analyzed in the City of Folsom 2017 Capacity Assurance Plan (Ultimate Build-Out Growth Development Scenario), the project shall be responsible for providing fees to analyze and construct localized wastewater improvements to address capacity issues in the sewer shed. Localized capacity improvements, such as upsizing pipes, shall be constructed and completed in accordance with a time schedule defined in the development specific conditions of approval. This shall be a condition of approval for all projects in the 27-inch shed within the project area.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The eastern project planning area north of Highway 50 is located within the FE3 Sewer Shed that has capacity to serve the project. Within the Folsom Plan Area new wastewater collection and conveyance facilities have been planned and there is adequate capacity to support the project. The central project planning area north of Highway 50 is located within the 33-Inch Sewer Shed. The simulation for project development in the 33-inch Shed indicated that the 33-inch sewer line would have capacity for the increased wastewater flow in general. However, development associated with the project would have the potential to reach the capacity of some localized sewer lines, specifically along Riley Road, Sibley Drive, and Glenn Road if the level of development exceeds that identified in the 2035 General Plan EIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-2a would ensure local improvements would be constructed to maintain capacity in the sewer shed. The western project planning area north of Highway 50 is located within the 27-Inch Sewer Shed, which upon buildout of the 2035 General Plan will be at capacity. Mitigation Measure 3.11-2b would require implementation of a Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan to allow for additional capacity for any new development in excess of the amount identified in the 2035 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation (Draft SEIR, pages 3.11-20 through 3.11-24).

6.13 CHAPTER 4: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative Aesthetics Impacts

As identified in Impacts 3.1-1 through 3.1-4 of this SEIR (pages 3.1-6 through 3.1-12), the project planning area is in areas planned for urban development. Implementation of the project would result in increased residential development capacity in the project planning area. Future development associated with project would be required to comply with FMC, applicable design guidelines, objective design and development standards, and General Plan policies to ensure design compatibility with surrounding development and to address light and glare effects. Future development in the Folsom Plan Area would implement FPASP Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1, 3A.1-4, and 3A.1-5 to minimize impacts related to visual degradation and lighting by maintaining a landscaped corridor adjacent to Highway 50, locating construction staging areas and material away from sensitive land uses, and implementing a lighting plan. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to aesthetics resources beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with the FMC, applicable design guidelines, objective design and development standards, and General Plan policies and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1, 3A.1-4, and 3A.1-5.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would not change the development footprint analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Future development in the East Bidwell Mixed Used Overlay designation and the new transit-oriented development overlay designation would generally improve the visual quality of the affected areas by developing vacant, underutilized, or aging properties and creating a more unified visual experience consistent with the surrounding development. Future development would be required to comply with FMC Chapter 17.59 regarding placement of signage to protect views from scenic corridors, which requires approval from the Planning Director for signs visible from a scenic corridor. Development identified in the FPASP would change the existing grassland and oak woodlands to urban land uses. Similar to the findings of the FPASP EIR/EIS, development as part of the project in the Folsom Plan Area would add to the alteration of existing views and the quality of the public views from Scott Road. However, these sites were planned for development and analyzed as such in the FPASP EIR/EIS. Implementation of the FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.1-1 and 3A.1-4 would reduce impacts to scenic vista.

Future development associated with the project would be subject to existing regulations governing scenic quality as discussed in Section 6.1 above. Future development would increase the amount of light and glare through the installation of exterior lighting and reflective window glazing within the project planning area similar to the conditions anticipated for the planned urban land uses for the City under the General Plan. Consistent with the General Plan EIR, compliance with California Building Code building standards, which require minimizing light pollution and nighttime glare; FMC Chapter 17.59.040, which identifies designated scenic corridors within the city and includes special provisions for the placement and lighting of signage in scenic corridors; FMC Chapter 17.23, which provides design standards for mixed-use zones, including lighting; lighting recommendations contained in the City's Multifamily Development Design Guidelines and the FPASP Community Design Guidelines; General Plan Policy NCR 2.1.3, which require lighting to be directed downward to minimize overspill and glare onto adjacent properties and reduce vertical glares; and, General Plan Implementation Program NCR-6, which requires shielding or screening lighting fixtures, prohibiting the use of unusually high intensity light fixtures, and using appropriate building materials (e.g., low-glare glass, low-glare building glaze, and neutral, earth-toned colored paint and roofing materials), would reduce and minimize light and glare impacts. Any future development in the Folsom Plan Area would be required to implement FPASP Mitigation Measure 3A.1-5 to reduce significant impacts associated with new sources of light and glare through compliance with lighting standards and implementation of a lighting plan.

The project would not change the development footprint analyzed in the General Plan EIR and would not result in a new or more severe aesthetics impact than disclosed in the General Plan EIR with compliance with existing regulations and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS mitigation measures. Therefore, the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-3).

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

The General Plan EIR determined that buildout of the General Plan would result in exposure of toxic air contaminants (TACs) to sensitive receptors that could not be reduced to less than significant levels within the Folsom Plan Area. Additionally, buildout of the General Plan would result in odorous emissions from construction throughout the city.

Consequently, implementation of the 2035 General Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. The project would generate greater mass emissions than the land uses in the 2035 General Plan EIR, but the project would be more efficient on a per person basis. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative air quality impacts beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with SMAQMD Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices, SMAQMD's Ozone Attainment Plan, MTP/SCS and General Plan policies, and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.2-1a, 3A.2-1f, 3A.2-2 and 3A.2-1c, and 3A.2-4a.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The geographic context for cumulative impacts related to air quality is regional for criteria pollutant and ozone precursors and includes the Sacramento County Valley Air Basin and Sacramento County within the jurisdiction of SMAQMD. The context is local for toxic air contaminants and odors. As identified in the SEIR, the project would not generate construction emissions of any criteria air pollutants or precursors that would substantially increase local mobile-source CO emissions. Development would be required to comply with SMAQMD Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices and General Plan policies to reduce emissions. While construction would occur nearby existing and future sensitive receptors the project would be subject to General Plan policies and mitigation from the General Plan EIR to reduce emissions. The project would not introduce a new or substantially more severe air quality impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative air quality impacts beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, pages 4-3 and 4-4).

Cumulative Historical Resources Impacts

Future development as part of the project would be subject to federal (National Historic Preservation Act), state (PRC Section 21000 et. Seq. and California Historical Building Code), and local regulations (General Plan Policies NCR 1.1.4, NCR 5.1.1, NCR 5.1.2, NCR 5.1.4, and NCR 5.1.5). Future development within the Folsom Plan Area would implement Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b to reduce impacts to historical resources. Because future development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to historical resources than disclosed in the General Plan EIR.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with existing federal and state regulations, and General Plan Polices NCR 1.1.4, NCR 5.1.1, NCR 5.1.2, NCR 5.1.4, and NCR 5.1.5; and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIR adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to historical resources throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Development associated with the project within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b requiring projects to perform an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources minimize or avoid damage or destruction and perform treatment where damage or destruction cannot be avoided. However, the environmental review would not prevent the demolition of all historical resources. Impacts would remain cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to historical resources (Draft SEIR, page 4-4).

Cumulative Archaeological Resources Impacts

Future development as part of the project would be subject to state and local regulations and General Plan policies to reduce impacts to archaeological resources. Future development within the Folsom Plan Area would implement Mitigation Measure 3A.5-1b Mitigation Measure 3A.5-2 to evaluate cultural resources on-site and provide cultural resources education to construction personnel. However, because this issue was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and the FPASP EIR/EIS and the proposed footprint of development has not changed from what was in those documents, there would be no additional impacts as a result of implementing the project. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to unique archaeological resources. Impacts would remain cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with state and local regulations and implementation of the FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1b and 3A.5-2.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to unique archaeological resources throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Development associated with the project would be required to comply with adopted Mitigation Measure CUL-2 (General Plan Implementation Program NCR 7) to develop a program for inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources. Development within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with Mitigation Measures 3.5A-1b to perform an inventory and evaluation of cultural resources minimize or avoid damage or destruction and perform treatment where damage or destruction cannot be avoided and 3A.5-2 to conduct construction personnel education, conduct on-site monitoring if required, stop work if cultural resources are discovered, assess the significance of the find, and perform treatment or avoidance as required. However, the environmental process of review would not prevent the demolition of all unique archaeological resources. Impacts would remain cumulatively considerable. Nevertheless, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to unique archaeological resources (Draft SEIR, pages 4-5 and 4-6).

Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources Impacts

Future development as part of the project would be subject to state and local regulations to reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources. Future development within the Folsom Plan Area would implement FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a, 3A.5-2, and 3A.5-3 to reduce the potentially significant impact associated with the possible destruction of tribal cultural resources. However, compliance with existing regulations and implementation of previously adopted mitigation would not prevent the demolition of all tribal cultural resources. Impacts would remain cumulatively considerable. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to tribal cultural resources.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with state and local regulations and implementation of General Plan Implementation Measure NCR9 and FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measures 3A.5-1a, 3A.5-2, and 3A.5-3.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The proposed project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to tribal cultural resources throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The results of the AB 52 consultation indicated that the project planning area is highly sensitive for tribal cultural resources. Implementation of projects contemplated in the proposed plan may require subsequent discretionary approvals and site-specific project-level analyses to fulfill CEQA requirements, which may include additional AB 52 consultation and identification of tribal cultural resources. However, the environmental process review would not prevent the demolition of all tribal cultural resources. Impacts would remain cumulatively considerable. All development in the City would be subject to General Plan Implementation Policy NCR 9 that requires management of tribal cultural resources through suspension of work in the vicinity of a tribal cultural resource find, notification of the appropriate oversight agency and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, and appropriate treatment (Final SEIR Section 4). Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to tribal cultural resources (Draft SEIR, page 4-5).

Cumulative Human Remains Impacts

Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIR Mitigation Measure 3A.5-3 would ensure that project impacts to human remains would be less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to human remains impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 and implementation of FPASP EIR/EIR adopted Mitigation Measure 3.A5-3.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The proposed project would result in increased residential density throughout the project planning area. Increased development has the potential to result in an adverse change to interred human remains throughout the project planning area. However, development would occur on the same footprint as previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Development associated with the project would be required to adhere to state regulations related to the handling of human remains. Additionally, development within the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with adopted Mitigation Measure 3.5A-3 (suspend ground-disturbing activities if human remains are encountered and comply with California Health and Safety Code procedures) and would reduce impacts to less than significant. Impacts would remain less than cumulatively considerable (Draft SEIR, page and 4-5).

Cumulative Energy Impacts

The project would comply with applicable energy efficiency requirements and would implement design features that meet or exceed current requirements per Title 24 and CALGreen. Because the project would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy and would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, the project would not result in a significant cumulative energy impact. The project's contribution to substantial effects related to energy would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with existing regulations (i.e., Title 24 and CALGreen).

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would consume energy related to transportation (i.e., gasoline and diesel consumption for passenger vehicles, trucks, buses, and other vehicles) and construction. The project would be required to implement energy efficiency measures in accordance with the Title 24 California Energy Code, which includes CALGreen, to reduce energy demand from buildings and would likely implement transportation demand management strategies to reduce the number of vehicle trips and VMT, which would reduce fuel consumption. The project would increase energy demand during temporary construction activities for new buildings and facilities. During operation, the project would be expected to require more energy overall when compared to the land uses evaluated in the General Plan EIR due to the increase in residential capacity. However, as discussed in Section 6.4 above, the project would result in less than significant energy impacts during construction and operation. Therefore, the project's contribution to energy impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 4-5 and 4-6).

Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change Impacts

The General Plan EIR concluded a less-than-significant impact associated with the buildout year of the general plan (i.e., 2035). However, the General Plan EIR concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact associated with future target year 2050. The project would be consistent with adopted GHG reduction strategies that aim to improve GHG

efficiency, the project would not conflict with the City's ability to achieve their 2035 targets, however, the project does not include any additional measures or GHG reduction strategies that would assist in meeting the 2050 targets. Therefore, the project would not result in new or substantially greater impacts relating to GHG emissions but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Because the issue of global climate change is inherently a cumulative issue because the GHG emissions of individual projects cannot be shown to have any material effect on global climate. Therefore, the project's impact on climate change is addressed only as a cumulative impact. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to GHG emissions would be cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No feasible mitigation is available beyond implementation of FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.4-1, 3A.4-2a, and 3A.4-2b.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Based on the comparative analysis conducted to represent the change in emissions associated with buildout of the project, total mass emissions associated with the project would result in an increase as compared to emissions from the General Plan EIR. This is primarily due to the increase in the number of residential land uses, which would result in an increase in daily trip generation and associated VMT. Because the project would increase GHG emissions compared to the General Plan EIR and because further substantial GHG emissions reduction would be required to meet the 2045 carbon neutrality goals and 2050 GHG reduction targets, the GHG impacts were determined to remain significant consistent with the conclusion of the General Plan EIR. Because climate change is a global problem caused by global pollutants and is inherently cumulative, the analysis concluded in the SEIR is a cumulative analysis. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to GHG emissions would be cumulatively considerable, consistent with the conclusion in the General Plan EIR (Draft SEIR, page 4-6).

Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impact

The project is consistent with applicable General Plan and FPASP policies related to environmental protections. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects to land use and planning beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would amend the City's 2035 General Plan and Zoning Code to increase the minimum density and maximum floor area ratio standards in the project planning area to maintain multi-family and mixed-use land available to meet the target housing demand at all income levels for the RHNA. The project would also amend the FPASP to increase residential development capacity on the proposed rezone sites within the Folsom Plan Area. As discussed in Section 6.5 above, future development associated with the project, including residential development within the project planning area, would be required to be consistent with the General Plan and the FPASP (for sites located within the Folsom Plan Area) policies and programs adopted to address environmental effects. In addition, the project would be in compliance with State law requirements and meet the RHNA for the City. The project would not remove or modify any policies or measures from the General Plan and FPASP that are intended for environmental protection. The project's land use and planning impact would be less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-6).

Cumulative Construction Noise and Vibration Impacts

Adherence to the construction noise requirements in the Standard Construction Specifications, the General Plan policies, FMC, and mitigation measures would avoid the generation of substantial temporary construction noise levels. The project would result in less than significant construction noise and vibration impacts with mitigation. The project's contribution to construction noise and vibration impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are offset and less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.7-1 and 3.7-2. The mitigation measures are feasible and will be adopted and included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 and Mitigation Measure 3.7-2 would be required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Adherence to the Folsom Standard Construction Specifications, General Plan policies, FMC, Mitigation Measures 3.7-1 and 3.7-2, and FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measures 3A.11-1 and 3A.11-2 would reduce construction noise and vibration impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project's contribution to construction noise and vibration impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 4-6 and 4-7).

Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts

The increase in traffic noise levels that would result from project implementation would not generate a substantial increase in traffic noise levels above those anticipated under the General Plan buildout. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not substantially more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. This impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with FPASP EIR/EIS adopted Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 and General Plan Policy SN 6.1.2.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The project would be subject to General Plan Policy SN 6.1.2, which requires mitigation for noise due to traffic on public roadways for new residential development to meet the noise standards. Additionally, the project would be subject to FPASP Mitigation Measure 3A.11-4 for development in the Folsom Plan Area, and the FMC noise standards as they aim to comprehensively address construction noise sources. Compliance with General Plan policy and implementation of adopted mitigation measure would ensure that no new significant traffic noise effect would occur, and the impact is not more severe than identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to traffic noise impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-7).

Cumulative Stationary Noise Impacts

Adherence to the General Plan Policy 6.1.2 and implementation of applicable mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant stationary noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors to less than significant. Therefore, the project would not contribute substantially to a cumulative impact related to stationary noise and this impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are offset and less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-4. The mitigation measure is feasible and will be adopted and included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 3.7-4 would be required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Adherence to General Plan Policy 6.1.2 and implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-4 and FPASP EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure 3A.11-5 would reduce potentially significant stationary and HVAC noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors to a less-than-significant level. Future developments would be required to adhere to the standards set forth in FMC, General Plan, and mitigation measures of the SEIR. The project's contribution to stationary noise impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-7).

Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts

The project would not induce substantial population growth above that which is already anticipated for the City and the region. Thus, the cumulative impact would not be significant. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative population growth beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to cumulative population growth would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

SACOG is the lead agency for developing the RHNA for the Sacramento region, which includes Sacramento County and the City of Folsom. The project would ensure that Folsom has adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA and also provides additional sites to ensure that over the long-term, beyond the 2021-2029 RHNA period, that the City continues to have adequate sites to accommodate a range of housing needs. The project has been developed to accommodate the growth projections in the RHNA and is consistent with long-term regional growth projections. Therefore, implementation of the project would assist Folsom in accommodating its fair share of growth and housing needs under cumulative conditions. Therefore, the project's contribution to population and housing impacts would be less than cumulative considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-7).

Cumulative Public Services Impacts

Development in the City would be subject to General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan EIR, which would subsequently reduce physical environmental effects and provide additional police and fire protection services, as well as school facilities, as areas develop. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to public services beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. The project's contribution to substantial effects related to public services would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Cumulative development in the city would continue to increase the concentration of people and structures within the local public service jurisdictions which in turn increases demand for such services. The increase in population under the project could continue the trend of increasing the demand for public services and could combine with other proposed development projects within the City to result in a cumulative increase in demand for public services such that new or physically altered governmental facilities would be required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. As noted in Section 3.9 of the SEIR, "Public Services and Recreation," it is not anticipated that new or expanded public facilities would be required to accommodate development under the project. Further, new development and growth would occur within existing developed areas where public services currently exist. To the extent that any potential expansion of public facilities is required to accommodate new development and growth in the area, it is reasonable to assume that these would be expansions of existing facilities, or new facilities in already developed areas which would typically be exempt from CEQA review as infill development. Future development projects would also be required to pay impact fees consistent with local jurisdiction requirements, including the City and FCUSD, to ensure the adequate provision of public services, including schools. Impacts related to public facilities construction and school services would be less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to public services impacts would be less than cumulative considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 4-7 and 4-8).

Cumulative Recreation Impacts

The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to recreation beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to recreation would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with Quimby Act, General Plan Policy LU 6.1.4, and FMC Chapters 16.32 and 4.10.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The Quimby Act, which applies to cities and counties in the context of approval of residential subdivisions, has a parkland standard of 5 acres per 1,000 persons. The City is subject to the standards of the Quimby Act, and the increase in recreational facilities/areas under the project would be consistent with the Quimby Act and would offset the incremental increase in recreational facility demand associated with implementation of the project. As discussed in Section 6.6 above, the City would have sufficient parkland to support project buildout. Future development would also be subject to General Plan Policy LU 6.1.4 that requires open space in each residential development. Future tentative subdivision and tentative parcel maps under the project would be required to dedicate land or pay an in-lieu fee for the development of neighborhood and community parks, pursuant to FMC Chapter 16.32 and Chapter 4.10. The project would result in less than significant impacts related to recreation and parks. Therefore, the project's contribution to recreation and parks impacts would be less than cumulative considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-8).

Cumulative Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facility Impacts

The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Implementation of the project would be subject to and would implement General Plan policies applicable to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and service. Additionally, subsequent development projects under the project would be subject to all applicable City guidelines, standards, and specifications related to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Compliance with the applicable General Plan and FPASP objectives and policies would ensure that the increased demand for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities resulting from the project would not exceed the capacity of existing

and planned facilities. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the project's contribution to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities impacts would be less than cumulative considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-9).

Cumulative Vehicle Miles Traveled Impacts

The addition of project-generated total daily VMT within the City would not result in an exceedance of the established Citywide threshold of 7.51 VMT per capita. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to VMT would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The discussion of VMT impacts associated with the project is inherently a cumulative impact analysis as it compares the project to City VMT standards associated with buildout of the City. The project would have a reduced VMT per capita of approximately 6.62 when incorporating the trip generation rate reduction and trip distance reduction associated with low-income units, which is less than the citywide threshold of 7.51 VMT per capita. Therefore, residential VMT cumulative effects associated with the project would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-9).

Cumulative Impacts Related to Hazardous Design Feature or Incompatible Uses

Implementation of the project would be subject to, and constructed in accordance with, applicable roadway design and safety guidelines and General Plan policies. The project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to design features or incompatible uses would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

As discussed above in Section 6.10, any new transportation facilities, or improvements to such facilities associated with future development would be required to comply with General Plan policies, including Policy M 1.1.3 to require new and reconstructed facilities to meet the Americans with Disability Act requirements and Policy M 3.1.1 to ensure all residents have access to safe and convenient public transit options. Development in the Folsom Plan Area would be required to comply with FPASP objectives and policies, including Objective 7.1 to create a safe and efficient circulation system for all modes of travel and Policy 7.2 to provide Americans with Disability Act accessible circulation and minimize barriers to access by pedestrians, persons with disabilities, seniors, and bicyclists. New or improved

transportation facilities would be designed in accordance with Caltrans' policies and procedures to ensure a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system is maintained. The project would include the addition of a roundabout prioritization policy in the City of Folsom General Plan. Future projects associated with the roundabout policy would be subject to the City's Public Works Department review and approval to ensure all applicable standards are met. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to transportation hazards. Therefore, the project's contribution to impacts related to hazardous design feature or incompatible use would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-9).

Cumulative Water Impacts

The additional water demand from implementation of the project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impact regarding water supply than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to water service beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Thus, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to water service would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

As discussed in Section 6.11 above, the development north of Highway 50 would result in increases in water demand of approximately 916 AFY in the City of Folsom. The City of Folsom would have sufficient water supplies to serve the projected 916 AFY of water demand during normal year, single-dry year, and five-year consecutive drought. The development south of Highway 50 would result in increases in water demand of approximately 414 AFY. Of the 414 AFY water demand, approximately 359 AFY would be within the City of Folsom's service area and 55 AFY within the El Dorado Irrigation District's service area. Both the City of Folsom and El Dorado Irrigation District would have sufficient water to serve the project. Modeling conducted for the project indicated that the increase in water demand resulting from the project would not result in adverse hydraulic impacts to the City's water distribution system. The impacts related to water supply and water infrastructure would be less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to impacts related to water supply and water infrastructure would be less than cumulatively considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, pages 4-9 and 4-10).

Cumulative Wastewater and Stormwater Impacts

Implementation of the project could generate wastewater as a result of increased housing in the City. The existing wastewater conveyance infrastructure in the City of Folsom would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated additional wastewater. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.11-2a and 3.11-2b would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to wastewater and stormwater services would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are offset and less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.11-2a and 3.11-2b. These mitigation measure are feasible and will be adopted and included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 3.11-2a and Mitigation Measure 3.11-2b would be required.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

The discussion of wastewater conveyance impacts associated with the project for is inherently a cumulative impact analysis as the wastewater model includes existing and proposed future development as anticipated in the General Plan EIR. As summarized in Section 6.11 above, development associated with the project beyond that identified in the City of Folsom 2017 Capacity Assurance Plan (Ultimate Buildout Scenario) would have the potential to reach the capacity of some localized sewer lines, specifically along Riley Road, Sibley Drive, and Glenn Road. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-2a would ensure local improvements would be constructed to maintain capacity in the sewer shed. The western project planning area north of Highway 50 is located within the 27-Inch Sewer Shed, which does not have capacity beyond the amount originally identified in the City of Folsom 2017 Capacity Assurance Plan (Ultimate Buildout Scenario). Mitigation Measure 3.11-2b would require preparation of sewer studies for future projects and development and implementation of a Wastewater Conveyance Master Plan to allow for additional capacity. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Therefore, the project's contribution to wastewater and stormwater impacts related to would be less than cumulative considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (SEIR, page 4-10).

Cumulative Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications Impacts

Future development associated with the project would be following more stringent energy efficiency standards, which would reduce the demand for energy use. In addition, compliance with General Plan Policies PFS 8.1.1 through PFS 8.1.5 would also ensure that adequate utilities services would be provided to the City's residents. Therefore, the project would not result in a new or greater contribution to cumulative effects related to dry utilities facilities beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR. Thus, the project's contribution to substantial effects related to dry utilities facilities would be less than cumulatively considerable.

FINDINGS

The City of Folsom City Council finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts related to the project's cumulative effects are less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measure

No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with most current energy efficiency standards and General Plan policies.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS

Implementation of the project would result in 6,046 housing additional units in the project planning area and reduction of 251,266 square feet of non-residential land use in the Folsom Plan Area. It is anticipated that the demand for electrical power, natural gas, and telecommunication services would be increased for residential use but would be decreased for non-residential use compared to what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. As discussed in Impact 3.11-4 of the SEIR (pages 3.11-25 and 3.11-26), a Technical Dry Utilities Study was prepared for the Folsom Plan Area by Capitol Utilities Specialists in 2009. The study concluded that all the major dry utilities (natural gas, electric, telephone, and cable television) necessary to serve the FPASP either already exist on-site or are available adjacent to the site. Furthermore, SMUD, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and AT&T and Comcast Communication have planned to construct additional electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication infrastructure to serve the Folsom Plan Area. Implementation of General Plan Policies PFS 8.1.1 through PFS 8.1.5 would ensure that adequate utilities services would be provided to the City's residents. Regulations, including State energy efficiency standards and building

regulations, have generally reduced the demand for energy on a per-unit basis compared to the industry standard when the General Plan EIR was prepared. It is reasonable to assume that the project would not result in a substantial increase in demand for dry utilities compared to what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR and planned for the Folsom Plan Area. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded dry utilities infrastructure that have not been evaluated in the General Plan EIR and have been planned for the Folsom Plan Area. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to impacts related to electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications would be less than cumulative considerable. The cumulative effects would be less than significant (Draft SEIR, page 4-10).

7 FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

7.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED IN THE SEIR

As described above, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) provides that the range of potential alternatives for the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. Alternatives that fail to meet the fundamental project purpose need not be addressed in detail in an EIR. (*In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165-1167.)

In determining what alternatives should be considered in an EIR, it is important to acknowledge the objectives of the project, the project's significant effects, and unique project considerations. These factors are crucial to the development of alternatives that meet the criteria specified in Section 15126.6(a). Although, as noted above, EIRs must contain a discussion of "potentially feasible" alternatives, the ultimate determination as to whether an alternative is feasible or infeasible is made by lead agency decision-maker(s). (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(3).) At the time of action on the project, the decision-maker(s) may consider evidence beyond that found in this EIR in addressing such determinations. The decision-maker(s), for example, may conclude that a particular alternative is infeasible (i.e., undesirable) from a policy standpoint, and may reject an alternative on that basis provided that the decision-maker(s) adopts a finding, supported by substantial evidence, to that effect, and provided that such a finding reflects a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and other considerations supported by substantial evidence. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 998.)

The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected during the planning or scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. The following two alternatives were considered in the SEIR but were not evaluated further:

- ▶ Reduced Units in the 27-inch Sewer Shed
- ▶ Relocated Units in the 27-inch Sewer Shed to 33-inch Sewer Shed

7.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE SEIR

Three alternatives, representing a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, were selected for detailed analysis. The goal for evaluating these alternatives is to identify ways to avoid or lessen the significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed project, while attaining most of the project objectives.

The following sections provide a general description of each alternative, its ability to meet the project objectives, and a qualitative discussion of its comparative environmental impacts. As provided in Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the significant effects of these alternatives are identified in less detail than the analysis of the proposed project in the SEIR.

Alternative 1: No Project

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE

Under Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, the City would continue to implement the adopted 2035 General Plan. No changes would be made to address the requirements of State law. Since the adoption of the 2035 General Plan, the City has been issued a RHNA by SACOG and is required by State law to address its housing needs in the 2021-2029 Housing Element. The General Plan land use and zoning designations would not be updated to address the City's housing needs under this alternative. The project planning area would retain the adopted General Plan land use and zoning designations.

The No Project Alternative would result in the continuation of existing conditions and planned development of the City. No new significant environmental impacts or an increased severity of environmental impacts identified in the 2035 General Plan EIR would occur under this alternative because it would retain the current General Plan land use and zoning designations.

FINDING

No new significant environmental impacts or an increased severity of environmental impacts identified in the General Plan EIR would occur under this alternative because it would retain the current General Plan land use designations and policy provisions. Implementation of this alternative would reduce all identified impacts of the project. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives. Therefore, the City of Folsom City Council rejects the No Project Alternative as undesirable as it fails the project's underlying purpose and does not meet any of the project objectives.

ANALYSIS

The No Project Alternative would not include land use or zoning amendments to plan for additional housing in the City or meet the direction from the State to meet the City's RHNA for housing. As part of the Housing Element update the City is required to establish and maintain sufficient multi-family and mixed-use land available to meet the target housing demand at all income levels over an 8-year period. The City's RHNA obligation for the eight-year Housing Element cycle is 6,363 housing units, of which 3,567 units are to be affordable to low- and very low-income households (collectively referred to as the lower-income RHNA). Program H-2 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element directs the City to strategically increase residential capacity in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay, SACOG Transit Priority Areas (Glenn and Iron Point light rail stations), and the FPASP Town Center to address the no net loss requirements (Draft SEIR, page 5-3).

Under this alternative, 2021-2029 Housing Element Program H-2 to increase opportunities for mixed-use and multi-family high density development would not be implemented and a new Transit Oriented Development overlay designation would not be established. This alternative would not include a roundabout prioritization policy in the General Plan that would promote reduced congestion and safety.

Alternative 2: Denser Development Alternative

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE

Under Alternative 2, multi-family development in the Glenn Station and Central Business districts would be reduced, specifically the development within the City's 27-inch sewer shed, and instead multi-family development in the College/Broadstone, Iron Point Station district and the portion of the Glenn Station district outside the 27-inch sewer shed would be increased.

FINDING

For the reasons set forth below and more fully described in Final SEIR and in the record of proceeding, the City of Folsom City Council finds that Alternative 2 is undesirable as it would result in greater impacts to aesthetics, air quality, energy, noise, population and housing, and public services. The City of Folsom City Council also finds that although this alternative would reduce impacts to the City's 27-inch sewer shed the Denser Development Alternative would have a greater impact on the City's 33-inch sewer shed. Therefore, the City of Folsom City Council declines to adopt this alternative pursuant to the standards in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

ANALYSIS

Denser development under Alternative 2 would result in an additional 49 units as part of the project. Although Alternative 2 would be consistent with the project objectives, Alternative 2 would not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the General Plan EIR including aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise (Draft SEIR, pages 5-4 through 5-7). As shown in Table 5-2 of the Draft SEIR Alternative 2 impacts to aesthetics, air quality, and noise would be increased under this alternative.

Alternative 3: Folsom Plan Area Alternative

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE

Under the Folsom Plan Area Alternative all development proposed for the project needed to meet the target housing demand for the City's RHNA would be in the Folsom Plan Area. The Folsom Plan Area Alternative would include all proposed 6,046 additional multi-family residential units south of Highway 50 in the Folsom Plan Area. To achieve additional residential development in the Folsom Plan Area this alternative would allow for increased building height of two additional stories, higher density, and greater FAR on sites designated as part of the project in the FPASP for development. Therefore, overall development under this alternative would be denser and taller than currently permitted in the Folsom Plan Area.

FINDING

For the reasons set forth below and more fully described in Final SEIR and in the record of proceeding, the City of Folsom City Council finds that Alternative 3 is undesirable as it would place all development in the Folsom Plan Area and thus would not meet the project objectives to increase opportunities for mixed-use and multi-family high density development in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay or SACOG Transit Priority Areas. Additionally, the project objective to establish a new Transit Oriented Development Overlay would not be met. Therefore, the City of Folsom City Council declines to adopt this alternative pursuant to the standards in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

ANALYSIS

Program H-2 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element directs the City to strategically increase residential capacity in the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay, the SACOG Transit Priority Areas (Glenn and Iron Point light rail stations), and the FPASP Town Center to address the no net loss requirements. Alternative 3, would not meet the requirements of Program H-2 by increasing residential capacity only in the Folsom Plan Area. Furthermore, it would conflict with Program H-2, which states that the "City shall strive to disperse affordable housing opportunities and avoid fair housing issues related to overconcentration." Additionally, Alternative 3 would result in greater environmental impacts to aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise and would not reduce the significant and unavoidable findings from the General Plan EIR for these issue areas (Draft SEIR, pages 5-7 through 5-10). See Table 5-2 of the Draft SEIR.