Livermore Monopine Project

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared by:

City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

With technical support from:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
11 Natoma Street, Suite 155
Folsom, CA 95630

November 2022

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
AT&T	AT&T Mobility
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CARB	California Air Resources Control Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CH_4	Methane
CHL	California Historical Landmarks
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO2e	carbon dioxide equivalents
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
CY	cubic yards
dB	Decibels
dBA	A-weighted Decibel
DPM	Deiseal Particulate Matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EQ Zapp	Earthquake Hazards Zone Application
EV	Electric Vehicle
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
GHG	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
GWh	Gigawatt hours
GWP	Global Warming Potential

HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISMND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
LOS	Level of Service
m	meters
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
N_2O	Nitrous Oxide
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OSC	Open Space and Conservation
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
O_3	Ozone
P	Parks
PM2.5	Fine Particulate Matter
PM10	Coarse Particulate Matter
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric
PM	Particulate Matter
PRC	Public Resources Code
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
sf	Square foot/feet
SF_6	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SPD	Surge Protection Device
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin

TAC	Toxic Air Contaminants
UAIC	United Auburn Indian Community
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled

1.0 INITIAL STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

1.	Project title:	Livermore Monopine Project ISMND
2.	Lead agency name and address:	City of Folsom, Community Development Department 50 Natoma Street Folsom, CA 95630
3.	Contact person and phone number:	Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner 916-461-6209
4.	Project location:	Livermore Community Park 6004 Riley Street Folsom, CA 95630
5.	General plan designation:	Parks (P)
6.	Zoning:	Open Space and Conservation (OSC)

2.0 INTRODUCTION

AT&T Mobility (AT&T) (Applicant) proposes to install a new 89-foot (ft)-tall telecommunications cell tower, disguised as a pine tree, with associated support structure (proposed project) located within the Livermore Community Park, in the City of Folsom, California. The project would be constructed to extend AT&T telephone service coverage to the proposed area.

This Initial Study addresses the proposed project and whether it may cause significant effects on the environment. These potential environmental effects are further evaluated to determine whether they were examined in the Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report (EIR; 2018). In particular, consistent with Public Resources Code (PRC) §21083.3, this Initial Study focuses on any effects on the environment which are specific to the proposed project, or to the parcels on which the project would be located, which were not analyzed as potentially significant effects in the General Plan EIR, or for which substantial new information shows that identified effects would be more significant than described in the previous EIRs. For additional information regarding the relationship between the proposed project and the previous EIRs, see Section 7 of this Initial Study.

The Initial Study is also intended to assess whether any environmental effects of the project are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or by other means [§15152(b)(2)] of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. If such revisions, conditions, or other means are identified, they will be identified as mitigation measures.

This Initial Study relies on CEQA Guidelines §15064 and 15064.4 in its determination of the significance of environmental effects. According to §15064, the finding as to whether a project may have one or

more significant effects shall be based on substantial evidence in the record, and that controversy alone, without substantial evidence of a significant effect, does not trigger the need for an EIR.

3.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The following technical reports, quantified analysis and/or surveys were used in preparation of this Initial Study and are incorporated by reference:

- Tribal Cultural Resource Memo, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (2022)

4.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

4.1 Project Location

The project site is located at 6004 Riley Street within the Livermore Community Park in the City of Folsom (City), Sacramento County, California. The project parcel is 17.42-acres and consists of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 072-0270-088. However, the area of disturbance associated with the proposed project would be approximately 2.0-acres. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would be constructed within a 1,600-square foot (sf) lease area on Site Ref# CVL05842/Livermore Park. The project site is located on the south side of Riley Street, between Oak Avenue Parkway to the east, Blue Ravine Road to the west, and Iron Point Road to the south. The site is located within Section 6, Township 9 North, Range 8 East (Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute "Folsom Quadrangle"). Refer to Figure 1 for the Site and Vicinity Map, Figure 2 for the Aerial Map, and Figure 3 for the Site Plan. Note: All figures are located in **Appendix A**.

4.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is within the Livermore Community Park in the City of Folsom. The Livermore Community Park includes play equipment and athletic facilities including volleyball courts, soccer fields, baseball and softball fields, grass fields, and pedestrian walkways. An existing water tank is located in the northern portion of the Livermore Community Park. The community park includes existing internal paved driveways with parking areas. The park is accessible from one entrance driveway on Riley Street, two entrance driveways on Carter Street, and one entrance driveway on McAdoo Drive.

The project site is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from approximately 350-feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 355-feet amsl. The project site is bounded by Riley Street to the north, McAdoo Drive to the east, Rowlands Court to the west, and Carter Street to the south. The project is immediately surrounded by single-family residential homes to the north, south, east, and west. Further southeast, past a residential neighborhood, is the Willow Creek Reservoir. Natomas Ditch transects the Livermore Community Park in the southeastern portion of the park, approximately 150-ft from the project site. Neighboring land uses are summarized in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Neighboring Land Uses

Direction	Land Use
North	Single-family residences
East	Single-family residences, Willow Creek Reservoir
South	Single-family residences
West	Single-family residences

4.3 Project Characteristics

AT&T proposes to install a single new 89-ft-tall stealth monopine co-locatable tower and associated structures within a 1,600-sf lease area on Site Ref# CVL05842/Livermore Park. The lease area would be located east of the existing water tank located on the northern portion of the Livermore Community Park. A proposed AT&T mobility staging area would border the 1,600-sf lease area to the west.

I. Telecommunications Cell Tower and Support Structures

The proposed project would install a single new 89-ft-tall stealth monopine co-locatable tower with 12 panel antennas, 15 remove ratio units, and a GPS antenna. A monopine is a monopole disguised as a pine tree. The top of the monopine foliage would reach 94-ft above ground level (agl).

The project would also install one 64-sf AT&T mobility Cellxion walk in closet (WIC) shelter with a proposed Surge Protection Device (SPD) box installed on the outside of the shelter. The project would include a 30-kilowatt (kw) diesel generator with 190-gallon fuel tank, as well as nine direct current (DC) power trunks and three fiber trunks. The diesel generator would operate in the case of an emergency and for maintenance purposes, approximately one time a month for approximately 20-30 minutes. In the event of a power outage, the generator would have the capacity to power the site for up to three days before refueling is required.

The proposed utilities would connect to an existing electrical cabinet for power and would connect to an existing telco box for fiber. The existing electrical cabinet and telco box are located on the western side of the existing water tank in the northern portion of the Livermore Community Park. The proposed utilities would connect to the existing electrical cabinet and telco box through 6-inch underground conduits locate underneath the paved entrance driveway off Riley Street.

The lease area would be surrounded by a 6-ft-high chain link fence installed with privacy slats and would be secured with a locked gate. The chain link fence would be surrounded by a landscaped easement with various shrubs.

II. Parking, Access, and Signage

The project would include a non-exclusive AT&T mobile technician parking space located directly south of the lease area. A 6-ft to 15-ft non-exclusive AT&T mobile access easement is proposed on the existing paved driveway leading to the lease area.

The project site would be accessible via an existing paved driveway off Riley Street, which is also an entrance to the Livermore Community Park. The lease area would be enclosed with a 6-ft-high chain link fence with a locked gate, to prevent unauthorized entrance.

Signage would be placed around the proposed chain link fence and within the lease area. The signage would include project information signage, caution and warning signage, no trespassing signage, authorized personal only signage, and Proposition 65 warning signage.

III. Hours of Operation and Employees

Operation of the project would occur 12 months a year, seven days a week, 24 hours a day consistent with the continuous schedule of normal telephone company operations. The facility is "unmanned" and would be visited on an "as needed" basis only. No more than two service vehicles, being either a van or a small pickup truck, would visit the facility at a time.

4.4 Construction and Phasing

The proposed project would be constructed in a single phase. Construction activities would take place during daytime hours between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays and between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays, in accordance with Section 8.4.2.060 of the City's Municipal Code (Noise Ordinance). No construction would take place on Sundays or holidays. Due to the small nature of the project, construction would last approximately three months and would require minimal equipment including a backhoe, an excavator, and a crane.

4.5 City Regulation and Urban Development

IV. General Plan

The project site is designated as Parks (P) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The P designation provides for active and passive recreational opportunities in Folsom. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would be consistent with the existing General Plan designation with a Use Permit.

V. Zoning Ordinance

The zoning designation of the project site is Open Space Conservation (OSC) District. The OSC District is intended to be applied to properties which should be generally maintained in an open or undeveloped state or developed for permanent open uses as parks or greenbelts. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would be allowed under the OSC zoning district with a Use Permit.

VI. Community Development Department Standard Construction Conditions

The City's standard construction requirements are set forth in the City of Folsom, Community Development Standard Construction Specifications updated in July of 2020. A summary of these requirements is set forth below and incorporated by reference into the project description. Copies of these documents may be reviewed at the City of Folsom, Community Development Department, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California 95630.

The Department's standard construction specifications are required to be adhered to by any contractor constructing a public or private project within the City.

Use of Pesticides – Requires contractors to store, use, and apply a wide range of chemicals consistent with all local, state, and federal rules and regulations.

Air Pollution Control – Requires compliance with all Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) and City air pollution regulations.

Water Pollution – Requires compliance with City water pollution regulations, including National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) provisions.

Sound Control Requirements – Requires that all construction work comply with all local sound control and noise level rules, including the Folsom Noise Ordinance (discussed further below), and that all construction vehicles be equipped with a muffler to control sound levels.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos – Requires compliance with all SMAQMD and City air pollution regulations, including preparation and implementation of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan consistent with the requirements of Section 93105 of the State Government Code.

Weekend, Holiday, and Night Work – Prohibits construction work during evening hours, or on Sunday or holidays, to reduce noise and other construction nuisance effects.

Public Convenience and Safety – Regulates traffic through the work area, operations of existing traffic signals, roadway cuts for pipelines and cable installation, effects to adjacent property owners, and notification of adjacent property owners and businesses.

Public Safety and Traffic Control – Regulates signage and other traffic safety devices through work zones.

Existing Utilities – Regulates the relocation and protection of utilities.

Preservation of Property – Requires preservation of trees and shrubbery and prohibits adverse effects to adjacent property and fixtures.

Cultural Resources – Requires that contractors stop work upon the discovery of unknown cultural or historic resources, and that an archaeologist be retained to evaluate the significance of the resource and to establish mitigation requirements, if necessary.

Protection of Existing Trees – Specifies measures necessary to protect both ornamental trees and native oak trees.

Clearing and Grubbing – Specifies protection standards for signs, mailboxes, underground structures, drainage facilities, sprinklers and lights, trees and shrubbery, and fencing. Also requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control erosion and siltation of receiving waters.

Reseeding – Specifies seed mixes and methods for reseeding of graded areas.

VII. City of Folsom Municipal Code

The City regulates many aspects of construction and development through requirements and ordinances established in the Folsom Municipal Code. These requirements are summarized in **Table 2**, and hereby incorporated by reference into the Project Description as though fully set forth herein. Copies of these documents may be reviewed at the City of Folsom, Office of the City Clerk, 50 Natoma Street; Folsom, California 95630.

Table 2. City of Folsom Municipal Code Regulating Construction and Development

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
8.42	Noise Control	Establishes interior and exterior noise standards that may not be exceeded within structures, including residences; establishes time periods for construction operations.
8.70	Stormwater Management and Discharge Control	Establishes conditions and requirements for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm-drainage system; requires preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans.
9.34	Hazardous Materials Disclosure	Defines hazardous materials; requires filing of a Hazardous Material Disclosure Form by businesses that manufacture, use, or store such materials.
9.35	Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances	Establishes standards for the construction and monitoring of facilities used for the underground storage of hazardous substances and establishes a procedure for issuance of permits for the use of these facilities.
12.16	Tree Preservation	Regulates the cutting or modification of trees, including oaks and specified other trees; requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification; establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged trees.
13.26	Water Conservation	Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.
14.19	Energy Code	Adopts the California Energy Code, 2019 Edition, published as Part 6, Title 24, C.C.R. to require energy efficiency standards for structures.
14.20	Green Building Standards Code	Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2019 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4, A5, and A6.1 published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encourage sustainable construction practices.
14.29	Grading Code	Requires a grading permit prior to the initiation of any grading, excavation, fill or dredging; establishes standards, conditions, and requirements for grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage, and revegetation.

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
14.32	Flood Damage Prevention	Restricts or prohibits uses that cause water or erosion hazards, or that result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights; requires that uses vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage; controls the modification of floodways; regulates activities that may increase flood damage or that could divert floodwaters.

5.0 PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

AT&T Wireless is currently improving the existing wireless network in the city of Folsom, Sacramento County. The new proposed monopine and installation of AT&T's telecommunication equipment would improve wireless and broadband internet coverage for the local area and provide First Net capability. The First Net program also known as First Responders Network is the country's first nationwide public safety communications platform dedicated to first responders. Being built with AT&T, in public-private partnership with the First Responder Network Authority, AT&T seeks to engage and work with federal, state, and local governmental agencies as part of FirstNet buildout to enhance coverage for first responders. Additionally, the improved network would provide service to those who live, travel, and do business from home in the local area. The project engineer has indicated that the proposed location would provide the necessary coverage and capacity with the ability to hand off the wireless signal to the next telecommunications site, enabling travelers and community members to have reliable and continuous wireless coverage.

6.0 REQUIRED APPROVALS

A listing and brief description of the regulatory permits and approvals required to implement the proposed project are provided below. This Initial Study is intended to address the environmental impacts associated with all of the following decision actions and approvals:

- Use Permit for the construction and operation of a telecommunications cell tower and associated structures within the Livermore Community Park.

The City of Folsom has the following discretionary powers related to the proposed project:

- Adoption of the Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program: The City of Folsom Planning Commission will act as the lead agency as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will have authority to determine if the Initial Study is adequate under CEQA.

- Approval of project: The City of Folsom Planning Commission will consider approval of the project and the entitlement described above.

7.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

7.1 City of Folsom General Plan

The Program EIR for the City of Folsom General Plan (2018) provides relevant policy guidance for this environmental analysis. The EIR evaluated the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan (2035 General Plan) (City of Folsom 2018). The Program EIR is intended to provide information to the public and to decision makers regarding the potential effects of adoption and implementation of the 2035 General Plan, which consists of a comprehensive update of Folsom's current General Plan. The 2035 General Plan consists of a policy document, including Land Use and Circulation Diagrams.

7.2 Tiering

"Tiering" refers to the relationship between a program-level EIR (where long-range programmatic cumulative impacts are the focus of the environmental analysis) and subsequent environmental analyses such as the subject document, which focus primarily on issues unique to a smaller project within the larger program or plan. Through tiering a subsequent environmental analysis can incorporate, by reference, discussion that summarizes general environmental data found in the program EIR that establishes cumulative impacts and mitigation measures, the planning context, and/or the regulatory background. These broad-based issues need not be reevaluated subsequently, having been previously identified and evaluated at the program stage.

Tiering focuses the environmental review on the project-specific significant effects that were not examined in the prior environmental review, or that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions or by other means. Section 21093(b) of the Public Resources Code requires the tiering of environmental review whenever feasible, as determined by the Lead Agency.

In the case of the proposed project, this Initial Study tiers from the EIR for the Broadstone Unit No. 3 Specific Plan, and the EIR for the City of Folsom General Plan. The Folsom General Plan, as amended, is a project that is related to the proposed project and, pursuant to §15152(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, tiering of environmental documents is appropriate.

The above mentioned EIRs can be reviewed at the following location:

City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street (2nd Floor)
Folsom, CA 95630
Contact: Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner
(916) 461-6209

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☒ Geology and Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

8.1 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☒	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☐	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
☐	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect I) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
☐	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

11-10-22
Date

Josh Kinkade
Printed Name

City of Folsom
For

9.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The lead agency has defined the column headings in the environmental checklist as follows:

A. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

B. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the inclusion of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." All mitigation measures are described, including a brief explanation of how the measures reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced.

C. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project does not create an impact that exceeds a stated significance threshold.

D. "No Impact" applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. "No Impact" answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

The explanation of each issue identifies the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Where appropriate, the discussion identifies the following:

a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identifies where earlier analyses are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identifies which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and states whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describes the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

VIII. AESTHETICS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is within the Livermore Community Park in the City of Folsom. The Livermore Community Park includes play equipment and athletic facilities including volleyball courts, soccer fields, baseball and softball fields, and pedestrian walkways. An existing water tank is located in the northern portion of the Livermore Community Park. The community park includes existing internal paved driveways with parking areas and various trees and shrubs that contribute to the overall visual aesthetic of the park.

The project site is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from approximately 350-feet amsl to 355-feet amsl. The project site is bounded by Riley Street to the north, McAdoo Drive to the east, Rowlands Court to the west, and Carter Street to the south. The project is immediately surrounded by single-family residential homes to the north, south, east, and west. Further southeast, past a residential neighborhood, is the Willow Creek Reservoir. Natomas Ditch transects the Livermore Community Park in the southeastern portion of the park, approximately 150-ft from the project site. The most prominent aesthetic features of the area include a 25-ft-high water tank, pine trees ranging from 43-ft to 58-ft in height, and an oak tree that is 71-ft in height.

One overview simulation map and four photo simulations of the proposed monopine are included as Figure 4 through Figure 8 (**Appendix A**). Figure 4 represents the overall locations of the visual simulations in Figure 5 through Figure 8. Figure 5 represents the view from Riley Street looking southeast at the project site. Figure 6 represents the view from McAdoo Drive looking northwest at the project site. Figure 7 represents the view from Riley Street looking southeast at the project site. Figure 8 represents the view from Carter Street looking north at the project site.

Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less than significant impact. A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive view of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. Neither the project site nor the surrounding areas are considered to be scenic vistas due to the existing development and suburban environment typical of the area. Further, neither the project site, nor views to or from the project site, have been designated an important scenic resource by the City of Folsom or any other public agency.

The 89-ft monopine has been designed to resemble a pine tree to hide the mechanical equipment underneath and blend in with the existing pine trees in the vicinity of the project site. The top of the monopine foliage would reach 94-ft above ground level. As shown in Figure 4 through Figure 8, at vantage points in the surrounding area the monopine would be consistent with the existing views that contain scattered pine trees and other tree species, park facility equipment, light poles, and overhead utility lines. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No impact. No potential scenic resources are located within the project site. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is the segment of US Highway 50 from Placerville to Echo Summit, beginning approximately 19-miles east of the project site (Caltrans 2021). Given that no eligible or designated state scenic highways are located near the project site, there would be no impact.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less than significant impact. The existing visual character of the area surrounding the project site is primarily defined by utility structures and recreational facilities for the Livermore Community Park. The project site itself is in an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the community park, consisting of open space with ornamental vegetation. Existing trees in the immediate vicinity include pine trees ranging from 43-ft to 58-ft in height, an oak tree that is 71-ft in height, and various other trees that are shorter in height. Various trees and shrubs are located throughout the Livermore Community Park and are located along entryways and surrounding public streets. As shown in Figure 4 through Figure 8 (**Appendix A**), the proposed monopine would be visible from Riley Street, McAdoo Drive, and slightly visible from Carter Street. Given the project's pine tree design and the distance from most of these roads, the monopine would be largely indistinguishable as a man-made feature from the surrounding pine trees and its visual intrusiveness would not be substantial. Although the top of the monopine would reach 94-ft above ground level, which is approximately 23-ft taller than the highest oak tree in the vicinity, the monopine has been designed to blend in with the surrounding vegetation with camouflage purposes. The monopine would blend in with the existing pine trees, oak trees, and other tree species surrounding the project site. The monopine would be located in the northern portion of the Livermore Community Park, surrounded by existing trees and vegetation and park facility equipment. Therefore, the monopine would be consistent with existing views of the project site from Riley Street and from McAdoo Drive.

Construction of the proposed project within the 1,600-sf lease area would not require the relocation of any trees. The proposed monopine and the associated structures, including the WIC shelter, generator, and fuel tank would be enclosed by a 6-ft-high chain link fence and gate. The project proposes to plant over 30 shrubs within a landscaped area surrounding the chain link fence. The planting of these shrubs would deter from the visual character of the chain link fence and add to the overall visual aesthetic of the project site. Within the vicinity of the proposed project there is an existing 25-ft-tall water tank enclosed within a chain link fence, as well as an existing trash enclosure. Therefore, the location of the proposed project would be consistent with the existing utility structures located in the northern portion of the community park.

Although the proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the site and the surrounding area, the proposed monopine would blend in with the surrounding trees within the Livermore Community Park. The proposed project is consistent with the overall suburban character through its visual similarity with existing pine trees and is expected to integrate into the existing and planned development of the area. A less than significant impact to visual character and quality would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less than significant impact. Existing sources of light in the area include down-tilt light poles within the Livermore Community Park and down-tilt street poles along entryways and surrounding streets. Any new lighting associated with development, including any security lighting or maintenance lighting, would be subject to City standard practices regarding night lighting. Consistent with the City's practices, the lighting would be sited and designed to avoid light spillage and glare on adjacent properties, with timers or photo-electric cells for turning the lights on and off within one-half hour after dusk and one-half hour prior to dawn. Therefore, impacts from lighting would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

The monopine branches and trunk would be painted to imitate the colors of a pine tree; these colors would not be substantially reflective. Additionally, the associated support structures, including the WIC shelter and generator, would be made out of non-reflective materials. Therefore, glare impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

IX. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

No agricultural activities or timber management occur on the project site or in adjacent areas and the project site is not designated for agricultural or timberland uses. The California Important Farmlands Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation (CDC) classifies the project site and surrounding area as Urban and Built-Up land (CDC 2021a). Urban and Built-Up Land is land occupied by structures or infrastructure to accommodate a building density of at least one unit to 1.5-acres, or approximately six structures to 10.0-acres.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey report generated for the project site (NRCS 2021) indicates that the soil unit at the site, Xerorthents, dredge tailings, 2 to 50 percent slopes, is not Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, or Unique Farmland.

Discussion

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No impact. The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance (Farmland), as indicated in the CDC Important Farmland Finder (CDC 2021a). Therefore, the project would have no impact on important farmland resources.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No impact. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No impact. The project site is not zoned for, nor used as, timberland or forest land. Although ornamental vegetation would occur throughout the project parcel, the project site itself does not include any existing trees. Because the project site is not designated nor zoned as forest land or timber land, is not used for such a purpose, and would not naturally support a crop of commercial timber species, no impact would occur for c) and d).

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No impact. No portions of the City or the project site are zoned for forest land or timberland, and the project site is not zoned for agriculture nor designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, no impact would occur.

X. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The City of Folsom lies within the eastern edge of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws in the project area. As required by the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), SMAQMD has published various air quality planning documents as discussed below to address requirements to bring the SVAB into compliance with the federal and state ambient air quality standards. The Air Quality Attainment Plans are incorporated into the State Implementation Plan (SIP), which is subsequently submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the federal agency that administrates the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended in 1990.

Climate in the Folsom area is characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, rainy winters. During summer's longer daylight hours, plentiful sunshine provides the energy needed to fuel photochemical reactions between Oxides of Nitrogen (NOX) and Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG), which result in Ozone (O_3) formation. High concentrations of O_3 are reached in the Folsom area due to intense heat, strong and low morning inversions, greatly restricted vertical mixing during the day, and daytime subsidence that strengthens the inversion layer. The greatest pollution problem in the Folsom area is from NOX.

Ambient air quality is described in terms of compliance with state and national standards, and the levels of air pollutant concentrations considered safe, to protect the public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect people most sensitive to respiratory distress, such as people with asthma, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The EPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for seven air pollution constituents. As permitted by the Clean Air Act, California has

adopted more stringent air emissions standards (California Ambient Air Quality Standards, or CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air constituents.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for any state standard. An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A "nonattainment" designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once. The air quality attainment status of the SVAB, including the City of Folsom, is shown in **Table 3**.

Table 3. Sacramento County- Attainment Status

POLLUTANT	STATE OF CALIFORNIA ATTAINMENT STATUS	FEDERAL ATTAINMENT STATUS
Ozone	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Suspended Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	Nonattainment	Attainment
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Attainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Lead	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	No Federal Standard

Sources: California Air Resources Board Area Designations. State Area Designations and Maps. Reviewed January 9, 2015. Accessed at http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/changes.htm#reports on December 14, 2015.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants. Accessed at http://www.epa.gov/airquality/greenbk/ancl2.html on December 14, 2015.

Sacramento County is designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state PM_{10} standards, and the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standards. Concentrations of all other pollutants meet state and federal standards.

Ozone is not emitted directly into the environment, but is generated from complex chemical reactions between ROG, or non-methane hydrocarbons, and NOX that occur in the presence of sunlight. ROG and NOX generators in Sacramento County include motor vehicles, recreational boats, other transportation sources, and industrial processes. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ arise from a variety of sources, including road dust, diesel exhaust, fuel combustion, tire and brake wear, construction operations, and windblown dust.

Air Quality Monitoring

CARB's air quality monitoring network provides information on ambient concentrations of air pollutants in the SVAB. SMAQMD operates a monitoring station in Folsom, where the air quality data for ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ were obtained. Other data are reported from one additional location in Sacramento County. **Table 4** compares a three-year summary of the highest annual criteria air pollutant emissions collected at these monitoring stations with applicable CAAQS, which are more stringent than the corresponding NAAQS. The pollutants ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} are expected to be fairly representative of the project site, due to the regional nature of these pollutants.

Table 4. Summary of Annual Air Quality Data for Folsom Area Air Quality Monitoring Stations

POLLUTANT	2013	2014	2015
Ozone (O3) 1-hour: Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street			
Maximum Concentration (ppm)	0.14	0.100	0.114
Days Exceeding State Standard (1-hr avg. 0.09 ppm)	5	7	3
Ozone (O3) 8-hour: Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street			
Maximum Concentration (ppm)	0.087	0.085	0.093
Days Exceeding State Standard (8-hr avg. 0.070 ppm)	17	35	11
Days Exceeding National Standard (8-hr avg. 0.075 ppm)	6	14	5
PM10: Monitoring location: Sacramento – Branch Center Road 2			
Maximum State 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m3)	63.0	46.0	35.0
Days Exceeding State Standard (Daily Standard 50 µg/m^3)	1	0	*
Maximum Federal 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m3)	59.0	45.0	35.0
Days Exceeding Federal Standard (Daily Standard 150 µg/m^3)	0	0	*
PM2.5: Monitoring location: Folsom – East Natoma Street			
Maximum National 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m^3)	*	*	*
Days Exceeding National 2006 Standard (Daily Standard 35 µg/m^3)	*	*	*

*Insufficient data to determine the value
Source: California Air Resources Board, Air Quality Data and Statistics. Accessed at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/index.html on April 26, 2016.

As indicated in **Table 4**, ozone and PM_{10} standards have been exceeded in Folsom over the past three years. Although no data are available for $PM_{2.5}$ at the Folsom monitoring station, data collected regionally at the Sacramento Health Department monitoring site on Stockton Boulevard in Sacramento show that there have been exceedances for this pollutant as well over the last five years.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TAC) are a diverse group of air pollutants that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. TACs can cause long-term chronic health effects such as cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, asthma, bronchitis, or genetic damage, or short-term acute effects such as eye watering, respiratory irritation (a cough), runny nose, throat pain, and headaches. TACs are considered either carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic based on the nature of the health effects associated with exposure to the pollutant. For carcinogenic TACs, there is no level of exposure that is considered safe and impacts are evaluated in terms of overall relative risk expressed as excess cancer cases per one million exposed individuals. Noncarcinogenic TACs differ in that there is generally assumed to be a safe level of exposure below which no negative health impact is believed to occur. These levels are determined on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

The Health and Safety Code (§39655[a]) defines TAC as "an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health." All substances that are listed as hazardous air pollutants pursuant to subsection (b) of Section 112 of the CAA (42 United States Code Sec. 7412[b]) are designated as TACs. Under State law, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), acting through CARB, is authorized to identify a substance as a TAC if it determines the substance is an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an

increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness, or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health.

Diesel engines emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, including both gaseous and solid material. The solid material in diesel exhaust is referred to as diesel particulate matter (DPM). Almost all DPM is 10 microns or less in diameter, and 90 percent of DPM is less than 2.5 microns in diameter (CARB 2022). Because of their extremely small size, these particles can be inhaled and eventually trapped in the bronchial and alveolar regions of the lung. In 1998, CARB identified DPM as a TAC based on published evidence of a relationship between diesel exhaust exposure and lung cancer and other adverse health effects. DPM has a notable effect on California's population—it is estimated that about 70 percent of total known cancer risk related to air toxics in California is attributable to DPM (CARB 2022).

Sensitive Receptors

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others due to the types of population groups or activities involved and are referred to as sensitive receptors. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. CARB and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) have identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, infants (including in utero in the third trimester of pregnancy), and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis (CARB 2005; OEHHA 2015).

Residential areas are considered sensitive receptors to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. Children and infants are considered more susceptible to health effects of air pollution due to their immature immune systems, developing organs, and higher breathing rates. As such, schools are also considered sensitive receptors, as children are present for extended durations and engage in regular outdoor activities.

The closest existing sensitive receptors to the project site would include an existing baseball and softball field within the Livermore Community Park, located approximately 200-ft southeast and southwest of the project site, and residential single-family homes located approximately 300-ft east of the project site. The closest school to the project site is Sandra J. Gallardo Elementary School, located approximately 1-mile southwest of the project site at 775 Russi Road.

Standards of Significance

While the final determination of whether or not a project has a significant effect is within the purview of the lead agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b), SMAQMD recommends that its air pollution thresholds be used to determine the significance of project emissions. The criteria pollutant thresholds and various assessment recommendations are contained in SMAQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (CEQA Guide; 2020, revised), and are discussed under the checklist questions below.

Discussion

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less than significant impact. In accordance with SMAQMD's CEQA Guide, construction-generated NOX, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, and operational-generated ROG and NOX (all ozone precursors) are used to determine consistency with the Ozone Attainment Plan. The Guide states (SMAQMD 2020 p. 4-6):

> *By exceeding the District's mass emission thresholds for operational emissions of ROG, NOX, PM10, or PM2.5, the project would be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the District's air quality planning efforts.*

As shown in the discussion for question 2) below, the project's construction-generated emissions of NOX, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ and operation-generated emissions ROG and NOX would not exceed SMAQMD thresholds. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and the impact would be less than significant.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less than significant impact.

Regional Emissions

Operational Emissions

Operation of the proposed project would not result in a population increase and would not generate new vehicle trips beyond occasional maintenance activities and would therefore produce negligible emissions. Although the project includes a 30-kw diesel generator with fuel tank, it would operate in the case of an emergency and for maintenance purposes, approximately one time a month for approximately 20-30 minutes. No other emissions would be associated with the operation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not exceed SMAQMD's mass emissions thresholds for operational emissions of ROG or NOx. Operational impacts to regional air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

Construction Emissions

Construction activities would be temporary and would likely only last approximately three months. In addition, given the small footprint of the site, including a 1,600-sf lease area and a 6-ft to 15-ft-wide non-exclusive road access easement on the existing driveway, limited construction equipment would be necessary for construction tasks. Therefore, construction would not produce emissions that would exceed SMAQMD construction thresholds for NOX, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Construction impacts to regional air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

Local Emissions

Operational Emissions

The primary pollutant of localized concern is mobile-source CO. Local mobile-source CO emissions near roadway intersections are a direct function of traffic volume, speed, and delay. Long-distance transport of CO is extremely limited because it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. Under specific meteorological conditions and traffic conditions, CO concentrations at receptors located near roadway intersections may reach unhealthy levels, when combined with background CO levels. The SMAQMD's two-tiered screening criteria identifies when a project has the potential to contribute to a CO hotspot and if CO dispersion modeling is necessary. According to the first screening tier, the proposed project will result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality for local CO if:

1. Traffic generated by the proposed project will not result in deterioration of intersection level of service (LOS) to LOS E or F; and,
2. The project will not contribute additional traffic to an intersection that already operates at LOS E or F.

The project would only be expected to generate occasional, "as-needed" maintenance trips and would therefore not result in the deterioration of an intersection's LOS. Impacts from operational emissions to regional air quality would be less than significant.

Construction Emissions

As stated in the SMAQMD's Guide, a project would result in less than significant PM_{10} (and, therefore, PM2.5) emissions if:

1. The project would implement all the Basic Construction Emission Control Practices; and
2. The maximum daily disturbed area would not exceed 15 acres.

The project site, including all proposed impervious services, is approximately 2.0-acres, and therefore much less than the 15-acre limit. Furthermore, the proposed project would incorporate the Basic Construction Emission Control Practices, as recommended by the SMAQMD. As such, the project would the two criteria above, and impacts related to construction generated PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be less than significant.

Cumulative Net Increase

Given the project's minimal construction and operational emissions, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase for a criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than significant impact. CARB and OEHHA have identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, infants (including in utero in the third trimester of pregnancy), and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis (CARB 2005, OEHHA 2015). Some land uses are

considered more sensitive to air pollution than others due to the types of population groups or activities involved and are referred to as sensitive receptor locations. Examples of these sensitive receptor locations are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers.

The closest existing sensitive receptors to the project site would include a baseball/softball field within the Livermore Community Park, located approximately 200-ft southeast and southwest of the project site, and single-family residential homes located approximately 300-ft east of the project site. The closest school to the project site is Sandra J. Gallardo Elementary School, located approximately 1-mile southwest of the project site at 775 Russi Road.

The dose (of TAC) to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance in the environment and the extent of exposure a person has with the substance; a longer exposure period to a fixed quantity of emissions would result in higher health risks. Current models and methodologies for conducting cancer health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods (typically 30 years for individual residents based on guidance from OEHHA) and are best suited for evaluation of long duration TAC emissions with predictable schedules and locations. These assessment models and methodologies do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. Cancer potency factors are based on animal lifetime studies or worker studies where there is long-term exposure to the carcinogenic agent. There is considerable uncertainty in trying to evaluate the cancer risk from projects that will only last a small fraction of a lifetime (OEHHA 2015). In addition, concentrations of mobile source DPM emissions disperse rapidly and are typically reduced by 70 percent at approximately 500-feet (CARB 2005). Considering this information, the highly dispersive nature of DPM, and the fact that construction activities would be short-term and temporary, it is not anticipated that construction of the project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations.

Utility projects do not typically have the potential to result in localized concentrations of criteria air pollutants that expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as criteria air pollutants are predominantly generated in the form of mobile-source exhaust from vehicle trips. These vehicle trips occur throughout a paved network of roads, and, therefore, associated exhaust emissions of criteria air pollutants are not generated in a single location where high concentrations could be formed (SMAQMD 2020). Therefore, localized concentration of CO from exhaust emissions, or “CO hotspots,” would only be a concern on high-volume roadways where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited, such as tunnels or below grade highways. There are no high-volume roadways in the region with limited mixing that would be affected by project generated traffic. During operation, the project would require only occasional, “as-needed” maintenance trips and would require the use of the diesel generator approximately once a month for 20-30 minutes for emergency and maintenance purposes. Routine activities associated with operation of the proposed project would not result in the release of pollutant concentrations in the air. Once operational, the project would not be a significant source of TACs due to the minimal number of vehicle trips and limited usage of the diesel generator.

As operation and construction emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to long-term, substantial pollutant concentrations, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than significant impact. The project could produce odors during construction activities resulting from heavy diesel equipment exhaust and VOC released during application of asphalt. The odor of these emissions is objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the project site and therefore should not be at a level that would affect a substantial number of people. Any odors emitted during construction activities would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature, and would cease upon the facility maintenance. As a result, impacts associated with temporary odors during construction are less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project could produce odors during occasional maintenance trips and from the proposed diesel generator with fuel tank. However, all maintenance trips would be limited to “as needed” and the generator would be used approximately once a month for approximately 20-30 minutes for emergency and maintenance purposes. Any odor emitted during operational activities would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature. As a result, impacts associated with temporary odors during routine operations are less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

XI. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

The project site is within the Livermore Community Park. The Livermore Community Park includes play equipment and athletic facilities including volleyball courts, soccer fields, baseball and softball fields, and pedestrian walkways. The community park also includes existing internal paved driveways with parking areas and various trees and shrubs to contribute to the overall visual aesthetic of the park. Land uses in the general area of the project site include residential development. The project site itself is an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park made up of open space with ornamental vegetation. Natomas Ditch transects the Livermore Community Park in the southeastern portion of the park; however, the project site is over 150-ft from Natomas Ditch.

Regulatory Framework Relating to Biological Resources

The City of Folsom regulated urban development through standard construction conditions and through mitigation, building, and construction requirements set forth in the Folsom Municipal Code. Required for all project constructed in the City, compliance with the requirements of the City's standard conditions and the provisions of the Municipal Code avoids or reduces many potential environmental effects. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan has been approved for the City of Folsom.

State and Federal Endangered Species Act

Special status species are protected by state and federal laws. The California Endangered Species Act (CESA; California Fish and Game Code Sections 2050 to 2097) protects species listed as threatened and endangered from harm or harassment. This law is similar to the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA; 16 USC 1531 et seq.) which protects federally threatened or endangered species (50 CFR 17.11, and 17.12; listed species) from take. Both laws include a process for issuance of permits for incidental take of listed species through consultation with the agency having jurisdiction over the protected species. Incidental take is a take resulting as an unintended consequence of an otherwise lawful action.

California Code of Regulations and California Fish and Game Code

The official listing of endangered and threatened animals and plants is contained in the California Code of Regulations Title 14 § 670.5. A state candidate species is one that the California Fish and Game Code has formally noticed as being under review by CDFW for inclusion on the state list pursuant to Sections 2074.2 and 2075.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. CDFW also designates Species of Special Concern that are not currently listed or candidate species.

Legal protection is also provided for wildlife species in California that are identified as "fully protected animals." These species are protected under Sections 3511 (birds), 4700 (mammals), 5050 (reptiles and amphibians), and 5515 (fishes) of the California Fish and Game Code. These statutes prohibit take or possession of fully protected species at any time. Incidental take of fully protected species is not permitted except in conjunction with an approved Natural Community Conservation Plan that provides adequate coverage to the fully protected species (California Fish and Game Code Section 2835).

California Native Plant Protection Act

The California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1900 to 1913) requires all state agencies to use their authority to implement programs to conserve endangered and otherwise rare species of native plants. Provisions of the act prohibit the taking of listed plants from the wild and require notification of CDFW at least 10 days in advance of any change in land use other than changing from one agricultural use to another, which allows CDFW to salvage listed plants that would otherwise be destroyed.

Nesting and Migratory Birds

Nesting birds are protected by state and federal laws. California Fish and Game Code (§3503, 3503.5, and 3800) prohibits the possession, incidental take, or needless destruction of any bird nests or eggs; Fish and Game Code §3511 designates certain bird species, including all raptors, "fully protected",

making it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy these species except under issuance of a specific permit. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 USF §703-711), migratory bird species and their nests and eggs that are on the federal list (50 CFR §10.13) are protected from injury or death, and project-related disturbance must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting cycle.

City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance

Requirements related to biological resources include protection of existing trees, and specify measures necessary to protect native oaks and ornamental trees. Chapter 12.16 of the Folsom Municipal Code, the Tree Preservation Ordinance, regulates the cutting or modification of protected trees. Protected trees include:

- Native oak trees with a diameter of 6 inches or larger for single trunk trees and 20 inches or greater combined diameter for multi-trunk trees;
- Heritage trees - a tree on the city's master tree list over thirty inches in diameter at standard height (DSH) or a multitrunked tree on the master tree list having a combined DSH of fifty inches or more;
- Landmark trees identified individually by the City Council through resolution as being a significant community benefit; and
- Regulated trees required by the city's zoning code, required as conditions of development project approval, or required by the Zoning Code as mitigation for the removal of a protected tree.

The Tree Preservation Ordinance requires a Tree Permit prior to cutting or modification of a protected tree, and establishes mitigation requirements for cut or damaged protected trees (City of Folsom 2000). Actions regulated by the Tree Preservation Ordinance include:

- Removal of a Protected Tree;
- Pruning/trimming of a Protected Tree;
- Grading or trenching within the Protected Zone of a Protected Tree.

Jurisdictional Waters

Any person, firm, or agency planning to alter or work in the waters of the U.S. (WOUS), including the discharge of dredged or fill material, must first obtain authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Section 401 of the CWA requires an applicant for a federal license or permit under Section 404 to also obtain a state certification that the discharge complies with other provisions of the CWA. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) administers the certification program in California. The extent of USACE jurisdiction under the CWA is determined by USACE according to published definitions that are informed by statute, regulatory practice, and judicial rulings.

Waters of the State are protected by state laws including Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code, and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Waters of the State generally have a broader definition than WOUS. Alteration of a lake or stream as defined in the California Fish and Game

Code requires the execution of a Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFW. Actions that would result in a discharge of pollutants into waters of the State must be permitted by the RWQCB pursuant to Porter-Cologne.

Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. The proposed project would be located on an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park, and the project site itself is made up of open space with ornamental vegetation. The project proposes to add various shrubs within a landscape easement around the 6-ft-high fence that would surround the 1,600-sf lease area. No existing trees are located on the project site; however, existing tree species are located directly adjacent to the project area. Common bird species protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Codes may nest on the trees directly adjacent to the project site. Project construction activities would potentially result in impacts to nesting birds if construction of the proposed project commences during the typical avian breeding season (February 1– August 31). Construction activities and construction-related disturbance (noise, vibration and increased human activity) could adversely affect these species if they were to nest in or adjacent to the project area. Mitigation Measure BIO-01 would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to nesting birds:

Mitigation Measure BIO-01: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Nesting Birds

- If project (construction) ground-disturbing and grubbing activities commence during the avian breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey no more than 14 days prior to initiation of project activities and again immediately prior to construction. The survey area shall include suitable raptor nesting habitat within 500-feet of the project boundary (inaccessible areas outside of the project site can be surveyed from the site or from public roads using binoculars or spotting scopes). Pre-construction surveys are not required in areas where project activities have been continuous since prior to February 1, as determined by a qualified biologist. Areas that have been inactive for more than 14 days during the avian breeding season must be re-surveyed prior to resumption of project activities. If no active nests are identified, no further mitigation is required. If active nests are identified, the following measure is required:

    - A suitable buffer (e.g., typically 300-500-feet for raptors; and 50-100-feet for passerines) shall be established by a qualified biologist around active nests and no construction activities within the buffer shall be allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (i.e., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest, or the nest has failed). Encroachment into the buffer may occur at the discretion of a qualified biologist. Any encroachment into the buffer shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine whether nesting birds are being impacted.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-01, potential impacts to special-status species and nesting birds would be less than significant and no additional mitigation measures would be required.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No impact. No riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or other protected habitats are located on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No impact. No riparian habitat or wetlands occur within or immediately adjacent to the project site. Natomas Ditch transects the Livermore Community Park in the southeastern portion of the park; however, the project site is over 150-ft from Natomas Ditch. As such, no direct impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act are anticipated and no mitigation would be necessary.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less than significant impact. The project site itself is made up open space with ornamental vegetation in an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park. The project site is surrounded by recreational facilities and park utility structures including an existing 25-ft-tall water tank enclosed within a chain link fence, as well as an existing trash enclosure. The proposed project would also be located adjacent to an existing parking lot that extends from the existing paved entrance driveway off Riley Street. Although the project site would have the potential to act as a wildlife movement corridor, the location of development in the vicinity of the project site, including existing utility structures, recreational facilities, and parking, would prevent the substantial interference with wildlife movement through the project area. Additionally, the project site does not include any trees or sensitive vegetation and contains only ornamental vegetation. Therefore, due to its proximity to surrounding developed areas, the project would not substantially interfere with wildlife movement corridors and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No impact. The project would include the installation of a telecommunications cell tower and associated structures within an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park. The project site itself is made up of open space with ornamental vegetation. Trees within the vicinity of the project site include pine trees ranging from 43-ft to 58-ft in height, and an oak tree that is 71-ft in height. Although the top of the monopine would reach 94-ft above ground level, which is approximately 23-ft taller than the highest oak tree in the vicinity, the monopine has been designed to blend in with the surrounding vegetation with camouflage purposes. The monopine would blend in with the existing pine trees, oak trees, and other tree species surrounding the project site.

The proposed project would not require the relocation or removal of any trees and would therefore not conflict with the City of Folsom Tree Preservation Ordinance criteria for protection. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No impact. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan has been approved for the City of Folsom. Therefore, no impacts to an existing adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

XII. CULTURAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

Study Area

The cultural resources study area for the proposed Project is defined as the geographic area where project activities may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties of archaeological or buildings, structures, objects, or features that are 45 years or older. The study area for the current undertaking includes approximately 2.0-acres within Livermore Park in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California. The Project area is in the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 6 of Township 9 North, Range 8 east on the USGS 7.5-minute Folsom Quadrangle Map.

Methodology

On August 4, 2022, HELIX requested a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, North Central Information Center (NCIC) at California State University, Sacramento. The records search encompassed the 2.0-acre study area and surrounding 0.25-mile area. The objective of the records search was to identify (1) prior cultural resource investigations completed in or near the Project area; and (2) prehistoric or historical resources previously documented in the Project area and within 0.25 miles of Project area. Sources consulted included reports of previous studies, cultural resource records (DPR 523-series forms), historical USGS topographic maps, and the Historic Properties Directory of the Office of Historic Preservation to identify National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligible or listed resources. The California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, and local Folsom Cultural Resource Inventory listings were reviewed to identify historical resources within the Project area. On August 3, 2022, HELIX requested a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) to identify recorded locations of Native American sacred sites or human remains within the Project area.

On October 10, 2022, HELIX mailed letters requesting information pertaining to the Project Area to Native American representatives identified by the NAHC. An archaeological survey of the Project area was overseen by HELIX's Senior Archaeologist, Clarus Backes, who meets Secretary of the Interior standards for professional archaeology. A full copy of the cultural resource letter report with findings is on file with the City; however, it is not being circulated due to confidentiality laws.

Records Search Findings

The NCIC records search identified two prior cultural resource studies conducted within the Project area, including *The Riley Street School Site Mine Tunnel* and *Archaeological Evaluation of a Portion of the Natomas Ditch and Replacement Pipeline Route, Near Folsom, Sacramento County, California*. The NCIC also identified two historical resources that intersect the Project area, including the Riley Street School Mine Tunnel (P-34-002264/CA-SAC-001124H), which is a contributing element of the second resource that encompasses the Project area, the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H). No prehistoric cultural resources were identified in the NCIC records search.

The Folsom area encompassing the Project area was heavily placer mined during the Gold Rush through the early half of the 20th century, and the immediate surrounding area was subject to dredging from 1933 to 1942 by the Gold Hill Dredging Company. Nearby Willow Springs Hill was mined as early as 1851 and continuing through the mid-twentieth century. Historic maps and aerial imagery encompassing the Project area were examined to identify historic uses of the Project Area, including: 1856 Public Land Survey System map; Folsom USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps dating to 1914, 1954, 1967, and 1975; 15-minute topographic quadrangle maps from 1941 and 1944, and aerial images dating to 1952, 1958, 1964, and 1966. The historic landscape encompassing the Project area comprises undeveloped dirt roads that access placer mining and dredging activity areas, a historic segment of the Southern Pacific Railroad trending northeast towards the Project area, and widespread evidence of historic mining activities (e.g., tailings, ditches) with the Natomas Ditch system to the east and northeast of the Project area. By 1967, major development occurred in the region surrounding the Project area, evident by the presence of major roadways, a substation, residential neighborhoods, and Folsom Lake. The 1975 topographic quadrangle shows historic mining tailings and dump areas, as well as artificial ponds, ditches, and flumes within 0.25-mile of the Project area. A water tower present at the center of the Project area is not historic in age (construction began prior to 1984 with completion visible in the 1993 aerial image).

Much of the ground surface historic landscape, buildings, structures, and features that is depicted in historical maps and aerial imagery has been dismantled, burned, or destroyed and modern development occurs in its place. However, buried and contributing elements of the NRHP/CRHR-eligible Folsom Mining District may be present below the ground surface.

Native American Outreach

On October 4, 2022, HELIX received a written response from the NAHC which stated that the SLF record search had negative results. The letter recommended communication with 10 local Native American representatives who might be able to supply further information related to the Project area. No responses were received to information request letters mailed by HELIX on October 10, 2022.

Archaeological Survey

Under the supervision of an SOI-qualified archaeologist, HELIX archaeologist Jentin Joe conducted a complete pedestrian survey of the Project area on August 28, 2022. The survey involved the systematic investigation of the Project area's ground surface by walking in parallel 15-meter transects across the 2-acre Project area. The ground surface was examined for artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, fire-affected rock, prehistoric ceramics), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a prehistoric cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former or

extant presence of structures or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, postholes, foundations, wells) or historic debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics). Ground disturbances such as gopher holes, burrows, cut banks, and drainage banks were also visually inspected. No prehistoric or historic-era cultural material, or possible contributing elements of Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H) were observed.

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. A survey of the built environment within the Project area by HELIX did not identify historic-era buildings, structures, objects, or features. However, the NCIC records search identified two resources within or adjacent to the project area that are listed in the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Update EIR as eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR, including the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H) and Riley Street School Mine Tunnel (P-34-002264/CA-SAC-001124H). There are no visible remains of these historical resources on the ground surface of the Project area, however, buried features related to either historical resource may be encountered during Project ground-disturbing construction activities. Damage or destruction of buried historical resources or contributing elements of known historical resources could adversely impact the resource. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-01, Response to an Inadvertent Discovery, potential adverse impacts to historical resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-01: Response to an Inadvertent Discovery

- If archaeological material or historic-era structural features or elements are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity of the discovery until an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's (SOI) Professional Qualifications Standards can assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for next steps. If the resource cannot be avoided during project construction, an SOI-qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the cultural resource's significance and eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP/CRHR or local register. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted as determined in consultation with the CEQA lead agency and Native American consulting tribe.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. An archaeological survey of the Project area by HELIX did not identify prehistoric or historic-era cultural material on the ground surface. Buried features or artifacts related to two historical resources encompassing the Project area, Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335) or Riley Street School Mine Tunnel (P-34-002264), may be encountered during Project ground-disturbing construction activities. Buried prehistoric cultural material may also be encountered during Project construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-01, Response to an Inadvertent Discovery, potential adverse impacts to archaeological resources that are eligible for or listed in the NRHP or CRHR would be less than significant.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No formal cemeteries or other places of human internment are known to exist in the Project area. However, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resource Code Section 5097.98, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing Project activities, Mitigation Measure CUL-02, Treatment of Human Remains, will be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-02: Treatment of Human Remains

- If human remains are uncovered or discovered during Project construction, the Sacramento County Coroner is to be notified to arrange proper treatment and disposition of the remains. If the remains are identified – based on archaeological context, age, cultural associations, or biological traits – to be those of a Native American, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resource Code Section 5097.98 require that the coroner notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of discovery. The NAHC will then identify the Most Likely Descendent who will determine the manner in which the remains are to be treated.

XIII. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

California's electricity needs are satisfied by a variety of entities, including investor-owned utilities, publicly owned utilities, electric service providers and community choice aggregators. In 2020, the California power mix totaled 272,576 gigawatt hours (GWh). In-state generation accounted 51 percent of the state's power mix. The remaining electricity came from out-of-state imports (CEC 2021a). **Table 5** provides a summary of California's electricity sources as of 2020.

Table 5. California Electricity Sources 2020

Fuel Type	Percent of California Power
Coal	2.74
Large Hydro	12.21
Natural Gas	37.06
Nuclear	9.33
Oil	0.01
Other (Petroleum Coke/Waste Heat)	0.19
Renewables (Excluding Large Hydro)	33.09
Unspecified	5.36

Source: CEC 2021a.

Natural gas provides the largest portion of the total in-state capacity and electricity generation in California, with nearly 45 percent of the natural gas burned in California used for electricity generation in a typical year. Much of the remainder is consumed in the residential, industrial, and commercial sectors for uses such as cooking, space heating, and as an alternative transportation fuel. In 2012, total natural gas demand in California for industrial, residential, commercial, and electric power generation was 2,313 billion cubic feet per year (bcf/year), up from 2,196 bcf/year in 2010 (CEC 2021b).

Transportation accounts for a major portion of California's energy budget. Automobiles and trucks consume gasoline and diesel fuel, which are nonrenewable energy products derived from crude oil.

Gasoline is the most used transportation fuel in California, with 97 percent of all gasoline being consumed by light-duty cars, pickup trucks, and sport utility vehicles (SUVs). In 2015, 15.1 billion gallons of gasoline were sold in California (CEC 2021c). Diesel fuel is the second most consumed fuel in California, used by heavy-duty trucks, delivery vehicles, buses, trains, ships, boats, and farm and construction equipment. In 2015, 4.2-billion gallons of diesel were sold in California (CEC 2021d).

Discussion

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would involve the construction and operation of a telecommunications cell tower and associated structures that would extend AT&T telephone service coverage to the proposed area in the City of Folsom. While construction activities would result in a temporary consumption of energy resources in the form of vehicle and equipment fuels (gasoline and diesel fuel) and electricity/natural gas (directly or indirectly), such consumption would be incidental and temporary and would thus not have a potential to result in wasteful, insufficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Construction of the project would incorporate on-site energy conservation features. The following practices would be implemented during project construction to reduce waste and energy consumption:

- Follow maintenance schedules to maintain equipment in optimal working order and rated energy efficiency, which would include, but not be limited to, regular replacement of filters, cleaning of compressor coils, burner tune-ups, lubrication of pumps and motors, proper vehicle maintenance, etc.;

- Reduce on-site vehicle idling; and,

- In accordance with CALGreen criteria as well as state and local laws, at least 50 percent of on-site construction waste and ongoing operational waste would be diverted from landfills through reuse and recycling.

With regard to long term operations, although the project would result in a new utility service with the construction of a new telecommunications cell tower with associated structure, the project would necessitate very limited new equipment that would create additional energy demands. Energy related to the onsite 30-kw diesel generator would be less than significant as the generator would operate approximately once a month for 20-30 minutes for maintenance or emergency purposes. The proposed utilities would connect to an existing electrical cabinet for power and would connect to an existing telco box for fiber. The existing electrical cabinet and telco box are located on the western side of the existing water tank in the northern portion of the Livermore Community Park. The proposed utilities would connect to the existing electrical cabinet and telco box through 6-inch underground conduits locate underneath the paved entrance driveway off Riley Street.

The proposed monopine would be in compliance with 2019 California Green Building Standards Code (Part 11) and the 2019 California Energy Code. Compliance with these energy codes would reduce potential impacts to consumption of energy resources. Therefore, with limited usage of the diesel generator, and compliance with the energy codes, impacts relating to energy resources would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No impact. See discussion under question a) above. The proposed project would not result in a substantial new demand for energy resources nor conflict with or obstruct any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impact would occur.

XIV. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Environmental Setting

Geology

The project site is situated on the eastern edge of Sacramento County, located within the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California. The project site is not located with an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there are no active faults or Earthquake Fault Zones located on the project site.

Soils

Soils on the project site are mapped entirely as Xerorthents, dredge tailings, 2 to 50 percent slopes (NRCS 2021). The soil drainage class is characterized as somewhat excessively drained and has a low runoff class.

City Regulations of Geology and Soils

The City of Folsom regulates the effects of soils and geological constraints on urban development primarily through enforcement of the California Building Code, which requires the implementation of engineering solutions for constraints to urban development posed by slopes, soils, and geology. The City has additionally adopted a Grading Code (Folsom Municipal Code Section 14.29) that regulates grading citywide to control erosion, stormwater drainage, revegetation, and ground movement.

Discussion

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

    i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

Less than significant impact. According to the CDC Earthquake Hazards Zone Application (EQ Zapp) Map, there are no known active faults crossing the property, and the project site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone (CDC 2021b). Therefore, ground rupture is unlikely at the subject property, and impacts would be less than significant.

    ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than significant impact. While earthquake-induced ground shaking could occur in the project vicinity, historically, seismic activity in the Folsom area has been limited. The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with standards imposed by the City of Folsom through the Grading Code, and in compliance with California Building Code requirements. Potential impacts would be reduced to levels considered acceptable in the City and region. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects of seismic events. Therefore, impacts would be a less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

    iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than significant impact. The project site is a relatively flat community park with elevations ranging from 350-ft to 355-ft amsl. Additionally, the project site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as mentioned in i.) and therefore, has a low seismicity. According to the soils mapping for the site, the Xerorthents, dredge tailings, complex soils have a depth to water table greater than 80-inches (NRCS 2016). The soils on the project site do not contain the characteristics typical of soils most susceptible to liquefaction, and because the depths to groundwater are more than 80-inches below the ground surface, it is unlikely that the proposed project would be exposed to liquefaction hazards. Therefore, liquefaction is unlikely at the project site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

Less than significant impact. The project site is currently a portion of the Livermore Community Park and has relatively flat topography. Elevations in the project site range from 350-ft to 355-ft amsl. Additionally, as mentioned in i.), the project site is not located near a fault and is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone. The topography and location of the project reduces the potential of site liquefaction, slope instability, and surface rupture to almost negligible. Therefore, landslides are unlikely at the subject property and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than significant impact. Soils on the project site, Xerorthents, dredge tailings, are classified as somewhat excessively drained, and have a low runoff class. A low runoff class designation would indicate a lower potential for water erosion. Ground disturbing activities during construction of the project would increase the potential for soil erosion. The 2019 CBC (California Building Code) and the City's Grading Code and standard conditions for project approval contain requirements to minimize or avoid potential effects from erosion hazards. As a condition of approval, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the City would require the applicant to prepare a soils report, a detailed grading plan, and an erosion control plan by a qualified and licensed engineer. The soils report would identify soil hazards, including potential impacts from erosion. The City would be required to review and approve the erosion control plan based on the California Department of Conservation's "Erosion and Control Handbook." The erosion control plan would identify protective measures to be implemented during excavation, temporary stockpiling, disposal, and revegetation activities.

Compliance with the City's regulations and the California Building Code requirements would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion from water to less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Less than significant impact. Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil shear strength and sudden increase in porewater pressure caused by shear strains, which could result from an earthquake. Research has shown that saturated, loose to medium-dense sands with a silt content less than about 25 percent located within the top 40-feet are most susceptible to liquefaction and surface rupture or lateral spreading. Slope instability can occur as a result of seismic ground motions and/or in combination with weak soils and saturated conditions.

As also discussed under "a" ii and iii, the potential for damage due to liquefaction, slope instability, and surface ruptures was considered negligible due to the relatively flat topography and location of the project site. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impact regarding unstable geological units or soils.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less than significant impact. Expansive soils shrink and swell in response to changes in moisture levels. The changes in soil volumes can result in damage to structures including building foundations, and

infrastructure, if the project design does not appropriately accommodate the changing soil conditions. The project site is mapped as Xerorthents, dredge tailings, 2 to 50 percent slopes (Unit 245), and NRCS does not have information regarding the shrink-swell of this soil type (NRCS 2021). The proposed project would be designed to meet the seismic safety requirements specified in the California Building Code, including standards to minimize impacts from expansive soils. Therefore, impacts related to the potential hazards of construction on expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No impact. The project is a proposed telecommunications cell tower with associated structures and would not require wastewater services. No on-site wastewater disposal would occur. No impact would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. No previous surveys conducted in the project area have identified the project site as sensitive for paleontological resources or other geologically sensitive resources, nor have testing or ground disturbing activities performed to date uncovered any paleontological resources or geologically sensitive resources. While the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources and other geologically sensitive resources is considered low, project-related ground disturbing activities could affect the integrity of a previously unknown paleontological or other geologically sensitive resource, resulting in a substantial change in the significance of the resource. Therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-01 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measure GEO-01: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Paleontological Resources

- In the event paleontological or other geologically sensitive resources (such as fossils or fossil formations) are identified during any phase of project construction, all excavations within 100 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted until the find is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate representative at the City of Folsom who shall coordinate with the paleontologist as to any necessary investigation of the find. If the find is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City shall implement those measures which may include avoidance, preservation in place, or other appropriate measures, as outlined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.

XV. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

Global climate change refers to changes in average climatic conditions on Earth including temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms. Global temperatures are moderated by atmospheric gases. These gases are commonly referred to as greenhouse gasses (GHG) because they function like a greenhouse by letting sunlight in but preventing heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere.

GHGs are emitted by natural processes and human (anthropogenic) activities. Anthropogenic GHG emissions are primarily associated with burning of fossil fuels during motorized transport; electricity generation; natural gas consumption; industrial activity; manufacturing; and other activities such as deforestation, agricultural activity, and solid waste decomposition.

The GHGs defined under California's Assembly Bill (AB) 32, described below, include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). Each GHG differs in its ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere based on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. Estimates of GHG emissions are commonly presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential (GWP). Expressing GHG emissions in CO_2e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO_2 were being emitted. GHG emissions quantities in this analysis are presented in metric tons (MT) of CO_2e. For consistency with United Nations Standards, modeling, and reporting of GHGs in California and the U.S. use the GWPs defined in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007): CO_2 – 1; CH_4 – 25; N_2O – 298.

GHG Reduction Regulations and Plans

The primary GHG reduction regulatory legislation and plans (applicable to the project) at the State, regional, and local levels are described below. Implementation of California's GHG reduction mandates is primarily under the authority of CARB at the state level, SMAQMD and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) at the regional level, and the City at the local level.

Executive Order S-3-05: On June 1, 2005, Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 proclaimed that California is vulnerable to climate change impacts. It declared that increased temperatures could reduce snowpack in the Sierra Nevada, further exacerbate California's air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To avoid or reduce climate change impacts, EO S-3-05 calls for a reduction in GHG emissions to the year 2000 level by 2010, to year 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Executive Orders are not laws and can only provide the governor's direction to state agencies to act within their authority to reinforce existing laws.

Assembly Bill 32- Global Warming Solution Act of 2006: The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, widely known as AB 32, requires that CARB develop and enforce regulations for the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. CARB is directed by AB 32 to set a GHG emission limit, based on 1990 levels, to be achieved by 2020. The bill requires CARB to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions.

Executive Order B-30-15: On April 29, 2015, EO B-30-15 established a California GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The EO aligns California's GHG emission reduction targets with those of leading international governments, including the 28 nation European Union. California is on track to meet or exceed the target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in AB 32. California's new emission reduction target of 40 perfect below 1990 levels by 2030 will make it possible to reach the goal established by EO S-3-05 of reducing emissions 80 percent under 19990 levels by 2050.

Senate Bill 32: Signed into law by Governor Brown on September 8, 2016, Senate Bill (SB) 32 (Amendments to the California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006) extends California's GHG reduction programs beyond 2020. SB 32 amended the Health and Safety Code to include Section 38566, which contains language to authorize CARB to achieve a statewide GHG emission reduction of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by no later than December 31, 2030. SB 32 codified the targets established by EO B-30-15 for 2030, which set the next interim step in the State's continuing efforts to pursue the long-term target expressed in EO B-30-15 of 80 percent below 1990 emissions levels by 2050.

California Air Resources Board: On December 11, 2008, the CARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) as directed by AB 32. The Scoping Plan proposes a set of actions designed to reduce overall GHG emissions in California to the levels required by AB 32. Measures applicable to development projects include those related to energy-efficiency building and appliance standards, the use of renewable sources for electricity generation, regional transportation targets, and green building strategy. Relative to transportation, the Scoping Plan includes nine measures or recommended actions related to reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle GHGs through fuel and efficiency measures. These measures would be implemented statewide rather than on a project-by-project basis (CARB 2008).

In response to EO B-30-15 and SB 32, all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions were directed to implement measures to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 targets. The mid-term target is critical to help frame the suite of policy measures, regulations, planning efforts, and investments in clean technologies and infrastructure needed to continue driving down emissions (CARB 2014). In December 2017, CARB adopted the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, the Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target, to reflect the 2030 target set by EO B-30-15 and codified by SB 32 (CARB 2017).

Sacramento Area Council of Governments: As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375), SACOG has developed the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. This plan seeks to reduce GHG and other mobile source emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning to reduce VMT.

City of Folsom: As part of the 2035 General Plan, the City prepared an integrated Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy (Appendix A to the 2035 General Plan; adopted August 28, 2018). The purpose of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy (GHG Strategy) is to identify and reduce current and future community GHG emissions and those associated with the City's municipal operations. The GHG Strategy includes GHG reduction targets to reduce GHG emissions (with a 2005 baseline year) by 15 percent in 2020, 51 percent in 2035, and 80 percent in 2050. The GHG Strategy identifies policies within the City of Folsom General Plan that would decrease the City's emissions of greenhouse gases. The GHG Strategy also satisfies the requirements of CEQA to identify and mitigate GHG emissions associated with the General Plan Update as part of the environmental review process and serves as the City's "plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases", per Section 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, which provides the opportunity for tiering and streamlining of project-level emissions for certain types of discretionary projects subject to CEQA review that are consistent with the General Plan (City 2018).

Standards of Significance

The final determination of whether or not a project has a significant effect is within the purview of the lead agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 (b). The City's GHG Strategy, described above, is a qualified plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Consistency with the GHG Strategy may be used to determine the significance of the project's GHG emissions.

The City's 2035 General Plan Policy NCR 3.2.8 and GHG Strategy include criteria to determine whether the potential greenhouse gas emissions of a proposed project are significant (City 2018).

NCR 3.2.8 Streamlined GHG Analysis for Projects Consistent with the General Plan

Projects subject to environmental review under CEQA may be eligible for tiering and streamlining the analysis of GHG emissions, provided they are consistent with the GHG reduction measures included in the General Plan and EIR. The City may review such projects to determine whether the following criteria are met:

- Proposed project is consistent with the current general plan land use designation for the project site;
- Proposed project incorporates all applicable GHG reduction measures (as documented in the Climate Change Technical Appendix to the General Plan EIR) as mitigation measures in the CEQA document prepared for the project; and,
- Proposed project clearly demonstrates the method, timing and process for which the project will comply with applicable GHG reduction measures and/or conditions of approval, (e.g., using a CAP/GHG reduction measures consistency checklist, mitigation monitoring and reporting plan, or other mechanism for monitoring and enforcement as appropriate)

Discussion

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of an 89-ft-tall telecommunications cell tower, disguised as a pine tree, with associated structures, including a WIC shelter, diesel generator, and fuel tank. The project site itself is within an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the community park, consisting of open space with ornamental vegetation. The project would not generate substantial operational GHG emissions as equipment used for the site including a diesel generator would operate approximately once a month for 20-30 minutes for maintenance and emergency purposes and due to the project only generating occasional, "as-needed" vehicle maintenance trips as the facility is "unmanned". Additionally, the project would generate a negligible amount of greenhouse gas emissions during construction and as a result of the short-term and temporary construction time of approximately three months. Therefore, the project would not generate significant greenhouse gas emissions and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less than significant impact. There are numerous State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The principal overall State plan and policy is AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The quantitative goal of AB 32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 32 would require further reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The mandates of AB 32 and SB 32 are implanted at the state level by the CARB's Scoping Plan. Because the project's operational year is post-2020, the project aims to reach the quantitative goals set by SB 32. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles (AB 1493), the LCFS, and regulations requiring an increasing fraction of electricity to be generated from renewable sources are being implemented at the statewide level; as such, compliance at the project level is not addressed. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with those plans and regulations.

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for Sacramento County is the 2020 MTP/SCS adopted by the SACOG on November 18, 2019. The 2020 MTP/SCS lays out a transportation investment and land use strategy to support a prosperous region, with access to jobs and economic opportunity, transportation options, and affordable housing that works for all residents. The plan also lays out a path for improving our air quality, preserving open space and natural resources, and helping California achieve its goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (SACOG 2019). The transportation sector is the largest source of GHG emissions in the state. A project's GHG emissions from cars and light trucks are directly correlated to the project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The proposed facility is "unmanned" and would be visited on an "as needed" basis only. Implementation of the proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would not generate an increase in population. Vehicles would only access the site for maintenance or for emergency purposes only and would therefore result in a negligible number of VMT for the proposed project.

As a result, the project would not conflict with CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan, the SACOG's 2020 MTP/SCS, or the City's GHG Strategy, and impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park. The project site is undeveloped and covered with ornamental vegetation. The project site has no known past land uses associated with potentially hazardous sites.

The school nearest to the project site is Sandra J. Gallardo Elementary School, located approximately 1.0-mile southwest of the project site at 775 Russi Road. Other schools in the vicinity include Golden Ridge Elementary School, located approximately 1.5-miles southeast of the project site, and Folsom High School, located approximately 2.0-miles southwest of the project site.

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker tool (SWRCB 2021), California Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStor online tool (DTSC 2021); and the EPA's Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2021b). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, no hazardous waste sites are on the project site.

Federal and state laws include provisions for the safe handling of hazardous substances. The federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) administers requirements to ensure worker safety. Construction activity must also be in compliance with the California OSHA regulations (Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970).

Discussion

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) 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?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would install a telecommunications cell tower with panel antennas, ratio units, and a GPS antenna. Utility structures, such as a telecommunications cell tower have the potential to emit radiofrequency (RF) energy, a type of electromagnetic energy. According to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Office of Engineering & Technology, levels of RF energy routinely encountered by the general public are typically far below levels necessary to produce significant heating and increased body temperature (FCC 1999). There have been no conclusive results that have examined the possibility of a link between RF exposure and cancer, and other studies have failed to find evidence for a causal link to cancer or any related conditions (FCC 1999). As no conclusive or causal evidence of biological effects from RF energy has been determined, there is no evidence to suggest the proposed telecommunications cell tower would cause health problems to the surrounding community. Due to lack of evidence, impacts regarding RF energy would be less than significant.

The proposed project also involves the storage of a fuel tank used to power a standby 30-kw diesel generator used for emergency purposes. The transport, storage, and use of diesel fuel could result in a hazard to the public in the event of upset or accident conditions. A Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) would be prepared in compliance with the California Health and Safety Code, section 25503.5. Therefore, with preparation of the plan impacts from the generator would be less than significant.

During the project construction period, hazardous substances used to maintain and operate construction equipment (such as fuel, lubricants, etc.) could be present; however, it is not expected that large-scale staging and equipment/materials storage would be necessary. The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials are subject to local, state, and federal regulations to minimize risk and exposure.

Further, the City has set forth its hazardous materials goals and policies in the Hazardous Materials Element of the General Plan. The preventative policies protect the health and welfare of residents of Folsom through management and regulation of hazardous materials. Consequently, use of the listed

materials above for their intended purpose would not pose a significant risk to the public or environment, and impacts would be less than significant for questions a) and b).

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No impact. The school nearest to the project site is Sandra J. Gallardo Elementary School, located approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site. Therefore, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No impact would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less than significant impact. The site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No hazardous materials sites are located at the project site based on review of EnviroStor (DTSC 2021), Geotracker (SWRCB 2021), and EPA Superfund Priority List (EPA 2021b). Therefore, project implementation would have no impact on hazards to the public or environment.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No impact. The nearest public or public use airport is Cameron Airpark, approximately 9.0-miles northeast of the project site. At this distance, the project is not within the airport land use plan area and the project would have no impact on safety hazards or excessive noise related to airports.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less than significant impact. The City of Folsom maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes as identified in the City of Folsom Evacuation Plan (City of Folsom 2021b). The proposed project is located in evacuation plan area #28-Willow Springs, which identifies Iron Point Road and Oak Avenue as minor evacuation routes. The proposed project would not modify any pre-designated emergency evacuation route or preclude their continued use as an emergency evacuation route. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout the project site to meet the Fire Department standards for fire engine maneuvering, location of fire engine to fight a fire, rescue access to the units, and fire hose access to all sides of the building. Additionally, installation of the new telecommunications cell tower would enhance coverage to first responders and would improve coverage to allow people to call for emergency services in the event of an accident.

Therefore, project impacts to the City's adopted evacuation plan and emergency plans would be less than significant.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less than significant impact. The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area and is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone or a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021). The project site is in an urbanized area in the City of Folsom and is provided with urban levels of fire protection by the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the risk of wildland fires and a less than significant impact would occur.

XVII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off- site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The project site is within an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park and the project site itself is made up of open space with ornamental vegetation. The topography of the project site is generally flat with elevations ranging from 350-ft to 355-ft amsl. Precipitation is the only apparent source of surface water as there are no wetlands or natural drainages located on the project site. Natomas Ditch transects the Livermore Community Park in the southeastern portion of the park; however, the project site is over 150-ft from Natomas Ditch.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate maps were reviewed for the project's proximity to a 100-year floodplain. The proposed project is on FEMA panel 06067C0117H effective 8/16/2012 (FEMA 2012). The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

Regulatory Framework Relating to Hydrology and Water Quality

The City is a signatory to the Sacramento Countywide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program (NPDES) permit for the control of pollutants in urban stormwater. Since 1990, the City has been a partner in the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership, along with the County of Sacramento and the Cities of Sacramento, Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. These agencies are implementing a comprehensive program involving public outreach, construction and industrial controls (i.e., Best Management Practices (BMP), water quality monitoring, and other activities designed to protect area creeks and rivers. This program would be unchanged by the proposed project, and the project would be required to implement all appropriate program requirements.

In addition to these activities, the City maintains the following requirements and programs to reduce the potential impacts of urban development on stormwater quality and quantity, erosion and sediment control, flood protection, and water use. These regulations and requirements would be unchanged by the proposed project.

Standard construction conditions required by the City include:

- Water Pollution – requires compliance with City water pollution regulations, including NPDES provisions.

- Clearing and Grubbing – specifies protection standards for signs, mailboxes, underground structures, drainage facilities, sprinklers and lights, trees and shrubbery, and fencing. Also requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control erosion and siltation of receiving waters.

- Reseeding – specifies seed mixes and methods for reseeding of graded areas.

Additionally, the City enforces the following requirements of the Folsom Municipal Code as presented in **Table 6**.

Table 6.City of Folsom Municipal Code Sections Regulating the Effects on Hydrology and Water Quality from Urban Development

Code Section	Code Name	Effect of Code
8.70	Stormwater Management and Discharge Control	Establishes conditions and requirements for the discharge of urban pollutants and sediments to the storm-drainage system; requires preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans.
13.26	Water Conservation	Prohibits the wasteful use of water; establishes sustainable landscape requirements; defines water use restrictions.
14.20	Green Building Standards Code	Adopts the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), 2010 Edition, excluding Appendix Chapters A4 and A5, published as Part 11, Title 24, C.C.R. to promote and require the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices.

14.29	Grading Code	Requires a grading permit prior to the initiation of any grading, excavation, fill or dredging; establishes standards, conditions, and requirements for grading, erosion control, stormwater drainage, and revegetation
14.32	Flood Damage Prevention	Restricts or prohibits uses that cause water or erosion hazards, or that result in damaging increases in erosion or in flood heights; requires that uses vulnerable to floods be protected against flood damage; controls the modification of floodways; regulates activities that may increase flood damage or that could divert floodwaters.
14.33	Hillside Development	Regulates urban development on hillsides and ridges to protect property against losses from erosion, ground movement and flooding; to protect significant natural features; and to provide for functional and visually pleasing development of the city's hillsides by establishing procedures and standards for the siting and design of physical improvements and site grading.

Source: City of Folsom 2021c.

Discussion

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

   i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

   ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off- site?

   iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff?

   iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less than significant impact. The project site is an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park. The project site itself is made up of open space with ornamental vegetation. Natomas Ditch transects the Livermore Community Park in the southeastern portion of the park; however, the project site is over 150-ft from Natomas Ditch.

Implementation of the proposed project may alter the existing drainage patterns on the project site through introduction of impervious surfaces such as the monopine, associated support structures, surrounding fencing, as well as a 6-ft to 15-ft non-exclusive AT&T mobile access easement on the existing driveway leading to the lease area. An increase in impervious surfaces may result in an increase in the total volume and peak discharges of stormwater runoff. However, due to the small nature of the

site and the small area of which would be developed with impervious surfaces, approximately 2.0-acres, the project would not result in a significant effect on the overall drainage by the area.

In addition, the slight increase in runoff that may be produced would not produce contamination or sediment conveyance that would violate water quality standards. Storm water generated at the project site would flow to pervious/vegetative areas adjacent to the project site or would flow to existing City maintained storm drains on McAdoo Drive and Riley Street. Additionally, a landscape easement with various shrubs would surround the outside of the proposed 6-ft-high chain link fence. Therefore, impacts to water quality, drainage, and runoff would be less than significant and no mitigation would be necessary.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would not result in the use of groundwater, as domestic water in Folsom is provided solely by a surface water source (Folsom Lake). While the construction of a telecommunications cell tower and associated structure within 1,600-sf lease area would result in additional impervious surfaces to the project site, the project size and small developed space would have a minimal effect on the existing groundwater infiltration in the Livermore Community Park. Storm water generated at the project site would flow to pervious/ vegetative areas adjacent to the project site or would flow to existing City maintained storm drains on McAdoo Drive and Riley Street. A landscape easement with various shrubs would surround the outside of the proposed 6-ft-high chain link fence. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less than significant impact. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain and is not subject to flood hazard. The project site is also approximately 70-miles northeast of the nearest tsunami inundation area near Benicia, CA (California Emergency Management Agency 2009). The nearest lake is Folsom Lake, approximately 3.0-miles to the north. Based on the site's location away from the 100-year floodplain, distance from tsunami inundation area, and distance to Folsom Lake, the project site is not subject to release of pollutants due to inundation. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

XVIII. LAND USE AND PLANNING

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Cause significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

Land use in the project area is regulated by the City of Folsom through the various plans and ordinances adopted by the City. These include the City of Folsom General Plan and the City of Folsom Municipal Code, including the Zoning Code.

The site is designated as Parks (P) in the Folsom 2035 General Plan. The P designation provides for active and passive recreational opportunities in Folsom. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would be consistent with the existing General Plan designation with a Use Permit.

The zoning designation of the project site is Open Space Conservation District (OSC). The OSC District is intended to be applied to properties which should be generally maintained in an open or undeveloped state or developed for permanent open uses as parks or greenbelts. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would be allowed under the OSC zoning district with a Use Permit.

Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The project site is currently an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park. Implementation of a telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would not physically divide an established community as there are no residences within the community park. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Cause significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project site has a general land use designation of Parks (P), and a zoning designation of Open Space Conservation District (OSC).

The City of Folsom General Plan identifies the Parks as a designation for recreational opportunities, and the City of Folsom Municipal Code identifies the OSC District as a zone for open uses or undeveloped states. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would be consistent with

the P designation and the OSC zoning district upon approval of an Use Permit. Therefore, with approval of an Use Permit, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

XIX. MINERAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

The Folsom area regional geologic structure is defined by the predominantly northwest- to southeast-trending belt of metamorphic rocks and the strike-slip faults that bound them. The structural trend influences the orientation of the feeder canyons into the main canyons of the North and South Forks of the American River. This trend is interrupted where the granodiorite plutons outcrop (north and west of Folsom Lake) and where the metamorphic rocks are blanketed by younger sedimentary layers (west of Folsom Dam) (Wagner et al. 1981 in Geotechnical Consultants 2003). The four primary rock divisions found in the area are: ultramafic intrusive, metamorphic, granodiorite intrusive, and volcanic mud flows (Geotechnical Consultants 2003).

The presence of mineral resources within the City has led to a long history of gold extraction, primarily placer gold. No areas of the City are currently designated for mineral resource extraction. Based on a review of the Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15' Quadrangle, Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California (CDC 1984), no known mineral resources are mapped in the project area.

Discussion

- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No impact. The proposed project is not located in a zone of known mineral or aggregate resources. No active mining operations are present on or near the site. Implementation of the project would not interfere with the extraction of any known mineral resources. Thus, no impacts would result, and no mitigation would be necessary.

XX. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

The predominant existing noise sources in the vicinity of the proposed project are from vehicles on adjacent streets and visitors of the Livermore Community Park. No commercial airports are located within 2.0-miles of the project site, though occasional overflights and associated noise could occur from aircrafts landing Cameron Airpark, approximately 9.0-miles northeast of the project site, and Mather Airport Air Force Base, approximately 10.0-miles southwest of the project site.

Regulatory Framework

Noise Element

The City of Folsom General Plan Noise Element establishes land use compatibility criteria for transportation noise sources such as roadways. For these sources, the City establishes a noise level criterion of 60 dBA LDN/CNEL[1] or less in outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses, and 45 dBA LDN/CNEL or less for interior noise levels of noise-sensitive land uses. As the project site would not contain people outside of an occasional maintenance worker, it would not be considered a noise-sensitive land use.

1 The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is a 24-hour average, where noise levels during the evening hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. have an added 5 dBA weighting, and sound levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. have an added 10 dBA weighting. Similarly, the Day-Night sound level (L_{DN}) is a 24-hour average with an added 10 dBA weighting on the same nighttime hours but no added weighting on the evening hours.

Noise Ordinance

For stationary noise sources, the City has adopted a Noise Ordinance as Section 8.42 of the Folsom Municipal Code (City of Folsom 2011). The Noise Ordinance establishes hourly noise level performance standards that are most commonly quantified in terms of the one-hour average noise level (LEQ). Using the limits specified in Table 8.42.040 of the Noise Ordinance, noise levels generated by the project would be significant if they exceeded 50 dBA LEQ from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dBA LEQ from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. at the following land uses: single- or multiple-family residence, school, church, hospital or public library.

The City has also established Standard Construction Specifications as published in May 2004 (City of Folsom 2004). The standard construction specifications are required to be adhered to by any contractor constructing a public or private project within the City. Standards regarding the noise environment are summarized below.

- *Noise Control* – Requires that all construction work comply with the City Noise Ordinance, and that all construction vehicles be equipped with a muffler to control sound levels.

- *Weekend, Holiday, and Night Work* – Prohibits construction work during evening hours, or on Sunday or holidays, to reduce noise and other construction nuisance effects.

Discussion

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than significant impact.

Construction Noise

Construction of the project would generate elevated noise levels. The magnitude of the impact would depend on the type of construction activity, equipment, duration of each construction phase, distance between the noise source and receiver, and any intervening structures.

Construction of the telecommunications cell tower and associated structures may require the use of construction equipment such as a backhoe, excavator, and a crane. Construction noise would be regulated by Section 8.4.2.060 of the City's Municipal Code (Noise Ordinance), which states that construction activities are exempt from noise standards if they take place during daytime hours between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays and between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays, with no Sunday or Holiday work permitted. Project construction would only occur during these exempted hours. Therefore, construction noise impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Operational Noise

The closest noise-sensitive land uses to the project site would be existing baseball and softball field within the Livermore Community Park, located approximately 200-ft southeast and southwest of the project site. The next closest sensitive receptors are single-family residential homes located

approximately 350-ft east of the project site. The project component most likely to generate audible exterior noise would be the 30-kW diesel generator. The diesel generator would only run in the case of an emergency and for maintenance purposes, approximately one (1) time a month for approximately 20-30 minutes. A potential model is the Kohler 30REOZJC-VER, which would generate a noise level of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at 23-ft (Kohler 2009). With the potential model, the proposed 30-kw generator would not exceed Noise Ordinance's limits of 50 dBA for 30 minutes of cumulative exterior noise as the nearest noise-sensitive land use would be approximately 200-ft southeast and southwest of the project site. Additionally, Section 8.4.2.060 of the City's Municipal Code (Noise Ordinance) states that any mechanical device related to emergency activities or work would be exempt from the chapter provisions. Therefore, any use of the generator for emergency purposes would be exempt from noise provisions. Impacts relating to operational noise would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would not include components that would result in excessive groundborne vibration. While equipment in use during construction may result in minimal amounts of groundborne vibration, these effects would be temporary and not excessive. Therefore, less than significant impacts associated with groundborne vibration would occur and no mitigation would be necessary.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No impact. Since the project site is not located in an area for which an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan has been prepared, and the nearest airport, Cameron Airpark, would be located 9.0-miles northeast of the project site, the proposed project would not be exposed to adverse levels of noise due to aircraft overflight. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation would be necessary.

XXI. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

Folsom's estimated population in 2019 was 81,328 people (U.S. Census Bureau 2019). The population is projected to increase to approximately 97,485 by 2035 (City of Folsom 2018).

Discussion

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less than significant impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of an 89-ft-tall telecommunication cell tower disguised as a monopine with associated structures within a 1,600-sf lease area. The project site would be accessible via an existing paved driveway off Riley Street, which is also an entrance to the Livermore Community Park.

The proposed project would not induce substantial growth in the City of Folsom. The project would not add new homes or businesses or extend existing roads or other infrastructure in a manner that promotes additional growth. The facility would be "unmanned" and is anticipated that employees would visit the site on an "as needed" basis. Employees would mainly reside locally; however, if future employees would move to the City of Folsom for work, it would be within the projected increase in population from planned growth as projected in the City's Housing Element. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impact, and no mitigation would be required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No impact. The project site is currently within an unutilized and undeveloped portion of the Livermore Community Park, and no existing residences reside on the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact on displacement of existing people or housing.

XXII. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is in an area currently served by urban levels of all utilities and services. Public services provided by the City of Folsom in the project area include fire, police, school, library, and park services. The Livermore Community Park is served by all public utilities including domestic water, wastewater treatment, and storm water utilities.

The City of Folsom Fire Department provides fire protection services. There are five fire stations providing fire/rescue and emergency medical services within the City of Folsom. Station 37 is nearest to the project site and is located at 70 Clarksville Road, approximately 1.7-miles east of the project site. The Fire Department responded to 8,474 requests for service in 2020, with an average of 23.2 per day (City of Folsom 2021a). The City of Folsom Police Department is located at 46 Natoma Street, approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the project site.

The project site is located within the Folsom Cordova Unified School District and is within the attendance area for Sandra J. Gallardo Elementary School, Sutter Middle School, and Folsom High School. The project parcel itself is the Livermore Community Park; however, there are several other parks in the vicinity of the project site including Amos P. Catlin Park and John Kemp Community Park.

The Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) would supply electricity to the project site. The City of Folsom has a program of maintaining and upgrading existing utility and public services within the City. Similarly, all private utilities maintain and upgrade their systems as necessary for public convenience and necessity, and as technology changes. The proposed telecommunications tower and associated support structures would be served by AT&T Wireless.

Discussion

a) Fire protection?

Less than significant impact. The project site currently receives service from the City of Folsom Fire Department. Due to the small amount of development located on the project site, proposed improvements would not result in significant additional demand for fire protection services. As such, the proposed project would not result in the provision of or the need for new or physically altered protection facilities. The potential for a minor increase in demand for fire services may occur during construction of maintenance of the telecommunications cell tower and associated structures. These minor public service demands would not overburden the Fire Department and no mitigation measures are proposed or warranted. Therefore, a less than significant impact related to fire protection services would occur.

b) Police protection?

Less than significant impact. Police services within the project area would continue to be provided by the Folsom Police Department. Proposed improvements would not result in additional demand for police protection services. As such, the proposed project would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered police protection facilities. The potential for minor increase in demand for services may occur for police protection if a crime or accident occurs during construction of maintenance of the telecommunications cell tower and associated structures. These minor demands would not overburden the Folsom Police Department and no mitigation measures are proposed or warranted. Therefore, a less than significant impact related to police protection services would occur.

c) Schools?

Less than significant impact. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated structures would not increase the number of residences in the City, as the project does not include residential units. Therefore, no new school facilities would be necessary to serve the proposed project and potential impacts would be less than significant.

d) Parks?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would be located within the Livermore Community Park. However, the project site would be developed on a portion of the park that is unutilized and undeveloped. The project site itself is made up of open space with ornamental vegetation. The project site would be located east of the existing water tank located in the northern portion of the park. Project operation would not interfere with existing park facilities, and construction of the proposed project would be short-term and temporary. The facility would be "unmanned" and would be visited on an "as needed" basis only. The proposed project would not increase demand for recreational and park facilities from an increase in population. Please refer to Section 9.*XXIII Recreation* for additional analysis on parks and recreational facilities. As the result, impacts to park facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less than significant impact. The project site is within the urban area of Folsom served by adequate police, fire, and emergency services. The proposed telecommunications cell tower and associated

structures would not increase the number of residents in the City and would therefore not cause an increase in demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of parks and other public facilities or would result in the degradation of those facilities. Potential impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be necessary.

XXIII. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

The Folsom Parks and Recreation Department provides and maintains a full range of recreational activities and park facilities for the community. The project parcel itself is the Livermore Community Park; however, there are several other parks in the vicinity of the project site including Amos P. Catlin Park, located 1.0-mile southwest of the project site, and John Kemp Community Park, located 1.5-miles east of the project site.

Discussion

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would be located within the Livermore Community Park. However, the project site, including the 1,600-sf lease area, would be developed on a portion of the park that is unutilized and undeveloped. The project site itself is made up of open space with ornamental vegetation. The project site would be located east of the existing water tank located in the northern portion of the park. Project operation would not interfere with existing park facilities, and construction of the proposed project would be short-term and temporary. The facility would be "unmanned" and would be visited on an "as needed" basis only, and no more than two service vehicles, being either a van or a small pickup truck, would visit the facility at a time. Therefore, the project would not result in an increase in population that would accelerate the deterioration and/or demand of existing park facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No impact. The proposed project includes the construction and operation of a new 89-ft-tall stealth monopine co-locatable tower and associated structures within a 1,600-sf lease area. The project would not require construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities within the Livermore Community Park. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XXIV. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

The project site would be accessible via an existing paved driveway off Riley Street, which is also an entrance to the Livermore Community Park. The community park includes existing internal paved driveways with parking areas. The Livermore Community Park is accessible from one entrance driveway on Riley Street, two entrance driveways on Carter Street, and one entrance driveway on McAdoo Drive.

Discussion

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would install a telecommunications cell tower and associated structures within an unutilized and undeveloped area in the Livermore Community Park. Project operation would not interfere with existing park facilities, which includes pedestrian pathways located throughout the park. The project would propose a 6-ft to 15-ft non-exclusive AT&T mobile access easement on the existing driveway leading to the lease area and would include a proposed non-exclusive AT&T mobile technician parking space located directly south of the lease area. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Less than significant impact. SB 743, passed in 2013, required OPR to develop new CEQA Guidelines that address traffic metrics under CEQA. As stated in the legislation (and Section 21099[b][2] of CEQA), upon adoption of the new CEQA guidelines, “automobile delay, as described solely by LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the CEQA guidelines, if

any." The Office of Administrative Law approved the updated CEQA Guidelines on December 28, 2018, and the changes are reflected in new CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.3). CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 was added December 28, 2018, to address the determination of significance for transportation impacts. Pursuant to the new CEQA Guidelines, VMT replaced congestion as the metric for determining transportation impacts.

Operation of the proposed facility would "unmanned" and would be visited on an "as needed" basis only for periodic maintenance. No more than two service vehicles, being either a van or a small pickup truck would visit the facility at a time. As such, average daily trip additions to the surrounding roadways would be negligible and VMT significance thresholds would not be exceeded. Therefore, the project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less than significant impact. The project site would be accessible via an existing paved driveway off Riley Street, which is also an entrance to the Livermore Community Park. The project would propose a 6-ft to 15-ft non-exclusive AT&T mobile access easement on the existing driveway leading to the lease area and would include a non-exclusive AT&T mobile technician parking space located directly south of the lease area. The proposed project does not include any design features that would create a hazard, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections in the access road. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No impact. Construction of the proposed project would not alter emergency access on Riley Street as the project would be accessible via an existing paved driveway off Riley Street, which is also an entrance to the Livermore Community Park. The proposed project would install a 6-ft to 15-ft non-exclusive AT&T mobile access easement which would not interfere with the existing entrance driveway off Riley Street. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XXV. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐

A Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) Memo was prepared by HELIX on October 11, 2022. The TCR Memo is included as **Appendix B**.

Environmental Setting

CEQA, as amended by Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), requires that the City provide notice to any California Native American tribes that have requested notice of projects subject to CEQA review and consult with tribes that responded to the notice within 30 days of receipt with a request for consultation. For the City, these included the following tribes that previously submitted general request letters, requesting such noticing:

- Wilton Rancheria (letter dated January 13, 2020);
- Ione Band of Miwok Indians (letter dated March 2, 2016); and,
- United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria (letter dated November 23, 2015 and updated per UAIC via email on September 29, 2021).

The purpose of consultation is to identify Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) that may be significantly impacted by the proposed project, and to allow the City to avoid or mitigate significant impacts prior to

project approval and implementation. Section 21074(a) of the PRC defines TCRs for the purpose of CEQA as:

> *Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (geographically defined in terms of the size and scope), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:*
>
> a) *included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; and/or,*
>
> b) *included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; and/or,*
>
> c) *a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

Because the first two criteria also meet the definition of a Historical Resource under CEQA, a TCR may also require additional consideration as a Historical Resource. TCRs may or may not exhibit archaeological, cultural, or physical indicators and can only be identified by a culturally affiliated tribe, which has been determined under State law to be the subject matter expert for TCRs.

CEQA requires that the City initiate consultation with tribes at the commencement of the CEQA process to identify TCRs. Furthermore, because a significant effect on a TCR is considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, consultation is required to develop appropriate avoidance, impact minimization, and mitigation measures. Therefore, in accordance with the requirements summarized above, the City carried out, or attempted to carry out, tribal consultation for the project.

On August 5, 2022, the City sent Project notification letters to the three California Native American tribes named above that had previously submitted general consultation request letters pursuant to Section 21080.3.1(d) of the PRC. The letter provided each tribe with a brief description of the Project and its location, the contact information for the City's authorized representative, and a notification that the tribe has 30 days to request consultation.

The Ione Band of Miwok Indians did not respond to the City's notification letter, and therefore, the threshold for conducting tribal consultation with that tribe under PRC 21080.3.1(e) was not met. No further attempts at consultation were required by state law.

Wilton Rancheria did not respond to the City's notification letter, and therefore, the threshold for conducting tribal consultation with that tribe under PRC 21080.3.1(e) was not met. No further attempts at consultation were required by state law.

On August 31, 2022 the City received an email from tribal representative Ms. Anna Cheng, within the 30-day response timeframe, that acknowledged receipt of the City's notification letter and informed the City that no map was attached to the notification letter which makes it difficult to review their system for traditional and cultural affiliation. Ms. Cheng requested the City forward the project's map and/or shapefiles. On August 31, 2022, the City emailed Ms. Cheng with the site plan and elevations. On August

31, 2022, Anna Cheng responded to the site plan and elevations noting that she will notify UAIC's Cultural Regulatory Specialist Ms. Anna Starkey if any sensitivity is identified. Ms. Cheng noted that Ms. Starkey will reach out to the City regarding recommendations.

On September 28, 2022 the City emailed Ms. Cheng and Ms. Starkey to notify them any information they wish to provide must be done by October 7th, otherwise consultation would be considered closed.

On September 29, 2022, Ms. Starkey emailed the City and asked if an archaeological survey was conducted and requested to see the results. She noted that the project is a smaller footprint with no known cultural sites present so they were not anticipating any unrecorded resources to be present. Ms. Starkey noted that if the archaeological survey did not identify any indigenous cultural resources, their unanticipated discoveries mitigation and TCR chapter recommendations would be sufficient.

On September 30, 2022 the City responded to Ms. Starkey noting that an archaeological survey and records search was being conducted and the TCR mitigation measure language will be prescribed in the ISMND. There was no further communication between the City and UAIC after September 30, 2022. As requested by the UAIC, the ISMND will be provided to the tribe during public review period.

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

    i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?

Less than significant impact. As discussed in Section V., Cultural Resources, the records search determined that the entire APE has previously been surveyed for cultural resources and that elements of two resources, the Riley Street School Mine or P-34-002264/CA-SAC-001124H and elements of the Folsom Mining District or P-34-000335 / CA-SAC-000308H, may lie within the currently proposed APE. The Riley Street School Mine has been previously recommended as ineligible for listing on the CRHR, though it is still considered a contributing element of the Folsom Mining District. Beyond identifying the Riley Street School Mine as a resource within the APE, the NCIC records search did not specify any other resources within the APE that might be associated with the Folsom Mining District. NCIC records also suggest that the Folsom Mining District taken as a unified entity has been determined to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR, but that individual elements within the district may be eligible for listing and should be evaluated as eligible or ineligible on a case-by-case basis.

HELIX Staff Archaeologist conducted a pedestrian survey of the project area on August 28, 2022. Attempts were made by HELIX's surveyor to identify cultural materials associated with the Riley Street School Mine Tunnel (P-34-002264/CA-SAC-001124H), and the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H) but no traces of these cultural resources were encountered. Ultimately no prehistoric or historic-era materials or features that would be impacted by project related activities were observed during HELIX's pedestrian survey of the APE.

The Sacred Lands File search by the NAHC provided no evidence that sites considered important by local Native American are located in the vicinity, and the individual tribal members confirmed there are no potential resources or areas of concern on or near the project site. Previous research has not determined that the area has more than a low potential to contain prehistoric cultural resources, and absent additional information from Native American sources the area should be considered to have a low sensitivity for undocumented prehistoric resources.

From the conclusions from the records search, Sacred Lands File search, and the confirmations from the individual tribal members, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. Information about potential impacts to TCRs was drawn from UAIC's provided information, the ethnographic context, and the results of a records search conducted by HELIX with the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). In summary, the ethnographic information reviewed for the project, including ethnographic maps, does not identify any villages, occupational areas, or resource procurement locations in or around the current project area. The cultural resources records search did not reveal any Native American archaeological sites within or adjacent to the proposed project area. Finally, as summarized in **Appendix B**, of the three tribes notified of the project, only UAIC responded to the City's offer to consult. As part of that consultation, UAIC provided information that there are likely no known TCRs in the project area and requested an unanticipated discoveries mitigation measure be added.

Based on the consultation record summarized above and included in **Appendix B**, the City concludes that there would be a less than significant impact on TCR's with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure TCR-01 regarding unanticipated discoveries.

Mitigation Measure TCR-01: Unanticipated Discovery of TCRs

- If potentially significant TCRs are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 50-feet of the find. A Native American Representative from traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribes that requested consultation on the project shall be immediately contacted and invited to assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment, as necessary. If deemed necessary by the City, a qualified cultural resources specialist, who meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Qualifications for Archaeology, may also assess the significance of the find in joint consultation with Native American Representatives to ensure that Tribal values are considered. Work at the discovery location cannot resume until the City, in consultation as appropriate and in good faith, determines that the discovery is either not a TCR, or has been subjected to culturally appropriate treatment, if avoidance and preservation cannot be accommodated.

XXVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

Existing utilities for the Livermore Community Park include gas and power lines (PG&E), electricity (SMUD), solid waste disposal (City of Folsom), and water and sewer facilities (City of Folsom). The current project site does not include any existing utilities; however, the proposed monopine would be serviced by AT&T and power would be serviced by the existing gas and power lines (PG&E).

Discussion

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less than significant impact. Discussion of the project's impact on water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities follows:

Water Supply

The City's public water supply is from the Folsom Reservoir and Folsom South Canal. The City's Urban Water Management Plan calculated supply and demand at buildout of the 2035 General Plan and determined that that there was sufficient supply available for normal, single dry, and multi-dry years scenarios (City of Folsom 2018a). Folsom's Water Treatment Plant has a capacity of 50-million-gallons per day. According to the Urban Water Management Plan and General Plan EIR, water demand is not anticipated to exceed the City's current water rights to 38,970-acre-feet annually (City of Folsom 2018a).

The proposed project would not require any water services. The project proposes to plant over 30 shrubs within a landscape easement around the 6-ft-high chain link fence that surrounds the lease area. Irrigation for the proposed landscape would be served by existing water services within the Livermore Community Park serviced by the City of Folsom. No other water services would be required for the proposed project. As no additional facilities would need to be constructed or expanded, impacts would be less than significant.

Water Conservation Efforts

The City actively implements water conservation actions in response to drought. Standards and regulations issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that came into effect June 1, 2015, require the City to reduce water consumption by 32 percent. In response, the City developed a water reduction plan to reduce water consumption, and conserve water in the City.

City actions include reducing watering in parks by one third, removing turf and retrofitting irrigation in more than 30 medians citywide, turning off irrigation in ornamental streetscapes that do not have trees, prohibiting new homes and buildings from irrigating with potable water unless water-efficient drip systems are used, replacing and upgrading sprinklers and irrigation systems with water-efficient systems, and suspending operation of water features throughout the City. The City also implemented water restrictions and rebate programs for residents. Folsom residents successfully reduced water consumption by 21 percent in 2014. The City reduced water consumption in parks by 27 percent, and 31 percent in Landscape and Lighting Districts. This was among the highest conservation rates statewide (Brainerd 2015).

Wastewater (Sanitary Waste)

The City of Folsom is responsible for managing and maintaining its wastewater collection system, including approximately 275.0-miles of pipeline and nine pump stations. This system ultimately discharges into the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District interceptor sewer system. Wastewater is treated at the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, located in Elk Grove.

In compliance with the 2006 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, the City of Folsom adopted a Sewer System Management Plan on July 28, 2009 which was updated and adopted on August 26, 2014. The plan outlines how the municipality operates and maintains the collection system, and the reporting of all Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO) to the SWRCB's online SSO database.

The proposed project would not require any connection to an existing sewer system or the construction of a new sewer system. As the project does not create any additional demand of wastewater services, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Stormwater

Folsom's Public Works Department handles stormwater management for the City, from design and construction of the storm drain system to operation and maintenance, and urban runoff pollution prevention.

Implementation of the proposed project may alter the existing drainage patterns on the project site through introduction of impervious surfaces such as the monopine, associated support structures, surrounding fencing, as well as a 6-ft to 15-ft non-exclusive AT&T mobile access easement on the existing driveway leading to the lease area.

An increase in impervious surfaces may result in an increase in the total volume and peak discharges of stormwater runoff. However, due to the small nature of the site and the small area of which would be developed with impervious surfaces, the project would not result in a significant effect on the overall drainage by the area. In addition, the slight increase in runoff that may be produced would not produce contamination or sediment conveyance that would violate water quality standards. Stormwater generated at the project site would flow to pervious/ vegetative areas adjacent to the project site, or would flow to existing City maintained storm drains on McAdoo Drive and Riley Street. A landscape easement with various shrubs would surround the outside of the proposed 6-ft-high chain link fence. No new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be necessary.

Electricity, Gas, and Telephone

Existing utilities for the Livermore Community Park include gas and power lines serviced by PG&E and electricity serviced by SMUD. The project, proposed by AT&T, would extend AT&T telephone service coverage to the proposed area in the City of Folsom. The proposed monopine and associated structures would improve wireless and broadband internet coverage for the local area. The proposed utilities would connect to an existing electrical cabinet for power, and would connect to an existing telco box, for fiber. The existing electrical cabinet and telco box are located on the western side of the existing water tank. The proposed utilities would connect to the existing electrical cabinet and telco box through 6-inch underground conduits locate underneath the paved entrance driveway off Riley Street.

Although the project would include the installation of a new telecommunication cell tower and associated structures, the project would not cause substantial environmental impacts, as analyzed in this Initial Study. The project would connect to existing utilities and utility services that already service the Livermore Community Park. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less than significant impact. The City of Folsom provides solid waste, recycling, and hazardous materials collection services to its residential and business communities. In order to meet the State mandated 50 percent landfill diversion requirements stipulated under AB 939, the City has instituted several community-based programs. The City offers a door-to-door collection program for household hazardous and electronic waste, in addition to six “drop off” recycling locations within the City.

After processing, solid waste is taken to the Kiefer Landfill, the primary municipal solid waste disposal facility in Sacramento County. The landfill facility sits on a site of 1,084.0-cres in the community of Sloughhouse. Currently 250.0-acres, the State permitted landfill is 660.0-acres in size, and is of sufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs of the City of Folsom. Because the landfill serving the project area is of sufficient capacity to accommodate solid waste needs associated with the proposed cell tower and associated structures, there is a less than significant impact and no mitigation would be necessary.

XXVII. WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental Setting

The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area, and it is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2021. Additionally, the project site is not located near a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021).

Discussion

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No impact. Questions “a” through “d” are not applicable because the project site is in a Local Responsibility Area and the site is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. It is not located near a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2021).

XXVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Evaluation of Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. The preceding analysis indicates that the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and tribal cultural resources. See Sections 9.XII, 9.XI, 9.XIV, and 9.XXV of this Initial Study for discussion of the proposed project's potential impacts on these environmental issue areas. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in those Sections, and compliance with City programs and requirements identified in this report, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. No significant or potentially significant impacts would remain.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when

viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?

Less than significant impact with mitigation. While the project would indirectly contribute to cumulative impacts associated with increased urban development in the City and region, these impacts have previously been evaluated by the City and considered in development of the City's General Plan as set forth in this Initial Study. Key areas of concern are discussed in detail below.

Evaluation of cumulative biological resources: Implementation of the proposed project would include the construction and operation of a telecommunications cell tower and associated structures. No existing trees are located on the project site but are located directly adjacent to the project area. However, common bird species protected by Fish and Game Code may nest on the building, trees, and other vegetation adjacent to the project site. Project construction activities would potentially result in impacts to nesting birds if construction of the proposed project commences during the typical avian breeding season (February 15 – August 31). Construction activities and construction-related disturbance (noise, vibration and increased human activity) could adversely affect these species if they were to nest in or adjacent to the project area. Potential effects include physical destruction of nests by construction equipment and/or nest abandonment. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-01, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative cultural resources A survey of the built environment within the Project area by HELIX did not identify historic-era buildings, structures, objects, or features. However, the NCIC records search identified two resources within or adjacent to the Project area that are listed in the City of Folsom 2035 General Plan Update EIR as eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR, including the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335/CA-SAC-000308H) and Riley Street School Mine Tunnel (P-34-002264/CA-SAC-001124H). There are no visible remains of these historical resources on the ground surface of the Project area, however, buried features related to either historical resource may be encountered during Project ground-disturbing construction activities. Damage or destruction of buried historical resources or contributing elements of known historical resources could adversely impact the resource. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-01, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. No formal cemeteries or other places of human internment are known to exist in the Project area. However, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resource Code Section 5097.98, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing Project activities, Mitigation Measure CUL-02, Treatment of Human Remains, will be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-01 and CUL-02, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative geology & soils: No previous surveys conducted in the project area have identified the project site as sensitive for paleontological resources or other geologically sensitive resources, nor have testing or ground disturbing activities performed to date uncovered any paleontological resources or geologically sensitive resources. While the likelihood encountering paleontological resources and other geologically sensitive resources is considered low, project-related ground disturbing activities could affect the integrity of a previously unknown paleontological or other geologically sensitive resource, resulting in a substantial change in the significance of the resource. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-01, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant

level and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts.

Evidence of cumulative tribal cultural resources: The City of Folsom sent project notification letters to three California Native American tribes. Although there is no evidence of TCRs occurring or having the potential to occur on the project site, the City recognizes that sensitive and/or protected resources could be unintentionally discovered during project demolition and construction. Additionally, the UAIC Tribe recommended standard unanticipated discovery mitigation measure language in the CEQA document. With implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-01, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and potentially significant cumulative impacts would be avoided. Thus, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less than significant impact. Because of site conditions, existing City regulations, and regulation of potential environmental impacts by other agencies, the proposed project would not have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings as demonstrated in the detailed evaluation contained in this Initial Study.

10.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared by the City per Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines and is presented in **Appendix C**.

11.0 PREPARERS

City of Folsom
Josh Kinkade, Associate Planner, City of Folsom

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Project Manager
Julia Pano, Environmental Planner
Clarus Backes, Senior Archeologist
Jentin Joe, Staff Archaeologist
John DeMartino, Geographic Information Systems

12.0 REFERENCES

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2022. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health. Accessed July 2022.

2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update. January. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf.

2014. First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/first_update_climate_change_scoping_plan.pdf.

2008. Climate Change Scoping Plan – A Framework for Change. December. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2008-scoping-plan-documents.

2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf.

California Department of Conservation (CDC). 2021a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed on July 25, 2022 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/.

2021b. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Accessed on July 26, 2022 from: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp

California Department of Conservation (CDC), Division of Mines and Geology. 1984. Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California, Open-File Report 84-50SAC. Accessed on July 25, 2022 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2021. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Accessed on July 26, 2022 from: https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. Envirostor. Accessed July 26, 2022 from https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Sacramento&tour=True.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2021. List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. Accessed on July 27, 2022 at: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2021a. 2020 Total System Electric Generation. Accessed July 28, 2022 at https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2019-total-system-electric-generation.

2021b. Supply and Demand of Natural Gas in California. Accessed on July 28, 2022 from: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/californias-natural-gas-market/supply-and-demand-natural-gas-california

2021c. California Gasoline Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on July 28, 2022 from https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/california-gasoline-data-facts-and-statistics

2021d. Diesel Fuel Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed on July 28, 2022 from https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/diesel-fuel-data-facts-and-statistics

California Emergency Management Agency. 2009. Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, Benicia Quadrangle, July 31, 2009. Accessed on July 26, 2022, at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Publications/Tsunami-Maps/Tsunami_Inundation_Benicia_Quad_Solano.pdf

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021. Geotracker. Accessed on July 26, 2022 from: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.

City of Folsom. 2021a. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy Consistency Checklist. Updated March 24. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/158/637522677783670000.

2021b. Evacuation Plan. Accessed July 26, 2022 from: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument?id=2229.

2021c.Folsom Municipal Code. Accessed January 20, 2022 at: http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom/.

2018. Folsom General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. Adopted August 28.

El Dorado, County of. 2012. El Dorado County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: Cameron Airpark Airport; Georgetown Airport; Placerville Airport. Available at: https://www.edctc.org/airport-land-use-compatability-plans-and-fee-schedule.

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) 1999. Questions and Answers about Biological Effects and Potential Hazards of Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields, OEC Bulletin 56. Fourth Edition. August. Accessed at: http://transition.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Engineering_Technology/Documents/bulletins/oet56/oet56e4.pdf

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2012. FEMA Flood Map: Folsom, CA Map 06067C0117H. Accessed on July 26, 2022 from: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=6004%20riley%20street%2C%20folsom#searchresultsanchor

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policymakers. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. February. Available at: https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar4/wg1/.

Kohler. 2009. Model: 30REOZJC-VER.

Lindstrom. S., J. Wells and N.L. Wilson 1988a. A Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Los Cerros-Morrison Homes Project, Willow Springs Hill, Folsom, California, Sacramento County. Susan Lindstrom, Consulting Archaeologist Submitted to Holliman, Hackard & Taylor, Attorneys. Copies available from the North Central Information Center, California State University, Sacramento. 36.

Lindstrom. S., J. Wells and N.L. Wilson 1998b. A comparative Evaluation of the Natoma Ground Sluice Diggings, Folsom, California, Sacramento County. Susan Lindstrom, Consulting Archaeologist. Submitted to Environmental Impact professionals. Copies Available from the North Central Information Center, California State University, Sacramento.

Lindstrom, S., J. Wells and N.L. Wilson, 1993. A Cultural Resource Inventory of Prairie Oaks Center Project, 90 Acres Near Folsom, California, Sacramento County. Susan Lindstrom, Consulting Archaeologist. Submitted to the City of Folsom. Copies available from the North Central Information Center, California State University, Sacramento.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. Available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/air/crnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0.

NETROnline. 2022. Historic Aerials. Electronic resource, https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer . Accessed October 3, 2022.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2021. Web Soil Survey. Accessed July 26, 2022 at http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2019. 2020 MTP/SCS. Available at: https://www.sacog.org/2020-metropolitan-transportation-plansustainable-communities-strategy.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County. Revised April. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/Residents/CEQA-Land-Use-Planning/CEQA-Guidance-Tools.

United States Census Bureau. 2019. QuickFacts, Folsom City, California, population estimates, July 1, 2019 (V2019). Accessed on July 25, 2022 from: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/folsomcitycalifornia.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2021. Superfund: National Priorities List. Accessed on July 26, 2022 from: https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl.

This page intentionally left blank