

1 INTRODUCTION

This environmental impact report (EIR) describes the potential environmental consequences of amending the respective Spheres of Influence (SOI) for the City of Folsom and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San), amending the City's general plan, annexing an approximately 58-acre property into the City, and rezoning the site for future use as a City corporation yard. The Folsom Corporation Yard Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) and Annexation project (Folsom Corporation Yard SOIA/annexation) would include a reorganization of service district boundaries, including the annexation and detachment of 57.8 acres from the following service districts:

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

While development of a corporation yard is not part of this project, it is a likely outcome of an SOIA, general plan amendment, rezone, and annexation, and therefore the impacts of a reasonable development scenario are described and evaluated throughout the Draft EIR. The approximately 58-acre site would include 36.03 acres for the future corporation yard, 16.25 acres for SouthEast Connector right-of-way, and 5.12 acres to realign Scott Road. In addition, a 0.8-acre easement is included in the project but not in the SOIA/annexation area. The SouthEast Connector right-of-way area is included as part of the Folsom Corporation Yard SOIA/annexation project, but development of this area is not included in the potential development scenario described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*. The SouthEast Connector would be developed as a separate project by the SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority through a separate process from future Folsom Corporation Yard development.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that state and local government agencies consider the environmental effects of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects. The purpose of an EIR is to evaluate the project's effects on environmental resources, both singularly and in a cumulative context, to examine alternatives to the project as proposed, and identify mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potentially significant effects. Projects with potential to result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less-than-significant levels can be approved, but the lead agency's decision-making body must issue a "statement of overriding considerations" explaining, in writing, the specific economic, social, or other considerations that they believe make those significant effects acceptable (Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code [PRC]; Section 15093 of the of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). This document has been prepared in compliance with CEQA (PRC Sections 21000-21189) and the State CEQA Guidelines (CCR Title 14, Sections 15000-15387 of the California Code of Regulations).

1.1 AGENCY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1.1.1 Lead Agency

Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) and the City of Folsom are the CEQA co-lead agencies for the project. In conformance with Sections 15050 and 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency is the “public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or disapproving a project.” LAFCo is responsible for approving the two SOIAs as the lead agency and is a responsible agency for the reorganization actions (annexations and detachments). The City is a responsible agency for LAFCo actions. The City is the lead agency for approving the rezoning and general plan amendment. As such, LAFCo and the City will use this EIR in evaluating the environmental impacts associated with each of their respective actions. Contacts for each agency are identified below:

Don Lockhart, AICP
Executive Officer
Sacramento LAFCo
1112 I Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95814-2836
916.874.2937
Don.Lockhart@SacLAFCo.org

Scott A. Johnson, AICP
Planning Manager
City of Folsom
Community Development Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
916.355.7223
sjohnson@folsom.ca.us

1.1.2 Responsible and Trustee Agencies

Responsible agencies are public agencies that have discretionary approval power over the project. Sacramento LAFCo has sole authority to consider local agency reorganizations, including requests to amend an existing SOI and City boundary under the Cortese-Knox Hertzberg Act. While LAFCo acts as the lead agency for the SOIA approvals, LAFCo acts as a responsible agency for the annexation approvals. Under CEQA, a trustee agency is a state agency that has jurisdiction by law over natural resources that are held in trust for the people of the State of California (PRC Section 21070).

This Draft EIR provides information to the following agencies to assist them in approval and/or permitting actions as they may apply to the project.

- ▲ State Water Resources Control Board: A Notice of Intent would need to be filed to obtain coverage under the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit before project construction.
- ▲ Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB): CVRWQCB review and/or approval of any activity affecting waters of the United States/waters of the state pursuant to Section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act and the state Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, respectively.
- ▲ USACE: Approval of any Section 404 permits required for the project.

- ▲ California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW): A Stream Alteration Agreement permit from the CDFW may be required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Actions and approvals for state-listed species may also be necessary.
- ▲ Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD): SMAQMD approval of dust control plans (authority to construct permit), and other permits may be necessary.
- ▲ Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District: Approval of annexation to the district and agreement to serve.

1.2 PROJECT REVIEW AND CEQA PROCESS

Public input is an important aspect of the environmental review process. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15083, LAFCo and the City provide opportunities for individual members of the public, as well as organization and agency representatives, to consider proposed actions and provide input and recommendations concerning the content of an EIR. The following sections summarize the public involvement efforts conducted by LAFCo and the City.

1.2.1 EIR Scoping

LAFCo and the City prepared and distributed a notice of preparation (NOP) for this EIR on November 8, 2017. The NOP provided a brief description of the project, a map of the project location, and an overview of the environmental review process. The purpose of the NOP was to provide notification that an EIR for the project would be prepared and to solicit guidance on the scope and content of the document. The NOP invited all interested parties to provide comments during a 30-day period. The NOP was mailed to individuals and organizations, including property owners and/or residents within the vicinity of the project site. The NOP was also filed with the State Clearinghouse and Sacramento County Recorder-Clerk's Office, and was posted on LAFCo's website (www.SacLAFCo.org). A public notice announcing the NOP's availability was posted in the Sacramento Bee on November 8, 2017.

A scoping meeting was held on December 4, 2017 from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. at the Folsom Library Meeting Room to receive public input on the scope of the EIR. Responsible agencies and members of the public were invited to provide input on the scope of the EIR. The comments received on the NOP and at the hearing are addressed, as applicable, in each technical section of this EIR. Table 1-1 lists the individuals and organizations who provided comments on the NOP. Appendix A contains a copy of the NOP and comment letters received on the NOP.

Commenter	Affiliation	Date of Comment
State Agencies		
Jeanne Sission	California State Parks	November 21, 2017
Sharaya Souza	Native American Heritage Commission	November 30, 2017
Stephanie Tadlock	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	November 30, 2017
Kelsey Vella	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	December 7, 2017
Local Agencies		
Sarena Moore	Regional San/Sacramento Area Sewer District	December 1, 2017
Kamal Atwal	County of Sacramento, Department of Transportation	December 5, 2017
Jamie Cutlip	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	December 7, 2017

Table 1-1 List of Commenters

Commenter	Affiliation	Date of Comment
Individuals		
Laurette Laurent		November 8, 2017, December 4, 2017, December 4, 2017, December 8, 2017
December 4, 2017 Scoping Meeting		
Laurette Laurent		December 4, 2017

1.2.2 Review of the Draft EIR

Upon completion of the Draft EIR, LAFCo and the City filed a notice of completion with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (PRC Section 21161). Concurrent with the notice of completion, this Draft EIR has been distributed to affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, as well as to all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR, in accordance with PRC Section 21092(b)(3). During the public review period, the Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the Sacramento LAFCo office and City of Folsom, located at the addresses provided below. Written comments on this Draft EIR are due by 4:00 p.m. on March 22, 2018, and should be addressed to Don Lockhart, AICP, Executive Officer, Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission.

Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission
 1112 I Street, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95814
 Phone: (916) 874-2937
 Fax: (916) 854-2939
 Email: Don.Lockhart@SacLAFCo.org

City of Folsom
 Community Development Department
 50 Natoma Street
 Folsom, CA 95630
 916.355.7223

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format is encouraged.

Following the public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared that will include comments on the Draft EIR received during the public review period and LAFCo’s responses to those comments. The Final EIR will address any revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to public comments. The Draft EIR and Final EIR together will comprise the EIR for the SOIA/annexation project.

1.2.3 EIR Type, Use, and Process

This EIR includes a program-level, or “first-tier,” analysis for future development, consistent with PRC Sections 21093 and 21094 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152 and 15168. This EIR provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed SOIA/annexation and future development in the area. The potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts of the project are analyzed in a way that is appropriate, given the level of detail provided to LAFCo in the SOIA and annexation application, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15146. This program-level or “programmatic” analysis relates to the broad environmental effects of future uses. It identifies policies and mitigation measures that would apply to subsequent projects. The program-level evaluation is warranted because no

development is proposed. However, the EIR acknowledges future use of the property as a City corporation yard as a connected action. Thus, this EIR provides the public and agency decision makers with information on the potential impacts of future development. Future development within the SOIA/annexation area (if approved) would require subsequent project-specific CEQA review.

Described below is the environmental review process for the project. The City and the landowner are co-project applicants for LAFCo proceedings (i.e., SOIA and annexation).

- ▲ Initially, this Draft EIR will be published and will be subject to review and comment by the public and by responsible, trustee, and other interested jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations during a 45-day public review period.
- ▲ LAFCo and the City will hold public workshops during the public review period at which time individuals and public agencies may comment on the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
- ▲ After the close of the public review period for the Draft EIR, written responses to comments received on the Draft EIR, with respect to significant environmental issues, will be prepared. The responses may specify changes to the Draft EIR or to the project or may explain why the comment does not raise substantive issues that would require such changes. The responses to comments and any changes to the Draft EIR and/or project description therein specified will, along with the Draft EIR, become the Final EIR.
- ▲ The Final EIR, consisting of all comments received on the Draft EIR together with responses to those comments and necessary changes to the EIR text, will be prepared and circulated to public agencies for a 10-day review period.
- ▲ After the close of a 10-day agency review period on the Final EIR, LAFCo will hold a public hearing at which it will consider the adequacy of the Final EIR regarding the SOIA, including review of written comments on the adequacy of the Final EIR response to comments on the Draft EIR. LAFCo will consider whether to certify the EIR.
- ▲ After certification of the Final EIR by LAFCo, the Commission would then consider the merits of the project as it relates to the issues of growth projections, rate of buildout, municipal service provision, and open space and prime agricultural resources in a public hearing at which time the public can comment on the merits of the SOIA application before LAFCo.
- ▲ After LAFCo has taken action on the Final EIR and approved the SOIA, the Folsom Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to determine whether it will make a recommendation to the City Council to approve the project and certify the EIR.
- ▲ After the Planning Commission meets and makes its recommendation, the Folsom City Council will hold a public hearing at which it will consider the adequacy of the Final EIR regarding the general plan amendment and prezone, including review of written comments on the adequacy of the Final EIR response to comments on the Draft EIR. In addition, depending on LAFCo's decision regarding the SOIA, and after certification of the Final EIR, the City Council would then consider the merits of the project at which time the public can comment on the merits of the project and applications for project approval. If approved, the City would adopt a resolution to amend the Folsom General Plan, and an ordinance to prezone the site.
- ▲ The City Council would meet a second time for a reading of the prezone ordinance. Before any additional action can be taken, the ordinance for the prezone would need 30 days after second reading and adoption before it can be put into effect.
- ▲ If the prezone is approved, and after it takes effect, LAFCo will hold a public hearing at which time the public can comment on the merits of the annexation application before LAFCo.

- ▲ If LAFCo approves the annexation, the City of Folsom’s annexing of the new corporation yard site would be finalized.
- ▲ Once all project entitlements are obtained from the City of Folsom and LAFCo, the City of Folsom would close on the purchase agreement with the landowner. No other actions are needed at this time from other responsible agencies to consider the project and associated entitlements when considering permitting or other related actions.
- ▲ When preparing to develop the site for a future corporation yard, the City would need to conduct an environmental review process before it can take action to commit budget and other resources to the development of this site. At that time, the City and other trustee and responsible agencies will review this EIR as well as any future environmental review documents to ensure that the environmental analysis is adequate for their actions. Examples of potential responsible and/or trustee agency actions that could be required for that future project are provided in Section 1.1.2, Responsible and Trustee Agencies.

If the lead agencies decide to approve the project, they will need to determine either (1) that adopted mitigation measures would reduce, to a level of insignificance, any significant impacts; or (2) if, after further consideration, one or more of the mitigation measures prove to be infeasible or they determine that the mitigation measures will not reduce the significant impacts to less-than-significant levels, the lead agencies will have to consider whether to proceed with the project despite its significant effects. If they decide to proceed with approval of the project, LAFCo and the City would need to prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations, in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, stating the reasons why they are proceeding with the project despite remaining significant and unavoidable impacts.

In addition, LAFCo and the City would need to make findings in response to each significant effect identified in the EIR if they decide to approve the project. Information contained in an EIR does not control the lead agency’s ultimate decision on a project. However, the lead agency must respond to each significant impact identified in the EIR by making findings in accordance with Section 15091(a) of the CEQA Guidelines which states,

No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
- (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

1.3 SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency shall focus the EIR’s discussion on significant environmental effects (PRC Section 21002.1, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15143). Furthermore, the EIR must also discuss the manner in which significant impacts can be feasibly mitigated or avoided. The purpose of an EIR is not to recommend approval or denial of a project, but to provide decision-makers, public agencies, and the general public with information about the project. A determination of which

impacts would be potentially significant was made for this project based on review of the information presented in the NOP, comments received as part of the public review process for the project, and additional research and analysis of relevant project data during preparation of this Draft EIR.

This EIR addresses the following technical issue areas:

- ▲ Aesthetics,
- ▲ Agriculture and Forestry Resources,
- ▲ Air Quality,
- ▲ Biological Resources,
- ▲ Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources,
- ▲ Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change
- ▲ Energy,
- ▲ Hazards and Hazardous Materials,
- ▲ Hydrology and Water Quality,
- ▲ Noise and Vibration,
- ▲ Transportation and Circulation, and
- ▲ Utilities and Service Systems.

1.3.1 Technical Issues Not Addressed Further

CEQA requires that the discussion of any significant effect on the environment address substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse changes in the physical conditions that exist within the affected area. A lead agency is not required to provide a detailed discussion of the environmental effects that would not be significant, and may instead provide a brief statement of dismissal (PRC Section 21100, State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.2[a] and 15128). Based on a review of the information presented in the NOP and comments received as part of the public review process (Appendix A), review by LAFCo and the City of the project, and the resources at the site and in the region, the project would not result in significant environmental effects on the following resources.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The California Building Standards Code (CBC) establishes minimum requirements for construction of new buildings. The CBC contains provisions intended to regulate grading activities, drainage and erosion control, and construction on unstable soil (expansive soils or areas subject to liquefaction). When no other building codes apply, Chapter 29 regulates excavations, foundations, and retaining walls. Chapter 18 of the Building Code contains provisions related to Soils and Foundations, including geotechnical investigations (Section 1803); excavation, grading, and fill (Section 1804); assessing soil load-bearing capacity (Section 1806); and foundation design (Sections 1808-1810). The Residential Code contains provisions regarding soil testing, geotechnical evaluations for building foundations, and excavations for compressible or shifting soils (Section R401), foundations on expansive soils (Section R403), and seismic provisions (Section R301). In addition, the Green Building Standards Code contains provisions regarding soil erosion and stormwater runoff, and grading activities.

Areas surrounding active earthquake faults with the potential to be adversely affected by fault rupture are delineated as Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones. The SOIA/annexation area is not located in an area classified as an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone (California Geological Survey 2010). According to the Sacramento County General Plan, the SOIA/annexation area is ranked as a “low” severity zone for earthquake intensity. The likelihood that an earthquake with strong seismic ground shaking would occur in the SOIA/annexation area is low. Further, topography at the project site is characterized as gently rolling to flat; therefore, landslides are not anticipated.

The SOIA/annexation would not have the potential to affect geology or soils on the project site, because no development is linked with this discretionary action. However, these actions would remove barriers to the development of a future City of Folsom corporation yard in an area that could experience some seismic shaking. As discussed above, the risk of exposing people or structures to substantial adverse effects associated with rupture of a known fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides is low. Subsequent development would be required to comply with the seismic design standards of the CBC, and may be required to complete geotechnical investigations in accordance with the CBC. These standards account for the shaking hazard of an area and the type of occupancy and are designed to minimize the potential risk to life and property. Through completion of any required geotechnical report and adherence to its recommendations, the potential to expose users to risk related to liquefaction and expansive soils would also be minimized. Additionally, development of the project site as part of future proposals would be required to comply with City of Folsom construction permitting and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit conditions requiring temporary and permanent erosion control best management practices.

Any future development would be designed in compliance with current building code requirements, including the preparation of site-specific geotechnical studies, which would identify specific recommendations for compaction and soils to minimize risks associated with local soils, geology, and seismicity. These requirements would be enforced by appropriate state and local agencies and documented in subsequent environmental reviews. For these reasons, analysis of potential impacts to geology and soils is not included in this EIR.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The project would be located on land owned by Aerojet Rocketdyne Inc., an Ohio Corporation, and would be purchased and used by the City for future use as a City corporation yard. The site is surrounded by mostly vacant, undeveloped land. An aggregate quarry is located to the south, Aerojet's Area 41 remediation site is to the east, and Prairie City State Vehicular Recreational Area is to the west. Therefore, the project would not divide an established community. The project site is designated in the *Sacramento County General Plan* as General Agricultural 80-acre (GA-80), but is currently not actively used for agricultural purposes. It is zoned as a Special Planning Area. The project would include a general plan amendment, prezone, and annexation of the project site. The site would be designated as Public and Quasi-Public Facility (PQP) and prezoned Industrial prior to use of the site as a corporation yard. Therefore, the proposed land uses would be consistent with the land use designation and zoning for the site.

The SACOG MTP/SCS identifies the project site as part of the "Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS or Blueprint." However, the MTP/SCS and Blueprint do not ensure growth or restrict growth from occurring in these areas. The project site is adjacent to areas planned for development and borders the City of Folsom. As such, changing the sphere of influence to include this area would not conflict with the MTP/SCS or Blueprint.

The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) plan area excludes the City of Folsom but includes the project site. The project site is outside of the SSHCP's Urban Development Area (UDA), defined as the area "where all proposed urbanization will occur, and therefore, where most incidental take will occur." The project site is not an area mentioned in the SSHCP for either development or for preservation, except for the SouthEast Connector right-of-way which is a covered activity under the SSHCP. Because the project site is outside the SSHCP UDA and is not mentioned as a covered activity, any potential impacts on special-status species would need to be addressed outside of the purview of the SSHCP. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan, and no significant land use and planning impacts would occur. Consistency with the SSHCP is further discussed in Section 3.4, *Biological Resources*. Otherwise, this issue is not discussed further in this EIR.

MINERAL RESOURCES

The SOIA/annexation area is not in an area of known mineral resources. The Sacramento County General Plan (Sacramento County 2011) does not map any mineral resources on the project site. As such, no loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state would occur. There are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan that include the project site. Therefore, analysis of potential impacts to mineral resources is not included in this EIR.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The project would not include construction of new housing or commercial businesses. Therefore, no direct population growth would result from implementation of the project. Construction would be short-term (approximately 24 months) and is not expected to result in construction employees relocating to the project vicinity due to this short duration. No additional permanent staff would be needed for project operation. City staff that would work on site, would relocate from the existing sites that currently serve the City's departments. Further, the project would not include removal of any housing, including any affordable housing. In addition, the site is currently zoned as General Agricultural 80-acre, so the site has not been identified as a site for future housing. Therefore, the project would have no impact on displacement of housing or people. No significant impacts to population and housing would occur, and this issue is not discussed further in this EIR. The potential for growth-inducing effects, however, is considered, as required by CEQA, in Chapter 6, *Other CEQA Sections*.

PUBLIC SERVICES

The project would not result in increased demands for school or park facilities, as no new housing is proposed. The project site is currently served by Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District and Sacramento County Sheriff, and with annexation of the site, it would be served by City of Folsom Fire Department and Police Department. Although development of the project site would change where police and fire services would be needed, it would not lead to an increase in fire and/or police services or facilities. The existing corporation yard and a future corporation yard would have similar police and fire needs. In addition, as described in Section 3.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the development would be built to the latest standards for fire safety and prevention. Construction of new police and fire facilities would occur in accordance with buildout of the City's general plan and the project would not require construction of any new fire or police facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts to public services would occur, and this issue is not discussed further in this EIR.

The potential impacts related to annexing the project site into Regional San and detaching from the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District are discussed in Chapter 6, *Reorganization*.

RECREATION

The project would not increase the number of residents or employees on the site or surrounding area who would use recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact related to the use of neighborhood or regional parks and no need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities. This issue is not discussed further in this EIR.

The potential impacts related to detaching the project site from County Service Area 4B (Wilton/Cosumnes Area) are discussed in Chapter 6, *Reorganization*.

1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THIS DRAFT EIR

This Draft EIR is organized as follows:

Executive Summary, summarizes the EIR process and the objectives of the project; provides a brief overview of the project description; describes the project alternatives; identifies areas of controversy; and summarizes the next steps in the public review process. The Executive Summary also contains a table that summarizes the significance of the environmental impacts that would result from the project.

Chapter 1: Introduction, introduces the environmental review process; describes the purpose of the EIR; identifies lead, responsible, and trustee agencies; discusses technical issue areas that are not analyzed further; and outlines the organization of the Draft EIR.

Chapter 2: Project Description, describes the background and need for the project, identifies project objectives, and provides a detailed description of the project.

Chapter 3: Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, is divided into sections for each environmental issue area that was not scoped out as part of the environmental review process. For each environmental issue area, the section describes the existing environmental setting and regulatory framework, presents significance criteria or thresholds for determining the significance of impacts, evaluates environmental impacts, identifies mitigation for any potentially significant and significant impacts, and identifies the level of significance following implementation of the mitigation.

Chapter 4: Cumulative Impacts, considers existing and reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the SOIA/annexation area and describes the project's potential to substantially contribute to potential environmental effects.

Chapter 5: Project Alternatives, describes alternatives to the project, including the No-Project Alternative and potentially feasible alternatives that would avoid, reduce, or eliminate significant impacts, and identifies the environmentally superior alternative. Alternatives that have been proposed and rejected from further consideration are also identified, along with an explanation of the reasons for their rejection.

Chapter 6: Reorganization, summarizes setting information and identifies potential impacts related to reorganization of the project specific to the Sacramento LAFCo policies and standards related to the environment.

Chapter 7: Other CEQA Considerations, identifies impacts associated with growth inducement and significant and irreversible environmental changes. This chapter also summarizes the project's significant and unavoidable impacts.

Chapter 8: Report Preparers, identifies report preparers.

Chapter 9: References, lists the references used in preparation of this Draft EIR.

1.5 STANDARD TERMINOLOGY

This Draft EIR uses the following terminology to describe environmental effects of the project:

Less-Than-Significant Impact: A project impact is considered less than significant when it does not reach the standard of significance and would, therefore, cause no substantial change in the environment (no mitigation is required).

Potentially Significant Impact: A potentially significant impact is an environmental effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the environment; however, additional information is needed regarding the extent of the impact to make the determination of significance. For CEQA purposes, a potentially significant impact is treated as if it were a significant impact.

Significant Impact: A project impact is considered significant if it results in a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment. Significant impacts are identified by the evaluation of project effects in the context of specified significance criteria. Mitigation measures and/or project alternatives are identified to reduce these effects to the environment where feasible.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact: A project impact is considered significant and unavoidable if it would result in a substantial adverse change in the environment that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level if the project is implemented. If a lead agency proposes to approve a project with significant unavoidable impacts, it must adopt a statement of overriding considerations to explain its actions (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b)).

Cumulative Impacts: According to CEQA, “cumulative impacts refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355). CEQA requires that cumulative impacts be discussed when the “project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable... [or] ... provide a basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 [a]).”

Mitigation Measures: The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15370) define mitigation as:

- a) avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- b) minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of magnitude of the action and its implementation;
- c) rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
- d) reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and
- e) compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

This page intentionally left blank.