

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary is provided in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(a), “[a]n EIR shall contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b) states, “[t]he summary shall identify: (1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid that effect; (2) areas of environmental controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public; and (3) issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.” Accordingly, this summary includes a brief synopsis of the project and project alternatives, environmental impacts and mitigation, areas of known environmental controversy, and issues to be resolved during environmental review. Table ES-1 (at the end of this section) presents the summary of potential environmental impacts, their level of significance without mitigation measures, proposed mitigation measures, and the levels of significance following the implementation of mitigation measures.

ES.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THIS DRAFT EIR

This draft environmental impact report (Draft EIR) has been prepared to inform decision makers, representatives of affected and responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed Folsom Corporation Yard Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) and annexation (SOIA/annexation) (LAFCo # 01-17; State Clearinghouse # 2017112020). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.).

ES.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT

The project is solely to facilitate the development of a new corporation yard for the City of Folsom which would be designated as Public and Quasi-Public Facility and rezoned Industrial. The project includes amending the respective Spheres of Influence (SOI) for the City of Folsom and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San), amending the City’s general plan, annexing an approximately 58-acre property into the City, and rezoning the site for future use as a City corporation yard. The Folsom Corporation Yard Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) and Annexation project (Folsom Corporation Yard SOIA/annexation) would include a reorganization of service district boundaries, including the annexation and detachment of 57.8 acres from the following service districts:

- ▲ annexation to the City of Folsom,
- ▲ annexation to Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District,
- ▲ detachment from Sacramento Regional Solid Waste Authority,
- ▲ detachment from Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (fire protection and emergency services),
- ▲ detachment from County Service Area No. 1 (street and highway lighting),
- ▲ detachment from County Service Area No. 10 (enhanced transportation services),
- ▲ detachment from Wilton/Cosumnes Park and Recreation Area (County Service Area 4B),
- ▲ detachment from Zone 13 of the Sacramento County Water Agency Zone 13, and
- ▲ detachment from Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District.

If the SOIA, general plan amendment, prezone, and annexation are approved, the City would purchase the property in fee title and begin more detailed planning on the design of the corporation yard. While development of a corporation yard is not part of this project, it is a likely outcome of the SOIAs, general plan

amendment, prezone, annexations, and detachments; therefore, the impacts of a reasonable development scenario are described and evaluated throughout the Draft EIR. The site would include 36.03 acres for the future corporation yard, 16.25 acres for SouthEast Connector right-of-way, and 5.12 acres to realign Scott Road. In addition, a 0.8-acre easement is included in the project but not in the SOIA/annexation area. This area would be used to provide access to Prairie City State Vehicular Recreational Area (SVRA) once the SouthEast Connector removes the current access. The parcel created through this project would be created by two separate grant deeds. The landowner will grant the property with these two deeds to the City after approval of the environmental document. Prior to the completion of the annexation, the County would provide a certificate of compliance for the remaining parcel outside of the boundaries of the two grant deeds.

The City anticipates that Scott Road would be realigned to connect to Prairie City Road and be abandoned from north of the realignment to White Rock Road.

A detailed description of the project elements is included in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of this document.

ES.2.1 Project Setting

The project site is located at the southeast corner of Prairie City Road and White Rock Road, just west of Scott Road in Sacramento County, California. The project site is currently owned by Aerojet Rocketdyne Inc., an Ohio Corporation. The site is vacant and surrounded by mostly vacant, undeveloped land. An aggregate quarry is located to the south and Aerojet's Area 41 remediation site is to the east. The site is surrounded by barbed wire fence and no structures (other than power lines and towers) are present. There is an existing access point along White Rock Road between Prairie City Road and Scott Road. This entrance is gated with a short dirt road leading up to it; there are no access roads within the site. Several power lines and towers run through the property; however, no utilities (e.g., water, wastewater, natural gas, and electricity) are located on site. Across White Rock Road to the northeast is the southern portion of the FPASP development area.

The SOIA/annexation area for the City of Folsom Corporation Yard is currently within the jurisdiction of the County of Sacramento, just outside the City of Folsom's SOI and outside the County's Urban Services Boundary (USB). To the west, California State Parks has an off-highway motor vehicle park, Prairie City SVRA, which contains trails and tracks open to almost daily off-highway motor vehicle use. In addition, the SVRA hosts public events throughout the year which access the site from Scott Road and White Rock Road.

While the area to the north of the site is currently undeveloped, it is within the FPASP area and is currently planned for a variety of uses, including open space, residential, commercial, and other uses.

ES.2.2 Project Objectives

Sacramento LAFCo and the City of Folsom have identified the following project objectives:

- ▲ amend the SOI boundary beyond the existing Folsom city limits to accommodate a municipal corporation yard use compatible with the City of Folsom and Sacramento County policies;
- ▲ implement the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 consistent with public service conditions present or reasonably foreseeable in the Folsom Corporation Yard SOIA/annexation area;
- ▲ establish an expanded SOI and city boundary for the City of Folsom that will provide a new corporation yard site and facilitate the protection of important environmental, cultural, and agricultural resources;
- ▲ provide a location within city boundaries to develop a consolidated corporation yard to improve operating efficiencies, minimize duplication of material and equipment, minimize unproductive travel time between

sites, improve staff coordination and supervision, minimize land use conflicts, and improve overall site security; and

- ▲ provide a new corporation yard site which would remove current corporation yard uses from the City's Historic District and other locations where land use conflicts are present.

ES.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. This Draft EIR evaluates impacts to environmental resources that could result from implementation of the Folsom Corporation Yard SOIA/annexation and discusses mitigation measures that could be implemented by Sacramento LAFCo and the City of Folsom to reduce potential adverse impacts to a level that is considered less than significant. The impacts and mitigation measures are identified Chapter 3, *Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, and are summarized in Table ES-1 at the end of this chapter. Chapter 4, *Cumulative Impacts*, provides a discussion of cumulative impacts. The mitigation measures presented in this Draft EIR will form the basis of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

ES.3.1 Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

An impact that remains significant after mitigation is considered an unavoidable adverse impact of the project. Implementation of the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the following resource areas:

- ▲ Aesthetics (Section 3.1)
- ▲ Agriculture and Forestry Resources (Section 3.2)
- ▲ Biological Resources (Section 3.4)
- ▲ Energy (Section 3.6)
- ▲ Noise and Vibration (Section 3.10)

ES.4 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this Draft EIR includes a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that meet most of the objectives of the project and avoid or substantially lessen the identified likely environmental impacts. The following summary describes the alternative to the project that is evaluated in this Draft EIR. As described in Chapter 5, *Project Alternatives*, there were no other feasible alternatives to the project. For further discussion, refer to Chapter 5, *Project Alternatives*.

- ▲ **Alternative 1: No Project** – This alternative would consist of not approving the Folsom Corporation Yard SOIA, annexation, or changes to land use/zoning designations. The SOIA/annexation area would remain under the jurisdiction of Sacramento County with no changes to the current General Agriculture 80 land use designation and Special Planning Area zoning.

As discussed in Chapter 5, *Project Alternatives*, the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it reduces several impacts associated with the project. However, it would not meet the project objectives and, as described in Section 5.3, *Alternatives Dismissed from Detailed Evaluation*, there are no other feasible alternatives to the project.

ES.5 AREAS OF POTENTIAL CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. The following provides a summary of issues raised through scoping and comments on the Notice of Preparation that could be considered controversial. The comment letters received on the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix A of this document.

- ▲ Adequate availability of potable water
- ▲ Water and sewer service to the site
- ▲ Aesthetics
- ▲ Native American consultation
- ▲ Impacts on nearby roadways
- ▲ Biological resources

The Draft EIR addresses the above issues to the extent that substantial evidence permits, and to the extent that the issue is an environmental issue. However, it does not address impacts that are speculative and not reasonably foreseeable. All the substantive environmental issues raised in the NOP comment letters have been addressed in this Draft EIR.

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.1 Aesthetics			
<p>Impact 3.1-1: Substantially adversely affect a scenic vista. The project would reduce the barriers preventing future development of the site, which could lead to the construction of a corporation yard within the viewshed of Scott Road and a rerouting of Scott Road. Because this would alter lands within a scenic vista in a locally designated scenic corridor, this impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.1-1: Design future corporation yard to soften visual impact. At the time the City proceeds with development of the site, the City will coordinate with Sacramento County to review design plans to ensure that appropriate landscaping and other best management practices (natural or naturally-colored building materials, berms, trees, attractive fencing, etc.) that can screen and soften views of corporation yard development to travelers along Scott Road to the degree feasible. At a minimum, the City will demonstrate how design measures were considered and determined to be feasible/infeasible based onsite conditions.</p>	SU
<p>Impact 3.1-2: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project would change the existing views on the site from open space grasslands to a more industrial setting. Future construction onsite would cause the removal of grasslands and of trees and introduce urban development in an area which is generally natural and could degrade the visual character or quality of the site. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.1-1.	SU
<p>Impact 3.1-3: Create new source of light or glare. The project would lead to the construction of urban buildings on the site. While the City has a policy reduce light and glare impacts offsite, no specific measures are included that would ensure lighting from the site would not trespass to offsite areas and adversely affect travelers and future neighbors of approved developments. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.1-3a: Conform to Construction Lighting Standards. The City shall limit construction to daylight hours to the extent possible. If nighttime lighting or construction is necessary, the City shall ensure that unshielded lights, reflectors, or spotlights would not be directed to shine toward or be directly visible from adjacent properties or streets. To the extent possible, the City shall minimize the use of nighttime construction lighting within 500 feet of existing residences. This measure shall be identified on grading plans and in construction contracts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.1-3b: Design development to reduce lighting and glare. The City shall design the lighting at the project site to include the following minimum requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ outdoor lighting shall be properly shielded and installed to prevent light trespass on adjacent properties; and ▲ flood or spot lamps installed shall be aimed no higher than 45 degrees above straight down (half-way between straight down and straight to the side) when the source is visible from any offsite residential property or public roadway. 	SU

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources			
<p>Impact 3.2-1: Conversion of farmland into non-agricultural uses. The project site is categorized as farmland and the conversion of this land to a nonagricultural use would be considered a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: Farmland preservation. Consistent with Sacramento County General Plan Policy AG-5, the City will provide in-kind or similar resource value protection for land similar to the project site. This protection may consist of the establishment of farmland easements, or other similar mechanism and shall be implemented prior to issuance of the first grading permit for development.</p>	SU
3.3 Air Quality			
<p>Impact 3.3-1: Construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. Construction-related activities from a future corporation yard would result in emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from site preparation (e.g., excavation, clearing), off-road equipment, material and equipment delivery trips, and worker commute trips, and other miscellaneous activities (e.g., building construction, asphalt paving, application of architectural coatings). Construction activities would not result in mass emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} that would exceed SMAQMD's thresholds of significance. Therefore, construction-generated emissions would not contribute to the existing nonattainment status of the SVAB for ozone and PM. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	None required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.3-2: Long-term operational emissions of air pollutants. Implementation of a future corporation yard would not result in long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ that exceed SMAQMD's thresholds of significance (65 lb/day for ROG, 65 lb/day for NO_x, 80 lb/day and 14.6 tons/year for PM₁₀). Therefore, operation-generated emissions would not conflict with the air quality planning efforts and contribute substantially to the nonattainment status of SVAB with respect to ozone and PM₁₀. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	None required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.3-3: Mobile-source CO concentrations. Long-term operation-related local mobile-source emissions of CO generated by the development a future corporation yard would not violate a standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	None required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.3-4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs. Construction- and operation-related emissions of TACs associated with the implementation of a future corporation yard would result an incremental increase in cancer risk greater than 10 in one million or a hazard index greater than 1.0 at existing or future sensitive receptors. Therefore, this impact would</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1: Incorporate design features to minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs. Prior to construction, the City of Folsom will implement the following measures to address TAC exposure: <u>Construction</u></p>	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>be potentially significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Enforce idling time restrictions for construction vehicles; ▲ Require construction vehicles to operate with the highest tier engines commercially available; and ▲ Increase use of electric and renewable fuel-powered construction equipment. <p><u>Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Proposed high-diesel truck traffic areas that have the potential to emit TACs or host TAC-generating activity shall be located as far away from existing and proposed off-site sensitive receptors as possible such that they do not expose sensitive receptors to TAC emissions that exceed an incremental increase of 10 in one million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0; and ▲ Signs shall be posted at all truck loading areas which indicate that diesel powered delivery trucks must be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises to reduce idling emissions of diesel PM. 	
<p>Impact 3.3-5: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors. A future corporation yard would introduce new odor sources into the area (e.g., temporary diesel exhaust emissions during construction and heavy-duty trucks associated with industrial land use). Construction and long-term operation of a future corporation yard would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive odors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	None required.	LTS
<p>3.4 Biological Resources</p>			
<p>Impact 3.4-1: Disturbance to or loss of special-status plant species and habitat. Future development of the SOIA/annexation area could result in the disturbance or loss of several special-status plant species. Because the loss of special-status plants could substantially affect the abundance, distribution, and viability of local and regional populations of these species, this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1: Protection and mitigation of special-status plants. Prior to breaking ground within the SOIA/annexation area, the City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Prior to construction and during the blooming period for the special-status plant species with potential to occur in the project site, a qualified botanist shall conduct protocol-level surveys for special-status plants in areas where potentially suitable habitat would be removed or disturbed by project activities. Table 3.4-4 summarizes the normal blooming periods for special-status plant species with potential to occur on the project site, which generally indicates the optimal survey periods when the species are most identifiable. ▲ If no special-status plants are found, the botanist shall document the findings in a letter report to USFWS, CDFW, and the project applicant and no further mitigation shall be required. 	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ If special-status plant species are found on the project site and are located outside of the permanent footprint of any proposed structures/site features and can be avoided, the project applicant will establish and maintain a 40-foot protective buffer around special-status plants to be retained. ▲ If special-status plant species are found that cannot be avoided during construction, the applicant shall consult with CDFW and/or USFWS, as appropriate depending on species status, to determine the appropriate mitigation measures for direct and indirect impacts that could occur because of project construction and shall implement the agreed-upon mitigation measures to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat or individuals. Mitigation measures may include preserving and enhancing existing populations, creation of offsite populations on mitigation sites through seed collection or transplantation, and/or restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat and/or individuals. A mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed describing how unavoidable losses of special-status plants will be compensated. ▲ If relocation efforts are part of the mitigation plan, the plan shall include details on the methods to be used, including collection, storage, propagation, receptor site preparation, installation, long-term protection and management, monitoring and reporting requirements, success criteria, and remedial action responsibilities should the initial effort fail to meet long-term monitoring requirements. ▲ Success criteria for preserved and compensatory populations shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The extent of occupied area and plant density (number of plants per unit area) in compensatory populations shall be equal to or greater than the affected occupied habitat. ➤ Compensatory and preserved populations shall be self-producing. Populations shall be considered self-producing when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – plants reestablish annually for a minimum of five years with no human intervention such as supplemental seeding; and – reestablished and preserved habitats contain an occupied area and flower density comparable to existing occupied habitat areas in similar habitat types in the project vicinity. ➤ If offsite mitigation includes dedication of conservation easements, purchase of mitigation credits, or other offsite conservation measures, the details of these measures shall be included in the mitigation plan, including information on 	

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		responsible parties for long-term management, conservation easement holders, long-term management requirements, success criteria such as those listed above and other details, as appropriate to target the preservation of long term viable populations.	
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Disturbance to or loss of special-status wildlife species and habitat. Future development of the proposed SOIA/annexation area could adversely affect several special-status wildlife species, including amphibians, nesting birds, mammals, and invertebrates. Future development activities such as ground disturbance and vegetation removal, as well as overall conversion of habitat to urban uses, could result in the disturbance or loss of individuals and reduced breeding productivity of these species. Special-status wildlife species are protected under ESA, CESA, California Fish and Game Code, CEQA, or other regulations. The loss of special-status wildlife species and their habitat would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2a: Avoidance and protection of spadefoot toad. The City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions prior to, and during, construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ For work conducted during the western spadefoot toad migration and breeding season (November 1 to May 31), a qualified biologist shall survey the project site (including access roads) within 48 hours prior to initiation of construction activities. If no western spadefoot individuals are found during the preconstruction survey, the biologist shall document the findings in a letter report to CDFW and the City of Folsom, and further mitigation shall not be required. ▲ If western spadefoot toad is found within the project site, the qualified biologist shall consult with CDFW to determine appropriate avoidance measures. When feasible, there will be a 50-foot no-disturbance buffer around burrows that provide suitable upland habitat for western spadefoot toad. Burrows considered suitable for spadefoot will be identified by a qualified biologist. The biologist will delineate and mark the no-disturbance buffer. ▲ If a 50-foot no-disturbance buffer is not feasible, then other mitigation measures may include relocation of aquatic larvae, construction monitoring, or preserving and enhancing existing populations. ▲ Prior to initiation of construction activities, the project applicant shall employ a qualified biologist to conduct environmental awareness training for construction activities. The training will describe special-status wildlife and habitats, and applicable measures designed to minimize disturbance to these species. 	LTS
	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b: Protection of burrowing owl. The City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions prior to, and during, construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused breeding and nonbreeding season surveys for burrowing owls in areas of suitable habitat on and within 1,500 feet of the project site. Surveys shall be conducted prior to the start of construction activities and in accordance with Appendix D of CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012). ▲ If no occupied burrows are found, a letter report documenting the survey methods and results shall be submitted to CDFW and no further mitigation would be required. 	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ If an active burrow is found during the nonbreeding season (September 1 through January 31), the applicant shall consult with CDFW regarding protection buffers to be established around the occupied burrow and maintained throughout construction. If occupied burrows are present that cannot be avoided or adequately protected with a no-disturbance buffer, a burrowing owl exclusion plan shall be developed, as described in Appendix E of CDFW's 2012 Staff Report. Burrowing owls shall not be excluded from occupied burrows until the project's burrowing owl exclusion plan is approved by CDFW. The exclusion plan shall include a plan for creation, maintenance, and monitoring of artificial burrows in suitable habitat proximate to the burrows to be destroyed, that provide substitute burrows for displaced owls. ▲ If an active burrow is found during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), occupied burrows shall not be disturbed and will be provided with a 150- to 1,500-foot protective buffer unless a qualified biologist verifies through noninvasive means that either: (1) the birds have not begun egg laying, or (2) juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. The size of the buffer shall depend on the time of year and level disturbance as outlined in the CDFW Staff Report (CDFW 2012). The size of the buffer may be reduced if a broad-scale, long-term, monitoring program acceptable to CDFW is implemented to prevent burrowing owls from being detrimentally affected. Once the fledglings are capable of independent survival, the owls can be evicted and the burrow can be destroyed per the terms of a CDFW-approved burrowing owl exclusion plan developed in accordance with Appendix E of CDFW's 2012 Staff Report. ▲ If active burrowing owl nests are found on the site and are destroyed by project implementation, the project applicant shall mitigate the loss of occupied habitat in accordance with guidance provided in the CDFW 2012 Staff Report, which states that permanent impacts to nesting, occupied and satellite burrows, and burrowing owl habitat shall be mitigated such that habitat acreage, number of burrows, and burrowing owls adversely affected are replaced through permanent conservation of comparable or better habitat with similar vegetation communities and burrowing mammals (e.g., ground squirrels) present to provide for nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal. The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to develop a burrowing owl mitigation and management plan that incorporates the following goals and standards: ▲ Mitigation lands shall be selected based on comparison of the habitat lost to the compensatory habitat, including type and structure of habitat, disturbance levels, potential for conflicts with humans, pets, and other wildlife, density of burrowing owls, 	

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>and relative importance of the habitat to the species range wide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ If feasible, mitigation lands shall be provided adjacent or proximate to the site so that displaced owls can relocate with reduced risk of take. Feasibility of providing mitigation adjacent or proximate to the project site depends on availability of sufficient suitable habitat to support displaced owls that may be preserved in perpetuity. ▲ If suitable habitat is not available for conservation adjacent or proximate to the project site, mitigation lands shall be focused on consolidating and enlarging conservation areas outside of urban and planned growth areas and within foraging distance of other conservation lands. Mitigation may be accomplished through purchase of mitigation credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank, if available. If mitigation credits are not available from an approved bank and mitigation lands are not available adjacent to other conservation lands, alternative mitigation sites and acreage shall be determined in consultation with CDFW. ▲ If mitigation is not available through an approved mitigation bank and will be completed through permittee-responsible conservation lands, the mitigation plan shall include mitigation objectives, site selection factors, site management roles and responsibilities, vegetation management goals, financial assurances and funding mechanisms, performance standards and success criteria, monitoring and reporting protocols, and adaptive management measures. Success shall be based on the number of adult burrowing owls and pairs using the site and if the numbers are maintained over time. Measures of success, as suggested in the 2012 Staff Report, shall include site tenacity, number of adult owls present and reproducing, colonization by burrowing owls from elsewhere, changes in distribution, and trends in stressors. 	
	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2c: Protection measures for nesting raptors. The City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions prior to, and during, construction: The following measures will be implemented and are intended to avoid and minimize impacts to nesting raptors including Swainson’s hawk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ For project activities, including tree removal and ground disturbance, that begin between February 1 and September 15, qualified biologists shall conduct preconstruction surveys for Swainson’s hawk and other nesting raptors and to identify active nests on and within 0.5 mile of the project site. The surveys shall be conducted before the beginning of any construction activities between March 1 and September 15. ▲ For construction activities that would occur within 0.5 mile of a likely Swainson’s hawk nest site, the project applicant shall attempt to initiate construction activities prior to nest initiation phase (i.e., before March 1). Depending on the timing, regularity, and 	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>intensity of construction activity, construction in the area prior to nest initiation may discourage a Swainson’s hawk pair from using that site and eliminate the need to implement further nest-protection measures, such as buffers and limited construction operating periods around active nests. Other measures to deter establishment of nests (e.g., reflective striping or decoys) may be used prior to the breeding season in areas planned for active construction. However, if breeding raptors establish an active nest site, as evidenced by nest building, egg laying, incubation, or other nesting behavior, near the construction area, they shall not be harassed or deterred from continuing with their normal breeding activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Impacts to nesting Swainson’s hawks and other raptors shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers around active nest sites identified during preconstruction raptor surveys. Project activity shall not commence within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist has determined, in coordination with CDFW, that the young have fledged, the nest is no longer active, or reducing the buffer would not likely result in nest abandonment. CDFW guidelines recommend implementation of 0.5-mile-wide buffer for Swainson’s hawk and 500 feet for other raptors, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and the project applicant, in consultation with CDFW, determine that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest. ▲ Trees shall not be removed during the breeding season for nesting raptors unless a survey by a qualified biologist verifies that there is not an active nest in the tree. 	
	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2d: Mitigation for loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. The City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions prior to, and during, construction: To mitigate for the loss of approximately 41.5 acres of suitable Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, the project applicant shall implement a Swainson’s hawk mitigation plan consistent with the Sacramento County Swainson’s Hawk Ordinance, including but not limited to the requirements described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, or recordation of a final map, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall acquire suitable Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat as determined by CDFW and approved by the County. ▲ The project applicant shall preserve through conservation easement(s) or fee title one 	SU

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>acre of similar habitat for each acre affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The project applicant shall transfer said easement(s) or title to the County, CDFW, and a third-party conservation organization as acceptable to the County and CDFW. The County may, at its discretion, waive the requirement for a third-party conservation organization to be party to the easement or fee title. Such third-party conservation organizations shall be characterized by non-profit 5019(c)(3) status with the Internal Revenue Service and be acceptable to both the County and CDFW. 	
	PS	<p>Mitigation 3.4-2e: Protection measures for American badger. The City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions prior to, and during, construction:</p> <p>This mitigation measure applies to projects or ground-disturbing activities with potential to disturb suitable habitat for American badger.</p> <p>Prior to construction activities within suitable habitat for American badger (e.g., annual grassland), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct surveys to identify any American badger burrows/dens. These surveys shall be conducted not more than 15 days prior to the start of construction. If occupied burrows are not found, further mitigation will be not required. If occupied burrows are found, impacts to active badger dens shall be avoided by establishing exclusion zones around all active badger dens, within which construction-related activities shall be prohibited until denning activities are complete or the den is abandoned. A qualified biologist shall monitor each den once per week to track the status of the den and to determine when a den area has been cleared for construction.</p>	LTS
	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2f: Mitigation for aquatic invertebrates; vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. The City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions prior to, and during, construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ This mitigation measure applies to projects or ground-disturbing activities with potential to disturb habitat for vernal pool crustaceans; it incorporates the conservation measures from the USFWS Programmatic Biological Opinion (USFWS 1996) that provide for both habitat preservation and habitat creation for vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. ▲ Because suitable wetland or vernal pool habitat is known to occur on the project site (see Mitigation Measure 3.4-3), the project applicant shall implement the following measures to minimize and compensate for loss of vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. ▲ Habitat Preservation: The applicant, in consultation with USFWS, shall compensate for 	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>direct effects of the project on potential habitat for vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp at a ratio of 2:1, by purchasing vernal pool preservation credits from a USFWS-approved conservation bank. Compensation credits shall be purchased prior to any ground-disturbing activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Habitat Creation: The applicant shall compensate for the direct effects of the project on potential habitat for vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp at a ratio of 1:1, by purchasing vernal pool creation credits from a USFWS-approved conservation bank. ▲ Mitigation shall occur before the approval of any grading or improvement plans for any project phase that would allow work within 250 feet of such habitat, and before any ground-disturbing activity within 250 feet of the habitat. ▲ For seasonal wetlands and drainages that shall be retained on the site (i.e., those not proposed to be filled), a minimum setback of at least 50 feet from these features will be avoided on the project site. The buffer area shall be fenced with high visibility construction fencing prior to commencement of ground-disturbing activities, and shall be maintained for the duration of construction activities. ▲ A worker environmental awareness training shall be conducted to inform onsite construction personnel regarding the potential presence of listed species and the importance of avoiding impacts to these species and their habitat. ▲ The applicant shall secure any necessary take authorization prior to project construction through formal consultation between USACE and USFWS pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA, and shall implement all measures included in the Biological Opinion issued by USFWS. 	
<p>Impact 3.4-3: Disturbance and loss of wetlands, other waters of the United States, and waters of the state. Seasonal wetlands, intermittent drainages, and vernal pools are present within the SOIA/annexation area. Future land use changes and development would result in conversion of wetland habitat to urban uses. Loss or degradation of wetland or vernal pool habitat would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3: Wetlands, other waters of the U.S., and waters of the state. The City of Folsom shall impose the following conditions prior to, and during, construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Wetlands and vernal pools are of special concern to resource agencies and are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA and other applicable regulations. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct an updated delineation of waters of the United States or state, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation shall be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States or state would result from implementation of the project, authorization for such fill shall be secured from USACE through the 404 permitting process. Any 	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>waters of the United States that would be affected by project development shall be replaced or restored on a “no-net-loss” basis in accordance with USACE mitigation guidelines (or the applicable USACE guidelines in place at the time of construction). In association with the Section 404 permit (if applicable) and prior to the issuance of any grading permit, Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB shall be obtained.</p> <p>▲ If it is determined that waters subject to jurisdiction by CDFW are present within the project site following the delineation of waters of the United States and state, and that site development would affect the bed, bank, or channel, a Streambed Alteration Notification will be submitted to CDFW, pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. If proposed activities are determined to be subject to CDFW jurisdiction, the project proponent will abide by the conditions of any executed agreement prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Several aquatic features on site, including intermittent streams, would likely fall under the jurisdiction of CDFW.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.4-4: Conflict with City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance. A large valley oak tree that would qualify as a “heritage tree” under the City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance is present within the northeastern corner of the property. Removal of this tree could result in a conflict with this ordinance and would be a potentially significant impact. However, future development of the SOIA/annexation area does not include plans to remove the tree. Because the one “heritage tree” within the SOIA/annexation area would not be removed under the project, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.4-5: Interference with resident or migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites. Future land use changes and development within the SOIA/annexation area would result in loss of grassland and wetland habitats but would not substantially impede wildlife movement because the project site is relatively small, and near existing urban development. The project site does not contain any native wildlife nursery sites. Impacts to movement corridors and habitat connectivity for these species would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources			
<p>Impact 3.5-1: Cause substantial adverse change to a historical resource. The cultural resources inventory revealed one, non-archaeological historical resource on the project site, P-34-1555. Minor alterations to the road would not affect its NRHP-eligibility; therefore, the impact to non-archaeological historic resources would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.5-2: Cause substantial adverse change to a unique archaeological resource. Based on the results of the cultural resources report, there are two archaeological resources within the project site that have been evaluated as eligible for the NRHP, P-34-2190/2193 and P-34-335. There are no known prehistoric-era archaeological sites within the SOIA/annexation area. Future development of the site could impact known archaeological resources and ground-disturbing activities from future corporation yard development could also result in discovery or damage of as yet undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2a. Minimize impacts to the Prairie House and refuse pit. The potentially significant impact to the Prairie House and refuse pit site may be mitigated in several ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ During future project planning, the site shall be avoided entirely. While the site has been partially excavated, additional surveys would be needed to ensure proper site boundaries so that future grading and development would not affect the site. ▲ If the site cannot be avoided, then the site may be capped. The site shall be covered with layer(s) of chemically compatible soil prior to construction of any physical structures or other improvements. ▲ If avoidance, including capping, is not feasible, then the site shall be mitigated through data recovery excavation. Much of the known area in which the Prairie House and Refuse Pit site is located is within the right-of-way for the future SouthEast Connector. Depending on whether the future corporation yard is built before the SouthEast Connector, either the SouthEast Connector JPA or the City of Folsom may be required to mitigate the site. The two entities shall negotiate appropriate cost-sharing for the mitigation if the site cannot be avoided or capped. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2b. Impacts to previously unknown archaeological materials. In the event that evidence of any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities (e.g., ceramic shard, trash scatters, lithic scatters), all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. If a prehistoric archaeological site, the appropriate Native American group shall be notified. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the CRHR standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, and a data recovery plan shall be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall work with the project applicant to avoid disturbance to the resources and, if completed avoidance is not possible, follow</p>	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System office for the project site (the NCIC).	
Impact 3.5-3: Accidental discovery of human remains. Although unlikely, construction and excavation activities associated with future development of the SOIA/annexation area could unearth previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains, if they are present. Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and PRC Section 5097 in the event that human remains are found would make this impact less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.5-4: Disturb a unique paleontological resource. The project site is underlain with metamorphic rock and Mesozoic granite, which have a low paleontological potential. No paleontological resources are known to occur within the project site or a one-mile radius of the site. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.5-6: Cause substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource. Tribal consultation pursuant to AB 52 did not identify TCRs within the project area. Therefore, there would be no impact.	NI	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.6 Energy			
Impact 3.6-1: Wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, during project construction or operation. Development of the future corporation yard would increase electricity and natural gas consumption at the site relative to existing conditions. Thus, this impact would be potentially significant.	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: Greenhouse gas emission reduction measures.	LTS
Impact 3.6-2: Demand for energy services and facilities. Electrical and natural gas infrastructure would need to be extended by SMUD and PG&E to meet the energy needs of the development of the future corporation yard. If determined to be necessary, offsite improvements to electrical and natural gas facilities would be the responsibility of the utility and would be analyzed by the utility provider under separate environmental review. Neither LAFCo nor the City of Folsom would have control over the approval, timing, or implementation of any electrical or natural gas facility improvements. Furthermore, the project may result in encroachment onto SMUD's transmission easements. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.6-2: Encroachment within SMUD's transmission easement. Prior to construction, the City of Folsom will work with SMUD through the connection process, electric service requirements, and encroachment requests for SMUD-owned transmission line easements, including overhead and/or underground transmission and distribution line easements.	SU

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change			
<p>Impact 3.7-1: Project-generated GHG emissions. The level of annual GHG emissions associated with the project, including amortized construction-related emissions, would be approximately 1,052 MT CO₂e/year. This level of GHG emissions has the potential to result in a considerable contribution to cumulative emissions related to global climate change and conflict with State GHG reduction targets established for 2030 and 2050. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: Greenhouse gas emission reduction measures. The City shall incorporate a combination of onsite and, if necessary offsite, GHG reduction measures to compensate the project’s GHG emissions of 1,052 MT CO₂e/year, thus resulting in a no net increase in GHG emissions over conditions existing without the project. The level of annual GHG reduction necessary can be adjusted if the City can demonstrate that project-generated emissions resulting from expansion of fleet and increased operations differ from this estimated value. The City can retain a qualified professional to estimate and track the status of this measure, ensuring compliance with the necessary reductions in emissions.</p> <p>To reduce GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the project, the following onsite GHG reduction measures shall be incorporated into project design, to the extent feasible:</p> <p><u>Onsite Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Enforce idling time restrictions for construction vehicles. ▲ Require construction vehicles to operate with the highest tier engines commercially available. ▲ Increase use of electric and renewable fuel-powered construction equipment. <p><u>Onsite Operation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Replace diesel-fueled heavy-duty fleet vehicles with renewable compressed natural gas (CNG)-fueled or renewable diesel-fueled fleet vehicles. ▲ Replace gasoline-fueled passenger vehicles with electric vehicles. ▲ Achieve reductions in onsite electricity use through use of onsite renewable energy (e.g., solar photovoltaic panels). Building design and solar installation shall take into account solar orientation to maximize solar exposure. ▲ Install 240-Volt electric vehicle chargers and signage in the parking areas. ▲ Install energy-efficient lighting for parking and outdoor area lighting ▲ Reduce indoor water use by installing low-flow plumbing fixtures. ▲ Reduce outdoor water use by reducing turf area and use water-efficient irrigation systems (i.e., smart sprinkler meters) and landscaping techniques/design, and install rain water capture systems. ▲ Install a grey water system to irrigate outdoor landscaping and/or to use for indoor non-potable water uses. 	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>▲ Incorporate site design features to reduce onsite heat island effect including wall shading.</p> <p><u>Offsite GHG Reduction</u> If after incorporation of all feasible onsite GHG construction and operations reduction measures, project GHG emissions are not reduced to zero, the City shall purchase carbon credits to offset the level of project-related GHG emissions remaining after implementation of the feasible onsite measures identified above.</p> <p>The quantity of carbon credits purchased by the City to offset the project’s operational GHG emissions shall be based on the annual mass of GHG emissions less the reduction achieved by implementation of the onsite reductions measures described above, multiplied by an operational life of 25 years.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.7-2: Impacts of climate change on the project. The project is not located within an area projected to experience a substantial increase in wildland fire risk or flooding as a result of climate changes in the future. Anticipated changes in future climate patterns are not anticipated to have any substantial adverse effects on the project. Therefore, the impacts of climate change on the project would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>			
<p>Impact 3.8-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or environment due to upset and accident conditions. Future development of the SOIA/annexation area would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment through compliance with existing regulations. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.8-2: Create potential human hazards from exposure to existing onsite hazardous materials. Future development of the SOIA/annexation area could expose construction workers to hazardous materials present onsite during construction activities and hazardous materials onsite could create an environmental or health hazard for later residents or occupants, if left in place. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-2a: Prepare environmental site assessments. Prior to any earth-moving activities, the City of Folsom will conduct a Phase II ESA, and recommendations of the Phase II ESA shall be fully implemented prior to ground disturbance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-2b: Prepare a hazardous materials contingency plan for construction activities. The City of Folsom will prepare and submit a hazardous materials contingency plan to Sacramento County EMD. The plan will describe the necessary actions that would be taken if evidence of contaminated soil or groundwater is encountered during construction. The contingency plan will identify conditions that could indicate potential hazardous materials contamination, including soil discoloration, petroleum or chemical odors, and presence of underground storage tanks or buried building material.</p>	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		The plan will include the provision that, if at any time during the course of constructing the project, evidence of soil and/or groundwater contamination with hazardous material is encountered, the City will immediately halt construction and contact Sacramento County EMD. Work will not recommence until the discovery has been assessed/treated appropriately (through such mechanisms as soil or groundwater sampling and remediation if potentially hazardous materials are detected above threshold levels) to the satisfaction of Sacramento County EMD, RWQCB, and DTSC (as applicable). The plan, and obligations to abide by and implement the plan, will be incorporated into the construction and contract specifications of the project.	
Impact 3.8-3: Create a significant risk from wildfires. Future development of the SOIA/annexation area would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 3.9-1: Short-term construction-related and operational water quality degradation. Development of the project site as a future corporation yard could result in water quality degradation from construction activities, as well as from operational sources of water pollutants. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.9-1: Development of a drainage master plan for the project site. Prior to final design of a future corporation yard, the City of Folsom will prepare and implement a drainage master plan for the entire project site that includes the following items and shall be consistent with the 2017 "Stormwater Quality Design Manual": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ an accurate calculation of pre-project and post-development runoff scenarios, obtained using appropriate engineering methods that accurately evaluate potential changes to runoff, including increased surface runoff; ▲ details on onsite detention basin and drainage channel design that are consistent with the requirements of the City of Folsom and provide enough storage to accommodate peak storm events and no increase post-development flows or flood conditions off site; ▲ identification of design features that avoid site development from occurring in the 200-year floodplain; ▲ implementation of appropriate BMPs to address construction and operational stormwater quality consistent with City requirements; ▲ a description of any treatments necessary to protect earthen channels from erosion, and modifications that may be needed to existing underground pipe and culvert capacities; ▲ a description of the proposed maintenance program for the onsite drainage system; and ▲ a description of the project-specific standards for installing drainage systems. 	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.9-2: Deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Future development would result in creation of impervious surfaces of sufficient area in relation to the size of the groundwater basin that could interfere with groundwater recharge. In addition, water supply for future development of the project site would not be from groundwater. Project groundwater impacts would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.9-3: Alteration of drainage pattern or increase in rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation. Future development of the project site could lead to alteration of the drainage pattern of the site. This could result in increased stormwater runoff and an increase in susceptibility to downstream flooding and sediment issues. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.9-1.	LTS
<p>3.10 Noise and Vibration</p>			
<p>Impact 3.10-1: Construction-generated noise. Short-term construction-generated noise levels associated with the future development of the SOIA/annexation area could expose nearby noise-sensitive receptors to noise levels that exceed applicable local standards. If construction activity were to occur during more noise-sensitive nighttime hours it could result in annoyance and sleep disruption to occupants of nearby residential land uses and substantial periodic increases in ambient noise levels. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.10-1a: Implement construction-noise reduction measures. To minimize noise levels during nighttime construction activities, the City and their construction contractors will comply with the following measures during all nighttime construction work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturer’s recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation. ▲ Individual operations and techniques shall be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete off site instead of on site) where feasible and consistent with building codes and other applicable laws and regulations. ▲ To the maximum extent feasible, construction activity shall take place within the City of Folsom construction noise exemption timeframes (i.e., 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Saturday and Sunday). <p>Mitigation Measure 3.10-1b: Implement construction-noise reduction measures during noise-sensitive time periods. At the time of construction, the City of Folsom will comply with the following construction noise requirements:</p> <p>For all construction activity that would take place outside of the City of Folsom construction noise exemption timeframe when located adjacent to residential uses (i.e., 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Saturday and Sunday), and that is anticipated to generate noise levels that exceed the City of Folsom nighttime exterior noise standards for sensitive receptors (Table 3.10-11/3.9-12), the City will require</p>	SU

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		their construction contractors to comply with the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Implement noticing to adjacent landowners at least one week in advance if construction activity would take place outside of the City of Folsom’s construction noise exemption timeframe when located adjacent to residential uses (i.e., 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Saturday and Sunday, as identified in the City of Folsom Code), and is anticipated to exceed the City of Folsom nighttime exterior noise standards for sensitive receptors (Table 3.10-11/3.9-12). ▲ Install temporary noise curtains as close as feasible to noise-generating activity and that blocks the direct line of sight between the noise source and the nearest noise-sensitive receptor(s). Temporary noise curtains shall consist of durable, flexible composite material featuring a noise barrier layer bounded to sound-absorptive material on one side. The noise barrier layer shall consist of rugged, impervious, material with a surface weight of at least one pound per square foot. ▲ Noise-reducing enclosures and techniques shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., concrete mixers, generators, compressors). ▲ Operate heavy-duty construction equipment at the lowest operating power possible. 	
<p>Impact 3.10-2: Exposure of existing sensitive receptors to excessive traffic noise levels and/or substantial increases in traffic noise. Future development of a future corporation yard within the SOIA/annexation area would generate vehicle trips and result in an increase in ADT volumes on affected roadway segments; and thus, an increase in traffic source noise levels. However, surrounding receptors would not be exposed to traffic noise levels or traffic noise level increases that exceed applicable City of Folsom or Sacramento County noise standards. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.10-3: Intermittent single-event noise from trucks passing offsite sensitive receptors. Intermittent SENL’s from project generated truck trips passing offsite sensitive receptors during the more noise-sensitive hours would not exceed 65 SENL. Therefore, the percentage of people expected to be awakened when inside the affected homes would not exceed 5 percent. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.10-4: Long-term operational non-transportation noise levels. The SOIA/annexation area could result in future corporation yard land uses in close proximity to noise-sensitive land uses. Thus, offsite receptors could experience project-generated noise levels that exceed the City’s daytime and nighttime noise levels standards. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.10-4: Reduce noise exposure to existing sensitive receptors from proposed stationary noise sources. <u>City of Folsom</u> The City shall require the future development of a corporation yard to meet the following noise requirements in the design of the development:</p>	

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Locate and design the more noise-intensive lands uses and activities so that noise emissions do not exceed the applicable stationary noise source criteria (i.e., exterior daytime [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] standards of 50 L_{eq} and 70 L_{max} for receptors within the City, and exterior nighttime [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.] standards of 45 L_{eq} and 65 L_{max} for receptors within the City.</p> <p>At the time of approval of special permits and/or development plan review, the City shall conduct a site-specific noise analysis to evaluate design and ensure compliance with City of Folsom noise standards. Reduction of specific noise activities can be achieved by locating activities as far away as feasible from noise-sensitive land uses, constructing noise barriers between where these activities would take place and noise-sensitive land uses, or using buildings and topographic features to provide acoustic shielding for noise-sensitive land uses. Final design, location, orientation and use restrictions shall be dictated by findings in the noise analysis and approved by City staff.</p>	
<p>3.11 Traffic and Transportation</p>			
<p>Impact 3.11-1: Impacts to intersection operations. Implementation of the project would add an estimated 83 a.m. peak hour and 31 p.m. peak hour trips to the roadway network in the study area. Based on the traffic modeling and analysis, all study area intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service except for the Scott Road/White Rock Road intersection, which would worsen from LOS D to LOS E in the a.m. peak hour. Because the LOS would degrade from an acceptable level to an unacceptable level, this would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.11-1: Scott Road realignment or improvements to the Scott Road/White Rock Road intersection. The removal of the Scott Road/White Rock Road intersection is planned as part of the construction of the Capital SouthEast Connector Project, and thus no mitigation is required with implementation of Access Scenario 2 and Access Scenario 3 as discussed in Section 2.6.3. Access Scenario 1 would be implemented should the project be constructed prior to the Capital SouthEast Connector and is the only access option that requires mitigation because it does not assume removal of the Scott Road/White Rock Road intersection. Since any near-term improvements constructed at the Scott Road/White Rock Road intersection would be removed with construction of the Capital SouthEast Connector Project, this EIR identifies two mitigation options. To satisfy Mitigation Measure 3.11-1, the City shall either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Option A: construct the realignment of Scott Road to connect to the Prairie City/White Rock Road intersection. All existing Scott Road traffic traveling through the Scott Road/White Rock Road intersection would instead use the Prairie City Road/White Rock Road intersection; or ▲ Option B: construct a westbound left turn pocket at the Scott Road/White Rock Road intersection. 	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 3.11-2: Impacts to freeway facilities. Implementation of the project would not add trips to US 50 and would not cause queuing at any freeway off-ramps to approach or extend beyond its storage capacity. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.11-3: Impacts to transit. Implementation of the project would not generate new demand for transit trips during either peak hour and would not adversely affect existing transit routes. Furthermore, the project would expand transit storage facilities and office space for administrative employees, which helps the City of Folsom Transit Division to better meet demand. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.11-4: Impacts to bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The project would not adversely affect existing or planned bicycle facilities, result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists, or fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.11-5: Construction-related impacts. Project construction may require restricting or redirecting pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular movements at locations around the site to accommodate construction, staging, and modifications to existing infrastructure. Such restrictions could include lane closures, lane narrowing, and detours. For these reasons, construction traffic impacts would be potentially significant.	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.11-5: Preparation and implementation of a construction traffic and parking management plan. Prior to the beginning of construction or issuance of building permits, the City will prepare a construction traffic and parking management plan to the satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer and subject to review by affected agencies. The plan will ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are maintained. At a minimum, the plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ description of trucks including: number and size of trucks per day, expected arrival/departure times, truck circulation patterns; ▲ description of staging area including: location, maximum number of trucks simultaneously permitted in staging area, use of traffic control personnel, specific signage; ▲ description of street closures and/or bicycle and pedestrian facility closures including: duration, advance warning and posted signage, safe and efficient access routes for existing businesses and emergency vehicles, and use of manual traffic control; and ▲ description of driveway access plan including: provisions for safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, minimum distance from any open trench, special signage, and private vehicle accesses. 	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
3.12 Utilities and Service Systems			
<p>Impact 3.12-1: Require or result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Implementation of the project would interconnect with water and wastewater infrastructure constructed as part of the FPASP development area immediately north of the project site. All onsite facilities have been evaluated throughout the resource chapters of this EIR. As a result, the project would have less-than-significant wastewater and water supply facility impacts.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.12-2: Require new or expanded entitlements to water. Presently, there are no public water supply facilities within the project site and the project site is not served by a water purveyor. Implementation of the project would increase water supply demands in the City that would use surface water. Pursuant to the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the City has adequate water supplies to serve the project under normal, dry, and multiple-dry year conditions. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.12-3: Exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment provider. The SRWWTP has a design capacity of 181 mgd with the potential to expand to 218 mgd. Future development of the project site according to the conceptual land use plan is estimated to generate less than 0.012 mgd of wastewater. The SRWWTP would have adequate capacity to treat wastewater flows generated by future development of the project site. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.12-4: Generate solid waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of the landfill serving the area. Based on the current rates of solid waste generation and the capacity of the landfills that serve the area, there is sufficient capacity in landfills to serve as a future corporation yard. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact on the permitted capacity of the affected landfills.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
6 Reorganization			
<p>Impact 6-1: Impacts to the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District. Detachment of the project site from Metro Fire would not result in significant service impacts to the district because the project site does not require fire services and the City and the County will negotiate a tax sharing agreement to address potential funding issues. Therefore, the project's impacts to Metro Fire would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 6-2: Impacts to Sacramento County Water Agency Zone 13. Detachment of the project site from Sacramento County Water Agency Zone 13 would not result in significant drainage service impacts because Zone 13 was established for the funding of water supply and drainage studies and does not include the maintenance of drainage facilities. Therefore, project's impacts to Sacramento County Water Agency Zone 13 would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 6-3: Impacts to Sacramento County Service Area No. 1 and 10. Detachment of the project site from Sacramento County Service Area No.1 (street and highway lighting) and No. 10 (enhanced transportation services) would not result in significant roadway facility service impacts because the project site is undeveloped and does not pose current transportation facility service impacts. Therefore, project's impacts to Sacramento County Service Area No. 1 and 10 would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 6-4: Impacts related to Sloughouse Resource Conservation District. Detachment of the project site from Sloughouse RCD would not result in significant impacts to the district because the detachment would reduce the service area and would not remove the ability of the district to continue service to other areas for which it remains responsible. Therefore, project's impacts to Sloughouse RCD would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 6-5: Impacts related to Regional San. Annexation of the project site into Regional San's SOI would increase the service area as well as the infrastructure Regional San must maintain and serve. However, the City would provide connections to the site through the FPASP area and Regional San has the capacity to serve the project site without additional upgrades to facilities. Therefore, project impacts to Regional San would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 6-6: Impacts related to consistency with Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission policies and standards. The project would generally be consistent with Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission standards associated with annexation requests that address environmental issues as set forth in its Policy, Standards and Procedures Manual. Therefore, the project's impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable