

## 2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

This chapter contains comment letters received during the public review period for the Draft SEIR (Appendix A), which concluded on June 6, 2024. In conformance with Section 15088(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, written responses were prepared addressing comments on environmental issues received from reviewers of the Draft SEIR.

### 2.1 LIST OF COMMENTERS ON THE DRAFT SEIR

Table 2-1 presents the list of commenters, including the numerical designation for each comment letter received, the author of the comment letter, and the date of the comment letter.

**Table 2-1 List of Commenters**

Letter No.	Commenter	Date
AGENCIES		
A1	California Highway Patrol B.J. Maynard, Lieutenant	May 24, 2024
A2	California Department of Transportation Gary Arnold, Branch Chief	May 28, 2024
A3	Sacramento Area Sewer District Robb Armstrong, SacSewer Development Services	June 4, 2024
INDIVIDUALS		
I1	Finley	May 15, 2024
I2	Loretta Hettinger	May 15, 2024
I3	Crystal Gorton	May 15, 2024

## 2.2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The written individual comments received on the Draft SEIR and the responses to those comments are provided below. The comment letters are reproduced in their entirety and are followed by the response(s). Where a commenter has provided multiple comments, each comment is indicated by a line bracket and an identifying number in the margin of the comment letter.

### 2.2.1 Agencies

#### Letter A1 California Highway Patrol

B.J. Maynard, Lieutenant  
May 24, 2024

##### Comment A1-1

The commenter states that the project would put a strain on existing public safety resources along U.S. Highway 50 and surrounding roadways in Sacramento County, including traffic safety and extended response times as Folsom is experiencing significant growth.

##### Response A-1

As discussed in the Draft SEIR Section 3.9, "Public Services and Recreation" the project would result in a 14 percent increase in population as compared to what is currently assumed in the Folsom General Plan and would thus require increased police services, including California Highway Patrol, to maintain service times and safety. New residents in Folsom would be required to pay local property and sales taxes. Money from these taxes would be provided to California Highway Patrol from the State for funding additional public safety services, as needed. Traffic safety was analyzed in Impact 3.11-3 of the Draft SEIR. As stated on page 3.10-19 of the Draft SEIR 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." No changes to the SEIR are required in response to this comment and no further response is required.

## Letter A2 California Department of Transportation

Gary Arnold, Branch Chief

May 28, 2024

### Comment A2-1

The commenter provides introductory remarks and a summary of the project description.

### Response A2-1

The comment does not address the adequacy of the SEIR analysis, and no further response is required. The comment is noted.

### Comment A2-2

The commenter states that individual developments under the project would be required to prepare VMT impact studies that include multimodal analysis. The commenter states that queuing analysis should be completed to determine cumulative impacts and spillback onto US Highway 50. The commenter continues that retail as part of larger development would not be exempt from VMT as it would not be local serving.

### Response A2-2

A queuing evaluation was completed as part of the Traffic Analysis for the project prepared by Kimley Horn in April 2024 for use by the City. The queuing analysis determined that 18 intersections are expected to have at least one left-turn movement that exceed available storage without and with the project, including the Prairie City Road intersection with US Highway 50 eastbound ramps. The City acknowledges that fair share contributions may be required to offset traffic impacts associated with the project.

The comment provides general statements regarding potential vehicle miles travelled (VMT) requirements for future development but does not raise specific issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR's analysis or identify applicable requirements that were not included as part of the analysis. Future projects may be subject to future transportation studies as individual development is proposed. No further response is required.

### Comment A2-3

The commenter states that complete streets should be developed in the Folsom Plan Area and that routes to local schools be visible and contiguous. The commenters requests clarification on if pedestrian facilities in the transit oriented development area are in good condition and if expansions to bicycle and pedestrian facilities will connect to existing trails.

### Response A2-3

As discussed in the Draft SEIR Impact 3.10-1, future development as part of the project would be subject to General Plan goals and policies that promote complete streets and alternative transportation. As included on pages 3.10-3 and 3.10-4 of the Draft SEIR policies included in the General Plan would promote complete streets throughout the City including to the Folsom Plan Area (Policy M 1.1.1), ensure that streets are safe and accessible to people with limited mobility (Policy M 1.1.3), promote intermodal connections including bicycle and pedestrian connections to transit stops (Policy M 1.1.6), require developers to provide a system of sidewalks, trails, and bikeways that link all land uses and provide accessibility to parks, schools, and trail facilities (Policy M 2.1.3), and encourage construction of facilities that ensure children can walk or bike safely to school (Policy 2.1.16). As part of the FPASP, the Folsom Plan Area has been planned for a transportation system that includes complete streets, bike and pedestrian facilities, and transit. For example, there are Class I shared used path and Class II bikeways planned throughout the Folsom Plan Area many of which have already been constructed. A Transit Master Plan was prepared for the Folsom Plan Area in April 2010. The Transit Master Plan identifies a bus route along Alder Creek Parkway that would link the residential areas with the major commercial areas in the Folsom Plan Area and the Hazel Avenue light rail station. It is anticipated that the transit system in the Folsom Plan Area would be developed in phases as development occurs. As concluded on page 3.10-17 of the Draft SEIR the project would not conflict with adopted plans and policies for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. No further response is required.

**Comment A2-4**

The commenter states that future development as part of the project that would require direct connection with a state route would require coordination with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 3 regarding plan sets and right-of-way.

**Response A2-4**

Regulatory requirements related to Caltrans are provided under Subsection 3.10.1 of Section 3.10, "Transportation," of the Draft SEIR. There is only one remaining planned connection to Highway 50 that would be impacted by the project, the Empire Ranch Interchange. The City is currently coordinating with Caltrans as part of the interchange project and will continue to coordinate with Caltrans and acquire any necessary permits or coverage administered by Caltrans District 3.

The comment provides general statements regarding potential requirements but does not raise specific issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR's analysis or identify applicable requirements that were not included as part of the analysis. No further response is required.

**Comment A2-5**

The commenter states that future development as part of the project may require an encroachment permit and coordination with Caltrans District 3.

**Response A2-5**

Please see response A2-4. The comment provides general statements regarding potential requirements but does not raise specific issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR's analysis or identify applicable requirements that were not included as part of the analysis. No further response is required.

## Letter A3 Sacramento Area Sewer District

Rob Armstrong, Sac Sewer Development Services  
June 4, 2024

### Comment A3-1

The commenter provides introductory remarks and a summary of the project need and description, noting that Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and the Sacramento Area Sewer District merged into the Sacramento Area Sewer District or SacSewer.

### Response A3-1

The comment does not address the adequacy of the SEIR analysis, and no further response is required. The comment is noted.

### Comment A3-2

The commenter states that the City is responsible for providing local sewer service for the project and SacSewer is responsible for conveying sewage from the City's collection system to the recovery facility for treatment and disposal.

### Response A3-2

The existing SacSewer conveyance system and facilities are described on pages 3.11-13 and 3.11-16 of the Draft SEIR in Section 3.11, "Utilities and Service Systems." The City will coordinate with SacSewer for conveying sewage from the City's collection system to the treatment facility. The comment does not address the adequacy of the SEIR analysis, and no further response is required. The comment is noted.

### Comment A3-3

The commenter states that the City will provide interim sewer service for the Folsom Plan Area until sewer flows generated within the Folsom Plan Area reach 1.9 million gallons per day and after minimum flows are reached SacSewer will construct the necessary infrastructure to convey sewer flows.

### Response A3-3

In response to this comment page 3.11-13 the Draft SEIR has been revised as follows:

The FPASP proposes a wastewater system similar to that north of Highway 50, with collectors and mains conveying wastewater to the SacSewer's system for treatment. The City would provide interim sewer service for the Folsom Plan Area until sewer flows generated within the Folsom Plan Area reach 1.9 million gallons per day (average dry weather), after which SacSewer will construct the necessary infrastructure to convey sewer flows. A pumping station would be constructed in the northwest section of the Folsom Plan Area to serve the area.

The City will coordinate with SacSewer as development occurs in the Folsom Plan Area. These edits are minor and do not constitute "significant new information" that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

### Comment A3-4

The commenter states that SacSewer adopted the Interceptor Sequencing Study in 2013 and that project identified within SacSewer planning documents directly result in growth projections considered by the City. The commenter continues that the City shall notify SacSewer before creating or making changes to City planning documents that affect build-out capacity and should provide design flow information for projects for SacSewer to assess.

### Response A3-4

The City will notify SacSewer prior to making significant changes to buildout that would impact the sewer system and will provide the necessary information to SacSewer to determine system impacts. Impact 3.11-2 of the Draft SEIR includes the technical analysis completed for the project that provides information on the impact to wastewater conveyance that would occur under the project. The comment provides general statements regarding future

requirements but does not raise specific issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR's analysis or identify applicable requirements that were not included as part of the analysis. No further response is required.

**Comment A3-5**

The commenter states the project would result in an additional 1,031 housing units in the College/Broadstone District that would be served by the Iron Point Pump Station and Folsom East interceptor. The commenter continues that SacSewer flow meter data downstream of the Iron Point Pump Station shows peak wet weather flow is higher than the design contemplated. The commenter states that the Iron Point Pump Station is at or near capacity and that future development as part of the project may require improvements to the system. The commenter provides hydrographs of flows from the system as an attachment.

**Response A3-5**

The City will coordinate with SacSewer to evaluate inflow and infiltration within the N40 shed. The comment does not address the adequacy of the SEIR analysis, and no further response is required. The comment is noted.

**Comment A3-6**

The commenter states that future SacSewer customers are responsible for rates and fees outlined in the latest SacSewer ordinance and fees recover the capital investment of sewer conveyance and treatment facilities to serve new customers. The commenter continues that sewer services are only guaranteed following proper permits and payment of fees.

**Response A3-6**

Future development as part of the project would be responsible for paying the necessary fees as outlined in the SacSewer ordinance. These fees would assist in funding improvements to the sewer system in the City, as included in Section 3.11 of the Draft SEIR. The comment does not address the adequacy of the SEIR analysis, and no further response is required. The comment is noted.

## 2.2.2 Individuals

### Letter I1 Finley

May 15, 2024

#### Comment I1-1

The commenter states that they oppose the project and that there are not sufficient parks, police, school, and other public services to serve the project.

#### Response I1-1

Section 3.9, "Public Services and Recreation" of the Draft SEIR includes an analysis of impacts to park, police, and school facilities with the project. General Plan EIR Impact PSR-1 concluded that increased development from buildout of the General Plan would result in increased demand for governmental facilities, including police and fire protection. With implementation of applicable City policies and regulatory requirements, impacts from construction and expansion of police and fire facilities were determined to be less than significant in the General Plan EIR. As discussed on page 3.9-10 of the Draft SEIR new development associated with the buildout of the project would be required to pay development fees into the City's General Fund to assist in funding public services, including fire and police protection. Additionally, the FPASP proposes to construct three fire stations and one police service center based on the increased demand for fire and law enforcement protection services to accommodate the influx of new residents and to maintain an adequate level of service. Therefore, the project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in severity of identified impacts as they relate to police and fire services.

General Plan EIR Impact PSR-1 concluded that increased development from buildout of the General Plan would result in increased demand for school facilities. The increased demand was determined to result in the need for new and expanded schools to serve the anticipated population increase. With implementation of applicable City policies and regulatory requirements, impacts from construction and expansion of new school facilities were determined to be less than significant in the General Plan EIR. As stated on page 3.9-12 of the Draft SEIR the anticipated increase in student enrollment from the project would require new public school facilities. New school facilities or expansion needed to serve the project would be funded through development under the project. Future applicants would be required to pay all applicable State-mandated school impact fees to the school district at the time of development. Therefore, the project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in severity of identified impacts as they relate to schools.

General Plan EIR Impact PSR-2 concluded that increased development from buildout of the General Plan would result in increased demand for recreational facilities. With implementation of applicable City policies and regulatory requirements, impacts from construction and expansion of new park and recreation facilities were determined to be less than significant in the General Plan EIR. As included on page 3.9-13 of the Draft SEIR, 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 Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 16.32 and Chapter 4.10. Therefore, the project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in severity of identified impacts as they relate to parks and recreation. No changes to the SEIR are required in response to this comment and no further response is required.

**Letter I2 Loretta Hettinger**

May 15, 2024

**Comment I2-1**

The commenter states that they are in support of mixed-use housing closer to jobs to improve traffic and air quality. The commenter continues that housing as part of the project should be restricted for affordability in the undeveloped portions of the Folsom Plan Area.

**Response I1-1**

The project would deed restrict some sites in the Folsom Plan Area for affordable housing. The comment does not address the adequacy of the SEIR analysis, and no further response is required. The comment is noted.

**Letter I3 Crystal Gorton**

May 15, 2024

**Comment I3-1**

The commenter states that they do not want to see affordable housing in the City or north of Highway 50.

**Response I3-1**

The comment does not address the adequacy of the SEIR analysis, and no further response is required. The comment is noted.