HELIX Environmental Planning

Benevento Family Park Project

Public Review Draft

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

November 2026

Prepared for:

City of Folsom
Department of Parks and Recreation
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

Prepared by:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
1180 Iron Point Drive, Suite 130
Folsom, CA 95630

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

INITIAL STUDY INFORMATION SHEET 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION 3

1.1 Project Background and Purpose 3

1.2 Previous Relevant Environmental Analysis 4

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION 5

2.1 Project Location 5

2.2 Project Setting 5

2.3 Project Components 5

2.4 Operation and Maintenance 7

2.5 Construction and Phasing 7

2.6 City Regulations and Urban Development 7

2.7 REQUIRED APPROVALS 9

3.0 DETERMINATION 10

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 11

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST 12

I. AESTHETICS 13

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES 15

III. AIR QUALITY 17

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 30

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES 51

VI. ENERGY 58

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS 60

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS 65

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS 70

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY 75

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING 80

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES 81

XIII. NOISE 83

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING 91

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

Section			Page
	XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES	93
	XVI.	RECREATION	96
	XVII.	TRANSPORTATION	98
	XVIII.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	102
	XIX.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	105
	XX.	WILDFIRE	109
	XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	112
6.0	**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**		**114**
7.0	**PREPARERS**		**115**
8.0	**REFERENCES**		**116**

LIST OF FIGURES (APPENDIX A)

No.	Title
1	Site and Vicinity Map
2	Aerial Map
3	Conceptual Benevento Family Park Master Plan
4	Noise Measurements and Receivers

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF TABLES

Title		Page
1	City of Folsom Municipal Code Regulating Construction	8
2	Sacramento County Attainment Status	18
3	Project Construction Schedule	22
4	Construction Equipment Assumptions	23
5	SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance	24
6	Daily Construction Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions	26
7	Daily Operational Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions	27
8	California Electricity Sources 2024	58
9	Noise Measurement Results	83
10	Operational On-Site Noise	88

LIST OF APPENDICES

A	Figures
B	CalEEMod Output Files
C	Biological Resources Assessment
D	Aquatic Resources Delineation
E	Arborist Inventory
F	Cultural Resources Assessment
G	Noise Model Output
H	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This page intentionally left blank

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
AC	Aggregate Concrete
ACT	Advanced Clean Trucks
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AFY	acre feet per year
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commissions
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans
Amsl	above mean sea level
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
APE	Area of Potential Effect
BMP	Best Management Practices
BCECP	Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices
Bcf/year	billion cubic feet per year
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFGC	California Fish and Game Code
CH_4	Methane
CHL	California Historical Landmarks
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CGS	California Geological Survey
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO2e	carbon dioxide equivalents
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (cont.)

CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
CWA	Clean Water Act
CVRWQCB	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
CY	cubic yards
dB	Decibels
dBA	A-weighted Decibel
DBH	diameter at breast height
DG	Decomposed Granite
DMR	Division of Mine Reclamation
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DPM	Diesel Particulate Matter
DSH	diameter at standard height
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EDCTC	El Dorado County Transportation Commission
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
EQ Zapp	Earthquake Hazards Zone Application
FAR	Floor Area Ratio
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FHSZ	Fire Hazard Severity Zones
FMC	Folsom Municipal Code
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
GHG Strategy	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy
GPS	Global Positioning System
GWh	Gigawatt hours
GWP	Global Warming Potential
H_2S	Hydrogen Sulfide
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
HSC	Health and Safety Code
HVAC	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning System
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (cont.)

LOS	Level of Service
LEP	Linear Extensibility Percentage
L_{EQ}	time-averaged noise level
L_p	Sound Pressure Level
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
mgd	million gallons per day
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MLC	Mineral Land Classification
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MT	Metric Tons
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
MTP/SCS	Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
MRZ	mineral resource zone
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCIC	North Central Information Center
NFHL	National Flood Hazard Layer
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides
NO_2	Nitrogen Dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSLU	Noise-sensitive land uses
N_2O	Nitrous Oxide
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OHWM	ordinary high-water mark
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
O_3	Ozone
P	Parks
Pb	Lead
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
PM	Particulate Matter
$PM_{2.5}$	Fine Particulate Matter
PM_{10}	Coarse Particulate Matter

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (cont.)

PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
RCNM	Roadway Construction Noise Model
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SacRT	Sacramento Regional Transit District
SacSewer	Sacramento Area Sewer District
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SO2	Sulfur Dioxide
SF6	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMARA	Surface Mine and Reclamation Act
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
SPL	sound pressure level
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWL	sound power level
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SSQP	Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership
SUV	sport utility vehicle
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
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (cont.)

VdB	vibration velocity in decibels
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
WTP	Water Treatment Plant

This page intentionally left blank

INITIAL STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

1.	Project title:	Benevento Family Park Project
2.	Lead agency name and address:	City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Department 50 Natoma Street Folsom, CA 95630
3.	Contact person:	Brad Nelson, Park Planning Manager (916) 461-6633
4.	Project sponsor:	Same as above
5.	Project location:	421 Carpenter Hill Road, southwest of the intersection of Carpenter Hill Road and Broadstone Parkway Folsom, CA 95630
6.	General plan designation:	Parks (P)
7.	Zoning:	SP-P (SP 92-3) Park/Empire Ranch Specific Plan

8. Description of project:

The proposed project would include the construction of a family park with both active and passive recreational elements, a floating dock in the approximately two-acre pond, two parking lots with a total of 87 parking spaces, and landscaping improvements. The proposed recreational elements would include various picnic and covered seating areas, a tot lot, playground, lighted sports fields and courts, several small unprogrammed lawn/green spaces, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant sidewalks and pathways, maintenance/access paths, and a building with a two-stall restroom and an electrical/maintenance storage and facilities.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The approximately 8.9-acre project site is located at 421 Carpenter Hill Road, immediately southwest of the intersection of Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road, adjacent to the west of Vista Del Lago High School in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California. The project site would be located on portions of two parcels identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 072-1170-149 and -152, which total approximately 19.3 acres. The project site is bound by Broadstone Parkway to the north, Carpenter Hill Road to the east, undeveloped land and the Carpenter Hill bike trail to the south, and Vista Del Lago High School to the east. The project site is situated within a residential community and is generally surrounded by single-family residential development to the north, east, and south, and Vista Del Lago High School to the west. Specifically, the Vista Del Lago High School baseball fields, football field, track, and swimming pool are located immediately west of the project. The project site has undulating topography with elevations ranging from approximately 620 feet to 660 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The project site is largely undeveloped and primarily consists of annual grassland with an

approximately two-acre pond. An existing informal dirt footpath/trail transects the southeastern corner of the site, and connects the off-site Carpenter Hill bike trail to the southern edge of the on-site pond.

10. Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement:

    - California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
    - Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
    - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

The City carried out the tribal consultation period for the project from July 16, 2025, to August 15, 2025. Formal invitations to consult under CEQA were sent by the City to the following tribal representatives from the following three tribes on July 16, 2025:

- Anna Starkey, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
- Sara D. Setshwaelo, Chairperson, Ione Band of Miwok Indians
- Ralph Hatch, Director, Wilton Rancheria
- Raymond C. Hitchcock, Chairman, Wilton Rancheria

Refer to Section 5.XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, for additional information.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared on behalf of the City of Folsom (City), Department of Parks and Recreation, by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) for the proposed Benevento Family Park Project ("proposed project" or "project") located in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County (County), California. The proposed project would include the construction of a family park with both active and passive recreational elements, a floating dock, two parking lots with a total of 87 parking spaces, and landscaping improvements. This IS/MND has been prepared to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that State and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before they approve or implement those projects.

The IS/MND is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. The City, as the CEQA Lead Agency, will use this IS/MND to determine whether the proposed project has a significant effect on the environment. These potential environmental effects are further evaluated to determine whether they were examined in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) prepared for the City of Folsom General Plan 2035 (General Plan), as amended (City 2024). Specifically, consistent with PRC Section 21083.3, this IS/MND focuses on any effects on the environment which are specific to the proposed project, or to the parcel on which the project would be located, which were not analyzed as potentially significant effects in the General Plan PEIR, or for which substantial new information shows that identified effects would be more significant than described in the previous PEIR. This IS/MND relies on CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 in its determination of the significance of the environmental impacts. Per Section 15064, the finding as to whether a project may have one or more significant impacts shall be based on substantial evidence in the record, and that controversy alone, without substantial evidence of a significant impact, does not trigger the need for an EIR.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The proposed project is located on the park site previously identified as Empire Ranch Park Site No. 51. The City of Folsom's Parks Master Plan and General Plan PEIR identified Park Site No. 51 as one of 18 parks in the City that were either undeveloped or had remaining development programming. The City of Folsom 2015 Master Plan Update further describes Park Site #51 to be approximately nineteen acres of land though only nine would be developed (City 2015). In addition, the site has been pre-graded to provide several terraces for park development, one of which includes a stock pond which retains water year-round (City 2015). Programing as described in the 2015 Master Plan Update, consists of pond enhancements, oak woodland enhancements, site furnishings, a youth baseball field with soccer field overlay, a group picnic shelter, parking for approximately sixty cars, play equipment, a restroom, and a lighted basketball court (City 2015). This site was planned to be developed as a neighborhood park, which the City defines as parks that intended to be up to 20 acres in size, in a central location to serve one neighborhood, and are ideally located next to schools to achieve joint use advantages (City 2018).

On April 28, 2026, the Folsom City Council approved the Benevento Family Park Master Plan, which provided decision makers and the public with a concept-level plan for the park and defined the overall layout, circulation, and major amenities. Development of the Benevento Family Park would serve to meet community recreation needs and fill park "service" gaps in the City. The proposed project would be the third of six parks that have been planned in the Empire Ranch neighborhood.

1.2 PREVIOUS RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

"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. CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(e) specifically provides that "[w]hen tiering is used, the later EIRs or Negative Declarations shall refer to the prior EIR and state where a copy of the prior EIR may be examined. The later [environmental document] should state that the Lead Agency is using the tiering concept and that the [environmental document] is being tiered with the earlier EIR."

The City of Folsom General Plan, as amended, provides a framework for the long-range development of Folsom (City 2024). The PEIR evaluated the environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the General Plan and associated buildout throughout the planning horizon. The PEIR is intended to provide information to the public and to decision makers regarding the potential effects of adoption and implementation of the General Plan. Pursuant to Section 15152(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, this IS/MND tiers from the General Plan PEIR because the project would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation and zoning requirements.

The above-mentioned General Plan PEIR can be reviewed at the following location:

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

Due to various references to the General Plan PEIR in this proposed project, and to its importance relative to understanding the environmental analysis that has occurred to date with respect to development in the Folsom area, the General Plan PEIR is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project site is located at 421 Carpenter Hill Road, immediately southwest of the intersection of Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road, adjacent to the west of Vista Del Lago High School in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California. The project site would be located on portions of two parcels identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 072-1170-149 and -152. The two parcels total approximately 19.3 acres; however, the project site would encompass approximately 9.8 acres. The project site is bound by Broadstone Parkway to the north, Carpenter Hill Road to the east, undeveloped land and the Carpenter Hill bike trail to the south, and Vista Del Lago High School to the east.

The project site is within Section 9, Township 9 North, Range 8 East (Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute "Clarksville" quadrangle). Refer to Figure 1 for a site and vicinity map and Figure 2 for an aerial map of the project site (Note: All figures are located within Appendix A).

2.2 PROJECT SETTING

The project site has undulating topography with elevations ranging from approximately 620 feet to 660 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The project site is largely undeveloped and primarily consists of annual grassland with an approximately two-acre pond. An existing informal dirt footpath/trail transects the southeastern corner of the site, and connects the off-site Carpenter Hill bike trail to the southern edge of the on-site pond. The majority of the project site has been previously disturbed and was largely mass graded in 2003. A graded pad in the northwest corner of the project site has been occasionally used since 2003 for equipment staging and soil stockpiling during construction of the Vista Del Lago High School and surrounding residential developments. Additionally, mitigation oak tree plantings were installed within the annual grassland in the southern portion of the project site.

The project site is situated within a residential community and is generally surrounded by single-family residential development to the north, east, and south, and Vista Del Lago High School to the west. Specifically, the Vista Del Lago High School baseball fields, football field, track, and swimming pool are located immediately west of the project.

The nearest community parks to the project site are the Handy Family Park approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the project site, which includes a large field, basketball court, and playground; and the Nisenan Community park approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the project site, which includes a basketball court, baseball field, and playground.

2.3 PROJECT COMPONENTS

The proposed project would include the construction of an approximately 9.8-acre park with both active and passive recreational elements, a floating dock, as well as two parking lots with a total of 87 parking spaces. The proposed park components would be constructed in two main portions of the park, roughly divided as an eastern portion and western portion. The proposed components are discussed in greater detail below. See Figure 3 for the conceptual Benevento Family Park Master Plan, which shows the concept-level layout of the proposed park.

Eastern Portion

The eastern portion of the park would include the construction of a picnic area with a 40-foot by 30-foot shade structure and seating areas, a tot lot (ages 2-5 years old), a playground (ages 5-12 years old), and two lighted sand volleyball courts. The seating areas and playgrounds would be constructed south of the volleyball courts and west of the proposed parking lot. The lighted volleyball courts would be situated south of Broadstone Parkway and approximately 280 feet west of Carpenter Hill Road and would have protective fencing installed around the perimeter of the courts. Small unprogrammed lawn/green spaces would be installed south of the playground areas and around the volleyball courts. A landscaped overlook area with shade trees and seating would be constructed in the northeast corner of the park, immediately east of the volleyball courts.

A parking lot with 26 parking spaces, including two Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant spaces, would be constructed on the eastern edge of the project site. The proposed parking lot would have an ingress/egress driveway off of Carpenter Hill Road, approximately 150 feet south of its intersection with Fenceline Drive. Proposed sidewalks along the driveway would connect with existing sidewalks along the west side of Carpenter Hill Road.

ADA-compliant sidewalks and pathways would be constructed to provide access and circulation from the parking lot and throughout the park facilities. A pathway would wrap around the northern edge of the pond, ultimately connecting to the western portion of the park, as discussed below. The pedestrian sidewalks would be concrete, and the pathways would be constructed with concrete and/or decomposed granite (DG). Additionally, a 10-foot-wide park maintenance path would be constructed from the southwestern corner of the parking lot to provide maintenance access to the park facilities. The maintenance path would be 8-inch aggregate concrete (AC) base with 12-inch concrete bands.

Western Portion

The western portion of the park would include the construction of four lighted pickleball courts, a lighted basketball court, a 240-foot by 195-foot multi-use field, a shade structure with seating, and a building with a two-stall restroom and electrical/maintenance storage and facilities. Benches would be installed within the pickleball courts and basketball court. A small unprogrammed lawn/green space area would be located between the proposed pickleball courts and basketball court. A floating dock would be installed on the south bank of the pond; however, no piers would be installed within the pond.

ADA-compliant sidewalks and pathways would be constructed to provide access and circulation throughout these various facilities, and would connect with the pathways on the eastern portion of the park. In addition, an ADA-compliant pathway would travel along the west and south side of the pond, which would access the floating dock and the existing dirt footpath/trail that located southeast of the project site. A 10-foot-wide gravel access road would be constructed to provide maintenance access between the Vista Del Lago High School baseball fields to the proposed multi-use field.

A parking lot with 61 parking spaces, including two ADA-compliant spaces, would be constructed in the northwest corner of the project site. This parking lot would have an ingress/egress off of Broadstone Parkway, approximately 680 feet west of its intersection with Carpenter Hill Road.

2.4 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The proposed park would typically be in operation during daylight hours, similar to other existing community parks in the area. Lighting for the proposed sand volleyball courts, basketball court, and pickleball courts would run on automatic timers and would shut off at 10:00 p.m. Maintenance required for the proposed project would occur during daylight hours and would include regular park maintenance activities such as cleaning, landscaping, general grounds upkeep, and as-needed facility repairs.

2.5 CONSTRUCTION AND PHASING

The project is anticipated to be constructed in one phase and construction could commence as early as April 2027. Project construction is expected to last approximately 12 months and could be completed as early as April 2028. The park would be operational approximately three months following the completion of construction to allow for an establishment period for new landscaping. 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 weekends, in accordance with Folsom Municipal Code (FMC) Section 8.42.060 (Noise Ordinance).

It is anticipated that excavated soils would be balanced on-site during construction. Native hydroseed would be installed on exposed areas following construction.

2.6 CITY REGULATIONS AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Improvement Standards, Construction Specifications, and Details

The City of Folsom's Community Development Department requires private and public projects in the City to adhere to the Standard Construction Specifications, which were most recently updated in July of 2020. The following requirements listed below may be applicable to the proposed project (City 2020).

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.

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.

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.

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.

City of Folsom Municipal Code

The City regulates many aspects of construction and development through requirements and ordinances established in the FMC (City 2026a), including but not limited to the codes summarized in Table 1, *City of Folsom Municipal Code Regulating Construction*. These requirements and ordinances of the FMC are summarized below and incorporated herein.

Table 1: City of Folsom Municipal Code Regulating Construction

FMC Chapter	Ordinance/Code	Effect of Ordinance/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. Noise sources associated with construction, provided such activities do not take place before 7 a.m. or after 6 p.m. on any day except Saturday or Sunday, or before 8 a.m. or after 5 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday are exempt from this chapter.
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.
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.
14.29	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.

Source: City 2026a

2.7 REQUIRED APPROVALS

A list and brief description of the approvals and/or regulatory permits that are anticipated to be required to implement the proposed project is provided below:

City of Folsom

- **Adoption of the Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:** The City of Folsom will act as the lead agency as defined by CEQA and will have authority to determine if this IS/MND is adequate under CEQA.

- **Project Approval:** The City of Folsom City Council will consider approval of the proposed project.

Other Agencies

- **California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW):** Obtain a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (California Fish and Game Code [CFGC] Section 1602) from CDFW (Region 2).

- **Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB):** Obtain a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 Water Quality Certification from CVRWQCB (Region 5).

- **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):** Obtain authorization under a CWA Section 404 Nationwide Permit from USACE to discharge dredged or fill material.

3.0 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

11/2/2026
Date

BRAD NELSON
Printed Name

For

4.0 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 in the Initial Study checklists in Chapter 5.0.

☐ 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

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The City of Folsom as the CEQA 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.

I. 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 has undulating topography with elevations ranging from approximately 620 feet to 660 feet amsl. The project site is largely undeveloped and primarily consists of annual grassland with an approximately two-acre pond. An existing informal dirt footpath/trail transects the southeastern corner of the site, and connects the off-site Carpenter Hill bike trail to the southern edge of the on-site pond. The project site is situated within a residential community and is generally surrounded by single-family residential development to the north, east, and south, and Vista Del Lago High School to the west. Specifically, the Vista Del Lago High School baseball fields, football field, track, and swimming pool are located immediately west of the project.

Impact Analysis

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides an expansive view of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the public. Neither the project site nor the surrounding areas are designated 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 as an important scenic resource by the City of Folsom or any other public agency (City 2018). As discussed below in the response to question b), the project site is not within the viewshed of State Scenic Highway (California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) 2026). Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and the impact would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The Caltrans manages the State Scenic Highway Program and maintains a list of State Scenic Highways, which includes a list of highways that are either eligible or officially designated as State Scenic Highways. There are no eligible or officially designated State Scenic Highways within the project viewshed. The nearest designated State Scenic Highway is the segment of US 50 between the City of Placerville and City of South Lake Tahoe, which begins over 16 miles east of the project site (Caltrans 2026). As such, due to significant distance and intervening structures and topography, the proposed project would not be visible from a State Scenic Highway. Therefore, the project would not damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway, and no impact would occur.

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 proposed project is located within an existing urban, residential area in the City. The existing visual character of the area surrounding the project site is primarily defined by single-family residential development and Vista Del Lago High School. The proposed project site has a General Plan land use designation of Parks (P) and is zoned SP-P (SP 92-3) – Park/Empire Ranch Specific Plan. The project site is largely undeveloped and primarily consists of annual grassland with an approximately two-acre pond. Public views of the project site are available from surrounding roadways, including Broadstone Parkway to the north and Carpenter Hill Road to the east. Although the proposed park facilities would alter existing views of the project site, the park would be generally consistent with the urbanized setting and existing General Plan land use and zoning of the site. In addition, the project is located immediately east of Vista Del Lago high School baseball fields, football field, track, and swimming pool, which have existing sources of light and similar facilities as the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, and the impact would be less than significant.

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 project area include street lights along Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill, residential lighting, as well as lighting associated with the sports fields and swimming pools on the Vista Del Lago High School campus, immediately west of the project site. Proposed sources of light would include lighting for the proposed sand volleyball courts, basketball court, and pickleball courts, which would run on automatic timers and would shut off at 10:00 p.m. In addition, all project lighting would be required to be dark sky compliant, and would be downward facing and shielded to prevent light spillage onto adjacent properties. Lighting would be designed and installed in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC) which regulates lighting intensity, efficiency, and shielding, and requires that lighting fixtures be designed to minimize light pollution and glare. Therefore, although the proposed would create new sources of light on a currently undeveloped site, the project would be situated within an urban setting with existing sources of light. As such, the proposed project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and the impact would be less than significant.

II. 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

The California Department of Conservation (DOC) Division of Land Resource Protection maintains the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), which monitors the conversion of the State's farmland to and from agricultural use. The FMMP maintains an inventory of State agricultural land and updates its Important Farmland Series Maps every two years. The FMMP designates Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance as Important Farmland. The FMMP classifies the project site as Grazing Land, which is defined as land on which the existing vegetation is suited for grazing of livestock (DOC 2026a).

The project is zoned SP 92-3 (Park/Specific Plan – Empire Ranch) and has a General Plan land use designation of P (Parks). No agricultural activities or timber management occur on the project site or in adjacent areas and the site is not designated for agricultural or timberland uses. Per the DOC's Williamson Act Enrollment Finder map, the project site is not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2026b).

Impact Analysis

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?

No Impact. The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance (Farmland), as indicated in the California Important Farmlands Map (DOC 2026a). The project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under Williamson Act contract (DOC 2026b). Therefore, the project would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur for questions a) and b).

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. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for forestland, timberland, and would not result in the loss or conversion of forestland. No impact would occur for questions 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. As discussed above in the response to questions a) through d), the project would result in no impacts to agricultural or forestry resources. The project site is surrounded by existing development and would not result in other changes in the existing environment that would result in impacts to Farmland or timberland. Therefore, no impact would occur.

III. 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 project site lies within the Sacramento County portion of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB comprises all of Sacramento, Yolo, Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Glenn, Butte, Tehama, and Shasta Counties, as well as parts of Solano and Placer Counties. Air Quality in Sacramento County is regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) at the federal level, by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) at the State level, and by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) at the regional level

Criteria Pollutants

Criteria pollutants are a list of specific air pollutants defined by state and federal law because they have been identified as a widespread risk to the health and welfare of the general public. Criteria air pollutants, as defined by the USEPA under the Clean Air Act (CAA) include the following compounds:

- Ozone (O_3)
- Carbon monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2)
- Particulate matter (PM), which is further subdivided:
  - Coarse PM, 10 microns or less in diameter (PM_{10})
  - Fine PM, 2.5 microns or less in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), a subset of PM_{10}.
- Sulfur dioxide (SO_2)
- Lead (Pb)

In addition, under the California Clean Air Act, CARB has identified and regulates the following additional criteria air pollutants:

- Visibility Reducing Particles
- Sulfates
- Hydrogen Sulfide (H_2S)
- Vinyl Chloride

Criteria pollutants can be emitted directly from sources (primary pollutants; e.g., CO, SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and lead), or they may be formed through chemical and photochemical reactions of precursor pollutants in the atmosphere (secondary pollutants; e.g., ozone, NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$). PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ can be both primary and secondary pollutants. The principal precursor pollutants of concern are reactive organic gases ([ROGs] also known as volatile organic compounds [VOCs])[1] and nitrogen oxides (NO_X).

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 asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and people engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The USEPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants. As permitted by the CAA, California has adopted the more stringent California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) and expanded the number of regulated air pollutant constituents.

The USEPA and CARB are required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified for the NAAQS and CAAQS. Designations are based on air quality data collected at multiple urban and rural monitoring stations in an area. 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. An “unclassifiable” or “unclassified” designation indicates that insufficient data was available to determine compliance with pollutant concentrations standards.

The project site is located within the City of Folsom, which lies within the SVAB. The air quality attainment status of Sacramento County, including the project site, is shown in Table 2, *Sacramento County Attainment Status*. Sacramento County is currently in nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone and the 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS; and nonattainment for the ozone and the PM_{10} CAAQS. Sacramento County is designated as attainment or unclassified for all other NAAQS and CAAQS (CARB 2026a).

Table 2: 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

[1] CARB defines and uses the term ROGs while the USEPA defines and uses the term VOCs. The compounds included in the lists of ROGs and VOCs and the methods of calculation are slightly different. However, for the purposes of estimating criteria pollutant precursor emissions, the two terms are often used interchangeably.

Pollutant	State of California Attainment Status	Federal Attainment Status
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	No Federal Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	No Federal Standard
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	No Federal Standard

Source: CARB 2026a

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 Section 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 Clean Air Act (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 Particulate Matter

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 2026b). 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 2026b).

Sensitive Receptors

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 (sensitive receptors): adults 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 receptor locations to the project site are single-family residences adjacent to the southeastern portion of the project site and the Vista De Lago High School baseball fields adjacent to the western side of the project site. The nearest school building to the project site is approximately 825 feet to the west.

Regulatory Setting

Sacramento Metropolitan Air District

As a regional agency, the SMAQMD works directly with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), County transportation commissions, and local governments and cooperates actively with all federal and State government agencies. The SMAQMD develops rules and regulations; establishes permitting requirements for stationary sources; inspects emissions sources; and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary.

CEQA Guidance and Tools

The Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (CEQA Guide) provides methods to analyze air quality impacts from plans and projects, including screening criteria, thresholds of significance, calculation methods, and mitigation measures to assist lead agencies in complying with CEQA. The primary purpose of the Guide is to provide useful tools to quickly identify proposed development projects that may have a significant adverse effect on air quality. This document includes screening approaches and specific methods for calculating emissions, with references to applicable models (SMAQMD 2020a).

Chapter 3 Construction: This chapter discusses how emissions from construction activities shall be assessed to determine if they could result in a significant air quality impact and, when necessary, appropriate mitigation shall be developed to reduce the impact (SMAQMD 2020b). Chapter 3 appendix details the Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices (BCECPs) or Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are considered feasible for controlling fugitive dust from a construction site (SMAQMD 2019).

Chapter 4 Operational: This chapter discusses how emissions from operational activities shall be assessed to determine if they could result in a significant air quality impact and, when necessary, appropriate mitigation shall be developed to reduce the impact (SMAQMD 2020c).

Chapter 7 Odors: This chapter discusses the District's recommendations for analyzing potential odor impacts associated with land use development, specifically siting a new odor source near existing and future receptors (SMAQMD 2016).

Air Quality Plans

As required by the CCAA, SMAQMD has published various air quality planning documents 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 USEPA, the federal agency that administrates the Federal Clean

Air Act (CAA) of 1970, as amended in 1990. The current air quality plan applicable to the project for attainment of the ozone NAAQS, the Sacramento Regional 2015 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (Regional Ozone Plan), was developed and adopted by the SMAQMD and adjacent air districts and adopted by CARB on October 26, 2023. The Regional Ozone Plan addresses the CAA requirements for the Sacramento Metro severe nonattainment area for the 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS, including emissions inventories, attainment demonstration, motor vehicle emissions budgets, and contingency measures (SMAQMD 2023). In addition to not attaining the federal or State ozone standards, the region is classified as nonattainment for the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standard and the State PM_{10} standard. The SIP contains all plans and programs for attainment of the PM NAAQS in Sacramento County.

Rules and Regulations

The following rules promulgated by the SMAQMD would be applicable to the project.

Rule 402 – Nuisance: Prohibits the discharge of such quantities of air contaminants or other materials which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or the public (SMAQMD 1977a).

Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust: Requires actions to prevent, reduce or mitigate anthropogenic fugitive dust emissions, including emissions from construction activities (SMAQMD 1977b).

Rule 442 – Architectural Coating: Establishes VOC limits for architectural coatings (e.g., paints, stains, preservatives). Building interior and exterior paint is limited to a maximum VOC content of 50 grams per liter for flat coatings and 100 grams per liter for non-flat coatings (SMAQMD 2024).

Methodology and Assumptions

Criteria pollutant emissions were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2022.1.1.46. CalEEMod is a computer model used to estimate air pollutant emissions resulting from the construction and operation of land development projects throughout the State of California. CalEEMod was developed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with California air quality management and pollution control districts. The model calculates emissions of CO, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, SO_2, the ozone precursors ROG and NO_X., and greenhouse gases (GHGs; discussed further in Section VII, below) The calculation methodology, source of emission factors used, and default data are described in the CalEEMod User's Guide, and Appendices C, D, and G (CAPCOA 2022). The input data and subsequent construction and operation emission estimates for the proposed project are discussed below. CalEEMod output files for the project are included in Appendix B.

CalEEMod uses OFFROAD2021 and EMFAC2021 emission factors from CARB's models for off-road equipment and on road vehicles, respectively. Public Laws passed in June 2025 disapproved several U.S EPA waivers granted to California that authorized the Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT)regulation and the Heavy-Duty Omnibus and Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission Warranty and Maintenance Provisions (Warranty Phase 1) regulations under the Clean Air Act. In response, CARB developed off-model adjustment factors that remove the estimated emissions benefits attributed to ACT, Zero-Emission Airport Shuttle, Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission Warranty and Maintenance Provisions, and Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations from EMFAC2021, which were approved by the USEPA in November 2025. The benefits and adjustment factors would only apply to the emissions associated with truck trips. As the majority, approximately 74 percent, of vehicle trips are not truck trips, use of the

adjustment factors would yield resulting emissions that vary from those estimated herein by less than 0.1 percent. Therefore, the Public Laws would have a negligible effect on calculated mobile source emissions, and the adjustment factors were not applied to this analysis.

Construction Assumptions

Construction emissions were assessed using CalEEMod. Construction input data for CalEEMod include, but are not limited to, (1) the anticipated start and finish dates of construction activity; (2) inventories of off-road diesel-powered construction equipment to be used; (3) areas to be excavated and graded; and (4) volumes of materials to be exported from and imported to the project area. The modeling assessed maximum daily emissions from construction activities associated with project implementation, which are expected to include site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and application of architectural coatings (painting). CalEEMod has the capability to calculate reductions in construction emissions from the effects of dust control, diesel-engine classifications, and other selected emissions reduction measures.

The quantity, duration, and intensity of construction activity influence the amount of construction emissions and their related pollutant concentrations that occur at any one time. As such, the emission forecasts provided herein reflect a specific set of conservative assumptions based on the expected construction scenario wherein a large amount of construction is occurring in a relatively intensive manner. If construction is delayed or occurs over a longer period, emissions could be reduced because of (1) a more modern and cleaner-burning construction equipment fleet mix than incorporated in the CalEEMod; and (2) a less intensive buildout schedule (i.e., fewer daily emissions occurring over a longer time interval).

Construction Schedule

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in April 2027 and be completed by April 2028. The construction activity schedule was estimated using data provided by the project engineer, CalEEMod defaults, and construction activities for past similar projects. The schedule included site preparation (clearing and grubbing), grading, building construction (including restroom construction, playground installation, sports field and court development, lighting installation, and landscaping), paving, and architectural coating (painting). The anticipated project construction schedule is shown in Table 3, *Project Construction Schedule*.

Table 3: Project Construction Schedule

Phase	Start Date	End Date	Work Days
Site Preparation	04/15/2027	04/28/2027	10
Grading	04/30/2027	05/27/2027	20
Building Construction	05/28/2027	03/02/2028	200
Paving	03/04/2028	03/04/2028	30
Architectural Coating	04/15/2028	04/28/2028	10

Source: CalEEMod (See Appendix B)

Construction Off-Road Equipment

Construction of the project would require heavy off-road equipment during these construction phases. Construction equipment estimates for each phase of construction were based on information provided by the model defaults. Equipment was assumed to operate up to eight hours per day, five days per week. Construction emissions modeling assumes the implementation of dust mitigation (watering exposed areas twice per day) during site preparation, and grading, and, therefore, a water truck was assumed to be used up to two hours per day. Table 4, *Construction Equipment Assumptions*, presents a summary of the equipment that was modeled for each construction activity.

Table 4: Construction Equipment Assumptions

Construction Activity	Equipment	Number	Hours per Day
Site Preparation	Tractor/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8
	Rubber Tired Dozer	3	8
	Water Trucks	1	2
Grading	Excavators	1	8
	Graders	1	8
	Rubber Tired Dozer	1	8
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8
	Water Trucks	1	2
Building Construction	Cranes	1	8
	Forklifts	3	8
	Generator Sets	1	8
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8
	Welder	1	8
Paving	Pavers	2	8
	Rollers	2	8
	Paving Equipment	2	8
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6

Source: CalEEMod (see Appendix B)

Construction On-Road Vehicle Trips

Construction workers and vendor trips and trip distances were modeled using CalEEMod defaults. Worker trips would range from one to 20 one-way trips per day. Approximately three one-way vendor trips per day would occur during building construction for delivery of supplies and material. During site preparation and grading, an estimated 741 cubic yards (CY) of soil would be imported to the project site on a net basis. Based on this import volume, approximately seven one-way haul truck trips per day would be required during the site preparation phase. During paving, approximately 103 truckloads of aggregate and asphalt (assuming 6 inches of uncompressed material depth and 16 CY per tandem trailer truckload) would be imported to the project site, resulting in approximately seven one-way truck trips per day. All construction haul truck trips assumed the CalEEMod default trip distance of 20 miles. All project construction vehicle trips would occur on paved roads.

Operational Assumptions

CalEEMod calculates operational criteria pollutant and precursor emissions from mobile sources (i.e., on-road vehicle trips), area sources (emissions from landscape equipment, painting, and the use of consumer products such as cleaning supplies); and energy sources. The project would not use natural gas; thus, the project would not result in energy source criteria pollutant and precursor emissions. In addition, CalEEMod calculates GHG emissions from energy sources (including electricity use), water and wastewater sources (based on the electricity used to supply and treat water), and solid waste sources. Project GHG emissions are discussed in Section VII, below).

Project trips were conservatively estimated based on the 87 parking spaces that would be included in the proposed parking lots, and assuming weekday trips would be approximately equal to the project parking spaces (87 trips per day) and weekend trips would be approximately equal to twice the project parking spaces (174 trips per day). The higher weekend trip estimate was based on the assumption of a typical work and school schedule that would limit visitation during the week but increase during the weekend when both children and adults are free. CalEEMod default trip distances and trip purposes were used.

Based on CalEEMod defaults, irrigation of project landscaping and proposed multi-use fields would require 3,040,411 gallons per year of water. The parking lots, basketball courts, pickleball courts, and walkways lighting would consume 77,394.6 kWh per year, based on CalEEMod defaults. Project operational solid waste generation was based on CalEEMod defaults for a city park, estimating 0.09 tons per unit per year.

Significance Criteria

SMAQMD has established significance thresholds to assess the regional and localized impacts of project-related air pollutant emissions. The significance thresholds are updated, as needed, to appropriately represent the most current technical information and attainment status in Sacramento County. Table 5, *SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance*, presents the most current significance thresholds, including regional daily thresholds for short-term construction and long-term operational emissions; maximum incremental cancer risk and hazard indices for TACs; and maximum ambient concentrations for exposure of sensitive receptors to localized pollutants. A project with daily emission rates, risk values, or concentrations below these thresholds is generally considered to have a less than significant effect on air quality (SMAQMD 2020d).

Table 5: SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
Mass Daily Thresholds (pounds per day)		
ROG	None	65
NO_X	85	65
PM_{10}	80[1]	80[1]
$PM_{2.5}$	82[1]	82[1]
Toxic Air Contaminants		
TACs	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk ≥ 10 in 1 million Chronic & Acute Hazard Index ≥ 1.0 (project increment)	

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
Ambient Air Quality for Criteria Pollutants		
NO_2	1-hour average ≥ 0.18 ppm Annual average ≥ 0.03 ppm	
CO	1-hour average ≥ 20.0 ppm (State) 8-hour average ≥ 9.0 ppm (State/federal)	
SO_2	1-hour average ≥ 0.075 ppm 24-hour average ≥ 0.04 ppm	
Lead	1.5 µg/m^3 30-day average	

Source: SMAQMD 2020d

[1] PM thresholds are zero (0) unless all feasible Best Available Control Practices/Best Management Practices are applied.

lbs./day = pounds per day; VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_X = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; PM_{10} = respirable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less; SO_X = sulfur oxides; TACs = toxic air contaminantsNO_2 = nitrogen dioxide; ppm = parts per million; µg/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter

Impact Analysis

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 NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, and operational-generated ROG and NO_X are used to determine consistency with the Ozone Attainment Plan and SIP. The Guide states (SMAQMD 2020c p. 4-6):

> *By exceeding the District's mass emission thresholds for operational emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$, 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 b) below, the project's construction-generated emissions of NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ and operation-generated emissions ROG and NO_X would not exceed SMAQMD thresholds. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Therefore, 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 with Mitigation Incorporated. By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in the nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, the potential for a project's individual emissions to contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts is evaluated.

Construction Emissions

CalEEMod was used to quantify project emissions, as discussed in Methodology and Assumptions, above. The model output report is included as Appendix B. Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in April 2027 and be completed by April 2028. The quantity, duration, and intensity of construction activities influence the amount of construction emissions and related pollutant concentrations that occur at any one time. As such, the emission forecasts provided herein reflect a specific set of conservative assumptions based on the expected construction scenario wherein a relatively large amount of construction activity is occurring in a relatively intensive manner. Due to this

conservative assumption, actual emissions could be less than those forecasted. If construction is delayed or occurs over a longer time period, emissions could be reduced because of: (1) a more modern and cleaner-burning construction equipment fleet mix than assumed in CalEEMod; and/or (2) a less intensive buildout schedule (i.e., fewer daily emissions occurring over a longer time interval).

The emissions generated from construction activities include:

- Dust (including PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$), primarily from fugitive sources such as soil disturbance and vehicle travel over paved and unpaved surfaces; and

- Combustion emissions (including ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, CO, and sulfur oxides [SO_X]), primarily from the operation of heavy off-road equipment and haul trucks.

The project's construction period emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ are compared to the SMAQMD construction thresholds in Table 6, *Daily Construction Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions*. The SMAQMD does not have a recommended threshold for construction-generated ROG. However, quantification and disclosure of ROG emissions is recommended. The modeling accounts for applications of water for dust control on exposed surfaces twice daily in accordance with SMAQMD Rule 403 and the SMAQMD BCECPs, which would be required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1.

Table 6: Daily Construction Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions

Construction Activities	Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)			
	ROG	**NO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Site Preparation	3.3	29.5	9.3	5.1
Grading	1.8	14.9	4.0	2.0
Building Construction	1.2	10.2	0.5	0.4
Paving	1.0	7.5	0.5	0.3
Architectural Coating	27.5	1.1	0.0	0.0
Maximum Daily Emissions	**27.5**	**29.7**	**9.3**	**5.1**
SMAQMD Thresholds	*None*	*85*	*80*	*82*
Exceed Thresholds?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Source: CalEEMod (output data is provided in Attachment B in Appendix A); Thresholds SMAQMD 2020d
ROG = reactive organic gases; NO_X = nitrogen oxides; PM_{10} = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter; SMAQMD= Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

As shown in Table 6, project construction emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors would not exceed the SMAQMD construction thresholds. However, SMAQMD considers construction period PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions to be significant unless the BCECPs are implemented (SMAQMD 2019). Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires implementation of the BCECPs for project construction.

Operational Emissions

As discussed in Methodology and Assumptions, above, operational emissions would be generated by the mobile and area. The project maximum daily operational emissions are shown in Table 7, *Daily Operational Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions*.

Table 7: Daily Operational Criteria Pollutant and Precursor Emissions

	Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)			
	ROG	**NO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Mobile	0.31	0.26	0.61	0.16
Area	0.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Maximum Daily Emissions	0.31	0.26	0.61	0.16
SMAQMD Thresholds	**65**	**65**	**80**	**82**
Exceed Thresholds?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*

Source: CalEEMod (output data is provided in Appendix B); SMAQMD 2020d
ROG = reactive organic gases; NO_X = nitrogen oxides; PM_{10} = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter; SMAQMD= Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

As shown in Table 7, project operational emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors would not exceed the SMAQMD thresholds.

Impact Summary

While short-term construction and long-term operation of the project would not result in criteria pollutant and precursor pollutant emissions that would exceed the SMAQMD significance thresholds, implementation of the project would result in an increase of emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ compared to existing conditions. The SMAQMD considers any increase in construction PM emissions to be significant unless the construction BCECPs are implemented. As such, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would require implementation of the SMAQMD construction BCECPs (SMAQMD 2019). The proposed project's operational emissions from mobile and area energy source would not exceed SMAQMD maximum daily threshold emissions and would have a less than significant impact. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which Sacramento Region is nonattainment. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The closest existing sensitive receptor locations to the project site are single-family residences adjacent to the southeastern portion of the project site and the Vista De Lago High School that is adjacent to the western side of the project site.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Construction of the project would result in emissions of DPM from the use of diesel engine-powered construction equipment on the project site. 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 to 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 the 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).

OEHHA recommends not conducting a health risk assessment for projects which would last less than two months (OEHHA 2015). Although project construction activities are anticipated to last approximately 12 months, the use of diesel-powered construction equipment would be intermittent and sparse. The most intense use of heavy off-road construction equipment would occur during site preparation and grading, which are anticipated to last a combined total of 30 workdays (about 6 weeks). Based on the limited numbers of diesel-powered construction equipment anticipated to be used on the project site, and due to the short duration and intermittent use of heavy diesel-powered construction equipment during the project construction period, construction of the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations.

Under the proposed project, park operations would include recreational activities, use of park facilities and routine maintenance. While routine maintenance would require the use of landscaped maintenance equipment, these activities are not substantial sources of TACs. Therefore, once operational, the project would not be a substantial source of TAC emissions.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

According to the SMAQMD, land use development projects do not typically have the potential to result in localized concentrations of criteria air pollutants that expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This is because air pollutants are predominantly generated in the form of mobile-source exhaust from vehicle trips associated with the land use development project. 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 2020c). 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. Once operational, the project would not be a significant source of TACs. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and the impact would be less than significant.

Impact Summary

Neither construction nor operation of the project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including concentrations of DPM or CO. Therefore, the impact 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 VOCs 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. Odors emitted during construction activities would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature, and

would cease upon the completion of construction. As a result, the impact associated with temporary odors during construction would be less than significant.

As a recreational park, operation of the project would not result in odors affecting a substantial number of people (SMAQMD 2016). Solid waste generated by the project would be collected by a contracted waste hauler, ensuring that odors resulting from on-site waste would be managed and collected in a manner to prevent the proliferation of odors. The project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices

The following Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices shall be implemented to control fugitive dust during project construction, as required by Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Rule 403. Prior to commencement of project construction, the City shall verify that the following measures are specified on construction contracts and/or construction documentation.

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to, soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.

- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways must be covered.

- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.

- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, and parking lots to be paved must be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads must be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

- Minimize idling time by either shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to five minutes. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site; and

- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition before it is operated.

IV. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

This section is based on the following biological reports conducted by HELIX for the proposed project: Biological Resources Assessment (BRA), October 2026 (HELIX 2026a; Appendix C); Aquatic Resources Delineation (ARD), October 2026 (HELIX 2026b; Appendix D); and an Arborist Inventory, November 2023 (HELIX 2023; Appendix E).

Environmental Setting

Methodology

Database and Literature Review

Before performing the field survey for this BRA, background research was conducted to inform and create target species lists to focus the survey efforts. Accessible information in public databases

pertaining to natural resources in the region of the Study Area was reviewed. These databases were subsequently queried following the initial field survey on October 31, 2023, for purposes of informing targeted plant surveys that occurred in 2025 and 2026. The databases were queried again on October 13, 2026, as part of an update to this BRA.

Special-status species are plant and wildlife species that have been afforded special recognition by federal, State, or local resource agencies or organizations. They are generally of relatively limited distribution and may require specialized habitat conditions. For the purposes of this report, special-status species are defined as meeting one or more of the following criteria:

- Listed as endangered or threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA; including candidates and species proposed for listing);
- Listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA; including candidates and species proposed for listing);
- Designated as rare, protected, or fully protected pursuant to CFGC;
- Designated as a Species of Special Concern (SSC) by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW);
- Considered by CDFW to be a Watch List species with the potential to become an SSC;
- Defined as rare or endangered under Section 15380 of the CEQA; or
- Having a California Native Plant Society California Rare Plant Rank of 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, or 3.

The criteria for implementing the delineation of aquatic features at the project site are presented in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region* (Version 2.0; USACE 2008). Primary criteria components utilized for determining the presence of wetlands are:

a) The presence of inundated or saturated soil conditions resulting from permanent or periodic inundation of ground water or surface water.

b) The prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions (hydrophytic vegetation).

To assess whether wetlands are present, USACE requires that data be recorded on three environmental parameters: vegetation, soil and hydrology. Positive wetland indicators for all parameters are generally required for USACE to assert jurisdiction.

Biological Reconnaissance Survey

The biological Study Area is coterminous with the approximately 9.8-acre project site. HELIX biologists conducted the biological field survey of the Study Area on October 31, 2023. The weather during the field survey was clear, with an average temperature of approximately 65° Fahrenheit. The project site was systematically surveyed on foot to ensure total search coverage, with special attention given to portions of the project site with the potential to support special-status species and sensitive habitats.

Binoculars were used to further extend site coverage and identify species observed. All plant and animal species observed were recorded (Appendix C), and all biological communities occurring on-site were characterized. All resources of interest were mapped with a Global Positioning System (GPS)-capable tablet equipped with a GPS receiver running ESRI Collector for ArcGIS® with sub-meter accuracy. Following the field survey, the potential for each species (including special-status species) identified in the database queries to occur within the project site was determined based on the site survey, soils, elevational and geographic ranges, habitats present within the project site, and species-specific information, as shown in Appendix D of Appendix C.

Aquatic Resource Delineation

Fieldwork for the jurisdictional determination was conducted by HELIX biologist Sophia Drewelow on July 30, 2026. The delineation was completed in accordance with the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987), *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region* (Version 2.0; USACE 2008), and the *National Ordinary High Water Mark Delineation Manual for Rivers and Stream* (Version: Final; USACE 2025). Vegetation, soil, and hydrologic characteristics were visually assessed by conducting meandering transects through the entire project site to obtain 100 percent visual coverage. Identifiable vegetation at the time of the surveys were recorded in the field and are included in Appendix C of Appendix D.

The Munsell Color Chart (Gretag Macbeth 2000) was used to determine moist soil colors, and thus, hydric soils, if present. Data was taken at 11 representative sample points throughout the project site and two ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) sample points to classify the site's vegetation, soil, and hydrologic characteristics. Wetland determination data forms are provided in Appendix D of Appendix C. Geographic coordinates of aquatic resource boundaries and locations of data points were recorded in the field with an electronic tablet wirelessly connected to a Juniper Geode® Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) receiver unit with sub-meter accuracy. This data was exported into ArcGIS Pro 3.1.5 and used to produce the Aquatic Resources Delineation Map included as Appendix B of Appendix D. Representative photographs of the project site, along with associated data points, are included as Appendix E of Appendix D.

Arborist Survey

HELIX International Society of Arboriculture certified arborist Marisa Brilts (#WE-13338A) conducted the arborist survey on October 24, 2023. All trees located within or overhanging the site were inventoried using a unique identification number, and the locations were recorded using an EOS Mapping Systems Arrow 100 GNSS receiver with sub-meter accuracy. A U.S. Tape Company forester's diameter tape measure was used to verify trunk diameter at breast height (DBH), defined as 4.5 feet above grade. Each tree was inspected, and data was taken on species, size, and condition. The measurement from the trunk to the end of the longest lateral limb was used as the drip line radius.

Focused Plant Surveys

HELIX biologist Dave Pfuhler conducted focused special status plant surveys on May 19, 2025, and June 6, 2025, to determine the presence of listed special status plants that have the potential to occur within the project site. A follow-up survey was conducted by HELIX biologist Brandt Muller on June 10, 2026. Rare plant surveys were conducted to coincide with the blooming period of special-status plant species with the potential to occur on-site. The entirety of the survey area was surveyed for those special status plants that were determined to have a potential to occur within the project site with particular attention

given to those habitats most likely to support these species. All resources of interest were mapped with a GPS-capable tablet equipped with a GPS receiver running ESRI Collector for ArcGIS® with sub-meter accuracy.

Soils

One soil unit is mapped within the Study Area: Auburn-Argonaut-Rock complex, 8 to 30 percent slopes. The Natural Resources and Conservation Service (NRCS) also includes water as a mapped unit that is present in the Study Area shown in Figure 4, Soils Map in Appendix A Figures of Appendix D. The general characteristics and properties of these units are described below (NRCS 2026b).

- **Auburn-Argonaut-Rock outcrop complex, 8 to 30 percent slopes (110)**: This soil occurs on hills between 120 to 4,000 feet above msl and consists of residuum weathered from metamorphic rock. Within the Study Area, the metamorphic rock of this soil map unit is associated with the Copper Hill Volcanics (Gutierrez 2011). Copper Hill Volcanics are described as metamorphosed basaltic/andesitic breccia and ash (mafic pyroclastic) rocks, pillow lava, and minor bodies of granitic composition (felsic porphyrite; Geotechnical Consultants, Inc. 2003). A typical soil profile is a relatively shallow surface layer of loam/clay (0 to 29 inches deep) that transitions to unweathered bedrock. This soil is a well-drained soil, with a frequency of ponding and flooding of “none”, and a depth to water table of more than 80 inches. This soil unit and its associated minor components are not considered hydric.

- **Water (247):** This map unit is associated with open water such as ponds, lakes, rivers, and other expansive open water communities.

Vegetation Communities

Three upland vegetation communities occur within the Study Area: annual grassland, valley foothill riparian, and ruderal/disturbed (Figure 5, Biological Communities in Appendix A, Figures of Appendix C). A comprehensive list of all plant and wildlife species observed within the Study Area in these habitats is provided in Appendix C, Plant and Wildlife Species Observed in the Study Area of Appendix C. Representative site photographs are included in Appendix E, Representative Site Photos of Appendix C.

Annual Grassland

A total of 8.75 acres of annual grassland habitat is mapped within the Study Area. Annual grassland habitats are open grasslands composed primarily of annual plant species. Many of these species also occur as understory plants in oak woodland and other habitats. Structure in annual grassland depends largely on weather patterns and livestock grazing; dramatic differences in physiognomy, both between seasons and between years, are characteristic of this habitat. Annual grassland is the dominant community in the Study Area and occurs on hillsides and graded pads.

Dominant plant species observed within annual grassland habitat in the Study Area include medusahead (*Elymus caput-medusae*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), soft brome (*Bromus hordeaceus*), wildoats (*Avena fatua*), nit grass (*Gastridium phleoides*), vinegarweed (*Trichostema lanceolatum*), Spanish lotus (*Acmispon americanus*), narrow tarplant (*Holocarpha virgata*), and Italian ryegrass (*Festuca perennis*).

Valley Foothill Riparian

A total of 0.39 acre of valley foothill riparian habitat is mapped within the Study Area. Valley foothill riparian habitats are found in valleys bordered by sloping alluvial fans, slightly dissected terraces, lower foothills, and coastal plains. This habitat is associated with riverine habitat and often has an abrupt transition to adjacent upland habitat (Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988). Valley foothill riparian habitat in the Study Area is located along the perimeter of the pond and wetland swale. The herbaceous layer of vegetation, where present, typically consisted of an intergrade between the annual grassland community and aquatic resources but also included broad brambles of Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*.

Dominant plant species observed within this habitat in the Study Area include arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), Goodding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), Fremont's cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), Chinese tallow (*Triadica sebifera*), Himalayan blackberry, tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*), Muehlenberg's centaury (*Zeltnera muehlenbergii*), nit grass, soft brome, and Spanish lotus.

Ruderal/Disturbed

A total of 0.48 acre of ruderal/disturbed habitat is mapped within the Study Area. Ruderal/disturbed habitat is characterized by an assemblage of plant species that are often the first to colonize disturbed landscapes. Abandoned agricultural fields, construction sites, vacant lots, and road shoulders are just a few of the settings that can create favorable conditions for ruderal plant species. Ruderal habitat is typically associated with invasive and noxious weeds and often features areas of bare ground.

The Study Area includes several abandoned graded pads that were heavily disturbed by past construction activities; however, these pads currently function as annual grassland and have become a semi-natural community since mass grading occurred. The extent of ruderal/disturbed areas is primarily limited to the roadsides of Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road in the northern and northeastern portions of the Study Area.

Dominant plant species observed within ruderal/disturbed habitat in the Study Area include medusahead, wildoats, ripgut brome, yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), skeletonweed (*Chondrilla juncea*), Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), stinkwort (*Dittrichia graveolens*), and turkey mullein (*Croton setiger*).

Aquatic Resources

A total of 0.194 acre of aquatic resources have been delineated in the Study Area. Wetland features mapped within the Study Area include a wetland swale (0.095 acre and 416 linear feet); and other aquatic features mapped within the Study Area include an intermittent drainage (0.014 acre and 203 linear feet) and a portion of a pond (0.085 acre; Appendix B, Aquatic Resources Delineation Map*,* of Appendix D). Aquatic resources within the Study Area as discussed below.

Wetland Swale

Wetland swales are shallow, seasonally inundated low areas within the local topography that form in soils with a subsurface layer that restricts the downward flow of water, causing water to flow over the surface or subsurface for extended and variable periods of time. Wetland swales generally do not exhibit a defined bed/bank with an OHWM. Depending on common factors such as daily average

temperatures and the amount and frequency of seasonal precipitation, wetland swales may be saturated or flooded for days, weeks, or even months. Plant species occurring within wetland swales are similar to species that have adapted to extended periods of inundation and, as such, are commonly associated with seasonal wetland features. This feature is located in the northern portion of the Study Area. The 0.095-acre of wetland swale within the Study Area is functionally a ditch that follows the eastern fill slope of the central graded pad before paralleling Broadstone Parkway along the northern portion of the Study Area, where it is then directed into a culvert beneath a graded pad that discharges into the intermittent drainage.

Dominant hydrophytic vegetation observed in the wetland swale within the Study Area at the time of the aquatic resources delineation include common spikerush (*Eleocharis macrostachya*) and annual beard grass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*). Other species observed include soft rush (*Juncus effusus*), Fremont's cottonwood, Himalayan blackberry, narrow leaf cattail (*Typha angustifolia*), narrowleaf willow (*Salix exigua*), and Goodding's black willow. Hydric soil indicators in the wetland swale included a loamy gleyed matrix with prominent redoximorphic features. Wetland hydrology indicators in the wetland swale included inundation visible on aerial imagery, the presence of biotic crust, and the secondary wetland hydrology indicator, FAC-neutral test.

Intermittent Drainage

Intermittent drainages are typically fed by a seasonally perched groundwater table and stormwater runoff, and do not carry year-round flows. Typically, intermittent drainages have a defined bed and bank and exhibit scouring characteristics due to rapid flow events. The bed of these features is variable with compositions ranging from cobble, boulder, sand, mud, rock, and gravel.

The 0.014-acre of intermittent drainage is located in the northern portion of the Study Area. The intermittent drainage originates at a culvert beneath a graded pad, which conveys water from the adjacent wetland swale. From its point of origin, the intermittent drainage flows west, generally paralleling Broadstone Parkway before reaching the northeast corner of the Study Area. At this location, flow is conveyed through a culvert and discharged into the existing stormwater drainage system.

Dominant hydrophytic vegetation observed in the intermittent drainage within the Study Area at the time of the aquatic resources delineation include common spikerush. Other species observed include medusahead, Italian ryegrass, Spanish lotus, prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), and wildoat.

Pond

The pond receives water from an off-site detention basin to the southeast through a vented overflow that consists of a culverted drop inlet paired with an emergency concrete-lined spillway. Approximately 0.085 acre of this pond is located within the Study Area. Excess water from the pond is conveyed into a culvert associated with a stormwater drainage system that is associated with Broadstone Parkway that directs water downslope to the northwest. This feature appears to remain inundated year-round and includes wetland vegetation along its margins as well as a riparian canopy. Herbaceous vegetation observed in the pond includes narrow leaf cattail and pennyroyal (*Mentha pulegium*).

Special-Status Species

Special-Status Plant Species

According to the database query, 21 listed and/or special-status plants have the potential to occur on-site or in the vicinity of the project site (CDFW 2026). However, based on the field observations, literature review, published information, soil types, and habitats present in the Study Area, special-status plants do not have the potential to occur within the Study Area. Suitable habitat is present in the Study Area for five special-status plant species, including Ahart's dwarf rush (*Juncus leiospermus* var. *ahartii*), big-scale balsamroot (*Balsamorhiza macrolepis*), dwarf downingia (*Downingia pusilla*), Sanford's arrowhead (*Sagittaria sanfordii*), and spicate calycadenia (*Calycadenia spicata*). However, the focused plant surveys were conducted during the blooming period when these species would be most visible and identifiable, and none were observed. All five of these species are therefore determined to be absent based on results of focused plant surveys. Habitat is not present in the Study Area for other potentially occurring special-status plant species that require vernal pools, or deep aquatic habitat; serpentine or gabbroic soils; or other habitats or soils that are absent from the Study Area.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

According to the database query, 36 listed and/or special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur on-site or in the vicinity of the project site (CDFW 2026). Based on field observations, published information, and literature review, eight special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur within the project site: Crotch's bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), northwestern pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*), Cooper's hawk (*Astur cooperii*), tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*), grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*). These species are discussed below.

In addition to these special-status wildlife species, other migratory birds and raptors protected under federal, State, and local laws/policies also have the potential to occur within the Study Area.

Crotch's Bumble Bee (Candidate Species)

Crotch's bumble bee is a candidate species that occurs in grassland and scrub habitats. New colonies are initiated by solitary queens, generally in the early spring, which typically occupy abandoned rodent burrows (CDFW 2019). This species is a generalist forager and has been reported to visit a wide variety of flowering plants. Food plants include *Asclepias* spp., *Antirrhinum* spp., *Clarkia* spp., *Eschscholzia* spp., *Eriogonum* spp., *Chaenactis* spp., *Lupinus* spp., *Medicago* spp., *Phacelia* spp., and *Salvia* spp. (Koch et al. 2012). The colony active season in California is from April to August. New queens hibernate over the winter and initiate a new colony the following spring. This species is rare throughout its range and in decline in the Central Valley and southern California (CDFW 2019). The annual grassland community within the project site provides suitable habitat for this species. Rodent burrows within the project site provide suitable nesting habitat for this species, and floral resources within the project site provide foraging habitat. There are two documented occurrences of this species within five miles of the Study Area, with the closest approximately 4.60 miles to the southwest. This occurrence documents one male observed in June 2023 (CDFW 2026).

Northwestern Pond Turtle (Federally Proposed Threatened and CDFW Species of Special Concern)

This species occurs in a variety of aquatic habitats; typically, permanent ponds, lakes, streams, irrigation ditches, canals, marshes, or pools in intermittent drainages. Appears to prefer areas lined with abundant vegetation and either rocky or muddy substrates. Requires basking sites such as logs, rocks, cattail mats or exposed banks. This species is active from February to November, and breeding occurs from April to May. Nesting typically occurs from March to August. Overwintering occurs in upland terrestrial habitats close to water sources (approximately 300 feet), in which they will bury themselves under loose soil (CDFW 2026). Nesting sites in uplands may be as far as 400 meters (1,312 feet) or more from the aquatic habitat, although the distance is usually much less and is generally around 100 meters (328 feet). In nonriverine habitats that experience little water level fluctuation, this species may overwinter underwater (Thomson et al. 2016). In mild climates, this species may be active year-round. An unidentified turtle was observed within the pond during the reconnaissance survey; it could not be confirmed if it was a northwestern pond turtle or a red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta elegans*). There are seven documented occurrences of this species within five miles of the Study Area, with the closest extant occurrence approximately 2.88 miles to the north. This occurrence documents numerous turtles observed in a wetland complex from 2009 to 2017 (CDFW 2026).

Cooper's Hawk (CDFW Watch List Species)

This species occurs in open woodlands, riparian forests, montane coniferous forests, and other open woodland habitats. It may also occur in wooded suburban habitats. This species nests high within large trees and preys on medium-sized birds and small mammals (Zeiner et al. 1990). Cooper's hawk was not observed during the biological survey on October 31, 2023; however, the project site provides nesting habitat in the valley foothill riparian community, and this species could also forage in the surrounding annual grassland. The project site is within this species' year-round range, and this species could nest in or adjacent to the project site. This species was not observed in the Study Area during the field surveys. There are no documented occurrences of this species within five miles of the Study Area (CDFW 2026a); however, Cooper's hawk is not regularly tracked by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). This is a common species in Sacramento County and there are numerous records in the vicinity of the Study Area (eBird 2026).

Tricolored Blackbird (CESA Threatened and CDFW Species of Special Concern)

This species is listed as a State threatened species. Tricolored blackbird nests and seeks cover in emergent wetland vegetation and thorny vegetation such as Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), cattail, willow, and tules. The nesting area must be large enough to support a minimum colony of 50 pairs, as they are a highly colonial species. As many as 20,000 to 30,000 nests have been recorded in cattail marshes of four hectares or less (Shuford and Gardali 2008). This species forages for insects on the ground in croplands, grasslands, flooded land, and edges of ponds. The basic requirements for selecting breeding sites are open accessible water, a protected nesting substrate, including either flooded or thorny vegetation, and a suitable foraging space providing adequate insect prey within a few miles of the nesting colony (Beedy and Hamilton 1999). The project site contains suitable nesting habitat for this species in blackberry brambles along the perimeter of the pond. This species may also forage within open areas of the project site. There are 12 CNDDB records of this species within a five-mile radius of the project site, with the nearest being 0.4 mile to the south (CDFW 2026).

Grasshopper Sparrow (CDFW Species of Special Concern)

Grasshopper sparrow is a summer resident of foothills and lowlands west of the Cascade-Sierra Nevada crest. It occurs in grasslands with scattered shrubs or other tall structures, which it utilizes as singing perches. It nests on the ground in dense grass with overhanging taller grasses and forbs (Zeiner et al. 1990). The project site contains suitable nesting and foraging habitat for this species in the annual grassland community. There are no CNDDB records of this species within a five-mile radius of the project site (CDFW 2026); however, grasshopper sparrow is not regularly tracked by the CNDDB. This is a relatively common species in Sacramento County and there are numerous records in the vicinity of the Study Area (eBird 2026).

Burrowing Owl (CESA Candidate and CDFW Species of Special Concern

This species occurs in a variety of open habitats; typically grasslands, desert scrub, agricultural fields, washes, and disturbed areas such as golf courses or vacant lots. Burrowing owls forage on the ground in areas with low, sparse vegetation and with an abundance of small mammal burrows. They nest in burrows, especially those of California ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*), but will also use other refuge sites such as rubble piles, pipes, and culverts. In the Central Valley of California, most foraging occurs within a 600-meter radius of the nest (Gervais et al. 2003). This species was not observed in the Study Area during the field surveys. There are five documented occurrences within five miles of the Study Area, with the closest approximately 0.82 mile away. This occurrence documents wintering owls observed in grassland habitat with rocky outcrops (CDFW 2026).

Swainson's Hawk (CESA Threatened)

This species occurs in a variety of open habitats, including expansive grasslands, agricultural areas, and open woodlands. It breeds in California and winters in Mexico and South America. Swainson's hawks usually arrive in the Central Valley between March 1 and April 1 and migrate south between September and October. This species usually nests in trees adjacent to suitable foraging habitat but is known to forage in areas away from the nest. Nests are usually located in trees near the edges of riparian stands, in lone trees or groves of trees in agricultural fields, and in mature roadside trees. Mature oak and riparian trees are the most used nest trees, typically associated with high-quality foraging habitat (CDFW 2026). Suitable foraging areas for Swainson's hawk include native grasslands or lightly grazed pastures, alfalfa and other hay crops, idle land, certain grain and row croplands, and ruderal lands. Swainson's hawks primarily feed on voles but will take a variety of prey, including small mammals, birds, and insects. This species was not observed in the Study Area during the field surveys. There are three documented occurrences of this species within five miles of the Study Area, with the closest approximately 2.1 miles to the south. This occurrence documents a non-nesting adult observed in 1982 (CDFW 2026).

White-tailed Kite (CDFW Fully Protected)

White-tailed kite is a year-round resident in California in coastal areas and lowlands in the Central Valley. Population sizes increase during the non-breeding season due to over-wintering migrants. White-tailed kites prefer open stages of habitats dominated by herbaceous species and will nest in tall trees adjacent to foraging habitat (Zeiner et al. 1990). White-tailed kites feed mainly on small mammals such as voles but will take other small vertebrate and invertebrate prey. An individual white-tailed kite was observed foraging adjacent to the pond during the biological survey on October 31, 2023. The project site provides nesting habitat in the valley foothill riparian community, and foraging habitat is present in

the adjacent annual grassland. The project site is within this species' year-round range. There are three CNDDB records of this species within a five-mile radius of the project site, with the nearest being 0.8 mile to the north (CDFW 2026). One white-tailed kite was observed foraging within the Study Area during the survey on October 31, 2023.

Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors

Migratory birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711). The MBTA makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed under 50 CFR 10; this also includes feathers or other parts, nests, eggs, or products, except as allowed by implementing regulations (50 CFR 21). Additionally, CFGC Section 3503 states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird. CFGC Section 3503.5 specifically states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any raptors (i.e., hawks, owls, eagles, and falcons), including their nests or eggs; Section 3513 specifically states that it is unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the MBTA or any part of such migratory nongame bird except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the MBTA. A number of migratory birds and raptors have the potential to nest in or adjacent to the project site. Many birds were observed within the project site during the field survey, and suitable nest locations include trees, shrubs, grass, and bare ground. Therefore, nesting birds may occur within the project site during the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31).

Protected Trees

In total, 65 trees were inventoried during the arborist survey, including four arroyo willows (*Salix lasiolepis*), 53 Goodding's black willow (*Salix gooddingii*), one Callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana*), two Chinese tallow (*Triadica sebifera*), four Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), and one valley oak. It should be noted that portions of the site contain oak tree mitigation plantings that were not assessed/inventoried as part of this survey. Of the 65 trees identified on or overhanging the project site, one valley oak (tree tag #50) is considered protected under the City's Tree Ordinance (FMC Chapter 12.16).

Impact Analysis

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 with Mitigation.

Special-Status Plant Species

Of the 21 listed and/or special-status plants with the potential to occur in the project region, five of these plant species have potential to occur on-site based on suitable habitat on-site: Ahart's dwarf rush, big-scale balsamroot, dwarf downingia, Sanford's arrowhead, and spicate calycadenia. The project site contains suitable habitat for these species in the annual grassland community and aquatic resources on-site, particularly the wetland swale.

However, none of these special-status plant species were observed during the biological survey on October 31, 2023, or during the focused rare plant surveys conducted during the blooming periods for

these species on May 19, 2025, June 6, 2025, and June 10, 2026. As these species were not observed during the surveys and are presumed to be absent on-site, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects on special-status plant species, and the impact would be less than significant.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

Of the 36 listed and/or special-status wildlife species with the potential to occur on-site or in the vicinity of the project site, eight special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur within the project site: Crotch's bumble bee, northwestern pond turtle, tricolored blackbird, Cooper's hawk, grasshopper sparrow, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and white-tailed kite. In addition, a number of migratory birds and raptors protected under the MBTA have the potential to nest in or adjacent to the project site. These species are discussed below.

In addition to the species-specific mitigation measures identified below, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be implemented, which would require a worker environmental awareness training for all construction and project related personnel. This training would including information regarding potential special-status species with potential to occur on-site, general measures to avoid impacts, and penalties for non-compliance. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, in addition to the mitigation measures identified for the species listed below, would minimize potential impacts on special-status wildlife species to a level of less than significant.

Crotch's Bumble Bee

The annual grassland community within the project site provides suitable habitat for this species. Rodent burrows within the project site provide suitable nesting habitat for this species, and floral resources within the project site provide foraging habitat. This species has a moderate potential to occur on the project site based on the presence of suitable habitat and documented occurrences in the vicinity of the project. There is potential for adverse effects to Crotch's bumble bee through colony disturbance, leading to the destruction of the colony if this species is present onsite. Vegetation removal and ground-disturbance may also remove potential foraging habitat for this species, contributing to the decline throughout the State. To avoid impacts to Crotch's bumble bee, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would be implemented and would require pre-construction surveys during the Colony Active Period to determine the presence or absence of the species, and consultation with CDFW may be necessary. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the impact on Crotch's bumble bee would be reduced to less than significant.

Northwestern Pond Turtle

The pond within the project site provides suitable aquatic habitat for northwestern pond turtle and the adjacent valley foothill riparian community provides suitable nesting habitat. The upland habitat would also allow for nesting, basking, hibernation, and dispersal. However, the project site is subject to some level of disturbance and is surrounded by development which may lower the overall habitat suitability for this species. Northwestern pond turtle has a moderate potential to occur based on the presence of suitable habitat and documented occurrences in the vicinity of the project site. Project implementation could result in temporary adverse effects on this species during construction activities through the elimination of suitable habitat for nesting, foraging, or wintering habitat on-site. However, once constructed, the areas surrounding the project would continue to provide suitable wintering and foraging habitat. To avoid impacts to northwestern pond turtle, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would be implemented, which would require pre-construction surveys to determine the presence or absence of

this species. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the impact on northwestern pond turtle would be reduced to less than significant.

Burrowing Owl

The project site provides suitable open, grassland habitat and numerous small mammal burrows were observed that could support this species. No sign of occupancy was observed during the surveys (whitewash, feathers, pellets etc.) but this species could occur during the breeding or non-breeding season. However, the project site is surrounded by development which may lower the overall habitat suitability of the site. This species has a moderate potential to occur based on the presence of suitable habitat and documented occurrences in the vicinity of the project. The proposed project has the potential for adverse effects to burrowing owl through nest disturbance, leading to the destruction of eggs or nestlings if this species nests on-site or the immediate surroundings during construction. Eggs and young still dependent on the nest would be susceptible to injury or mortality through physical contact or through nest abandonment caused by the displacement of adults. Needless destruction of eggs or young would be a violation of the CFGC. Non-breeding adults could be impacted if trapped within a burrow or other refugia location during construction and could also be more susceptible to predation after exclusion or habitat elimination. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, which requires a pre-construction burrowing owl survey, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Tricolored Blackbird

Tricolored blackbird nests and seeks cover in emergent wetland vegetation and thorny vegetation such as Himalayan blackberry, cattail, willow, and tules. The project site contains suitable nesting habitat for this species in blackberry brambles along the perimeter of the pond. This species may also forage within open areas on-site and adjacent to the project site. Given that suitable nesting and foraging habitats are present within the project site, tricolored blackbird may have high potential to occur. There is potential for adverse effects to tricolored blackbird if this species were to nest within or adjacent to the project site during construction activities. Non-breeding adults could readily avoid contact with construction equipment or personnel by moving out of the construction area. However, eggs and young still dependent on the nest would be susceptible to injury or mortality through physical contact or through nest abandonment caused by the displacement of adults. Needless destruction of eggs or young would be a violation of the CFGC. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would require pre-construction surveys for other nesting migratory birds and raptors, which would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Grasshopper Sparrow

The open grassland provides suitable foraging habitat and grasshopper sparrow could nest in dense patches of grass or within or near shrubs. This species has a moderate potential to occur based on the presence of suitable habitat and documented occurrences in the vicinity of the project site. There is potential for adverse effects to grasshopper sparrow if this species were to nest within or adjacent to the project site during construction. Non-breeding adults could readily avoid contact with construction equipment or personnel by moving out of the construction area. However, eggs and young still dependent on the nest would be susceptible to injury or mortality through physical contact or through nest abandonment caused by the displacement of adults. Needless destruction of eggs or young would be a violation of the CFGC. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would require pre-construction surveys for other nesting migratory birds and raptors, which would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Swainson's Hawk

The project site provides suitable nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk in suitable trees on-site and adjacent to the site. Suitable foraging habitat is also present on-site, and potential small mammal prey species are present in annual grassland. Project implementation would not substantially eliminate suitable nesting habitat; however, foraging habitat would be reduced. The areas surrounding the project site would continue to provide suitable nesting and foraging habitat after project completion since the project would not develop the entirety of potential foraging habitat or remove potential nest trees. There is potential for adverse effects to Swainson's hawk if this species were to nest within or adjacent to the project site during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would require pre-construction surveys for other nesting migratory birds and raptors, which would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Cooper's Hawk

Cooper's hawk is a year-round resident in California in wooded areas in the Central Valley and Sierra foothills. This species was not observed during the biological survey; however, the project site provides nesting habitat in the valley foothill riparian community, and this species could also forage in the surrounding annual grassland. There are no CNDDB records of this species within a five-mile radius of the Study Area (CDFW 2026). However, there is potential for adverse effects to Cooper's hawk during construction activities if this species were to nest within or adjacent to the project site. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would require pre-construction surveys for other nesting migratory birds and raptors, which would reduce the impact to less than significant.

White-tailed Kite

White-tailed kite is a year-round resident in California in coastal areas and lowlands in the Central Valley. Population sizes increase during the non-breeding season due to over-wintering migrants. An individual white-tailed kite was observed foraging adjacent to the pond during the October 2023 biological survey. The project site provides nesting habitat in the valley foothill riparian community, and foraging habitat is present in the adjacent annual grassland. The project site is within this species' year-round range. There are four CNDDB records of this species within a five-mile radius of the project site, with the nearest being 0.8 mile to the north (CDFW 2026). There is potential for adverse effects to white-tailed kite if this species were to nest within or adjacent to the project site during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would require pre-construction surveys for other nesting migratory birds and raptors, which would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Other Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors

Migratory birds are protected under the MBTA of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711). A number of migratory birds and raptors have the potential to nest in or adjacent to the project site. Many birds were observed within the project site during the field survey, and suitable nest locations include trees, shrubs, grass, and bare ground. Therefore, nesting birds may occur on-site during the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31). There is potential for adverse effects to nesting birds if they were to nest within or adjacent to the project site during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would require pre-construction surveys for other nesting migratory birds and raptors, which would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Impact Summary

The project would have no substantial adverse effect on special-status plant species, as no species were observed on-site during the biological survey on October 31, 2023, or during the focused rare plant surveys conducted during the blooming periods for these species on May 19, 2025, June 6, 2025, and June 10, 2026. Therefore, the impact on special-status plant species would be less than significant.

The project site contains suitable breeding, nesting, and/or foraging habitat for several special-status wildlife species, as well as for nesting migratory birds and raptors protected under the MBTA. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-6 would reduce potential impacts on special-status wildlife species to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the impact on special-status wildlife species would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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? and,

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?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies or those that are protected under CEQA, Section 1600 of the CFGC (i.e., riparian areas), and/or CWA Sections 401 and 404, which include wetlands and other waters of the U.S. Sensitive habitats on the project site include wetlands and other potential jurisdictional waters, and riparian habitat.

A total of 0.194 acre of aquatic resources were mapped in the project site, as well as 0.39 acre of riparian habitat associated with these communities within uplands. Wetland features mapped within the project site include a wetland swale (0.095 acre and 416 linear feet); and other aquatic features include an intermittent drainage (0.014 acre and 203 linear feet) and a portion of a pond (0.085 acre). All 0.194 acre of mapped aquatic resources are likely to be considered waters of the U.S. and subject to USACE jurisdiction because they maintain a relatively permanent continuous surface connection to tributaries of traditional navigable waters of the U.S. The intermittent drainage and the pond convey a relatively permanent flow underground through a stormwater drainage system. This drainage system flows into a series of detention basins that discharge into a headwater drainage of Willow Creek. Willow Creek ultimately flows into Lake Natoma, a tributary of the Sacramento River. The jurisdiction of the features will be determined by the USACE review and verification process. Therefore, all aquatic features on-site would likely be considered waters of the State and subject to CVRWQCB jurisdiction, because waters of the State includes all waters of the U.S.

The project is in the final stages of design; however, it is anticipated that up to 0.194 acre of State and/or federally protected aquatic resources would be temporarily and/or permanently impacted. The City would be required to obtain applicable regulatory permits prior to the start of construction, which would include coordination with the applicable jurisdiction to verify the extent of the features. Conditions included in the final permits, including prescribed mitigation measures, would be implemented to minimize potential impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-6 and regulatory permitting requirements, the impact would be less than significant for questions b) and c).

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. Wildlife corridors link areas of suitable wildlife habitat that are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. This fragmentation of habitat can also occur when a portion of one or more habitats is converted into another habitat; for instance, when woodland or scrub habitat is altered or converted into grasslands after a disturbance such as fire, mudslide, or construction activities. Wildlife corridors mitigate the effects of this fragmentation by (1) allowing animals to move between remaining habitats thereby permitting depleted populations to be replenished and promoting genetic exchange; (2) providing escape routes from fire, predators, and human disturbances, thus reducing the risk of catastrophic events (such as fire or disease) on population or local species extinction; and, (3) serving as travel routes for individual animals as they move within their home ranges in search of food, water, mates, and other needs.

The project site is surrounded by major roadways and residential development. Although wildlife may disperse through the project site on a local level, the site is not considered a wildlife migration or movement corridor. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The City regulates trees under FMC Chapter 12.16, which requires a permit to remove native oaks defined as valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), interior live oak (*Quercus wislizeni*), and coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) measuring at least six inches in diameter at standard height (i.e., 54-inches above natural grade, DSH), or a multi-stemmed native oak measuring a total of at least 20 inches at DSH. For a tree with a common root system that branches at the ground, DSH is defined as the sum of the diameter of the largest trunk and one-half the cumulative diameter of the remaining trunks measured at 4.5 feet above natural grade.

Of the 65 trees identified on or overhanging the project site, one valley oak (tree tag #50) is considered protected by the City's Tree Ordinance. If removal of this protected tree is required during project construction, mitigation would be required per FMC Section 12.16.150. Based on the DSH equivalency ratio, mitigation for a total of 10 inches would be required. Therefore, with adherence to the City's Tree Ordinance and mitigation ratios, the impact would be less than significant.

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. The project is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan area. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Worker Environmental Awareness Training

The City shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct an environmental awareness training for all project-related personnel before the initiation of work, including vegetation removal, grubbing, or other construction activities. The training shall include, but is not limited to, information on the identification of special-status species that may be encountered, nesting birds and bird nests, and any other sensitive species or communities with the potential to occur on-site and required practices to implement before the start of construction. General measures that are being implemented to protect species that may occur on-site shall be referenced, including penalties for non-compliance, and boundaries of the permitted disturbance zones. Upon completion of the training, all construction personnel shall sign a form stating that they have attended the training and understand all the measures. Proof of this instruction should be kept on file with the City.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Crotch's Bumble Bee

The City shall retain a qualified biologist familiar with California bumble bee species to conduct preconstruction surveys to confirm the presence or absence of Crotch's bumble bee prior to the start of project construction activities. Initial ground-disturbing work (e.g., grading, vegetation removal, staging) within potential habitat in annual grassland, perennial grassland in off-site areas and riverine habitats in on-site areas of the Study Area shall take place between 1 September and 31 March (i.e., outside the colony active period), if feasible, to avoid impacts on special-status bumble bees.

- If completing all initial ground-disturbing work within potential habitat in annual grassland, perennial grassland in off-site areas and riverine habitats in on-site areas of the Study Area between 1 September and 31 March is not feasible, then a biologist with experience conducting biological resource surveys within California shall conduct a pre-construction survey for Crotch's bumble bee in the areas proposed for impact no more than 14 days before the commencement of construction activities. The survey shall occur during the period from one hour after sunrise to two hours before sunset, with temperatures between 65° F and 90° F, with low wind and no rain. If the timing of the start of construction makes the survey infeasible due to the temperature requirements, the surveying biologist shall select the most appropriate days based on the National Weather Service seven-day forecast and shall survey at a time of day that is closest to the temperature range stated above. The survey duration shall be commensurate with the extent of suitable floral resources (which represent foraging habitat) present within the area proposed for impact. A meandering pedestrian survey shall be conducted throughout the area proposed for impact to identify patches of suitable floral resources. Suitable floral resources for Crotch's bumble bee include species in the following families: *Apocynaceae*, *Asteraceae*, *Boraginaceae*, *Fabaceae*, and *Lamiaceae*.

- At a minimum, pre-construction survey methods shall include the following:

    - Search areas with floral resources for foraging bumble bees. Observed foraging activity may indicate a nest is nearby, and therefore, the survey duration shall be increased when foraging bumble bees are present.

- If special-status bumble bees are observed, watch any special-status bumble bees present and observe their flight patterns. Attempt to track their movements between foraging areas and the nest.
- Visually look for nest entrances. Observe burrows, any other underground cavities, logs, or other possible nesting habitat.
- If floral resources or other vegetation preclude observance of the nest, small areas of vegetation may be removed via hand removal, line trimming, or mowing to a height of no less than 4 inches to assist with locating the nest.
- Look for concentrated special-status bumble bee activity.
- Listen for the humming of a nest colony.
- If bumble bees are observed, attempt to photograph the individual and identify it to species.

- The biologist conducting the survey shall record when the survey was conducted, a general description of any suitable foraging habitat/floral resources present, a description of observed bumble bee activity, a list of bumble bee species observed, a description of any vegetation removed to facilitate the survey, and their determination of if survey observations suggest a special-status bumble bee nest(s) may be present or if construction activities could otherwise harm special-status bumble bees. The report shall be submitted to the City of Davis before the commencement of construction activities.

- If no bumble bees are located during the pre-construction survey or the bumble bees located are definitively identified as common (i.e., not special-status) species, then no further mitigation or coordination with CDFW is required.

- If any sign(s) of a bumble bee nest is observed, and/or if it cannot be established the species present is not a special-status bumble bee, then construction shall not commence until either 1) the bumble bees present are identified as common (i.e., not special status) by a qualified biologist, or 2) the completion of coordination with CDFW to identify appropriate mitigation measures, which may include but not be limited to: waiting until the colony active season ends, establishment of nest buffers, or obtaining an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) from CDFW (see below).

- If, after coordination with CDFW, impacts to special-status bumble bees cannot be avoided, the applicant shall obtain an ITP from CDFW, and the applicant shall implement all conditions identified in the ITP. Mitigation required by the ITP may include but will not be limited to, the applicant translocating nesting substrate in accordance with the latest scientific research to another suitable location (i.e., a location that supports similar or better floral resources as the impact area), enhancing floral resources on areas of the Study Area that will remain appropriate habitat, worker awareness training, and/or other measures specified by CDFW.

The City may also elect to assume presence of Crotch's bumble bee and consult with CDFW to obtain an Incidental Take Permit (ITP).

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Northwestern Pond Turtle

The following measures shall be implemented to avoid and minimize potential impacts to northwestern pond turtle:

- If possible, the City shall require that all grading and land disturbing activities be conducted outside of the nesting season for northwestern pond turtle (nesting season is generally March to August) to avoid potential impacts to breeding/nesting individuals.

- The City shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for this species within 24 hours prior to the start of grading or land disturbing activities. If the survey shows that there is no evidence of northwestern pond turtle, then a letter report shall be prepared to document the survey and be provided to the City. If development does not commence within 24 hours of the survey, or halts for more than 7 days, then an additional survey will be required prior to starting or resuming work.

    - If northwestern pond turtle is observed during the survey and has potential to be adversely impacted (e.g., nesting), no work shall occur until CDFW has been consulted to determine appropriate mitigation and avoidance measures. If non-nesting turtles are observed and construction occurs during the active season, turtles would be assumed to move away from construction activities. The City shall retain a biological monitor to monitor construction activities in and around the pond to ensure northwestern pond turtles are not impacted.

- Wildlife exclusion fencing shall be installed around the work areas prior to construction, especially along the pond. Exclusion fencing could include general silt fencing or other solid fencing. Fencing must be trenched into the soil at least six (6) inches and the soil must be carefully compacted against both sides of the fence for its entire length to prevent animals from entering the construction area. Exclusion fencing shall be inspected daily for the duration of construction to ensure it remains intact and any holes, tears, or gaps must be repaired immediately. Fencing will be removed upon construction completion.

- If this species is observed within the project area during work, specifically within the construction zone, all work shall immediately halt in the vicinity of the animal and the animal will be allowed to leave the area of its own will. If the animal is in immediate danger, an approved biologist shall be retained and will relocate the animal outside of the construction zone, at a safe distance from all construction-related activities, and within suitable habitat. No one other than an approved biologist shall handle, take, or otherwise harass the animal. No work shall resume until the animal has moved or been removed from areas of potential disturbance.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Conduct Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Surveys

The following measures shall be implemented to avoid and minimize potential impacts to burrowing owl:

- The City shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct take avoidance surveys in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012). One survey shall occur within the project site and surrounding 500 feet (where accessible) no less than 14 days prior to initiating ground disturbing activities; and a second survey shall occur within 24 hours of the start of ground disturbing activities.

- If no owls or signs of occupancy are observed, a letter report describing the methods and results of the surveys shall be prepared and submitted to the City/

- If owls or signs of occupancy are observed, the City shall consult with CDFW before ground disturbance/construction and may be required to submit a Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan. This plan would document all proposed measures, which may include avoidance, minimization, monitoring, and other measures as needed. All measures provided by CDFW shall be followed. Before the commencement of construction activities (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) within 500 feet of suitable habitat, a survey for burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The survey shall occur within 30 days of the date that construction will encroach within 500 feet of suitable habitat. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the following:

    - A survey for burrows and owls shall be conducted by walking through suitable habitat over the entire project site and in areas within 150 meters (about 500 feet) of the work areas.

    - Pedestrian survey transects should be spaced to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the ground surface. The distance between transect center lines should be no more than 30 meters (about 100 feet) and should be reduced to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and ground surface visibility. Surveyor(s) should maintain a minimum distance of 50 meters (about 160 feet) from any owls or occupied burrows. It is important to minimize disturbance near occupied burrows during all seasons.

- If no occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found in the survey area, no further measures are necessary.

- If occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found, then a complete burrowing owl survey is required. This consists of a minimum of four site visits conducted on four separate days, which must also be consistent with the Survey Method, Weather Conditions, and Time of Day sections of Appendix D of the California Fish and Wildlife "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation". A survey report shall be prepared which is consistent with the Survey Report section of Appendix D of the California Fish and Wildlife "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (CDFW 2012).

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for other Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors

To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds and other raptors, all ground-disturbing activity shall be completed between September 1 and January 31, if feasible. If project activities take place outside of the nesting season, no additional mitigation measures for nesting birds are required. If project activities occur during the nesting season, the following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to nesting birds:

- The City shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey no more than seven days before the initiation of project activities. The survey area shall include suitable raptor and tricolored blackbird nesting habitat within 500 feet and suitable Swainson's hawk habitat within 0.25 mile of the project boundary (inaccessible areas outside of the project boundary can be surveyed from the site or from public roads using binoculars or spotting scopes). If no active nests are identified, no further mitigation is required.

- If active nests are identified, a species-specific buffer 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 must be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine whether nesting birds are being impacted.

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Avoid Impacts to Aquatic Resources

A total of 0.194-acre of aquatic resources were mapped in the project site, as well as 0.39-acre of riparian habitat associated with these communities within uplands. This acreage is preliminary, and the formal aquatic resources delineation prepared for the site shall be submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for verification and final determination.

- Before the initiation of any construction activities that could result in impacts to potentially regulated aquatic features or riparian habitat, the extent of the features within the project site must be verified by the USACE (if applicable), and applicable permits shall be prepared and submitted to the appropriate regulatory agencies for any project-related impacts to these features. Any conditions included in the final permits, including prescribed mitigation measures, will be required to be implemented before filling or impacting these features.

- Authorization to fill wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. under Section 404 of the federal CWA (Section 404 Permit) must be obtained from USACE prior to discharging any dredged or fill materials into any Waters of the U.S. Mitigation measures will be developed as part of the Section 404 Permit to ensure no-net-loss of wetland function and values. To facilitate such authorization, an application for a Section 404 Permit for the Project will be prepared and submitted to USACE and will include direct, avoided, and preserved acreages to Waters of the U.S. Mitigation for impacts to Waters of the U.S. typically consists of a minimum 1:1 ratio for direct impacts; however, final mitigation requirements will be developed in consultation with USACE.

- A Water Quality Certification or waiver pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA must be obtained from the RWQCB for Section 404 permit actions.

- If the aquatic features are determined to not be subject to federal jurisdiction, then these features may still be subject to waste discharge requirements under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Section 13260(a) of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (contained in the California Water Code) requires any person discharging waste or proposing to discharge waste, other than to a community sewer system, within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the State (all surface and subsurface waters) to file a report of waste discharge. The discharge of dredged or fill material into the aquatic resources mapped within the Study Area may constitute a discharge of waste that could affect the quality of waters of the State. A report of waste discharge will be filed for impacts to non-federal waters, if required.

- The valley foothill riparian habitat may also be regulated by CDFW under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code. CDFW asserts jurisdiction over native riparian habitat adjacent to aquatic features, including native trees over four inches in DBH. If an existing fish or wildlife resource may be substantially adversely affected by the activity, CDFW may propose reasonable measures that will allow the protection of those resources. If these measures are agreeable to the parties involved, they may enter into an agreement with CDFW identifying the approved activities and associated mitigation measures. Generally, CDFW recommends submitting an application for a SAA for any work done within the lateral limit of water flow or the edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is greater.

V. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

This section is based on a Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by HELIX in January 2024 for the proposed project (HELIX 2024; Appendix F).

Environmental Setting

Area of Potential Effects

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) 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 prehistoric or historic age, if any such properties exist. The APE corresponds to the overall 19.3-acre project property, comprised of APNs 072-1170-149 and -152. However, physical development of the project would occur on approximately 9.8 acres. Because the project is currently in the planning stages, the vertical dimensions of, and the subsurface dimensions of, the APE are still unknown.

Methodology

HELIX conducted background research on the APE and vicinity to identify cultural resources and to assess the area's sensitivity for such resources. Background research included a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search and a review of aerial photographs and historic-era maps. Each source of information and the results obtained by HELIX are described below.

CHRIS Records Search

On September 12, 2023, a records search addressing the APE and a 0.5-mile radius beyond the APE boundaries was conducted by the North Central Information System (NCIC) at California State University, Sacramento. The purpose of the record search was to: (1) identify prehistoric and historic resources previously documented in the APE and within 0.5 miles of APE boundaries; (2) determine which portions of the APE may have been previously studied, when those studies took place, and how the studies were conducted; and (3) ascertain the potential for archaeological resources, historical resources, and human remains to be found in the APE. This search also included a review of the appropriate USGS topographic maps on which cultural resources are plotted, archaeological site records, building/structure/object records, and data from previous surveys and research reports. The California Points of Historical Interest, the California Historical Landmarks, the National Register of Historic Places

(NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and the California State Historic Resources Inventory listings were also reviewed to ascertain the presence of designated, evaluated, and/or historic-era resources within the APE.

Previous Studies

The NCIC records search revealed that 17 cultural studies have been conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the APE, and that four of those studies at least partially overlap with the currently proposed APE. All studies previously conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the APE are briefly described in Table 1 in the Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix F). The four studies that at least partially overlap with the currently proposed project are discussed below.

Report 4475 – *Cultural Resources Assessment of The Russell Ranch Project, Sacramento County, California* was written by Peak and Associates, Inc in 1990. The report covered the cultural resources investigation of land located on a parcel that extends north from US 50 to just south of the Mormon Island Cemetery. The western edge is bounded by the Natomas Ditch. At the time of the survey "the project area was used primarily for cattle grazing." Contained within the project area were radio towers on the southern hill, the Russell Ranch Complex and the Broder Ranch Complex. Efforts for this report include a summary of previous cultural resources inventory, pedestrian survey of the APE, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) outreach, and shovel test pits within the APE adjacent to bedrock milling features.

Report 4476 – *An Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance of the Proposed Russell Ranch Development Project, Folsom, California* was written by Archeo-Tec in 1986. The report covered the cultural resources investigation of roughly 1,686 acres located on a parcel of land bounded on the east by the slopes of the western El Dorado Hills, and on the west by the Natomas Ditch. US 50 bounds the property on the south, and Green Valley Road Follows the northern limit of the property. Efforts for this report included archival research, pedestrian survey of the APE, and the recordation of sites found within the APE. Site RR-1, a bedrock milling feature, falls within the current APE.

Report 4477 -- *Determination of Adverse Effect for the Russell Ranch Project* was written by Pacific Legacy, Inc in 1994. This report covered the evaluation of adverse effects by construction of a mixed residential community covering approximately 1,700 acres. Efforts for this report included a record search conducted at the NCIC, NAHC outreach and State Historic Preservation Office consultation. Site CA-SAC-449, known as RR-11 in previous reports, promoted the Army Corp of Engineers to recommend "if the Russell Ranch residential community is developed, the exclusion of CA-SAC-449 from development, a carefully designed program of monitored site capping, and long-term protective measures would provide maximum protection and preservation."

Report 4483—*A Determination of Eligibility and Effect on Cultural Resources withing the Russell Ranch Project Area, Sacramento County, California* was written by Peak and Associates, Inc. in 1994. This report described NHPA compliance for a 1,686-acre project in the eastern portion of the City of Folsom. The project area was located entirely in Sacramento County, with the eastern boundary being formed by the El Dorado County line. The project's southern border corresponded to US 50, while the northern portion of the property incorporated a short section of Blue Ravine. Peak and Associates recommended only CA-SAC-449 as an eligible site, but recommended that the other sites, although ineligible, should be avoided if possible.

Previously Recorded Resources

The NCIC records search revealed that 11 cultural resources have been previously recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed project, although none of them are located within the APE itself. The resources within the project vicinity consist of both prehistoric and historic era resources, including multiple bedrock milling features (P-34-000466, P-34-000467, P-34-000468), historic rock walls (P-34-000808, P-34-000902, P-34-000903, P-34-000904, P-34-000905, P-34-000996) and a historic foundation (P-34-000806). In addition, resource P-34-000335 corresponds to the Folsom Mining District.

According to records on file with the NCIC there are no resources within the APE. Although there are no resources within the direct APE it is important to note that a historic wall structure (IF 90-27) and a bedrock milling feature (RR-1), both described in report 4475, are located near the project site.

Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Search

On September 20, 2023, HELIX requested that the NAHC conduct a search of their Sacred Lands File (SLF) for the presence of Native American sacred sites or human remains in the vicinity of the proposed project area. On November 2, 2023, HELIX received a response from the NAHC that indicated the SLF search returned negative results but that the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not necessarily indicate the absence of cultural resources within the project area. As a result, the letter recommended that HELIX reach out to sixteen Native American tribal representatives who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Documentation of the NAHC's response is included in Appendix C of the Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix F).

Pedestrian Survey

HELIX archaeologists surveyed the APE on September 21, 2023. The pedestrian survey involved the systematic investigation of the APE's ground surface by walking in parallel, 15 to 25-meter transects. During the pedestrian survey, 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 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. Representative survey photographs are found in Appendix D.

During the survey, ground visibility was found to range from 0-20 percent in the southern portion of the APE and between 70-100 percent in the northern portion of the APE. Within the southern portion of the APE there were modern landscaping efforts that had installed above ground irrigation lines and small circular clearings no more than a meter in diameter with sapling trees planted. The areas surrounding these trees had been cleared, producing limited circles of 100 percent visibility. Exposed soils were found to consist primarily of a dark brown loam, and exposed bedrock is present throughout the APE.

The topography of the APE can be described as hilly in the southern and southwestern portion of the APE with the steepness of the hill increasing from east to west. The northwestern portion of the APE is generally flat, and is marked by a seasonal drainage that begins at the western border of the APE. This drainage runs eastward to the center of the APE, turns north, and then finally turns west along the northern border of the APE and extends to the northwestern corner of the APE. Just east of the center of the APE is a large pond. There is a path looping around the south edge of the pond, while the rest of

the area around the pond is covered with dense vegetation. A graveled road measuring approximately 72 feet north to south and 23 feet east to west is present in the center of the northern portion of the APE, extending from the northern border southward.

The northeastern portion of the APE features two plateaus of varying elevation, along with the same landscaping work seen along the southern border of the APE but running eastward along its northern edge. The higher and easternmost of the two plateaus may have been used as a staging area for previous construction, as it appears to be artificially leveled.

During the survey, two artificial drainages were encountered. These drainages run from the southeast corner of the APE northwest to the pond, and in the northwest of the APE on the border. These drainages are approximately five feet wide and two feet deep.

Strewn throughout the project area are several walking paths through the brush leading to different areas. These paths are visible in satellite imagery and indicate that there is regular foot traffic through the APE. HELIX archaeologists also encountered modern trash, including plastic bottles, tarps, and other miscellaneous debris in various locations across the APE. Some of the discarded materials were bait cups as well as plastic bottles and glass bottles found on the southern shore of the pond. These materials indicate current fishing of the pond.

During the survey, areas just outside of the APE were also observed. To the north is Broadstone Parkway, which runs along the entire northern edge of the APE. To the east is Carpenter Hill Road, which separates the eastern border of the project area from a residential neighborhood. During the pedestrian survey members of the residential neighborhood were observed to cross the street and enter the APE. To the south is a paved walking path spanning the southern border of the project area. This path begins on Carpenter Hill Road and travels east along the southern border ending on Iris Road, which leads to a residential neighborhood to the southwest. The western edge of the APE is bordered by Vista Del Largo High School. There is a visible foot path from the high school leading into the APE, and there were several baseballs observed in the western portion of the APE outside of the high school baseball diamonds present to the direct west.

Impact Analysis

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

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The NCIC records search revealed that 17 cultural studies have been conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the APE, and that four of those studies at least partially overlap with the APE. These four studies, referred to as Reports 4475, 4476, 4477, and 4483, are all associated with the Russel Ranch Development Project and are dated between 1986 and 1994. However, there are no previously recorded resources within the APE. No historical resources eligible for inclusion or listed on the CRHR or NRHP no archaeological resources were observed on-site during the archaeological field surveys. The APE was determined to have a moderate to high potential to contain previously unrecorded precontact and or/historic era cultural resources beneath the ground surface based on the presence of resources in the immediate surrounding areas outside of the APE. These resources include the locations of thirteen (now mostly destroyed) bedrock milling features identified in

the surrounding area by Peak and Associates in 2004. Additionally, a series of historic fences identified in the same 2004 study to the west of the APE also appear to have been destroyed. As recorded in the previously mentioned report, shovel test pits conducted during the survey and inventory of the area all produced material culture, including but not limited to midden, stone tools and flakes, and multiple bedrock milling features. Due to the potential for the APE to contain archaeological or historical resources, implementation of the project could result in a potentially significant impact on cultural resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5.

Ground disturbance and excavation associated with project construction could result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a previously unknown archaeological or historical resource. To ensure that construction personnel are aware of the project site's potential to contain cultural resources, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would require a worker awareness training program to be implemented to educate all construction personnel in the recognition of possible cultural resources and stop-work requirements in the event that such resources are discovered. In addition, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would require implementation of an archaeological monitoring program to monitor for any kind of archaeological or cultural resources or human remains that might be exposed during ground-disturbing construction activities. In the event that cultural resources are inadvertently discovered, Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would require construction activities within 100 feet of the find to halt, and further assessment of the potential resource would be required. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3, the impact on cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. No formal cemeteries or other places of human internment are known to exist on the project site. Although considered highly unlikely, there is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown human remains. However, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98, if human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, Mitigation Measure CUL-4 would be implemented to minimize impacts to human remains. In addition, the worker awareness training program outlined in Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would educate construction personnel in the recognition of potential Native American burials. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Worker Awareness Training Program

Prior to the start of project construction, all construction personnel involved in ground-disturbing activities shall be trained in the recognition of possible cultural resources and the protection of such resources. The training will inform all construction personnel of the procedures to be followed upon the discovery of archaeological materials, including Native American burials. Construction personnel will be instructed that cultural resources must be avoided, and that all travel and construction activity must be confined to designated roads and areas. The training will include a review of the local, State, and federal laws and regulations related to cultural resources, as well as instructions on the procedures to be implemented in the event that unanticipated resources are encountered during construction, including stopping work in the vicinity of the find and contacting the appropriate environmental compliance specialist (e.g., qualified archaeologist).

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Monitoring Program

The City shall retain the services of an experienced archaeological monitor who will be present on-site to observe ground-disturbing activities that will require grubbing, grading, trenching, or excavation. Oversight of the archaeological monitor will be provided by a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology. The archaeological monitor will be given access to inspect all ground surface and subsurface modifications, excavations, installations, equipment parking, and any other construction-related activities.

Archaeological monitoring will consist of on-the-ground and close observation by an experienced archaeologist for any kind of archaeological or cultural resources that might be exposed during ground-disturbing construction activities. Construction activities will be monitored by following the construction equipment as it removes or modifies soils and vegetation, and may involve walking cuts or excavations after the machinery has passed, or standing to the side and observing the soil removal activity. The archaeologist on-site shall be given "stop work authority" so that in the event that artifacts, structural remains, or a change in soil conditions are noted, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find will be stopped. Further ground disturbances in the vicinity of the find will remain stopped while an assessment is underway and until the qualified archaeologist can provide recommendations for treatment of the discovery. If a potentially significant find cannot be avoided by the project, the qualified archaeologist shall develop an evaluation plan in consultation with the City that contains a research design to guide assessments of the resource's significance and scientific potential.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources

In the event that cultural resources are inadvertently exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities shall be halted within 100 feet of the discovery. Cultural resources could consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, wood, or shell artifacts, or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources cannot be avoided during the remainder of construction, a qualified archaeologist retained by the City, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, shall assess the resource and provide appropriate management recommendations. If the discovery proves to be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and shall be discussed in consultation with the City.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains

In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98:

- There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the specific location or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the Sacramento County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make for means of treating or disposing of, with

appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98; or

- Where the following conditions occur, the City shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the MLD or on the project area in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:

    - The NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission;

    - The MLD identified fails to make a recommendation; or

    - The City rejects the recommendation of the MLD, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

VI. 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 Energy Sources

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 2024, the California power mix totaled 278,338 gigawatt hours (GWh). In-State generation was 216,181 GWh in 2024, which accounted for approximately 78 percent of the State's power mix. The remaining electricity came from out-of-State imports (California Energy Commission (CEC) 2026a). Table 8, *California Electricity Sources 2024*, provides a summary of California's electricity sources as of 2024.

Table 8: California Electricity Sources 2024

Fuel Type	Percent of California Power
Coal	2.21
Large Hydro	11.06
Natural Gas	34.01
Nuclear	9.92
Oil	0.01
Other (Petroleum Coke/Waste Heat)	0.08
Renewables (Excluding Large Hydro and Nuclear)	41.25
Unspecified	1.46

Source: CEC 2026b

Natural gas is the single fuel source that provides the largest portion of the total in-State capacity and electricity generation in California, with 34.01 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 2026c).

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 2024, 13.4 billion gallons of gasoline were sold in California (CEC 2026d). 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 2024, 3.5 billion gallons of diesel were sold in California (CEC 2026e).

Impact Analysis

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. Energy consumed during project construction would primarily consist of transportation fuels in the form of diesel and gasoline. Fuel consumption would result from the use of on-road and off-highway trucks for the transportation of construction materials, construction worker vehicles traveling to and from the proposed project site, and the use of off-road construction equipment. While construction activities would consume petroleum-based fuels, consumption of such resources would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction. The consumption of energy during construction would be incidental and temporary and, therefore, would not constitute wasteful, insufficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

During operation, the project would consume minimal amounts of energy in the form of electricity for the four lighted pickleball courts, lighted basketball court, lighted volleyball courts, and the restroom and electrical/maintenance building. Energy would also be consumed during park maintenance activities, primarily in the form of fuel for landscaping equipment. However, project operation and maintenance activities would not consume large amounts of electricity and fuel, and would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed 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. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

VII. 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

Regional Geology

Folsom is located within the Great Valley geomorphic province, composed of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys. The province is generally bounded by the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the east, Coast Ranges to the west, Transverse Ranges to the south, and Klamath Mountains to the north. The region has been determined by the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) as generally being underlain on the west with alluvium, lake, playa, and terrace deposits and on the east with Pliocene or Pleistocene sandstone, shale, and gravel deposits (City 2018).

Seismic and Geologic Hazards

California's Earthquake Fault Hazard Zones are regulatory areas identified by the California Geological Survey (CGS) under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (1972) and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (1990) to flag locations prone to surface fault rupture, liquefaction, or earthquake-triggered landslides. The numerous faults in California include Holocene-active, pre-Holocene (Quaternary), and inactive (pre-Quaternary) faults. The criteria for these major groups were developed by the CGS for the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Program (DOC 2018). By definition, a Holocene-active fault is one that has had surface displacement within Holocene time (about the last 11,700 years). A pre-Holocene fault has demonstrated surface displacement during Quaternary time (approximately the last 1.6 million years) but has had no known Holocene movement. Faults that have not moved in the last 1.6 million years are considered inactive.

According to the CGS's Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation (EQ Zapp), the nearest Alquist-Priolo Fault to the project site is the Cleveland Hill Fault of the Foothills Fault System located approximately 60 miles north of the project site near Oroville, and the West Tahoe Fault of the West Tahoe-Dollar Point Fault Zone located approximately 60 miles east of the project site in South Lake Tahoe (DOC 2026c).

CGS's EQ Zapp also maps liquefaction and landslide hazard zones. The proposed project site is not located within or near a mapped liquefaction or landslide hazard zone (DOC 2026c).

Soils

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) NRCS mapped one soils unit on-site, Auburn-Argonaut-Rock outcrop complex, 8 to 30 percent slopes. This soil occurs on hills between 120 to 4,000 feet amsl and consists of residuum weathered from metamorphic rock. A typical soil profile is a relatively shallow surface layer of loam/clay (0 to 29 inches deep) that transitions to unweathered bedrock. This soil is a well-drained soil, with a frequency of ponding and flooding of "none" and a depth to water table of more than 80 inches. This soil unit and its associated minor components are not considered hydric (USDA 2026).

Linear extensibility is used to determine the shrink-swell potential of soils. The shrink-swell potential is low if the soil has a linear extensibility of less than 3 percent; moderate if 3 to 6 percent; high if 6 to 9 percent; and very high if more than 9 percent. If the linear extensibility is more than 3, shrinking and swelling can cause damage to buildings, roads, and other structures and to plant roots (USDA 2008). The soil unit on the project site has a linear extensibility percentage (LEP) of 1.5 (USDA 2026), which indicates a low shrink-swell potential.

Impact Analysis

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? and,

   ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the CGS's EQ Zapp, the nearest Alquist-Priolo Fault to the project site is the Cleveland Hill Fault of the Foothills Fault System located approximately 60 miles north of the project site near Oroville, and the West Tahoe Fault of the West Tahoe-Dollar Point Fault Zone located approximately 60 miles east of the project site in South Lake Tahoe (DOC 2026c). Therefore, the project would not cause substantial adverse effects as a result of rupture of an earthquake fault. While earthquake-induced ground shaking could occur in the project vicinity from regional earthquakes, historically, seismic activity in the City has been limited. The project would not include the construction of permanently habitable structures. The proposed structures on the project site would be required to be constructed in accordance with the current CBC requirements and City of Folsom development standards. The City regulates the effects of soils and geological constraints on urban development primarily through enforcement of the CBC, which requires the implementation of engineering solutions for constraints to urban development posed by slopes, soils, and geology. Additionally, FMC Chapter 14.29, Grading Code, regulates grading citywide to control erosion, storm water drainage, revegetation, and ground movement (City 2026a). The project would be required to adhere to FMC Chapter 14.29, as well as the City's Standard Construction Specifications and Details in the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards (City 2020). As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects of seismic events. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant for questions a.i) and a.ii).

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? and;

iv. Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. Seismic activity, flooding, heavy rain, and seasonal changes can create instabilities in the ground that can damage built structures such as buildings, roads, and utilities. Liquefaction, landslides, land subsidence, and shrinking or swelling of the soil are the major forms of ground instability that can result (City 2018). As discussed in the response to questions a.i) and a.ii) above, the project would not be subject to strong seismic ground shaking, and, therefore, the risk of secondary seismic hazards, including ground failure, liquefaction, and landslides would be low. Further, according to the CGS's EQ Zapp, the proposed project site is not located within or near a mapped liquefaction or landslide hazard zone (DOC 2026c). The City regulates the effects of soil and geological constraints on urban development primarily through enforcement of the CBC, which requires the implementation of engineering solutions for constraints to urban development posed by slopes, soils, and geology. Additionally, FMC Chapter 14.29, Grading Code, regulates grading citywide to control erosion, storm water drainage, revegetation, and ground movement (City 2026a), which would minimize potential for liquefaction and landslide. The project would be required to adhere to FMC Chapter 14.29, as well as the City's Standard Construction Specifications and Details in the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards (City 2020). Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse effects as a result of ground failure, including liquefaction, and landslides. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant for questions a.iii) and a.iv).

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would include grading, excavation, and removal of vegetation cover, which could temporarily increase erosion and sedimentation. Construction activities could also result in soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at the construction sites and staging areas. As the proposed project would disturb greater than one acre of land, the proposed project would be subject to

NPDES Construction General Permit, which would require the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP during construction. The project would be required to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ adopted on September 2, 2009, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-006-DWQ. The SWPPP must include details of how the sediment and erosion control BMPs would be implemented. Typical erosion-prevention measures such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover would be used to minimize erosion impacts. In addition, following construction, exposed/disturbed areas would be replanted with native hydroseed. The project would be required to adhere to FMC Chapter 14.29, as well as the City's Standard Construction Specifications and Details in the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards (City 2020). Therefore, through compliance with existing NPDES regulations the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, and the impact would be less than significant.

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. As discussed above in the responses under question a), the project site would not result in strong seismic ground shaking, not result in substantial adverse effects as a result of ground failure, including liquefaction, and landslides. No landslides have been recorded in the City, nor are any areas in the City prone to experiencing subsidence. The project would be subject to the most current CBC requirements, which requires the implementation of engineering solutions for constraints to urban development posed by slopes, soils, and geology. Additionally, FMC Chapter 14.29, Grading Code, regulates grading citywide to control erosion, storm water drainage, revegetation, and ground movement (City 2026a). The project would be required to adhere to FMC Chapter 14.29, as well as the City's Standard Construction Specifications and Details in the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards (City 2020). Adherence to these existing regulations would further minimize the potential for adverse effects as a result of unstable geologic units or soils. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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. Soils that expand by shrinking or swelling can create a hazard, possibly causing structural damage over a long period of time. Expansive soils are largely comprised of clays, which expand in volume when water is absorbed and shrink as the soil dries, stressing building foundations, roads, and other structures. None of the soils underlying the City have high shrink/swell potential (City 2018). The soil unit mapped on-site, Auburn-Argonaut-Rock outcrop complex, 8 to 30 percent slopes, has an LEP of 1.5 (USDA 2026), which indicates a low shrink-swell potential (USDA 2008). Therefore, the proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, and the impact would be less than significant.

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 would construct a two-stall restroom which would tie into the existing municipal wastewater infrastructure. The project and would not include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, 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. Further, the PEIR prepared for the General Plan concluded there are no known paleontological resources in the 2035 Plan Evaluation Area (City 2018). 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. However, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would be implemented in the event that paleontological resources are inadvertently discovered during construction activities. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: 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 retained by the City, 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 the California Environmental Quality Act, 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.

VIII. 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 GHGs 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.

Regulatory Setting

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 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 1990 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, 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 2025 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) Blueprint. 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 of Folsom prepared an integrated Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Strategy (GHG Strategy) to identify and reduce current and future community GHG emissions and those associated with the City's municipal operations. The GHG Strategy includes goals and strategies to reduce community and municipal GHG emissions, compared to the 2005 baseline year, by 15 percent in 2020, 51 percent in 2035, and 80 percent in 2050 (City 2018a; City 2018b).

Methodology and Assumptions

See Section 6.III, Air Quality, for a discussion on methodology and assumptions.

Significance Criteria

Given the relatively small levels of emissions generated by a project in relationship to the total amount of GHG emissions generated on a national or global basis, individual projects are not expected to result in significant, direct impacts with respect to climate change. However, given the magnitude of the impact of GHG emissions on the global climate, GHG emissions from new development could result in significant, cumulative impacts with respect to climate change. Thus, the potential for a significant GHG impact is limited to cumulative impacts. According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the following criteria may be considered in establishing the significance of GHG emissions:

Would the project:

1. Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

The City has not adopted quantitative significance thresholds for construction or operational GHG emissions associated with city park projects. However, the SMAQMD has adopted a screening threshold of 1,100 MT of CO_2e per year for the construction and operational phases of land development and construction projects. In addition, the Sacramento County Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Screening Criteria has developed methods to determine whether a project falls within screening criteria or other CEQA exemption resulting in an immediate determination of less-than-significant impact regarding VMT impacts (SACOG 2025) Therefore, the significance of the proposed project's GHG impacts was determined through a qualitative analysis based on the project's contribution to regional VMT.

Impact Analysis

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Long-term operation of the project would result in emissions of GHGs from area sources such as the use landscape maintenance equipment; energy sources form the use of electricity or natural gas; mobile sources related to the use of vehicles by park patrons; solid waste sources related to the disposal and decomposition of waste generated by the project; and water sources related to the energy used for the conveyance and treatment of freshwater and wastewater.

Construction GHG emission sources include construction equipment exhaust, on-road hauling trucks exhaust, vendor vehicle exhaust, and worker commuting vehicle exhaust. The proposed project's construction is estimated to commence in 2027 and require approximately seven to ten months to complete. Based on the temporary construction period and relatively small size of the site, construction GHG emissions would be less than significant at 242 MT/year in 2027, well below the construction threshold of 1,100 MT of CO_2e per year

The Sacramento County Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Screening Criteria Table 3-1 identifies Local-Serving Public Facilities/Services as a development project category which would be expected to result in less-than-significant VMT impacts (SACOG 2025). As a community/neighborhood park, the proposed project would provide nearby recreational facilities to the existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the project site, reducing residents' need to travel to similar amenities. The nearest community parks to the project site are the Handy Family Park approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the project site, which includes a large field, basketball court, and playground; and the Nisenan Community park approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the project site, which includes a basketball court, baseball field, and playground. With comparable parks in nearby neighborhoods, the proposed project and existing parks would likely serve the neighboring communities. In addition, the project would not introduce recreational amenities that are unique within the City and therefore would not be expected to attract substantial regional travel. Comparable amenities already exist at other parks in the area, including Livermore Community park located 2.5 miles west which features both a sand volleyball court and soccer field while Lembi Park, approximately 3.2 miles west of the project site, features 12 pickleball courts.

Due to the City's comparable recreational facilities, the proposed park would be intended primarily to serve the local community, meaning the project would result in a redistribution of existing trips and would not result in an increase in regional VMT and VMT-related GHG emissions. Emissions related to energy sources, solid waste sources, and water/wastewater sources would total approximately 14 MT CO_2e per year and would constitute a very small fraction of the City's 657,892 MT CO_2e per year baseline inventory (City 2018). Therefore, the proposed project's operational and construction GHG emissions 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.

Beyond 2030, AB 1279 aims to achieve carbon neutrality in the state by 2045. As discussed in Section 2.3.2, the 2022 Scoping Plan lays out a path for achieving the regulatory requirements of AB 32, SB 32, and AB 1279. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles (AB 1493), the LCFS, and regulations requiring an increasing proportion 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.

The CARB 2022 Scoping Plan is the primary State plan for achieving the GHG reduction goals mandated by AB 32, SB 32, and AB 1279. As described above, the project would be considered local serving. Adding local serving recreational opportunities tends to redistribute existing vehicle trips and would not result in regional VMT increases (SACOG 2025). A reduction in regional VMT (and VMT-related GHG emissions) is a primary objective of SACOG's 2025 MTP/SCS. Implementation of the MTP/SCS plans in the state's metropolitan areas to reduce VMT is a key component of the mobile source GHG emissions reduction policies and control measures in the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with SACOG's 2025 RTP/SCS or the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan, and the impact would be less than significant.

IX. 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

Hazardous Materials Regulations

Numerous federal and State laws regulate hazardous materials and wastes, such as the CalEPA and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). However, depending on the waste, the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM), the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), or another agency may be involved. The Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Management Regulatory Program (Unified Program; Senate Bill [SB] 1082, 1993) is a State and local effort to consolidate, coordinate, and make consistent existing programs regulating hazardous waste and hazardous materials management. CalEPA adopted implementing regulations for the Unified Program (CCR, Title 27, Division 1, Subdivision 4, Chapter 1) in January 1996. The Unified Program, codified in California Health and Safety Code

Sections 25404 et seq., requires the administrative consolidation of six hazardous materials and waste programs under one local agency, a Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA).

Hazardous Sites

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Section 65962.5(a)(1) of the Government Code requires the DTSC to compile and submit to the Secretary for Environmental Protection a list of all hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code (HSC). According to the DTSC's EnviroStor Database, there are no hazardous waste sites on the project site. The nearest open hazardous materials site is a School Cleanup site on the Vista Del Lago High School (DTSC 2026).

SWRCB maintains the GeoTracker Database, which was developed pursuant to AB 592 and SB 1189. GeoTracker is used by the State Board, regional boards, and local agencies to track and archive compliance data from authorized or unauthorized discharges of waste to land, or unauthorized releases of hazardous substances from UST. Government Code Section 65962.5(c) requires the SWRCB to submit to the Secretary for Environmental Protection a list USTs with unauthorized releases, solid waste disposal sites with hazardous waste migration, and cleanup or abatement sites. There are no sites mapped by GeoTracker on the project site or in the immediate vicinity (SWRCB 2026a).

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as Superfund, was enacted by Congress on December 11, 1980. CERCLA was subsequently amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) on October 17, 1986. The National Priorities List (NPL) is the list of sites of national priority among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the U.S. and its territories. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the USEPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation. The nearest Superfund site is located approximately 5.5 miles southwest of the project site in Rancho Cordova (USEPA 2026).

Evacuation and Emergency Response Plans

The City maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes as identified in the City of Folsom Evacuation Map. The project site is located within Evacuation Zone 30, which identifies Vista Del Lago High School and Russel Ranch Elementary School as critical facilities in the event of an emergency or evacuation. Evacuation routes are identified on this map, which include Broadstone Parkway, Carpenter Hill, and Iron Point Road as the primary evacuation routes in the project vicinity (City 2026b).

Airport Hazards

In 1967, the State of California amended the State Aeronautics Act (Pub. Util. Code, Section 21670 et seq.) by adding a requirement for the establishment of Airport Land Use Commissions (ALUCs) in counties with one or more airports serving the general public. In 1970, the legislature further amended the State Aeronautics Act requiring each ALUC to develop Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) for areas around public-use and military airports in their jurisdiction. ALUCs are charged with assisting local agencies in ensuring compatible land uses in the vicinity of all new airports or heliports and existing airports or heliports to the extent that the land in the vicinity of those airports is not already devoted to incompatible uses (Pub. Util. Code, Section 21674).

The nearest airport to the project alignment is the Cameron Airpark, located approximately 6.4 miles northeast of the proposed project. The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) is the designated ALUC for the Cameron Airpark, and developed the Cameron Airpark ALUCP. The Cameron Airpark ALUCP identifies the decibel-level contours that would affect surrounding land uses during airport operation and designates safety zones in which land uses are restricted to prevent interference with airport operations and ensure the safety of surrounding land uses. The project site is located outside of the Cameron Airpark's Airport Influence Area and Safety Zone boundaries (EDCTC 2012).

Wildland Fire Hazards

PRC Section 4201-4204 directs the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) to map fire hazard within State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) based on fuel loading, slope, fire weather, and other relevant factors present, including areas where winds have been identified by the department as a major cause of wildfire spread. These zones, referred to as Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ), classify a wildland zone as Moderate, High, or Very High fire hazard based on the average hazard across the area included in the zone.

Based on Cal FIRE's FHSZ Map, the project site is located within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) and has no FHSZ, meaning the area has no elevated wildfire risk (Cal FIRE 2026). The primary financial responsibility for preventing and suppressing wildfires for areas within LRAs falls on the local agency (i.e., the City).

Impact Analysis

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. Project construction activities may involve the limited transport, storage, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials, such as for the fueling and servicing of construction equipment on-site. These activities would be short-term or one-time in nature and would be subject to federal, State, and local health and safety regulations, which would minimize hazards related to the use of these materials. As discussed in the response to question d) below, the project site is not located on a hazardous materials site; as such, construction would not create other hazards to the public or environment involving the release of hazardous materials.

Operation and maintenance activities for the proposed project improvements would include the occasional use of cleaners, fuels for equipment, and other materials typically required for park maintenance. However, these materials would be required to be used in accordance with existing regulations and would not create a significant hazard to the public. Therefore, in compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment, and the impact 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The school nearest to the project site is Vista Del Lago High School, located immediately west of the project site. However, the nearest school buildings on the Vista Del Lago High School campus are located approximately 825 feet west of the project site. As discussed in the response to questions a) and b), the proposed park would not involve unique activities that would result in the emission of acutely hazardous materials. 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, and the impact would be less than significant.

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?

No Impact. The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the SWRCB GeoTracker tool (SWRCB 2026), DTSC EnviroStor online tool (DTSC 2026); and the USEPA's Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2026). Based on the results of the databases reviewed, no hazardous waste sites are on the proposed project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and no impact would occur.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The closest airports to the project site are the Cameron Park Airport, approximately 6.3 miles to the northeast, and Mather Airport, approximately 11.5 miles to the southwest. The project site is not located within the influence area or noise contours for the Cameron Park Airport (El Dorado County 2012). The project site is located within the review area identified in the Mather Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The project site is beneath the approach paths for runways 22 Left and 22 Right, however, the project site is not with the 60 dBA noise contour for the airport (SACOG 2022). Therefore, although the project site would be subject to occasional aircraft overflights associated with arrivals to and departures from Mather Airport, future residents, visitors, and employees at the project site would not be exposed to excessive aircraft noise levels. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The City maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes as identified in the City of Folsom Evacuation Map. The project site is located within Evacuation Zone 30, which identifies Vista Del Lago High School and Russel Ranch Elementary School as critical facilities in the event of an emergency or evacuation. Evacuation routes are identified on this map, which include Broadstone Parkway, Carpenter Hill, and Iron Point Road as the primary evacuation routes in the project vicinity (City 2026b).

Project construction and staging would occur within the project site and would not substantially interfere with existing roadway facilities in the project area. Construction activities would be required to

comply with the City's Standard Construction Specifications, particularly with the regulations listed under Public Convenience and Safety as well as Public Safety and Traffic Control, which regulate construction traffic to ensure adjacent roadway facilities are not impeded. Adherence with these regulations would safely regulate traffic, ensure property owners are notified in advance of the project, and ensure that traffic safety devices, such as signage, would be in place. For more information on standard construction requirements, refer to Section 2.6 of this IS/MND.

Once operational, the two new ingress/egress driveways off of Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road would not modify pre-designated emergency evacuation routes or preclude the continued use as an emergency evacuation route on area roadways. 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. As discussed in Section 5.XX, Wildfire, the project is located within an LRA and has no FHSZ, meaning the area has no elevated wildfire risk (Cal FIRE 2026). The project is located in a urbanized area surrounded by existing development and roadways, and is not located within a wildland urban interface area. The project would be required to adhere to existing regulations that would minimize fire risk, such as FMC Chapter 8.36, Folsom Fire Code, which implements and amends certain requirements of the California Fire Code, and FMC Section 17.57.080, which requires that the project driveways and parking lots provide an unencumbered continuous width of 27 feet. Implementation of the proposed park would not substantially increase the risk of wildland fire. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

X. 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

Surface Water

The primary waterway within the City of Folsom is the Lower American River. The American River watershed covers approximately 2,100 square miles northeast of Sacramento, spanning portions of Sacramento, El Dorado, and Placer counties. The American River watershed, including all its tributaries, is divided into three major subbasins, the North Fork American River, the South Fork American River and the Lower Fork American River. The Lower Fork American River subbasin begins at Folsom Dam and extends 30 miles downstream to the mouth of the American River at its confluence with the Sacramento River. Two groundwater subbasins of the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin underlie the City of Folsom, the North American Subbasin and the South American River Subbasin (City 2018).

An approximately two-acre pond is located in the center of the project site. Previous grading that occurred on-site between 2002 and 2003 made alterations to the local hydrology that filled/modified the drainage that fed the pond within the project site. Other modifications to the pond included the fill of the drainage downstream of the pond and the construction of an outfall culvert that conveys excess flow underground through a stormwater drainage system associated with Broadstone Parkway for approximately 0.3 mile, which flows into a series of detention basins off Russell Drive that discharge into a headwater drainage of Willow Creek.

The City obtains most of its water from the Folsom Reservoir. While supplies are expected to meet demand well into the future, the City has adopted a long-term planning effort called the Folsom Water Vision, wherein opportunities to improve the City's water supply reliability and resilience are identified (City 2025). The Folsom Water Vision identified the following themed portfolios to address water supply concerns: (1) Improved Infrastructure (2) Enhanced Surface Water (3) Groundwater (4) Enhanced Groundwater. As one of the themed portfolios in the Folsom Water Vision, the City aims to enhance the surface water supply by constructing a new intake at the Folsom South Canal or Lake Natoma, adding treatment process and treated water piping redundancy, and using treated groundwater from Aerojet for non-potable water.

Groundwater

The City of Folsom is not located in an area of important groundwater recharge. It is situated in an area dominated by bedrock formations of the Sierra Nevada foothill complex, where groundwater is found primarily in fractured geologic formations. Two groundwater subbasins of the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin underlie the City of Folsom, the North American Subbasin and the South American River Subbasin (City 2018). For these reasons, groundwater is not considered a viable water supply source due to the thick bedrock that is incapable of storing or extracting water below the surface (City 2025).

For groundwater, the Folsom Water Vision recommends partnering with the Sacramento County Water Agency or Golden State Water Company to bring in groundwater from south of the American River or partner with other agencies to bring in groundwater from north of the American River. To enhance groundwater supplies, the Folsom Water Vision recommends adding treatment process and treated water piping redundancy as well as utilizing current water rights with the Aerojet to supply non-potable water (City 2025).

Stormwater

The City's Public Works Department oversees stormwater management and operates under NPDES Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit to ensure compliance with water quality standards. Since 1990, the City has been a partner in the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (SSQP), 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., BMP, water quality monitoring, and other activities designed to protect area creeks and rivers (SSQP 2026)

Flooding

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maintains the National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL), a geospatial database that contains current effective flood hazard data. FEMA provides the flood hazard

data to support the National Flood Insurance Program, which provides information on the level of flood risk and type of flooding. FEMA flood insurance rate maps were reviewed for the project's proximity to a 100-year floodplain. The proposed project is on FEMA Panel No. 06067C0138J effective 2/22/2024 and has been classified as Zone X, which is an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2026). The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

Impact Analysis

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would involve surface disturbance and grading, which could result in inadvertent runoff of potential pollutants related to erosion, sedimentation, and discharge or construction debris. However, the proposed project would be subject to provisions of the FMC, including Chapter 8.70, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control, and Chapter 14.29, Grading Code, which regulate construction activities in order to avoid erosion and discharge of pollutants into watercourses generated by surface water runoff (City 2026a).

As previously described in Section 5.VII Geology and Soils, the proposed project would be greater than one acre in size and would be subject to NPDES Construction General Permit requirements, which would require the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP during construction. The project would be required to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ adopted on September 2, 2009, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-006-DWQ. The SWPPP must include details of how the sediment and erosion control BPMs would be implemented. Typical erosion-prevention measures such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover would be used to minimize erosion impacts. Therefore, compliance with existing City regulations would ensure that project activities would not violate water quality standards or substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality during construction activities.

The City requires new developments to protect natural drainage systems through site design, runoff reduction measures, and on-site water treatment (City 2024). Once operational, the surface water collected on-site from the proposed parking lots and driveways would be conveyed to the existing City-maintained storm drain collection and disposal systems along Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road, which consists of curbs and gutters that collect storm water. Project operation would not violate water quality standards or otherwise degrade water quality. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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 include the construction of impervious surfaces including the paved parking lots, paved structure foundations, sidewalks, and pathways, which could interfere with groundwater recharge. However, the project site is not in area of important groundwater recharge because it is not underlaid by a defined groundwater basin. Furthermore, the City does not utilize any groundwater within its service area due to the hard bedrock that sits below the surface that does not allow for significant storage or extraction of water (City 2024). Therefore, construction of the proposed project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge.

The project would construct a two-stall restroom and would install irrigation for the proposed landscaping, green space/lawn areas, and multi-use field, which would require water supplies from the City. However, as the City does not use groundwater for water supplies, the new water usage on-site would not significantly impede management of groundwater basins. Therefore, the proposed park would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management. The impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section5.VII Geology and Soils, the proposed project would be subject to NPDES Construction General Permit, which would require the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP during construction. The project would be required to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ adopted on September 2, 2009, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-006-DWQ. The SWPPP must include details of how the sediment and erosion control BMPs would be implemented. Typical erosion-prevention measures such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover would be used to minimize erosion impacts. In addition, following construction, exposed/disturbed areas would be replanted with native hydroseed. The project would be required to adhere to FMC Chapter 14.29, as well as the City's Standard Construction Specifications and Details in the Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards (City 2020). Therefore, through compliance with existing NPDES regulations the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, and the impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site has undulating topography with elevations ranging from approximately 620 feet to 660 feet amsl. The project site is largely undeveloped and primarily consists of annual grassland with an approximately two-acre pond. The majority of the project site has been previously disturbed and was largely mass graded in 2003. The proposed project would be subject to provisions of the FMC, including Chapter 8.70*,* Stormwater Management and Discharge Control, and Chapter 14.29, Grading Code, which regulate construction activities in order to avoid erosion and discharge of pollutants into watercourses generated by surface water runoff (City 2026a).

Once built, the proposed park would introduce additional impervious services such as the parking lots and sidewalks. However, surface water collected on site is expected to be collected in the existing City-maintained storm drain collection and disposal system along Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road. By utilizing existing drainage systems, the project would not 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. In addition, the project would only encompass

approximately 9.8 acres of the overall 19.3-acre property, which would allow for the remaining undeveloped areas of the property to facilitate stormwater infiltration. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

i. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed below in the response to question d), the project site is located in Flood Zone X, which is an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2026). Therefore, the project would not impede or redirect flood flows, and the impact 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 within Flood Zone X, an area of minimal flooding risk (FEMA 2026). The project site is also approximately 71 miles northeast of the nearest tsunami inundation area near Benicia, CA (DOC 2026d). The nearest lake is Folsom Lake, approximately 3.5 miles to the north, which is not known to experience seiches. Based on the project site's location away from a 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. In addition, the project would be subject to FMC Chapter 14.32*,* Flood Damage Prevention, which requires site improvements to be designed to avoid increasing flood risks. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in questions a) and b), the project would not violate water quality standards, and the project is not within a groundwater sustainability plan area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan, and the impact would be less than significant.

XI. 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

The project is zoned SP 92-3 (Park/Specific Plan – Empire Ranch) and the General Plan land use designation for the project site is Parks (P), which provides for active and passive recreational opportunities in Folsom. This designation permits a floor area ration (FAR) of up to 0.1 (City 2024). The proposed park facilities and associated structures (e.g., restroom and electrical/maintenance building) would be consistent with this existing General Plan land use designation.

Impact Analysis

a) Physically divide an established community?

Less than Significant Impact. The majority of the project site has been previously disturbed and was largely mass graded in 2003. The project site is situated within a residential community and is generally surrounded by single-family residential development to the north, east, and south, and Vista Del Lago High School to the west. Specifically, the Vista Del Lago High School baseball fields, football field, track, and swimming pool are located immediately west of the project. While in close proximity to the established community, construction of Benevento Family Park and associated structures would not physically divide an established community as there are no residences within the park. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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 park and associated structures would be consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning district. In addition, the City of Folsom's Parks Master Plan and General Plan PEIR identified Park Site No. 51 as one of 18 parks in the City that were either undeveloped or had remaining development programming. This site was planned to be developed as a neighborhood park, which the City defines as parks that intended to be up to 20 acres in size, in a central location to serve one neighborhood, and are ideally located next to schools to achieve joint use advantages (City 2018). As discussed throughout this IS/MND, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse environmental effects and would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

XII. 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 State of California, under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) act of 1975, can designate certain areas as having mineral deposits of regional significance. SMARA was enacted in response to land use conflicts between urban growth and essential mineral production. It requires the CGS to classify California lands into mineral resource zones (MRZ).

The DOC's Division of Mine Reclamation (DMR) compiles data on the current status of mines and the commodities produced. The DOC's CGS produces Mineral Land Classification (MLC) studies that identify areas with potentially important mineral resources that should be considered in local and regional planning. The project site is located within several MLC studies, including the Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15-Minute Quadrangle Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California (DOC 1984). In 1984, the counties within this study area were designated MRZ's by the CGS. The area study is broken into a series of maps (Plate 2-6), each assigning MRZs relative to a different type of deposit. The area in which the project site is located was given the following MRZs for each plate and deposit type:

- Plate 2 Industrial Minerals: The area was designated as MRZ-4, or an area where geological information is not substantial enough to refute or support the presence of the minerals (DOC 1984).

- Plate 3 Copper and Gold: The area was designated as MRZ-4, or an area where geological information is not substantial enough to refute or support the presence of the minerals (DOC 1984).

- Plate 4 Gold, Copper, and Zinc: The area was designated as MRZ-3a, or an area where undiscovered mineral resources similar to known deposits in the same producing district or region may exist. Also known as hypothetical resources, the area has the potential to be reclassified upon further exploration (DOC 1984).

- Plate 5 Chromite: The area was designated as MRZ-1, or an area where geological information indicates there is little likelihood of the presence of the mineral deposit (DOC 1984).

- Plate 6 Placer Gold Deposits: The area was designated as MRZ-4, or an area where geological information is not substantial enough to refute or support the presence of minerals. (DOC 1984).

There are no designated mineral resource extraction sites within the City limits. The nearest mining operations include five sites located south of White Rock Road, ranging from approximately 3.5 miles to 6.8 miles south of the project site (DOC 2026e).

Impact Analysis

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?

No Impact. The project site is located within areas designated as MRZ-3a and MRZ-4 by the CGS. MRZ-3a indicates the presence of "hypothetical resources" and has potential to be reclassified while the MRZ-4 classifications indicate that the presence or absence of mineral resources cannot be based on the existing information (DOC 1984). Both classifications indicated there are no known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and residents of the State. The General Plan does not attribute any important mineral resources to the site (City 2024). Additionally, since there are no active mining operations occurring at the project site, no known mineral resource deposit has been identified as important to the area (DOC 2026e). Subsequently, the proposed project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State or the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, no impact would occur for questions a) and b).

XIII. 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

Existing Noise Environment

Noise sources in the project vicinity are dominated by traffic noise from Broadstone Parkway. Additional existing noise sources in the area include the Vista Del Lago High School with athletic fields adjacent to the west side of the project site and typical suburban residential noise (e.g., landscape maintenance equipment, dogs, and building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning [HVAC] systems).

Ambient Noise Survey

A site visit and noise surveys were conducted on October 26, 2023, which included four short-term (10 to 15 minutes) ambient noise measurements. See Figure 4 for the measurement locations. The noise measurement survey notes are included as Appendix G to this IS/MND. The measured noise levels are shown in Table 9, *Noise Measurement Results*.

Table 9: Noise Measurement Results

	M1
Date	October 26, 2023
Conditions	Temperature: 53°F; Wind Speed: 6 mph; 88% humidity
Time	11:04 a.m. – 11:19 a.m.
Location	Sidewalk on the south side of Broadstone Parkway.
Measured Noise Level	63.8 dBA L_{EQ}
Traffic Counts	46 cars and light trucks, 2 medium trucks, 2 heavy trucks

M3	
Date	October 26, 2023
Conditions	Temperature: 53°F; Wind Speed: 6 mph; 88% humidity
Time	10:11 a.m. – 10:26 a.m.
Location	Sidewalk on the west side of Carpenter Hill Road.
Measured Noise Level	54.7 dBA L_{EQ}
Traffic Counts	7 cars and light trucks
M3	
Date	October 26, 2023
Conditions	Temperature: 53°F; Wind Speed: 9 mph; 87% humidity
Time	10:31a.m. – 10:41 a.m.
Location	On the project site approximately 50 feet from the athletic fields at Vista Del Lago High School
Measured Noise Level	50.8 dBA L_{EQ}
M4	
Date	October 26, 2023
Conditions	Temperature: 53°F; Wind Speed: 6 mph; 88% humidity
Time	11:28 a.m. – 11:38 p.m.
Location	On the project site approximately 50 feet from the northernmost home on the west side of Carpenter Hill Road
Measured Noise Level	53.3 dBA L_{EQ}

°F = degrees Fahrenheit; mph = miles per hour; dBA = A-weighted decibels; L_{EQ} = time averaged noise level

Noise-Sensitive Land Uses

Noise-sensitive land uses (NSLUs) are land uses that may be subject to stress and/or interference from excessive noise, including residences, hospitals, schools, hotels, resorts, libraries, sensitive wildlife habitat, or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute of the environment. Noise receptors (receivers) are individual locations that may be affected by noise. The closest existing NSLUs to the project site are three single-family residences adjacent to the east side of the project on Carpenter Hill Road. Additional single-family residences near the project site are located: approximately 120 feet to the north, across Broadstone Parkway; approximately 80 feet to the east across Carpenter Hill Road; and approximately 300 feet to the south on Caversham Way and Iris Circle. The closest school to the project site is the Vista Del Lago High School with the closest building approximately 825 feet to the west.

Noise Metrics

All noise-level and sound-level values presented herein are expressed in terms of decibels (dB), with A weighting, abbreviated "dBA," to approximate the hearing sensitivity of humans. Time averaged noise levels of one hour are expressed by the symbol "L_{EQ}" unless a different time period is specified. Maximum noise levels are expressed by the symbol "L_{MAX}." Some of the data also may be presented as octave-band-filtered and/or A-octave band-filtered data, which are a series of sound spectra centered on each stated frequency, with half of the bandwidth above and half of the bandwidth below, the stated frequency. These data are typically used for machinery noise analysis and barrier-effectiveness calculations. 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. This is similar to the Day Night sound level (L_{DN}), which is a 24-hour average with an added 10 dBA weighting on the same nighttime hours but no added weighting on the evening hours.

Because decibels are logarithmic units, Sound Pressure Level (L_P) cannot be added or subtracted through standard arithmetic. Under the decibel scale, a doubling of sound energy corresponds to a 3 dBA increase. In other words, when two identical sources are each producing sound of the same loudness, the resulting sound level at a given distance would be 3 dBA higher than from one source under the same conditions. For example, if one automobile produces an L_P of 70 dBA when it passes an observer, two cars passing simultaneously would not produce 140 dBA—rather, they would combine to produce 73 dBA. Under the decibel scale, three sources of equal loudness together produce a sound level 5 dBA louder than one source.

Under controlled conditions in an acoustic laboratory, the trained, healthy human ear is able to discern 1 dBA changes in sound levels, when exposed to steady, single-frequency ("pure-tone") signals in the mid-frequency (1,000 Hertz [Hz]–8,000 Hz) range. In typical noisy environments, changes in noise of 1 to 2 dBA are generally not perceptible. It is widely accepted, however, that people begin to detect sound level increases of 3 dB in typical noisy environments. Further, a 5 dBA increase is generally perceived as a distinctly noticeable increase, and a 10 dBA increase is generally perceived as a doubling of loudness.

Vibration Metrics

Groundborne vibration consists of rapidly fluctuating motions or waves transmitted through the ground with an average motion of zero. Sources of groundborne vibrations include natural phenomena and anthropogenic causes (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous (e.g., factory machinery) or transient (e.g., explosions). Peak particle velocity is commonly used to quantify vibration amplitude. The peak particle velocity, with units of inches per second (in/sec), is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration wave.

Regulatory Framework

City of Folsom General Plan Noise Element

The Safety and Noise Element of the City of Folsom General Plan regulates noise emissions from public roadway traffic on new development of residential uses or other NSLUs. Policy SN 6.1.2 and Table SN-1 from the General Plan provide noise compatibility standards for transportation noise at various land uses. For the project's proposed neighborhood park land use, the standard for noise due to transportation is 70 L_{DN} or CNEL for outdoor activity areas (City 2024).

Policy SN 6.1.8 requires construction projects and new development anticipated to generate a significant amount of vibration to ensure acceptable interior vibration levels at nearby vibration-sensitive uses based on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria (provided in Table SN-3 of the General Plan). For residential land uses the vibration impact levels are 72 VdB for frequent events (more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day), 75 VdB for occasional events (between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day), and 80 VdB for infrequent events (fewer than 30 vibration events of the same source per day; City 2024).

City of Folsom Municipal Code

For stationary noise sources, the City has adopted a Noise Ordinance as FMC Chapter 8.42, which establishes hourly noise level performance standards that are most commonly quantified in terms of the one-hour average noise level (L_{EQ}). In accordance with FMC Section 8.42.040, noise levels generated on

the project site for 30 or more minutes in any hour may not exceed 50 dBA L_{EQ} from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA L_{EQ} from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. when measured at an off-site residence, school, church, hospital, or public library.

FMC Section 8.42.060(A) exempts activities conducted in in lighted public parks, public playgrounds and public or private school grounds, during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

FMC Section 8.42.060(C) exempts construction noise provided that construction does not occur before 7:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday.

Methodology and Assumptions

Noise Modeling Software

Project construction noise was analyzed using the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Roadway Construction Noise Model ([RCNM]; USDOT 2008), which utilizes estimates of sound levels from standard construction equipment.

Modeling of the exterior noise environment for this report was accomplished using the Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA) model version 2026. Traffic noise was evaluated within CadnaA using the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5 (USDOT 2004), as implemented within CadnaA. The noise models used in this analysis were developed from the site plan provided by the project architect.

Traffic Noise

The one-hour L_{EQ} traffic noise level is calculated utilizing peak-hour traffic. For typical urban and suburban traffic patterns, the model-calculated afternoon peak hour (PM peak hour) L_{EQ} noise output is approximately equivalent to the L_{DN} or CNEL (Caltrans 2013). The traffic noise modeling accounts for noise attenuation from terrain but does not account for noise attenuation from buildings, or structures (e.g., sound walls). PM peak hour traffic volumes for Broadstone Parkway were based on City traffic counts taken in 2017 at the intersection of Broadstone Parkway and Golf Links Drive, approximately 2,100 feet (0.4 mile) northwest of the project site, when 6,539 daily vehicles were recorded (City 2017). Modeled traffic volumes on Broadstone Parkway in the project vicinity were adjusted based on the site survey noise measurements and on typical California urban roadway hourly traffic distribution where the peak hour occurs late afternoon with approximately 7.6 percent of the average daily traffic (Ogden International 1986; Wyle Laboratories 1973). Traffic was modeled traveling at the posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour and traffic was assumed to be comprised of a typical mix of vehicles for suburban streets in California: 96 percent cars and light trucks; 3 percent medium trucks and buses; and 1 percent heavy trucks.

On-Site Noise Sources

Project on-site noise sources would include player and spectator noise from the multi-use field, pickleball courts, basketball court, and sand volleyball courts; children in the play areas; and vehicles in the parking lots.

Player and spectator noise was modeled based on noise measurements taken at the San Diego Surf Cup soccer tournament where a crowd estimated at 300 persons resulted in 61.2 dBA at a distance of 200

feet from the center of the field/crowd (HELIX 2019). Project crowd assumptions (player and spectators were: 100 people at the multi-use filed, 30 people at the pickleball courts, 50 people at the sand volleyball courts, and 25 people at the basketball court. Because pickleball produces a distinctive noise from the impact of the paddle and ball, noise from play on the four project pickleball courts was modeled using CadnaA default pickleball noise source and assuming all courts in continuous use concurrently for an hour.

Noise generated by students in the project playgrounds was modeled based on measurements taken of students at play at the St. John's Lutheran Church and School Playground in Hemet, California. Noise generated by a preschool play area with 15 children was 53.5 dBA L_{EQ}, measured at a distance of 55 feet from the center of the play area. Noise generated by a play area with 50 children in the 5 to 12 years old range was 71.6 dBA, measured at 145 feet from the center of the play area (HELIX 2008).

Noise from project parking lots was model using CadnaA default parking area sources and assuming two parking events (entry or exit) per parking space per hour during the daytime (7:00 a.m. to dusk) and one parking event (entry or exit) per parking space per hour during the evening/night (dusk to 10:00 p.m.).

To be conservative, all project recreation facilities were assumed to be in use concurrently for one hour during the daytime, and all lighted project facilities (pickleball courts, basketball court, and sand volleyball courts) were assumed to be in use concurrently for one hour during the evening/night.

Significance Criteria

Lawful noise generated on the project site would be exempt from the provisions of FMC Chapter 8.42. The City has not established standards for allowable increase in traffic noise resulting from a development project's addition to traffic on City streets; however, in typical outdoor environments, a 3-dBA increase in ambient noise level is considered just perceptible and a 5 dBA increase is considered distinctly perceptible. In areas where the existing ambient noise exceeds 60 CNEL (the City's low density residential land use compatibility standard), the project's contribution to traffic noise would be considered significant if it exceeds 1.5 dBA. In areas where the existing ambient noise is between 55 and 60 CNEL, the project's contribution to traffic noise would be considered significant if it exceeds 3 dBA. In areas where the existing ambient noise is less than 55 CNEL, the project's contribution to traffic noise would be considered significant if it exceeds 5 dBA. Per the FMC, any noise from project construction activity would be considered significant for construction activities occurring before 7:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday.

Per the General Plan, excessive ground-borne vibration would occur if construction-related ground-borne vibration exceeds 80 VdB at nearby residential properties. The General Plan Safety and Noise Element establishes a land use noise compatibility standard of 70 CNEL for park outdoor activity areas.

Impact Analysis

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 with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction Noise

The project would use heavy off-road equipment during construction. The most intensive use of heavy construction equipment is anticipated to be during grading when a grader and a dozer could be working on the project site concurrently in close proximity to each other. The scraper and dozer would be moving around the site, estimated to be an average distance of 250 feet from the NSLUs east of the project site over the course of a day. Modeling with the RCNM shows that the combined noise from a grader and a dozer would result in 68.7 dBA L_{EQ} at a distance of 250 feet. The RCNM modeling output is included in Appendix G to this IS/MND

According to FMC Section 8.42.060(C), noise sources associated with construction of the project which are conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., on weekdays and between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends are exempt from the City noise standard. Nighttime construction noise is not anticipated for the project. However, nighttime construction is not exempt from the FMC, and project construction noise would exceed the nighttime standard of 45 dBA if it were to occur, resulting in a potentially significant noise impact. If project construction activities were to occur outside the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends, construction noise generated by the project would not be exempt for the City's noise ordinance nighttime exterior standard, and the impact would be potentially significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would prohibit construction outside of the exempted hours outlined in the FMC.

Operational Noise

As discussed in the Methodology and Assumptions section above, on-site project noise from the recreational facilities, playgrounds, and parking lots was modeled using CadnaA. Modeling assumed all project recreation facilities were in use concurrently for one hour during the daytime, and all lighted project facilities (pickleball courts, basketball court, and sand volleyball courts) were in use concurrently for one hour during the evening/night. Per the FMC Section 8.42.060(A), impacts related to the generation of lawful noise on the project site would be exempt from the provisions of FMC Chapter 8.42. The maximum daytime and evening/night noise generated by the project at residences around the project site are presented in Table 10, *On-Site Operational Noise*. See Figure 4 for modeled receiver locations. Printouts of the modeling input and output tables are included in Appendix G.

Table 10: Operational On-Site Noise

Receptor	Location	7 a.m. to Dusk (dBA)	Dusk to 10 p.m. (dBA)
R1	2194 Stockman Circle	53.4	53.0
R2	2190 Stockman Circle	53.6	53.2
R3	2186 Stockman Circle	53.2	52.5
R4	2182 Stockman Circle	51.8	50.5
R5	2178 Stockman Circle	51.5	50.2
R6	2174 Stockman Circle	51.2	49.8
R7	2170 Stockman Circle	50.9	49.4
R8	2166 Stockman Circle	49.4	47.4
R9	2162 Stockman Circle	51.1	49.6
R10	2158 Stockman Circle	49.0	47.1
R11	2154 Stockman Circle	49.2	47.6
R12	2150 Stockman Circle	48.3	46.4
R13	2146 Stockman Circle	48.1	46.6

Receptor	Location	7 a.m. to Dusk (dBA)	Dusk to 10 p.m. (dBA)
R14	2136 Stockman Circle	44.0	42.3
R15	2076 Fenceline Drive	46.9	44.5
R16	2075 Fenceline Dr	48.6	45.4
R17	415 Carpenter Hill Road	51.2	46.8
R18	411 Carpenter Hill Road	51.0	46.8
R19	407 Carpenter Hill Road	51.7	47.6
R20	399 Carpenter Hill Road	44.3	41.0
R21	342 Iris Circle	49.1	45.4
R22	1944 Caversham Way	49.4	45.7
R23	1940 Caversham Way	50.3	46.5

Source: CadnaA (Appendix G)

The modeling accounts for terrain but does not account for noise reductions resulting from existing structures, such as sound walls. Backyards for residences along Stockman Circle which backup to Broadstone Parkway (R1 – R14) are shielded from noise generated on the project site by an approximately 8-foot sound wall. Based on the model for traffic noise on Broadstone Parkway, the ambient noise level around the project site ranges from 61 dBA L_{DN} for residences along Broadstone Parkway to 45 dBA L_{DN} for residences along Caversham Way. Although some noise sources on the project site may be distinct from the ambient noise due to the frequency or sound characteristics (such as children playing and pickleball paddle/pickleball impact noise), project noise would be exempt from the City's noise standards and the project's noise generation ranging from 44 dBA to 54 dBA would not be substantially different than the ambient traffic noise in the area.

Traffic Noise

As described in Methodology and Assumptions, above, based on City traffic counts and the project site visit measurements, Broadstone Parkway carries approximately 6,540 average daily vehicles. The project would add approximately 87 vehicles on weekdays and approximately 174 vehicles on weekends. A barely perceptible 3-dBA increase in traffic noise requires a doubling of sound energy which would require a doubling of traffic volume. Therefore, the incremental addition of project traffic to existing traffic levels on Broadstone Parkway would not result in a noticeable increase in ambient traffic noise.

Impact Summary

Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would restrict construction hours to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends. Noise generated on the project site would be exempted from the FMC noise standards and project noise would not be substantially different than the ambient traffic noise in the area. The addition of project-generated traffic vicinity on roadways would not result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of City standards, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. An on-site source of vibration during project construction would be a vibratory roller (primarily used to achieve soil and asphalt compaction as part of the foundation construction and paving), which could be used within approximately 75 feet of the residences across

Carpenter Hill Road. A large vibratory roller creates approximately 0.21 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet, or 94.4 VdB (FTA 2018). At a distance of 60 feet, a vibratory roller would create a PPV of 0.04 in/sec, or 80 VdB.[2] This would not exceed the City General Plan residential standard of 80 VdB for infrequent events. Once operational, the project would not be a source of groundborne vibrations. Therefore, the project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and the impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The closest airports to the project site are the Cameron Park Airport, approximately 6.3 miles to the northeast, and Mather Airport, approximately 11.5 miles to the southwest. The project site is not located within the influence area or noise contours for the Cameron Park Airport (El Dorado County 2012). The project site is located within the review area identified in the Mather Airport ALUCP. The project site is beneath the approach paths for runways 22 Left and 22 Right, however, the project site is not with the 60 dBA noise contour for the airport (SACOG 2022). Therefore, although the project site would be subject to occasional aircraft overflights associated with arrivals to and departures from Mather Airport, future residents, visitors, and employees at the project site would not be exposed to excessive aircraft noise levels. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Construction Noise Reduction Measures

Construction activities for all phases of construction, including servicing of construction equipment, delivery of materials or equipment to the site, and truck traffic coming to and from the site, shall only be permitted during the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends.

[2] Equipment PPV = Reference PPV * $(25/D)^{1.5}$(in/sec), where Reference PPV is PPV at 25 feet, D is distance from equipment to the receptor in feet; formula from FTA 2018. VdB = 20 * Log $(PPV/4/10^{-6})$.

XIV. 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 was 91,983 people in July 2025 and is projected to increase to approximately 97,485 by 2035 (U.S Census Bureau 2026; City 2018). The City's population grew by 14.3 percent between April 2020 and July 2025. Between 2020 to 2024, there was an estimated 29,963 households (U.S Census Bureau 2026). The number of housing units is expected to grow 1.35 percent annually, from 27,550 in 2016 to 38,010 in 2040 (City 2021).

According to the City's Housing Element, the worker to household ratio was 1.33 in 2016 and expected to remain the same in 2040 (City 2021). This ratio is influenced by substantial commuting in and out of the City; about 80 percent of people employed in the City commute out of Folsom and 83 percent of those who work in the City commute from areas outside of the City (City 2021).

Impact Analysis

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. The proposed project would include the construction of an approximately 9.8-acre park with both active and passive recreational elements, a floating dock, as well as two parking lots with a total of 87 parking spaces. The proposed project would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation of Parks (P) and would not induce substantial growth in the City. The project would not add new homes or businesses or extend existing roads or other infrastructure in a manner that would promote additional growth. Operation of the park would require limited maintenance and operational staff and would not create substantial new employment opportunities. In addition, the proposed community park would not include unique park features that would attract substantial new populations to the area. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The project site is largely undeveloped and does not include existing residences. The project site is situated within a residential community and is generally surrounded by single-family residential development to the north, east, and south, and Vista Del Lago High School to the west. However, construction of the proposed project would not physically displace any existing people or housing, nor would the project preclude the construction of new housing. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XV. 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 City of Folsom Fire Department provides fire protection services. There are six fire stations that provide fire/rescue and emergency medical services within the City. Station 39 is nearest to the project site and is located at 2139 Ritchie Street, approximately 0.9 mile north of the project site.

The City of Folsom Police Department is located at 46 Natoma Street, approximately 3.9 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 Russell Ranch Elementary School, Vista Del Lago High School, and Folsom Middle School. The proposed project is located immediately east of Vista Del Lago High School. Los Rios Community College District is a two-year public college district that covers the greater Sacramento region, including much of Sacramento County and most of El Dorado County. The district has four colleges, one of which, Folsom Lake College, is located in the City.

The proposed project would include the construction of the approximately 9.8-acre Benevento Family Park; however, there are several other parks in the vicinity of the project site including Handy Family Park approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the project site, which includes a large field, basketball court, and playground; and the Nisenan Community park approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the project site, which includes a basketball court, baseball field, and playground.

The Folsom Public Library is located approximately 4.1 miles northwest of the project site, at 411 Stafford Street, which is operated by the Folsom Library Commission.

Impact Analysis

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would receive fire protection services from the Folsom Fire Department. As discussed in Section 5.XIV, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth and, therefore, would not substantially increase the overall demand on fire protection services. However, as the project site is currently undeveloped, the project would require an incremental increase of fire protection services to the site compared to existing conditions. However, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with applicable City regulations, including the following policies from the Public Facilities and Services Element of the General Plan related to fire protection:

- Policy PFS 7.1.8: New Development. Require that new development provides all necessary water service, fire hydrants, and roads consistent with Fire Department standards (City 2024).

- Policy PFS 7.1.10: Removal of Fire Hazards. Require property owners to remove fire hazards, including excessive/overgrown vegetation, hazardous structures and materials, and debris (City 2024).

In addition, the project would be constructed in accordance with FMC Chapter 8.36, Folsom Fire Code, which implements and amends certain requirements of the California Fire Code. FMC Section 17.57.080 establishes emergency vehicle access requirements, and requires that the project driveways and parking lots provide an unencumbered continuous width of 27 feet. Therefore, although construction and operation of the project may result in an incremental increase on fire protection services to the site, the project would not result in a substantial increase in demand on the Folsom Fire Department. Adherence to these existing regulations would ensure that the project would not result in substantial fire hazards or access issues, thereby minimizing potential burden on the Folsom Fire Department. Therefore, the impact on fire protection would be less than significant.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would receive police protection services by the Folsom Police Department. As discussed in Section 5.XIV, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth and, therefore, would not substantially increase the overall demand on police protection services. However, as the project site is currently undeveloped, the project would require an incremental increase of police protection services to the site compared to existing conditions. The potential for minor increase in demand for services may occur for police protection if a crime or accident occurs during construction and operation of the park and associated facilities. However, the project would be subject to Policy PFS 6.1.7: Development Review, in the Public Facilities and Services Element of the General Plan, which would require the police department to be included in the review of development proposals to ensure that projects adequately address crime (City 2024). Compliance with this policy would ensure the project would not result in a

substantial demand on the Folsom Police Department. Therefore, the impact on police protection would be less than significant.

c) Schools?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 5.XIV, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth. As such, the proposed park and associated structures would not increase the number of school-aged children or increase the demand on existing schools in the City. Therefore, no new school facilities would be necessary to serve the proposed project, and no impact would occur.

d) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project includes the construction of a new approximately 9.8-acre park on a primarily undeveloped site. Although the project would construct a new park that would result in potential environmental impacts, these impacts have been adequately addressed throughout this IS/MND and would be reduced to a level of less than significant. The proposed project would not increase demand on existing recreational and park facilities. Refer to Section 5.XXIII, Recreation, for additional analysis on parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, the impact on parks would be less than significant.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 5.XIV, Population and Housing, and in questions a) through d) above, the proposed park and associated structures would not result in substantial unplanned population growth and, therefore, would not cause a substantial 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, nor would it result in the degradation of those facilities. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

XVI. 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 proposed project would involve the construction of the approximately 9.8-acre Benevento Family Park; however, there are several other parks in the vicinity of the project site including Handy Family Park approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the project site, which includes a large field, basketball court, and playground; and the Nisenan Community park approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the project site, which includes a basketball court, baseball field, and playground.

According to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan: 2015 Plan Update, approximately 5.47 acres of parkland and 7.5 acres of open space were available per 1,000 population in 2015, and planned parklands would result in a park acreage standard of 6.21 acres of parkland and 17.58 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. The City's total parkland standard is five acres per 1,000 residents. The Master Plan determined that development of the planned parks would provide at least 7.3 acre per 1,000-population, an excess of the five acres for 1,000 residents standard. The Master Plan Update also found unmet needs for picnic areas, open space, and children's play areas, as well as baseball, adult soccer, youth football, tennis, and volleyball facilities (City 2015).

Impact Analysis

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 include the construction of the approximately 9.8-acre Benevento Family Park, which would include amenities such as basketball, volleyball, and pickleball courts, a multi-use field, two playgrounds, unprogrammed green spaces, and seating and other amenities. As discussed in Section 5.XIV, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in population that would accelerate the deterioration and/or demand for existing park facilities. Although the project would include a new park in the City of Folsom, the proposed project would not substantially increase the use of other parks and recreational facilities in the City. Implementation of the proposed project would serve to meet community recreation needs and fill park "service" gaps in the City, and would help meet demand for future recreational demands. In

addition, the proposed volleyball court, children's play areas, and open space would fulfil recreational needs identified in the City's Park and Recreation 2015 Master Plan Update. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would include the construction of an approximately 9.8-acre neighborhood park, which may have a potentially adverse physical effects on the environment. However, as discussed throughout this IS/MND, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial impacts with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, BIO-1 through 6, CUL-1 through 3, GEO-1, and NOI-1. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

XVII. 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

Roadways

The following roadways provide primary local and regional circulation in the vicinity of the proposed project:

- **Broadstone Parkway** is a four-lane arterial roadway that runs from Iron Point Road to Empire Ranch Road, two lanes eastbound and two lanes westbound. Broadstone Parkway is located north of the project site and intersects Carpenter Hill Road to the east. It has six through lanes at the East Bidwell Street intersection.

- **Carpenter Hill Road** is a residential roadway that runs north-south from Stockman Circle to Iron Point Road. Carpenter Hill Road is located adjacent to the east of the project site.

- **Serpa Way** is a residential roadway that runs north-south from Broadstone Parkway to Iron Point Road. Serpa Way intersects with Caversham Way to the east.

- **Caversham Way** is an east-west residential roadway that extends from Serpa Way to the edges of the project site. Caversham Way runs adjacent to Vista Del Lago High School and the project site.

- **US 50** is a four-lane divided freeway that runs east-west between Lake Tahoe and West Sacramento. US 50 is located approximately 0.5 mile south of the project site.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Pedestrian facilities within the project vicinity include sidewalks located along both sides of Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road. Pedestrian crosswalks are located at the intersection of Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road, and at Broadstone Parkway near the Vista De Lago High School

parking lot and entrance. Bicycle facilities within the project vicinity include a Class II bike lane along both sides of Broadstone Parkway to the north of the site and the Carpenter Hill Trail, a Class I Share Use Path connecting Carpenter Hill Road to Iris Circle (City 2023).

Transit Facilities

Transit services in the City are available through the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT), operating both the Folsom Stage Line bus service and the SacRT Gold Line light rail that connects downtown Sacramento and the City. The nearest bus stop to the project site is the Broadstone Parkway and Eagles Drive stop located approximately 1,050 feet northwest that is served by Bus Route 20. The nearest light rail stop is Iron Point Station, located 5.5 miles west of the project site (SacRT 2026).

Impact Analysis

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 construct two ingress/egress driveways to provide access to the proposed parking lots and entrance into the park. The eastern driveway would be constructed off of Carpenter Hill Road, approximately 150 feet south of its intersection with Fenceline Drive; and the northern driveway would be constructed off of Broadstone Parkway, approximately 680 feet west of its intersection with Carpenter Hill Road. New ADA-compliant sidewalks along both sides of the driveways and along the perimeter of the parking lots would connect with existing sidewalks along the west side of Carpenter Hill Road and along the south side of Broadstone Parkway. The project would also include ADA-compliant sidewalks and pathways that would provide circulation throughout the park facilities. In addition, a new pathway would travel along the west and south side of the pond to connect to the existing dirt footpath/trail southeast of the project site, which connects to the off-site Carpenter Hill Trail.

Within Appendix B, Sacramento Regional Blueprint Growth Principles, of the General Plan, the SACOG Board of Directors encourages developers to design projects that promote people to use modes of transportation outside of auto trips such as walking or biking (City 2018). With the new pathway along the west and south side of the pond connecting to the existing Carpenter Hill Trail, the project design would enhance connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians through the area. Pedestrian connectivity would also improve with the project connecting pre-existing sidewalks on Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road to the proposed sidewalks along the perimeter of the parking lots. In addition, the following policies from the Mobility Element of the General Plan would be applicable to the proposed project:

- M 1.1.3 Accessibility: Strive to ensure that all streets are safe and accessible to people with limited mobility and other disabilities. New and reconstructed facilities shall meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (City 2024).

- M 2.1.3 Pedestrian and Bicycle Linkages in New Development Require developers to provide a system of sidewalks, trails, and bikeways that link all land uses, provide accessibility to parks and schools, and connect to all existing or planned external street and trail facilities (City 2024).

- M 4.2.1: Parking: Maintain and implement a comprehensive on- and off-street parking system that serves the needs of residents and businesses while supporting the use of multiple modes of transportation (City 2024).

The project design would comply with policies M 1.1.3 and M2.1.3 as the project would include ADA accessible sidewalks along both sides of the driveway and perimeter of the parking lots that would connect to existing sidewalks. Additionally, the proposed project would comply with policy M 4.2.1 by including the previously discussed pathways that encourage alternative modes of transportation and by having a comprehensive parking system. Per Section XIV Population and Housing, the project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth and therefore would not have a demand on transit. Also, the proposed driveways would not interfere with existing transit facilities or bus stops.

By complying with the policies outlined in the General Plan, the project would not substantially alter the circulation system, and the impact would be less than significant.

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 the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) 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 level of service (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.

As discussed in Section 5.VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the Sacramento County Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Screening Criteria Table 3-1 identifies Local-Serving Public Facilities/Services as a development project category which would be expected to result in less-than-significant VMT impacts (SACOG 2025). The proposed park would be considered local serving, as it would provide recreational opportunities primarily to existing residences and neighborhoods surrounding the project site. Due to the City's comparable recreational facilities, the proposed park would be intended primarily to serve the local community, meaning the project would result in a redistribution of existing trips and would not result in an increase in regional VMT. Therefore, the impact related to VMT 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 Carpenter Hill Road and Broadstone Parkway. The proposed project would construct two ingress/egress driveways to provide access to the proposed parking lots and entrance into the park. The eastern driveway would be constructed off of Carpenter Hill Road, approximately 150 feet south of its intersection with Fenceline Drive; and the northern driveway would be constructed off of Broadstone Parkway, approximately 680 feet west of its intersection with Carpenter Hill Road. The proposed access

road from Broadstone Parkway to the parking lot would be constructed in accordance with the applicable City standards and does not include any design features that would create a hazard, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections in the access road. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would construct two ingress/egress driveways to provide access to the proposed parking lots and entrance into the park. The eastern driveway would be constructed off of Carpenter Hill Road, approximately 150 feet south of its intersection with Fenceline Drive; and the northern driveway would be constructed off of Broadstone Parkway, approximately 680 feet west of its intersection with Carpenter Hill Road. The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with FMC Chapter 8.36, Folsom Fire Code, which implements and amends certain requirements of the California Fire Code. FMC Section 17.57.080 establishes emergency vehicle access requirements and requires that the project driveways and parking lots provide an unencumbered continuous width of 27 feet. The construction of two access points would ensure there would be adequate emergency vehicle access to the proposed site in the event of an emergency. Through adherence with the local fire code requirements and having multiple access points to the project site, the project would not substantially impair emergency access. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

XVIII. 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.	☐	☐	☒	☐

Environmental Setting

CEQA, as amended in 2014 by AB 52, requires that lead agencies provide notice to 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. Section 21073 of the PRC defines California Native American tribes as "a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of the Statutes of 2004." This includes both federally and non-federally recognized tribes.

The purpose of consultation is to identify Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) that may be significantly impacted by the proposed project, and to allow the County 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.

Impact Analysis

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)?

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. CEQA requires that the City initiate consultation (known as AB 52) 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 the tribal consultation period for the project from July 16, 2025, to August 15, 2025. Formal invitations to consult under CEQA were sent by the City to the following tribal representatives from the following three tribes on July 16, 2025:

- Anna Starkey, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
- Sara D. Setshwaelo, Chairperson, Ione Band of Miwok Indians
- Ralph Hatch, Director, Wilton Rancheria
- Raymond C. Hitchcock, Chairman, Wilton Rancheria

Each tribal representative was provided with a brief description of the project and its location, the contact information for the City's authorized representative, and a notification that the tribal

representative has 30 days to request consultation. The City received a letter via email from one tribal representative of the Wilton Rancheria requesting consultation. No other tribal responses were received by the City, and no TCRs were identified by Wilton Rancheria or other tribes listed above during the 30-day period.

During consultation with Wilton Rancheria, the City and Wilton Rancheria conducted a tribal field meeting on October 30, 2026. Following the field meeting, the City received a letter via email from Wilton Rancheria dated October 30, 2026, requesting to close consultation. No TCRs were identified during consultation with Wilton Rancheria. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, and the impact would be less than significant for questions a.i) and a.ii).

XIX. 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

Water Supply

The City's water supply is almost entirely from surface water supplied by Folsom Reservoir, though the City does have rights to remediated groundwater supplied by Aerojet and in emergencies, water supplied by the San Juan Water District and Golden State Water Company. See Section 5.X, Hydrology and Water Quality, for additional information on surface water and groundwater resources. Water supplied by the Folsom Lake Reservoir is transported through a 60-inch diameter pipeline to be treated by the City's Water Treatment Plant (WTP) with a nominal capacity of 50 million gallons per day (mgd) and the seven Booster Pump Stations that supply water from low elevations to higher elevations. To store treated water, the City's system has 12 storage tanks with a total capacity of 33.2 million gallons. The City also has 12 30-inch diameter transmission mains that transport water from the WTP to local distribution systems (City 2018).

Wastewater

The City's Wastewater Collection Division operates the City's wastewater collection system, servicing 22,800 connections and collecting on average 8 mgd of wastewater. The collection system consists of

308 miles of gravity sewer mains ranging from two to 33 inches in diameter, approximately five miles of sewer force mains and approximately 117 miles of lower sewer laterals serving 26,020 connections. All wastewater is discharged to a 54-inch main interceptor in Folsom Boulevard that is owned, operated, and maintained by Sacramento Area Sewer District (SacSewer; City 2025b). The collected sewage is then treated by the Echo Water Resource Recovery Facility and discharged to the Sacramento River.

Stormwater Drainage

The City's Public Works Department operates the City's storm drain collection and disposal system. The storm drain system consists of 190 miles of pipe, 23 miles of natural drainage channels and creeks, 30 flood control detention basins and more than 200 outfalls to creeks and rivers (City 2026c). The Public Works department also manages the NPDES and MS4 permit as described in Section 5.X Hydrology and Water Quality. Stormwater runoff is collected through the City's storm drain network and conveyed directly to local waterways such Alder Creek, Humbug Creek, and Willow Creek.

Solid Waste

The City of Folsom Waste and Recycling Division collects trash, recycling, green waste, and hazardous material from residential and commercial properties. Most refuse collected within the City is transported to Kiefer Landfill, a Class III (Non-hazardous Solid Waste) landfill located at 12701 Kiefer Boulevard in Sloughhouse, about 10 miles south of US 50 (CalRecycle 2026). Kiefer Landfill is the primary solid waste disposal facility in Sacramento County and is operated by Sacramento County. It operates seven days a week and is permitted to accept household waste from the public, businesses, and private waste haulers. The landfill also accepts some recyclable material and hard-to-handle wastes (CalRecycle 2026). There is a Special Waste Facility Drop-Off Center on site that accepts common household hazardous waste. The landfill is permitted to receive a maximum of 10,815 tons per day. As of December 31, 2023 it had a remaining capacity of 102,300,000 CY, with an estimated closure date of 2080 (CalRecycle 2026).

Energy

Gas in the City is provided by Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E), and electricity is provided by the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD).

Impact Analysis

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?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Water Supply

The City's 2025 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) calculated supply and demand at buildout of the 2035 General Plan and determined that there was sufficient supply available for normal, single dry, and multi-dry years scenarios (City 2020). The project would construct a two-stall restroom and would install irrigation for the proposed landscaping, green space/lawn areas, and multi-use field, which would require water supplies from the City. However, as the proposed project would be consistent with the

General Plan and Parks (P) land use designation, water usage for future development of the project site as a park has been accounted for and evaluated in the PEIR. Further, water demand generated by the project would represent an incremental amount of the City's available water supply and would not require the construction of new or expanded water supply infrastructure off-site. Therefore, the impact related to water supply facilities would be less than significant.

Wastewater

The project would include the construction of a two-stall restroom that would require wastewater conveyance by the City and treatment from SacSewer at the Echo Water Resource Recovery Facility. As the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan and Parks (P) land use designation, demand on wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities required for future development of the project site as a park has been accounted for and evaluated in the PEIR. The proposed project would tie into existing sewer collection systems along roadways in the project area, and would not require the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities off-site. Therefore, the impact related to wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant.

Stormwater Drainage

Once operational, surface water collected on-site from the proposed parking lots and driveways would be conveyed to the existing City-maintained storm drain collection and disposal systems along Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road, which consist of a series of curbs and gutters that collect and convey stormwater to the City's drainages and creeks. The project would not create or contribute substantial amounts of runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the impact related to stormwater would be less than significant.

Electric Power

The project would require electric power for the lighting throughout the park, including lighting for the sand volleyball courts, basketball court, and pickleball courts, which would run on automatic timers and would shut off at 10:00 p.m. In addition, electricity would be required for irrigation controls. However, the demand for lighting and irrigation controls would be minimal and would connect to existing infrastructure. Therefore, the impact on electric power would be less than significant.

Impact Summary

As demonstrated above, implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of water, wastewater, stormwater, or electric power facilities off-site. As the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan, and as the project site has been identified as a future neighborhood park in the City of Folsom's Parks Master Plan and General Plan PEIR, the project's incremental demand on utilities have been accounted for during the environmental review process for the General Plan. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would construct a two-stall restroom and would install irrigation for the proposed landscaping, green space/lawn areas, and multi-use field, which would

require water supplies from the City. As the project site has been designated and identified as future park in the General Plan, the water usage would be consistent with the buildout assumptions integrated into the General Plan and UWMP. The City's 2025 UWMP calculated supply and demand at buildout of the General Plan and determined that that there was sufficient supply available for normal, single dry, and multi-dry years scenarios (City 2025). According to the UWMP, water demand is not anticipated to exceed the City's current water rights to 38,350 acre-feet per year (AFY; City 2025). Further, the proposed project would be required to comply with FMC Chapter 13.26, Water Conservation, which prohibits the wasteful use of water, establishes sustainable landscape requirements, and defines water use restrictions. Therefore, as the City's water supplies would be sufficient to serve the City's current and future demand anticipated under the General Plan, the impact would be less than significant.

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. The project would include the construction of a two-stall restroom that would require wastewater conveyance by the City and treatment from SacSewer at the Echo Water Resource Recovery Facility. Due to the size of the restroom and operation of the proposed park, the project would generate an incremental amount of wastewater. However, as the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation, demand on wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities required for future development of the project site as a park has been accounted for and evaluated in the PEIR. The proposed project would tie into existing sewer collection systems along roadways in the project area, and would not require the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities off-site. The project would continue to be served by existing wastewater infrastructure, and wastewater flows generated by project operations would be within the capacity of the existing collection and treatment system. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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. Construction of the proposed project would generate solid waste during site preparation and the removal of silt or vegetation from the construction area, as well as waste from materials packaging. Solid waste generated during construction would be minimal and short-term and would be transported to the Kiefer Landfill, the primary municipal solid waste disposal facility in Sacramento County. Solid waste generated during project operation would mainly derive from the two-stall restroom and trash cans, as well as occasional waste associated with operation and maintenance activities. Currently at 250 acres, the Kiefer Landfill is permitted up to 660 acres and would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs of the proposed project (CalRecycle 2026). The proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in the excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and would comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant for questions d) and e).

XX. 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

PRC Section 4201-4204 directs the Cal FIRE to map fire hazard within SRA based on fuel loading, slope, fire weather, and other relevant factors present, including areas where winds have been identified by the department as a major cause of wildfire spread. These zones, referred to as FHSZ, classify a wildland zone as Moderate, High, or Very High fire hazard based on the average hazard across the area included in the zone.

Based on Cal FIRE's FHSZ Map, the project site is located within an LRA and has no FHSZ, meaning the area has no elevated wildfire risk (Cal FIRE 2026). The primary financial responsibility for preventing and suppressing wildfires for areas within LRAs falls on the local agency (i.e., the City).

Although the project is not located within an SRA or in a VHFHSZ, and the CEQA Appendix G thresholds do not apply, the following questions are still evaluated with respect to potential fires on-site.

Impact Analysis

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 5.IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the proposed project would not substantially interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The City maintains pre-designated emergency evacuation routes as

identified in the City of Folsom Evacuation Map. The project site is located within Evacuation Zone 30, which identifies Vista Del Lago High School and Russel Ranch Elementary School as critical facilities in the event of an emergency or evacuation. Evacuation routes are identified on this map, which include Broadstone Parkway, Carpenter Hill, and Iron Point Road as the primary evacuation routes in the project vicinity (City 2026b).

Project construction and staging would occur within the project site and would not substantially interfere with existing roadway facilities in the project area. Construction activities would be required to comply with the City's Standard Construction Specifications, particularly with the regulations listed under Public Convenience and Safety as well as Public Safety and Traffic Control, which regulate construction traffic to ensure adjacent roadway facilities are not impeded. Adherence with these regulations would safely regulate traffic, ensure property owners are notified in advance of the project, and ensure that traffic safety devices, such as signage, would be in place. For more information on standard construction requirements, refer to Section 2.6 of this IS/MND.

Once operational, the two new ingress/egress driveways off of Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road would not substantially modify pre-designated emergency evacuation routes or preclude the continued use as an emergency evacuation route on area roadways. Therefore, the project would not involve design features that would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site has undulating topography with elevations ranging from approximately 620 feet to 660 feet amsl, and is largely undeveloped and primarily consists of annual grassland with an approximately two-acre pond. As described above, the proposed project site is not located in a FHSZ or Cal FIRE SRA. Further, the project site located within a developed area of the City that is substantially surrounded by urban uses. The proposed project design would not involve unique features that would exacerbate fire risk beyond existing conditions and, therefore, would not expose people or structures to significant risks. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would include lighting for the proposed basketball, volleyball, and pickleball courts and the restroom and electrical/maintenance building. The project would also construct two ingress/egress driveways to provide access to the proposed parking lots and entrance into the park. The eastern driveway would be constructed off of Carpenter Hill Road, approximately 150 feet south of its intersection with Fenceline Drive; and the northern driveway would be constructed off of Broadstone Parkway, approximately 680 feet west of its intersection with Carpenter Hill Road. These project components would require utility improvements through additional connections to existing infrastructure. However, the improvements would not substantially exacerbate wildfire risk, as the proposed project is not located within a high or very high FHSZ. In addition, the proposed project would be required to adhere to existing City regulations, including the following policies from the Public Facilities and Services Element of the General Plan to minimize fire risk:

- Policy PFS 7.1.9: Fire Access Design and Building Materials. Ensure that fire equipment access is integrated into the design of new developments, as well as the use of fire-resistant landscaping and building materials (City 2024).

- Policy PFS 7.1.10: Removal of Fire Hazards: Require property owners to remove fire hazards, including excessive/overgrown vegetation, hazardous structures and materials, and debris (City 2024).

In addition, the project would be constructed in accordance with FMC Chapter 8.36, Folsom Fire Code, which implements and amends certain requirements of the California Fire Code. FMC Section 17.57.080 establishes emergency vehicle access requirements, and requires that the project driveways and parking lots provide an unencumbered continuous width of 27 feet. Compliance with these existing regulations would minimize the potential fire hazards associated with the project infrastructure. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 5.X Hydrology and Water Quality, the project site is located in Flood Zone X, which is an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2026). Further, per Section 5.VII Geology and Soils, the project site is not located within or near a mapped liquefaction or landslide hazard zone (DOC 2026c). As the project is not located within an area prone to landslides or flooding, the project would not expose people or structures to significant post-fire risk. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

XXI. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Impact Analysis

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 with Mitigation Incorporated. Based on the preceding analyses contained in Sections 5.IV, Biological Resources; 5.V, Cultural Resources; and 5.VII, Geology and Soils, the proposed project would incorporate Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-6, CUL-1 through CUL-4, and GEO-1 to reduce the potential impacts to biological, cultural, and paleontological resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, with implementation of these mitigation measures, the project would not 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. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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 with Mitigation Incorporated. As evaluated in Sections 5.I through 5.XX of this IS/MND, implementation of the project would not result in substantial adverse effects with incorporation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, BIO-1 through 6, CUL-1 through 3, GEO-1, and NOI-1. The project would be consistent with the General Plan and Parks (P) land use designation, and as discussed in Section 1.1 of this IS/MND, the project site has been previously identified as a future neighborhood park in the City's Parks Master Plan and General Plan PEIR. As such, the potential cumulative impacts that may occur during buildout of the General Plan, including buildout of the project site as a future park have been considered in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified throughout this IS/MND, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts in combination with past, present, and probable future projects in the project area. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in Sections 5.VII, Geology and Soils; 5.IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 5.XIII, Noise; 5.XVII, Transportation; and 5.XX, Wildfire, the proposed project would not result in substantial environmental effects that would cause substantial direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and NOI-1. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

PRC Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 require that a lead agency adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for any project for which it has adopted mitigation measures. PRC Section 21081.6(a)(1) provides that "[t]he public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation." Further, PRC Section 21081.6(b) states that "[a] public agency shall provide that measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures …" An MMRP has been prepared by the City in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 and PRC Section 21081.6 and is presented in Appendix H to this IS/MND.

7.0 PREPARERS

City of Folsom

Brad Nelson, Park Planning Manager
Brett Bollinger, Senior Trails Planner

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.

Robert Edgerton, AICP CEP, Project Manager
Emmaline deBecker, Environmental Planner
Anviti Singh, Environmental Planner
Mickayla Frasier, Environmental Planner and Air Quality Specialist
Martin Rolph, Senior Air Quality and Noise Specialist
Todd Wood, Principal Biologist
Sophia Drewelow, Biologist
John DeMartino, Senior GIS Specialist

8.0 REFERENCES

Beedy, E. C., and Hamilton, W.J. 1999. Tricolored Blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*), in The Birds of North America (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.), no. 423. Birds N. Am., Philadelphia.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2022. User's Guide for CalEEMod Version 2022.1. Available at: http://www.caleemod.com/.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2026a. California Air Resources Board Area Designations. State and Federal Area Designations and Maps. Accessed August 7 at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations.

2026b. Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/overview-diesel-exhaust-and-health. Accessed September 21.

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 (DOC). 2026a. Division of Land Resource Protection. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Accessed July 22 at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/.

2026b. California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder 2026. Accessed July 20 at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/WilliamsonAct/.

2026c. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Accessed July 29 at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/eqzapp/#data_s=id%3AdataSource_4-19b2eb30106-layer-15-0%3A9955.

2026d. California Geological Survey. California Tsunami Maps. Accessed July 31 at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps.

2026e. Division of Mine Reclamation. Mines Online Map. Accessed August 4 at: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3e87537a1ec94c86aff526ceb3ca23d5.

California Department of Conservation (DOC) (cont.)
2018. Earthquake Fault Zones: A Guide for Government Agencies, Property Owners/Developers, and Geoscience Practitioners for Assessing Fault Rupture Hazards in California, Special Publication 42. Revised 2018. Available at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/publications/sp42.

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 30, 2026 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2026. *California Natural Diversity Database* (CNDDB); For: *Latrobe, Shingle Springs, Coloma, Folsom SE, Folsom, Clarksville, Pilot Hill, Rocklin,* and *Buffalo Creek* USGS 7.5-minute series quadrangles, Sacramento, CA. Accessed November 1, 2023.

2019. Report to the Fish and Game Commission: Evaluation of the Petition from the Xerces Society, Defenders of Wildlife and the Center for Food Safety to List Four Species of Bumble Bees as Endangered Under the California Endangered Species Act. April 2019. Special California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, California, USA.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal FIRE). 2026. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Accessed August 4 at: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/5065c998b4b0462f9ec3c6c226c610a9.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2026. Solid Waste Information System (SWIS) for the Sacramento County Landfill (Kiefer) (34-AA-0001). Accessed July 28 at: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Summary/2507.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2026. EnviroStor Database. Accessed July 30 at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Folsom.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2026. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. Accessed July 29 at: https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aacaa.

2013. Technical Noise Supplement (TeNS) to the Traffic Noise Protocol. September. Available at: https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tens-sep2013-a11y.pdf.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2026a. 2024 Total System Electric Generation. Accessed June 8 at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2024-total-system-electric-generation.

2026b. Supply and Demand of Natural Gas in California. Accessed June 8 at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/californias-natural-gas-market/supply-and-demand-natural-gas-california.

California Energy Commission (CEC) (cont.)
2026c. California Gasoline Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed June 8 at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/california-gasoline-data-facts-and-statistics.

2026d. Diesel Fuel Data, Facts, and Statistics. Accessed June 8 at: https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/diesel-fuel-data-facts-and-statistics.

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2022. GeoTracker Database. Accessed July 30 at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Folsom.

eBird. 2026. Explore Species or Explore Regions. Available online at: https://ebird.org/explore.

El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC). 2012. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans. Chapter 6. Individual Airport Policies and Compatibility Maps. June 18. Available at: https://www.edctc.org/files/942036f08/Chapter+6.pdf.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1 *Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual*. January.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2024. FEMA Flood Map: Folsom, CA Map 06067C0140H. Accessed on July 31, 2026 from: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=Vista%20del%20Lago%20High%20School.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. Available at: https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf.

Folsom, City of (City). 2026a. City of Folsom Municipal Code (FMC). Updated April 28. Accessed July 29 at: https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Folsom.

2026b. City of Folsom Evacuation Routes Map. Accessed July 30 at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/2233/638368512312000000.

2026c. Stormwater Management. Accessed August 6 at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/government/public-works/stormwater-management.

2025a. Folsom Water Vision. December. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/23430/639026933867030000.

2025b. Sewer System Internal Audit Report. January. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/21344/638839494812870000.

2024. Folsom General Plan 2035. Adopted August 28, 2018. Amended August 27, 2024. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=18784&t=638630306939444676.

Folsom, City of (City) (cont.)
2023. Folsom Trails Map. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/government/parks-recreation/parks-trails-and-open-space/trails.

2021. Housing Element. Adopted August 24, 2021. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=7573&t=637667924557081193.

2020. Design and Procedures Manual and Improvement Standards. Standard Construction Specifications and Details. Updated in July. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/390/637466585865470000.

2018. Folsom General Plan 2035 Draft Program Environmental Impact Report. March. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/government/community-development/planning-services/environmental-documents.

2017. Traffic Counts. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/1274/637472568156130000.

2015. Folsom Parks and Recreation 2015 Master Plan Update. Available at: https://www.folsom.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/1392/637473414406330000.

Geotechnical Consultants, Inc. 2003. Environmental Conditions – Geology for the Folsom Lake Recreation Area.

Gervais, J. A., Rosenberg, D. K., and Anthony, R. G. 2003. Space use and pesticide exposure risk of male Burrowing Owls in an agricultural landscape. J. Wildl. Mgmt. 67:156–165.

Gretag Macbeth. 2000. Munsell Soil Color Charts. New Windsor, NY.

Gutierrez, C.I. 2011. Preliminary Geologic map of the Sacramento 30’ x 60’ quadrangle, California. California Geological Survey Publications. Sacramento, CA.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX). 2026a. Biological Resources Assessment. October. Included as Appendix C.

2026b. Aquatic Resources Delineation. October. Included as Appendix D.

2024. Cultural Resources Assessment. January. Included as Appendix F.

2023. Arborist Inventory. November. Included as Appendix E.

2019. Acoustical Analysis Report for the 3Roots San Diego Project.

2008. Noise Impact Analysis for the St. John’s Lutheran Church and School Playground Project.

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/.

Koch, J., J. Strange, and P. Williams. 2012. Bumble bees of the Western United States. USDA-Forest Service, Pollinator Partnership. Washington, DC. 144 pp.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. March 6. Available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/air/crnr/notice-adoption-air-toxics-hot-spots-program-guidance-manual-preparation-health-risk-0.

Ogden International. 1986. Road Travel Survey.

Mayer, K.E. and W.F. Laudenslayer. 1988. A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA, 166pp.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2025. 2025 MTP/SCS Blueprint. November 20. Available at: https://www.sacog.ca.gov/planning/2025-blueprint/2025-blueprint-plan.

2022. Mather Airport – Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. August. Available at: https://www.sacog.org/home/showpublisheddocument/312/638218237413630000.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2024. Rule 442 Architectural Coating. Amended July 25. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/rule442.pdf.

2023. Sacramento Regional 2015 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan. October 17. Available at: https://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/Sacramento%20Regional%202015%20NAAQS%208%20Hour%20Ozone%20Attainment%20and%20Reasonable%20Further%20Progress%20Plan.pdf.

2020a. CEQA Guide. Chapter 1: Introduction and Air Quality. Revised April. Available at: https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch1IntroAq4-25-2020.pdf.

2020b. CEQA Guide. Chapter 3: Construction. Available at: https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch3Construction4-30-2020.pdf.

2020c. CEQA Guide Chapter 4: Operational Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions. Revised October. Available at: https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch4OperationalFinal10-2020.pdf.

2020d. CEQA Guide. Chapter 2 Appendix: Thresholds of Significance Table. Revised April. Available at: https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/CH2ThresholdsTable4-2020.pdf.

2019. Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices. Revised July. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch3BasicEmissionControlPracticesBMPSFinal7-2019.pdf.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) (cont.)
2016. CEQA Guide Chapter 7: Odors. Available at: https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch7Odors%20FINAL6-2016.pdf.

1977a. Rule 402 Nuisance. August 3. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/rule402.pdf.

1977b. Rule 403 Fugitive Dust. August 3. Available at: http://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/rule403.pdf.

Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership (SSQP)2026. About Us. Accessed August 4 at: https://www.beriverfriendly.net/about-us/.

Shuford, W.D. and T. Gardali, editors. 2008. California Bird Species of Special Concern: A ranked assessment of species, subspecies, and distinct populations of birds of immediate conservation concern in California.

Thomson, R.C., Wright, A.N., and H.B. Shaffer. 2016. California Amphibian and Reptile Species of Special Concern. Oakland, California: University of California Press.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2023. Arid West 2022 Regional Wetland Plant List.

2008. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0). J.S. Wakeley, R.W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble, Editors. Technical Report prepared for the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

2025. National Ordinary High Water Mark Field Delineation Manual for Rivers and Streams: Final Version. Gabrielle C. L. David, Ken M. Fritz, Tracie-Lynn Nadeau, Brian J. Topping, Aaron O. Allen, Patrick H. Trier, Steven L. Kichefski, L. Allan James, Ellen Wohl, and Daniel Hamill. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2026. QuickFacts: Folsom city, California. Accessed July 30 at: http://censusreporter.org/profiles/16000US0624638-folsom-ca/.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2026. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). Web Soil Survey. Accessed July 29 at: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/.

2008. Natural Resource Conservation Service. Technical Guide Section II. May. Available at: https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/Public/CA/4j-SectionIIengininterp.pdf.

U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). 2008. Roadway Construction Noise Model version 1.1. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/.

2004. Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/traffic_noise_model/tnm_v25/.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2026a. Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants (Green Book). Accessed August 18 at: https://www.epa.gov/green-book.

2026b. Superfund: National Priorities List. Accessed July 30 at: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/4822dbc3d1c04131a548d4404bb1496av

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2026. National Wetlands Inventory. Accessed July 31 at: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/mapper.html.

Wyle Laboratories. 1973. Development of Ground Transportation Systems Noise Contours for the San Diego Region.

Zeiner, D.C., W.F. Laudenslayer, and K.E. Mayer (eds.). 1990. California's wildlife. Volume I – III. California Statewide Wildlife Habitat Relationships System. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Fish and Game.