



Folsom City Council Staff Report

MEETING DATE:	7/14/2026
AGENDA SECTION:	Consent Calendar
SUBJECT:	Resolution No. 11673 - A Resolution Finding the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project Exempt from CEQA Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 and Public Resources Code Section 21080.25
FROM:	Public Works Department

RECOMMENDATION / CITY COUNCIL ACTION

The Public Works Department recommends that the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 11673 – A Resolution Finding the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project Exempt from CEQA Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 and Public Resources Code Section 21080.25

BACKGROUND / ISSUE

The Riley Street Safety Improvement Project is a high-priority initiative to improve pedestrian safety and connectivity along Riley Street between East Bidwell Street and Sutter Street. Riley Street serves as a critical corridor linking Sutter Middle School, the Central Business District, and Historic Folsom.

A 2020 feasibility study prepared by R.E.Y. Engineers, Inc., segmented the corridor into three primary areas, documenting severe deficiencies in sidewalk continuity, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, storm drainage, and pedestrian crossings. Key hazards include substandard or missing sidewalks, non-compliant curb ramps, inadequate stormwater infrastructure, and challenging grades along the section of Riley Street between Mormon Street and Sutter Street.

In February 2022, Congressman Bera’s office requested a call for projects for potential federal funding that included a city cost-share requirement of 11.47%. Public Works staff submitted a request for the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project, and the project was ultimately chosen to receive \$4 million in project funding with a local cost share requirement of \$518,243. This

Congressionally Directed Spending grant funding includes a requirement that funds must be obligated to the appropriate project phase by September 30, 2026.

On August 26, 2025, City Council approved Resolution No. 11452 to execute a design and engineering contract with R.E.Y. Engineers for the project to initiate project approval and environmental document (PA&ED) tasks, and on April 28, 2026, City Council approved Resolution No. 11603 to authorize contract amendment #1 with R.E.Y. Engineers for final design tasks.

A project overview and status update were presented to the Historic District Commission at their June 24th special meeting. No action was requested of the commission, but public comments at the meeting were supportive of the project. Specific design decisions related to conforming to the Historic District Design Guidelines will be implemented where feasible as design progresses.

The project has completed preliminary design tasks, and the environmental document has been prepared and reviewed by staff. As a result of the environmental analyses, the project has been determined as eligible for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 – Existing Facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, and a Statutory Exemption pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.25.

POLICY / RULE

The environmental review process and notice of exemption preparation and filing are pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15062 of the California Administrative Code. The City of Folsom is the responsible agency, and the City Council is responsible for the final determination of the environmental analysis.

ANALYSIS

In support of the proposed project, the environmental subconsultant working on the project, HELIX, prepared the following project-specific technical studies to substantiate the project's exemption from further CEQA review:

- Arborist Inventory and Reconnaissance-Level Biological Resources Overview
- Historical Resources Evaluation Report
- Archaeological Survey Report
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
- Air Quality Conformity and Impact Assessment

The Notice of Exemption and additional pages report summarizing the findings in the various technical studies are included as Attachment 2. Below is a brief overview of the results of the technical studies.

Arborist Inventory and Reconnaissance Level Biological Resources Overview

Seven trees located within or overhanging the riparian corridor adjacent to the project alignment are potentially subject to CFGC Section 1602 and may require permitting through CDFW if they are removed. Ultimate determination will be made as the final design progresses.

No special-status plant species were determined to have the potential to occur in the project alignment or be impacted by the proposed project. No special-status wildlife species were determined to have the potential to occur in the project alignment or be impacted by the proposed project. Preconstruction surveys for nesting birds will be required.

Historic Resources Evaluation Report

The HRER determined that three resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) are determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which includes Bridge No. 24C0269 (which carries Figueroa Street over the Riley Ravine Creek), the commercial building at 701 Sutter Street/302 Riley Street (P-34-000962), and the Quonset hut at 701 Bidwell Street. However, all three resources are located outside the Area of Direct Effects (ADE) and would not be impacted by project construction.

Archaeological Survey Report

During the archaeological field survey, no undocumented cultural resources were found within the project site. In the unlikely event that archaeological cultural resources, and/or human remains or funerary objects are discovered during project construction, standard construction BMPs will be incorporated into the project's construction specifications and will be implemented as necessary.

Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment

Daytime construction noise (7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends) is exempt from the City's Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.42 of the Folsom Municipal Code). The project would likely require temporary nighttime construction work for reasons including avoiding traffic congestion, maintaining emergency access, and worker safety. Therefore, to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance, the City would be required to follow the variance process per Section 8.42.090 (including approval by the City Council) to allow nighttime construction work. As final design progresses, if it is ultimately determined that night work will be allowed or required, staff will bring back a request for authorization to the City Council with recommended noise reduction measures for consideration.

Construction activities known to generate excessive ground-borne vibration, such as pile driving or blasting, would not be conducted during project construction. The project construction specifications will include standard construction vibration reduction measures to minimize vibration disturbances.

Air Quality Conformity and Impact Assessment

The project would not result in a substantial change to existing traffic volumes or flows on City streets during operation. Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (BCECPs) will be incorporated into the project's construction specifications.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no financial impact associated with the proposed action of finding the project as CEQA Exempt.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Per Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Class 1 Categorical Exemption consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of existing or former use. Subsection (b) applies to existing facilities of both investor and publicly owned utilities used to provide electric power, natural gas, sewerage, or other public utility services. Subsection (c) applies to existing streets, sidewalks, gutters, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and similar facilities (this includes road grading for public safety), and other alterations such as the addition of bicycle facilities, including but not limited to bicycle parking, bicycle-share facilities and bicycle lanes, transit improvements such as bus lanes, pedestrian crossings, street trees, and other similar alterations that do not create additional automobile lanes.

The proposed bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway improvements, as well as the utility relocation and improvements, would be eligible for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption under Sections 15301(b) and 15301(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed project would not involve a substantial expansion of use; rather, the project aims to provide safer designated spaces for cyclists and pedestrians who already utilize Riley Street. As documented in the NOE report and substantiated by the technical studies prepared for the project, the proposed project would result in no significant impacts to the environment and would be exempt from CEQA review.

The applicability of all Categorical Exemptions is qualified by the exceptions listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(a) through (f). As noted in detail in the NOE report, each exception listed would not apply to the proposed project.

Additionally, Senate Bill (SB) 288, signed in 2020, created Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.25, which establishes Statutory Exemptions for projects related to the institution or increase of public mass transit, including bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, and passenger rail, or commuter services, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This list of projects established in PRC Section 21080.25(b) has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and, as a result, is exempt from further review under CEQA. Specifically, PRC Section 21080.25(b)(1) states that CEQA shall not apply to “pedestrian and bicycle facilities that improve safety, access, or mobility, including new facilities, within the public right-of-way.” Bicycle facilities include, but are not limited to, bicycle parking, bicycle sharing facilities, and bikeways, as defined in Section 890.4 of the Streets and Highways Code. Section 890.4 of the Streets and Highways Code defines these facilities as all facilities that provide primarily for, and promote bicycle travel (e.g., Class I bikeways [bike paths], Class II bikeways [bike lanes], Class III bikeways [bike routes], and Class IV bikeways [cycle tracks]).

The proposed project would improve pedestrian safety, ADA accessibility, and connectivity along a key residential and commercial corridor that links the FHD, Central Business District, and Sutter

Middle School. The proposed project would establish a Class II bike lane along the entire corridor, rehabilitate or reconstruct pavement along Riley Street, and construct sidewalks and other pedestrian safety features to enhance transportation infrastructure and promote mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Due to its nature, the project qualifies for a Statutory Exemption under PRC Section 21080.25(b)(1) and, as a result, would not have a significant effect on the environment.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 11673 – A Resolution Finding the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project Exempt from CEQA Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 and Public Resources Code Section 21080.25
2. CEQA Notice of Exemption report

Submitted,

Rebecca Neves, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR/CITY ENGINEER

Attachment 1

RESOLUTION NO. 11673

**A RESOLUTION FINDING THE RILEY STREET SAFETY IMPROVEMENT
PROJECT EXEMPT FROM CEQA PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES
SECTIONS 15301 AND PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21080.25**

WHEREAS, the City of Folsom has identified the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project as a priority to improve pedestrian safety along the Riley Street corridor; and

WHEREAS, City Council approved Resolution No. 11452 authorizing the City Manager to execute a design and engineering contract with R.E.Y. Engineers, Inc. to prepare project approval and environmental document (PA&ED) for the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project; and

WHEREAS, the design team has prepared environmental technical studies to support the findings; and

WHEREAS, the project has been determined as eligible for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 – Existing Facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, and a Statutory Exemption pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.25; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Folsom finds the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project Exempt from CEQA Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 and Public Resources Code Section 21080.25.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 14th day of July 2026, by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Councilmember(s):
NOES: Councilmember(s):
ABSENT: Councilmember(s):
ABSTAIN: Councilmember(s):

Justin Raithel, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Christa Freemantle, CITY CLERK

Attachment 2

Notice of Exemption

Appendix E

To: Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3044, Room 113
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

County Clerk

County of: Sacramento

3636 American River Drive, Suite 110

Sacramento, CA 95864

From: (Public Agency): City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
(Address)

Project Title: Riley Street Safety Improvement Project

Project Applicant: City of Folsom, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

Project Location - Specific:

Riley Street between Sutter Street and E. Bidwell Street

Project Location - City: Folsom Project Location - County: Sacramento

Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project:

The project includes safety improvements along an approximately 0.5-mile-long segment of Riley Street between Sutter Street and E. Bidwell Street. The project would establish a Class II bike lane, rehabilitate or reconstruct pavement along Riley Street, and construct sidewalks and other pedestrian safety features to enhance transportation infrastructure and promote mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. The project would also include utility improvements and relocation where necessary. See additional pages.

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: City of Folsom, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project: City of Folsom, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

Exempt Status: **(check one):**

- ☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
- ☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));
- ☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
- ☒ Categorical Exemption. State type and section number: Class 1: CEQA Guidelines Sec.15301(b), 15301(c)
- ☒ Statutory Exemptions. State code number: Public Resources Code (PRC) Sec. 21080.25(b)(1)

Reasons why project is exempt:

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15301(b) and (c), the project includes improvements to an existing street, and would not involve a substantial expansion of use; rather, it would provide safer designated spaces for cyclists and pedestrians who already utilize an existing street. Existing overhead and underground utilities within right-of-way (ROW) would be relocated or reconfigured where necessary. None of the exceptions in Sec. 15300.2(a) through (f) would apply. Pursuant to PRC Sec. 21080.25(b)(1), the project would meet the definition of a pedestrian and bicycle facility, and would include safety improvements and new bike facilities within the ROW. It would not induce vehicle trips or add new lanes. None of the excluding criteria in PRC Sec. 21080.25(c), (d), and (e) would apply.

Lead Agency

Contact Person: Rebecca Neves, PE, Public Works Director Area Code/Telephone/Extension: 916.461.6711

If filed by applicant:

1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project? Yes No

Signature: _____ Date: _____ Title: _____

Signed by Lead Agency Signed by Applicant

Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21110, Public Resources Code.
Reference: Sections 21108, 21152, and 21152.1, Public Resources Code.

Date Received for filing at OPR: _____

INTRODUCTION

This report serves as the technical documentation of an environmental analysis for the Riley Street Safety Improvement Project (“proposed project” or “project”) in the City of Folsom (City), Sacramento County (County), California. The project would include the construction of bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway improvements along an approximately 0.5-mile-long segment of Riley Street between Sutter Street and E. Bidwell Street. The intent of the analysis is to document the project’s eligibility for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 – Existing Facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, and a Statutory Exemption pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.25.

However, even where a project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption, the CEQA lead agency may not rely on it if any of the exceptions to the categorical exemptions set forth in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(a) through (f) apply. In addition, PRC Sections 21080.25(c), (d), and (e) establish criteria that projects must meet in order to qualify for a Statutory Exemption. This document also provides an explanation as to why none of the exceptions to a Categorical Exemption apply to the project and that the project would meet the criteria for a Statutory Exemption. This document concludes that the project is eligible for a Categorical Exemption according to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301(b) and 15301(c) and a Statutory Exemption pursuant to PRC Section 21080.25(b)(1).

This document has been prepared per the requirements of CEQA of 1970 (PRC Section 21000, et seq.), and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.) by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) on behalf of the City of Folsom as the CEQA lead agency.

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

In November 2021, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), was passed into law. With the passage of IIJA, the Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending (CPFCDs) program was created to support specific community projects as part of the annual appropriations process. The proposed project is federally funded under the CPFCDs program, which, in the case of the project, is administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Caltrans is the federal lead agency for the project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve pedestrian safety, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, and connectivity along a key residential and commercial corridor that links the Folsom Historic District, Central Business District, and Sutter Middle School. The project is needed to close critical gaps in the pedestrian network, eliminate safety hazards caused by substandard infrastructure, and provide a safe, accessible route for students, residents, and visitors. Additionally, utility improvements are necessary to reduce localized flooding and improve system performance, as identified by the City in recent feasibility studies.

The project improvements would provide safer designated spaces for cyclists and pedestrians through improved connectivity while adhering to pertinent standards, including the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM), Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM), Caltrans Traffic Manual, applicable City standards, and current American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines.

PROJECT LOCATION AND EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located along Riley Street between Sutter Street and E. Bidwell Street in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, California. The project site includes the approximately 0.5-mile-long segment of Riley Street and up to 0.1 mile (520 feet) wide. Project activities may extend up to 15 feet below ground surface (bgs) in limited areas. The project is located within a suburban area and is generally surrounded by residential, commercial, and retail structures. The project site is located within Flood Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard, outside the 100-year flood zone mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 2026). The project site is not in an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or within a mapped landslide or liquefaction zone (DOC 2026). Refer to Figure 1 for the regional location of the project site and Figure 2 for an aerial view of the project site (Note: all figures are located within Appendix A).

Riley Street is an arterial corridor that runs roughly northwest-southeast from Oak Avenue in the southeast to Greenback Lane in the northwest. Within the project alignment, Riley Street consists of two travel lanes (one in each direction) with lane widths varying from approximately 11 feet to over 20 feet. The existing pavement within the project alignment is generally in fair-to-poor condition, with visible alligator cracking and areas of surface deterioration. There are currently no dedicated bicycle facilities, and pedestrian infrastructure is inconsistent, with narrow, damaged, or missing sidewalks, non-ADA-compliant curb ramps, and sections of paved shoulders, asphalt paths, and dirt walkways. The existing roadside environment includes non-native and declining trees, utility poles encroaching into already narrow sidewalks, and light poles and signal cabinets that create barriers to accessible travel. Underground utilities include communication, water, storm drain, sewer, and gas lines, and overhead utilities include electrical and communication. The corridor also experiences localized flooding near Mormon Street, where the existing storm drain system provides limited capacity.

Safety issues are prevalent, particularly during school release times at Sutter Middle School. Site investigations indicated conflicts between pedestrians and motorists at the Riley Street and Persifer Street intersection, where visibility is limited and driver behavior is unpredictable. Additionally, stacked vehicles waiting at the Natoma Street signal obstruct visibility of pedestrians on the southeast corner of Persifer Street.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would establish a Class II bike lane along the entire project alignment, rehabilitate or reconstruct pavement along Riley Street, and construct sidewalks and other pedestrian safety features to enhance transportation infrastructure and promote mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Complete streets enhancements would also be implemented to improve safety, accessibility, and connectivity between Sutter Street and E. Bidwell Street. The project would include:

- New Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant sidewalks and curb ramps along both sides of Riley Street;
- Pedestrian railings and retaining walls where grade differentials exist to improve safety and stability;
- Upgraded pedestrian crossings, including potential installation of a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB) signal at Persifer Street;

- Narrowed vehicle lanes to encourage slower speeds and reduce pedestrian crossing distance;
- Landscaping, public seating, and pedestrian-scale amenities to enhance comfort and streetscape aesthetics; and,
- Drainage, sewer, and water improvements to support long-term flood mitigation goals and rehabilitate existing infrastructure.

In addition, the project would include the relocation and improvement of existing utilities along the project alignment, including adjusting utility boxes, meters, manholes and service lines for adjacent properties as well as partial storm drain and separated sewer line reconstruction. Conduit for future broadband is proposed to be installed as part of this project to a depth of two feet below grade, adjacent to the gutter on both sides of Riley Street. Utility boxes, valve lids, drainage inlets, and manholes would be adjusted as needed to match new grades. To the extent feasible, the project would underground existing overhead communication lines to improve corridor aesthetics, enhance safety, and reduce future maintenance needs.

The proposed project would be constructed primarily within the existing City right-of-way (ROW); however, permanent acquisitions, temporary construction easements, and/or permission to enter and construct would be required in portions of the project alignment. Permanent ROW acquisition would be required for the construction of retaining walls and ADA-compliant ramps. Drainage easements, dedications, temporary construction easements (TCE), and/or permits to enter and construct would be required for the proposed drainage improvements, utility and signage relocation, retaining walls, and frontage improvements/driveway conforms.

TECHNICAL STUDIES

In support of the proposed project, HELIX prepared the following project specific technical studies to substantiate the project's exemption from further CEQA review:

- Arborist Inventory and Reconnaissance-Level Biological Resources Overview, March 2026 (HELIX 2026a).
- Historical Resources Evaluation Report, May 2026 (HELIX 2026b).
- Archaeological Survey Report, May 2026 (HELIX 2026c).
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, June 2026 (HELIX 2026d).
- Air Quality Conformity and Impact Assessment, June 2026 (HELIX 2026e).

The results of the technical studies are summarized below and are hereby incorporated into this report by reference. The project specific technical studies are available for review with the City during normal business hours at the following location:

City of Folsom
Public Works Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

Arborist Inventory and Reconnaissance-Level Biological Resources Overview

HELIX prepared an Arborist Inventory and Reconnaissance-Level Biological Resources Overview (“Biological Evaluation”) for the proposed project in March 2026 (HELIX 2026a). The purpose of the Biological Evaluation was to conduct an inventory of trees and provide a general overview of biological conditions and habitat types present within the project alignment. The evaluation was not intended to constitute a full biological assessment or impact analysis.

Special-Status Species

Lists of special-status species known to occur or with the potential to occur in the project vicinity were obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS; 2026), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS; 2026), and the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB; CDFW 2026). A total of 21 regionally occurring special-status plant species and 31 regionally occurring special-status wildlife species were identified during the database queries and desktop review.

Special-Status Plant Species

No special-status plant species were determined to have the potential to occur in the project alignment or be impacted by the proposed project. Of the 21 regionally occurring special-status plant species, the majority occur in habitats such as oak woodland, wetlands, aquatic habitats, grasslands, or areas with native vegetation and relatively undisturbed soils that do not occur within a majority of the project alignment. The 0.04-acre riparian habitat adjacent to the project alignment has previously been disturbed with the construction of a stormwater drain and consists of non-native or invasive vegetation. No special-status plant species were observed within the riparian habitat and, due to the levels of disturbance, no special-status plant species are expected to occur within the riparian habitat. The riparian habitat is not expected to be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, no significant adverse effect on special-status plants would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

No special-status wildlife species were determined to have the potential to occur in the project alignment or be impacted by the proposed project. There are no reported occurrences of special-status animal species on or adjacent to the Study Area. Of the 31 regionally occurring special-status wildlife species, the majority are associated with aquatic habitats that are not present in the project alignment. The remaining potentially occurring special-status wildlife species are associated with mature or late-successional coniferous forest habitats that do not occur within the project alignment. The 0.04-acre riparian habitat adjacent to the project alignment would be avoided by the project and would result in no impact on the habitat. There is no habitat for any of the regionally occurring special-status wildlife species in the project alignment and, therefore, no significant adverse effect on special-status wildlife species would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Migratory Birds and Raptors

The project alignment and immediate vicinity provide suitable nesting and foraging habitat for nesting migratory birds and raptors that are protected during the nesting season by the California Fish and Game Code (CFGF) and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Nests were not observed during surveys; however, a variety of migratory birds have the potential to nest in and adjacent to the site, in trees, shrubs and on the ground in vegetation. Project activities such as clearing and grubbing during the

avian breeding season (February 1 – August 31) could result in injury or mortality of eggs and chicks directly through destruction or indirectly through forced nest abandonment due to noise and other disturbance. Needless destruction of nests, eggs, and chicks would be a violation of the CFGC. However, standard construction best management practices (BMP), including pre-construction nesting bird surveys, would be implemented as Conditions of Approval to ensure the project would not result in significant adverse effects on migratory birds and raptors.

Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey

Active nests and nesting birds are protected by the California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5, 3513, and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Ground-disturbing and other construction activities, including vegetation clearing, tree removal/trim, and construction, could impact nesting birds if these activities occur during the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31). To avoid impacts to nesting birds, all ground-disturbing activity shall be completed between September 1 and January 31, if feasible. If construction cannot occur outside of the nesting season, the following measures would be implemented during construction:

- If project construction, including ground-disturbing or vegetation clearing and grubbing activities, commence during the avian breeding season (February 1 – August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey no more than 14 days prior to initiation of project activities and again immediately prior to construction. The survey area shall include suitable raptor nesting habitat within 500 feet of the project boundary (inaccessible areas outside of the Study Area can be surveyed from the site or from public roads using binoculars or spotting scopes). Pre-construction surveys are not required in areas where project activities have been continuous since prior to February 1, as determined by a qualified biologist. Areas that have been inactive for more than 14 days during the avian breeding season must be re-surveyed prior to resumption of project activities. If no active nests are identified, no further mitigation is required. If active nests are identified, the following measure is required:
 - A suitable buffer (e.g., up to 500 feet for raptors; 100 feet for passerines) shall be established by a qualified biologist around active nests and no construction activities within the buffer shall be allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (i.e., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest, or the nest has failed). Encroachment into the buffer may occur at the discretion of a qualified biologist. Any encroachment into the buffer shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine whether nesting birds are being impacted. Buffer distances may need to be expanded if the biologist determines that the nest is being impacted by project activities.
- If construction occurs outside of the nesting bird season (September 1 to January 31), a nesting bird survey will not be required.

Aquatic Resources and Sensitive Natural Communities

The project is located approximately 0.35-mile southeast of Lake Natoma in the Lower American hydrologic unit (HUC12: 180201110201). A reconnaissance-level evaluation of aquatic resources was conducted as part of the December 19, 2025, biological survey. The purpose of this evaluation was to identify the presence of potential wetlands, waters of the U.S., waters of the State, or riparian habitat

within or adjacent to the project alignment. No formal wetland delineation or jurisdictional determination was conducted as part of this assessment.

Field observations identified a small, isolated area of riparian vegetation located north of the intersection of Riley Street and Natoma Street (Attachment A, Figure 4, of the Biological Evaluation). This feature comprises approximately 0.04 acre and appears to be associated with a constructed stormwater drainage conveyance and is surrounded by urban development and paved surfaces. The feature is characterized by non-native and ornamental vegetation, limited surface water at the time of survey, cobble and compacted substrate, and hydrologic influence likely associated with localized stormwater runoff. The feature lacks clear connectivity to Lake Natoma or other natural stream systems in the area. The proposed project would avoid construction work within the riparian habitat.

No additional wetlands, streams, ponds, or other aquatic features were observed during the site visit. Indicators of hydric soils and sustained wetland hydrology were not observed within the project alignment outside of the isolated riparian feature described above.

Arborist Inventory

A total of 73 trees are present on or overhanging the Study Area (Attachment A, Figure 3). The trees onsite include three almonds (*Prunus dulcis*), eight American sycamores (*Platanus occidentalis*), three black walnuts (*Juglans nigra*), one blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), four Callery pears (*Pyrus calleryana*), three camphors (*Cinnamomum camphora*), one Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*), one coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), one coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), five crape myrtles (*Lagerstroemia indica*), one English laurel (*Prunus laurocerasus*), one eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus globulus*), one foothill pine (*Pinus sabiniana*), one ginkgo (*Ginkgo biloba*), nine interior live oaks (*Quercus wislizeni*), one Japanese pagoda (*Styphnolobium japonicum*), one Japanese zelkova (*Zelkova serrata*), one liquidambar (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), one London plane (*Platanus × acerifolia*), one Mexican cypress (*Hesperocyparis lusitanica*), three Mexican fan palms (*Washingtonia robusta*), one mulberry (*Morus alba*), seven ornamental olives (*Olea europaea*), one ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), two privets (*Ligustrum lucidum*), one silk tree (*Albizia julibrissin*), six tree of heavens (*Ailanthus altissima*), three valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*), and one dead tree that could not be identified. Trees #1 through #25 were not physically tagged due to inaccessibility.

Of the 73 trees inventoried in and along the project alignment, 29 trees are considered protected by the Folsom Municipal Code. If protected trees would be removed by the proposed project, mitigation will be required per Section 12.16.150 according to the diameter at standard height (DSH) removed as shown in Table 1. Protected trees rated three (3) or above will be mitigated at 1:1 ratio. Trees rated two (2) shall be replaced at a ratio of one-half-inch equivalent for every one inch removed. Protected trees rated zero (0) or one (1) require no replacement or any other mitigation. Mitigation for trees can be done through on-site replacement planting, payment of in-lieu fees of 250 dollars per trunk inch, or a combination thereof.

Table 1: Tree Replacement Equivalency Table

Replacement Tree Size	DSH Replacement Equivalency
A sapling tree	0.5-inch DSH
Tree in container less than 15 gallons	0.5-inch DSH
15-gallon container tree	1-inch DSH
24-inch box tree	2-inch DSH
36-inch box tree	3-inch DSH

DSH = diameter at standard height

The 29 trees protected by the Folsom Municipal Code would require mitigation for their removal based on having a health rating of 5, 4, 3, or 2. None of the protected trees have a health rating of 1. Based on the DSH equivalency ratio, mitigation for a total of 392.3 inches is required if all protected trees subject to mitigation requirements are impacted by the project. Seven trees (Trees #15, 16, 17, 433, 434, 435, and 436) located within or overhanging the riparian corridor adjacent to the project alignment are potentially subject to CFGC Section 1602 and may require permitting through CDFW if they would be removed.

Historical Resources Reports

HELIX prepared a Historical Resources Evaluation Report (HRER) and an Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) for the proposed project in May 2026 (HELIX 2026b and HELIX 2026c). The purpose of the reports is to identify potential cultural and historical resources within the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE), which is approximately 10.84 acres and includes the approximately 0.5-mile-long segment of Riley Street and up to 0.1 mile (520 feet) wide. Project activities may extend up to 15 feet below ground surface (bgs) in limited areas.

Archaeological Resources

During the archaeological field survey, no undocumented cultural resources were found within the project site. The only previously documented archaeological resource within the APE is the Folsom Mining District (P-34-000335; CA-SAC-000308H), a large archaeological district that covers the entire area of Folsom. As is the case in large portions of the City that have seen extensive historic-era and modern development, no archaeological evidence of the district is visible within the APE. No components of the Folsom Mining District and no undocumented archaeological resources were found during the survey. However, in the unlikely event that archaeological cultural resources, and/or human remains or funerary objects are discovered during project construction, the following standard construction BMPs would be implemented as Conditions of Approval.

Accidental Discovery of Cultural Materials

If previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during construction, work will be halted in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. Additional archaeological surveys will be needed if project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits.

Accidental Discovery of Human Remains

If human remains are encountered during construction, work in the immediate area shall be halted within 60 feet of the find and arrangements made to protect the remains in place until their disposition has been arranged according to this section. The treatment of human remains and associated and unassociated funerary objects discovered during any ground-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable federal and State laws. The remains are to be uncovered sufficiently to identify them as human by qualified personnel. If they are so identified, all provisions of California Health and Safety Code Sections 7054 and 7050.5 and Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 5097.9 through 5097.99, as amended per Assembly Bill 2641, will be followed. The qualified archaeologist (should it be different than a Caltrans Archaeologist) will immediately communicate the find to the Caltrans Project Archaeologist, who will contact the Sacramento County Coroner.

In the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American, they will contact the NAHC within 24 hours, who will designate a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC Section 5097.98) to consult with and determine proposed treatment in the case of the discovery of human remains.

Historical Resources

The HRER determined that three resources within the APE (including two previously identified and one newly identified resources) are determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which includes Bridge No. 24C0269 (which carries Figueroa Street over the Riley Ravine Creek), the commercial building at 701 Sutter Street/302 Riley Street (P-34-000962), and the Quonset hut at 701 Bidwell Street. However, all three resources are located outside the Area of Direct Effect (ADE) and would not be impacted by project construction.

Bridge No. 24C0269

Project work would not occur on Bridge No. 24C0269; however, project improvements would occur within ROW in the vicinity of the bridge, including the Figueroa Street approach to Riley Street, and along Riley Street immediately to the northwest and southeast of Figueroa Street. Project work in the vicinity of Bridge No. 24C0269 would include roadway excavation and cold planning of the existing asphalt concrete (AC) surface up to three inches in depth, and overlay of three-inch hot-mix asphalt (HMA). Existing underground utilities would be relocated/reconfigured as needed. A new five-foot-wide pedestrian sidewalk consisting of six-inch-thick Portland cement concrete (PCC) over four-inch-thick aggregate base (AB) would be installed immediately to the northwest and southeast of Figueroa Street to connect to other sidewalks in the area. Work would be limited to areas outside of Bridge No. 24C0269 and would largely occur on previously disturbed areas including roadways and shoulders. Therefore, the proposed project improvements would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of Bridge No. 24C0269.

Resource P-34-000962

Resource P-34-000962 at 701 Sutter Street/302 Riley Street is located on APN 070-0105-012, which is outside of but immediately adjacent to the APE and ADE. Project work would not occur on this property; however, project improvements would occur along Riley Street in the vicinity of this resource. Project work would include cold planning of the existing AC surface up to three inches in depth and removal of a

portion of the existing sidewalk along the southwestern side of Riley Street. The sidewalk would be reconstructed with six-inch-thick PCC over four-inch-thick AB and would connect in the southwest with the new sidewalk near Figueroa Street, as described in the paragraph above. Existing underground utilities will be relocated/reconfigured as needed. Work would be limited to areas outside of this property. Therefore, the proposed project improvements would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of Resource P-34-000962.

Quonset Hut

The Quonset hut at 701 Bidwell Street is located on APN 071-0156-013, which is within the APE but outside of the ADE. Project work would not occur within this property; however, a temporary construction easement (TCE) would be required for the construction of frontage improvements and driveway conforms for the property's driveway onto Bidwell Street. Project work in the vicinity of the property would include demolition of the existing concrete sidewalk and a portion of the existing sidewalk along the corner of Bidwell Street and Riley Street. The sidewalk would be reconstructed with six-inch-thick PCC over four-inch-thick AB and would be reconfigured to connect with the existing sidewalk. No permanent acquisition of this property would be required, and no project work would occur on this property. Therefore, the proposed project improvements would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Quonset hut.

Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment

HELIX prepared a Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment for the proposed project in June 2026 (HELIX 2026d). The purpose of the noise assessment was to evaluate potential noise and vibration impacts associated with project construction, as well as to identify existing noise sources in the project vicinity. As the project would result in a substantial change to existing traffic volumes or flows on City streets during operation, operational traffic noise was not evaluated.

Construction Noise Generation

The closest existing noise-sensitive land uses (NSLUs) to the project site are single-family residences with buildings located as close as 20 feet from the nearest travel lane on Riley Street, or approximately 40 feet from the roadway centerline. Using methodology from the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual, Option A for a quantitative construction noise assessment, construction equipment is assumed to operate at the center of the project, and the two noisiest pieces of construction equipment are assumed to operate concurrently in close proximity to each other (FTA 2018). The two noisiest pieces of construction equipment that could be used concurrently would be a jack hammer and a concrete saw used during demolition. Using the Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), the combined noise of a jackhammer and a concrete saw at 40 feet would be 87.2 dBA LEQ. This noise level would exceed the City exterior noise standards of 50 dBA daytime and 45 dBA nighttime. However, daytime construction noise (7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends) is exempt from the City's Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.42 of the Folsom Municipal Code).

It is likely that the project would require temporary nighttime construction work for reasons including avoiding traffic congestion, maintaining emergency access, and worker safety. Therefore, to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance, the City would be required to follow the variance process per Section 8.42.090 (including approval by the City Council) to allow nighttime construction work. Therefore, the

project would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project exceeding standards established in the City General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Nighttime construction work is a common requirement for planned roadway projects due to traffic congestion and safety concerns. Therefore, nighttime construction is not an unusual circumstance per CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(c) that would preclude the project from qualifying for a CEQA categorical exemption. Although project construction would not generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels exceeding the City's Noise Ordinance for the reasons discussed above, as Conditions of Approval, the project would implement standard construction noise reduction measures to minimize noise disturbances:

Construction Noise Reduction Measures

1. Noise Shielding and Muffling: Power construction equipment (including combustion engines and pneumatic equipment), fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with noise shielding and muffling devices consistent with manufacturers' standards or the Best Available Control Technology. All equipment shall be properly maintained, and the construction contractor shall keep documentation on-site during any earthwork or construction activities demonstrating that the equipment has been maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.
2. Enclosure or Screening of Stationary Equipment: All outdoor stationary equipment (e.g., generators, compressors) shall be enclosed or visually screened. The equipment enclosure or screen shall be impermeable (i.e., solid material with minimum weight of 2 pounds per square feet) and break the line of sight between the equipment and any offsite noise-sensitive uses.
3. Location of Construction Staging Areas: Construction staging areas shall be located as far from noise-sensitive uses as reasonably possible and technically feasible in consideration of site boundaries, topography, intervening roads and uses, and operational constraints. The burden of proving what constitutes "as reasonably possible and technically feasible" shall be upon the construction contractor, in consideration of the above factors.
4. Temporary Walls: Noise barriers, such as temporary walls (minimum one half inch thick plywood) or sound blankets (minimum Sound Transmission Class [STC] 25 rating), that are a minimum of eight feet tall and have no gaps or holes (including between the barrier and the ground), shall be erected between construction activities and noise-sensitive uses as reasonably possible and technically feasible in consideration of site boundaries, topography, intervening roads and uses, and operational constraints. The burden of proving that compliance is technically infeasible shall be upon the construction contractor. Technical infeasibility shall mean that noise barriers cannot be located between construction activities and noise-sensitive uses due to site boundaries, topography, intervening roads and uses, and/or operational constraints.
5. Notification: The City or designated contractor shall provide written notification of nighttime work to all residences located within 300 feet of the proposed work. The notification shall:
 - a. Be delivered a minimum of 48 hours prior to commencement of nighttime work;
 - b. Include the days and hours of upcoming nighttime work; and

- c. Include noise complaint contact information, including phone numbers and email addresses to register noise complaints with both the construction contractor and the City.
- d. The City and the construction contractor shall log all received noise complaints. The construction contractor shall submit to the City a daily log of all noise complaints received, including the date and time of the complaint and address of the complainant (if provided). The City shall work with the construction contractor to respond to noise complaints and limit nighttime work and locations of noise generating equipment to the extent feasible.

Construction Ground Vibration

Construction activities known to generate excessive ground-borne vibration, such as pile driving or blasting, would not be conducted during project construction. The piece of construction equipment with the highest typical vibration level that would be used during project construction activities would be a vibratory roller. A vibratory roller could be used within 20 feet of the closest off-site structure, a single-family residential building east of the project building site. For assessing potential building damage, a large vibratory roller would create approximately 0.210 inch per second peak particle velocity (PPV) at a distance of 25 feet (FTA 2018). A 0.210 inch per second PPV vibration level would equal 0.27 inch per second PPV at a distance of 20 feet.¹ This level would be lower than the structural damage impact of 0.3 inches per second PPV for timber and masonry structures. Therefore, the project would not result in excessive ground-borne vibration levels. However, a vibration level of 0.27 inches per second PPV is equivalent to 96.5 VdB, which would exceed the City's General Plan standard of 80 VdB for disturbance of vibration-sensitive land uses. As Conditions of Approval, the project would implement standard construction vibration reduction measures to minimize vibration disturbances:

Construction Vibration Reduction Measure

The designated contractor shall ensure that vibratory rollers are used in static mode only (no vibrations) when operating within 120 feet of an occupied residence.

Air Quality Conformity and Impact Assessment

HELIX prepared an Air Quality Conformity and Impact Assessment for the proposed project in June 2026 (HELIX 2026e). The purpose of the air quality assessment was to evaluate the federal air quality conformity and potential air quality impacts associated with project construction. As the project would not result in a substantial change to existing traffic volumes or flows on City streets during operation, project operational emissions were not calculated.

Criteria Pollutants and Air Quality Plans

The project site is located within the Sacramento County portion of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). 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

¹ Equipment PPV = Reference PPV * (25/D)ⁿ (inches per second), where Reference PPV is PPV at 25 feet, D is distance from equipment to the receiver in feet, and n = 1.1 (the value related to the attenuation rate through the ground); formula from Caltrans 2020. VdB = 20 * Log(PPV/4/10⁻⁶)

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) at the regional level. Sacramento County is in non-attainment for ozone (ozone precursors reactive organic compounds [ROGs; also known as volatile organic compounds [VOCs]²), and oxides of nitrogen [NO_x] and particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM_{2.5}) and 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and/or California ambient air quality standards (CAAQs). SMAQMD recommends lead agencies require implementation of the following Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (BCECPs; SMAQMD 2019), which would be implemented as Conditions of Approval for the project:

Basic Construction Emission Control Practices

- 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 should 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 miles per hour (mph);
- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, and parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should 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 time of idling to 5 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.

The project's construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2022.1.1.44. Modeling assumptions for the project includes implementation of the fugitive dust control measures included in the SMAQMD's BCECPs. The modeling results indicate that construction emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors would not exceed the SMAQMD significance thresholds, as summarized in Table 2 below.

² 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.

Table 2: Maximum Daily Construction Emissions

Activity	ROG (lbs./day)	NO _x (lbs./day)	CO (lbs./day)	SO _x (lbs./day)	PM ₁₀ (lbs./day)	PM _{2.5} (lbs./day)
Grubbing, Land Clearing, & Demolition	1.5	12.6	19.2	<0.1	1.8	0.6
Grading & Excavation	1.7	154	21.7	<0.1	1.7	0.7
Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	1.6	11.4	19.5	<0.1	0.7	0.4
Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade plus Sidewalks, Retaining Walls, & Paving	3.2	22.8	36.4	<0.1	1.7	1.0
Sidewalks, Retaining Walls, & Paving	1.6	10.8	17.4	<0.1	1.1	0.5
Installation of Signals	0.7	6.3	8.7	<0.1	0.3	0.2
Road Striping	4.4	4.2	6.3	<0.1	0.2	0.2
Maximum Daily Emissions	4.4	22.8	36.4	<0.1	1.8	1.0
<i>SMAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>80¹</i>	<i>82¹</i>
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod; Thresholds: SMAQMD 2020a

¹ SMAQMD PM thresholds are zero unless all feasible Best Available Control Practices/Best Management Practices are applied. lbs./day = pounds per day; ROG = reactive organic gas; NO_x = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter

SMAQMD recommends a set of BCECPs, considered by the SMAQMD to be feasible for controlling fugitive dust from a construction site. The practices also serve as best management practices, allowing the use of the non-zero PM significance thresholds. The SMAQMD recommends lead agencies to enforce implementation emission control practices via mitigation, conditions of project approval, or project construction contract specifications. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which Sacramento Region is non-attainment.

In accordance with SMAQMD's CEQA Guide, construction-generated NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, and operational-generated ROG and NO_x (ozone precursors) are used to determine consistency with the Regional Ozone Plan. The Guide states (SMAQMD 2020b, p. 4-6):

By exceeding the District's mass emission thresholds for operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}, the project would be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the District's air quality planning efforts.

As discussed above, the project's construction-generated emissions of NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, ROG and NO_x would not exceed SMAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of SMAQMD's Regional Ozone Plan.

Pollutant Concentrations

Project construction would use heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, portable generators, and construction worker vehicles, which could generate toxic air contaminants (TAC), specifically diesel particulate matter (DPM). Generation of DPM from construction projects typically occurs in a localized area (e.g., at the project site) for a short period of time. Because construction activities and subsequent emissions vary depending on the construction activity, the construction-related emissions to which nearby receptors are exposed would also vary throughout the construction period. During some equipment-intensive phases such as demolition and grading, construction-related emissions would be higher than other less equipment-intensive phases such installation of signals. In addition, due to the

linear nature of the project, construction would not be concentrated near any single sensitive receptor location for extended periods.

The dose (of TAC) to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance in the environment and the extent of exposure a person has with the substance; a longer exposure period to a fixed quantity of emissions would result in higher health risks. Current models and methodologies for conducting cancer health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods (typically 30 years for individual residents based on guidance from Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment [OEHHA]) and are best suited for evaluation of long duration TAC emissions with predictable schedules and locations. These assessment models and methodologies do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. Cancer potency factors are based on animal lifetime studies or worker studies where there is long-term exposure to the carcinogenic agent. There is considerable uncertainty in trying to evaluate the cancer risk from projects that will only last a small fraction of a lifetime (OEHHA 2015). Considering this information, the short duration of construction activities and the linear nature of the project, construction of the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including DPM.

Other Emissions and Odors

Odors associated with diesel exhaust and ROG from application of asphalt and architectural coatings would be emitted during project construction. 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. Further, construction activities would be temporary. According to SMAQMD, typical land uses which could generate significant odor impacts include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, composting/green waste facilities, recycling facilities, petroleum refineries, chemical manufacturing plants, painting/coating operations, rendering plants, and food packaging plants (SMAQMD 2016). The project would not include any of these land uses. Therefore, the project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

CLASS 1 CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION

Per Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Class 1 Categorical Exemption consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of existing or former use. Subsection (b) applies to existing facilities of both investor and publicly owned utilities used to provide electric power, natural gas, sewerage, or other public utility services. Subsection (c) applies to existing streets, sidewalks, gutters, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and similar facilities (this includes road grading for the purpose of public safety), and other alterations such as the addition of bicycle facilities, including but not limited to bicycle parking, bicycle-share facilities and bicycle lanes, transit improvements such as bus lanes, pedestrian crossings, street trees, and other similar alterations that do not create additional automobile lanes.

The proposed bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway improvements, as well as the utility relocation and improvements, would be eligible for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption under Sections 15301(b) and 15301(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed project would not involve a substantial expansion of use; rather, the project aims to provide safer designated spaces for cyclists and pedestrians who already

utilize Riley Street. As documented in this report, and substantiated by the technical studies prepared for the project, the proposed project would result in no significant impacts to the environment and would be exempt from CEQA review.

Exceptions to the Categorical Exemption

The applicability of all Categorical Exemptions is qualified by the exceptions listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(a) through (f). In the discussion below, each exception is followed by an explanation of why the exception would not apply to the proposed project.

Exception 15300.2(a): Location.

(a) Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located – a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply in all instances, except where the project may impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, State, or local agencies.

A Class 1 Categorical Exemption is not subject to this exception. Nevertheless, as documented in this report, the project would not result in impacts related to an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern. Therefore, this exception to a Categorical Exemption would not apply to the proposed project.

Exception 15300.2(b): Cumulative Impact.

(b) All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

The proposed project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts that would be cumulatively considerable when viewed in conjunction with other cumulative projects in the City. The proposed project would not involve a substantial expansion of use; rather, the project aims to provide safer designated spaces for cyclists and pedestrians who already utilize Riley Street. Furthermore, the effects of the proposed project would generally be beneficial, as the proposed project would provide pedestrian, bicyclist, and roadway improvements. The project would close critical gaps in the pedestrian network, eliminate safety hazards caused by substandard infrastructure, and provide a safe, accessible route for students, residents, and visitors. Additionally, utility improvements are necessary to reduce localized flooding and improve system performance, as identified by the City in recent feasibility studies. No other projects are anticipated to occur in the immediate area of the proposed project at the same time. Therefore, the project's contributions to potential cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and this exception to a Categorical Exemption would not apply to the proposed project.

Exception 15300.2(c): Significant Effect.

(c) A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

As explained in *Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley* (2015) 60 Cal.4th 1086 (Berkeley Hillside), a two-part test applies to determine whether an unusual circumstance is present that excludes

use of a categorical exemption. This two-part test requires the lead agency to first consider whether there are unusual circumstances ("whether a particular project presents circumstances that are unusual for projects in an exempt class is an essentially factual inquiry, founded on the application of the fact-finding tribunal's experience with the mainsprings of human conduct.") This inquiry is subject to the substantial evidence standard of review, which means that all evidentiary conflicts must be resolved in the agency's favor and all legitimate and reasonable inferences must be made to uphold the agency's finding. Second, if a lead agency finds an unusual circumstance exists, the lead agency next asks if there is a reasonable possibility of a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. If this second inquiry is necessary, the lead agency applies the "fair argument" standard of review to determine whether the project may have a significant impact on the environment. In establishing this bifurcated test, the Court emphasized that circumstances do not become unusual merely because a fair argument can be made that they might have a significant effect. For environmental impacts to constitute an unusual circumstance, the lead agency must determine based on substantial evidence that the project will have a significant environmental effect.

The proposed project would establish a Class II bike lane, rehabilitate or reconstruct pavement, and construct sidewalks and other pedestrian safety features along an approximately 0.5-mile-long segment of Riley Street to enhance transportation infrastructure and promote mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Riley Street along the project segment is currently a two-lane road, and would continue to operate as a two-lane road following construction of the project improvements. The project would not induce single-occupancy vehicle trips, would not create additional vehicle lanes, and would not include the addition of other infrastructure that would increase automobile capacity along the project alignment. In addition, the project would not introduce new types of facilities, unusual design features, unprecedented processes, or development in an environmentally sensitive or hazardous location. Furthermore, to apply to a project, the unusual circumstance exception requires findings of both unusual circumstances and a potentially significant effect. As discussed under *Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, nighttime construction work is a common requirement for planned roadway projects due to traffic congestion and safety concerns, and would not be considered an unusual circumstance. As no unusual circumstances are present, the City is not required to analyze the second inquiry further. Nevertheless, this analysis also demonstrates that the proposed project would not have the potential to result in any significant environmental impacts. For these reasons, the unusual circumstances exception is not applicable to the project.

Exception 15300.2(d): Scenic Highways:

- (d) A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.*

There are no officially designated State Scenic Highways in the City or other important scenic resources in the vicinity of the project. The nearest officially designated State Scenic Highway to the project site is a segment of U.S. Highway (US) 50 located approximately 19 miles to the east in the City of Placerville (Caltrans 2026). Due to distance, the project site is not visible from US 50. Therefore, the proposed project would not damage scenic resources within a designated State Scenic Highway, and this exception to a Categorical Exemption would not apply to the project.

Exception 15300.2(e): Hazardous Waste Sites.

(e) A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

The following databases were reviewed for the project site and surrounding area to identify potential hazardous contamination sites: the SWRCB's GeoTracker database (SWRCB 2026), California Department of Toxic Substance Control's (DTSC's) EnviroStor database (DTSC 2026); and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA's) Superfund National Priorities List (USEPA 2026). According to the GeoTracker database, a closed leaking underground storage tank (LUST) associated with a Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD) transportation facility is located on the northern side of E. Bidwell Street; however, this case was closed in July 2010 and requires no further remedial action (DTSC 2026). Therefore, based on the results of the databases reviewed, the project is not located on an active hazardous materials site included on a list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code. This exception to a Categorical Exemption would not apply to the proposed project.

Exception 15300.2(f): Historical Resources.

(f) A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Structures, sites, buildings, districts, and objects over 50 years of age can be listed in the NRHP as significant historical resources. Resources eligible for the NRHP are automatically listed on the CRHR. Historical resources are further defined as "a resource listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources" (PRC Section 5024.1; 14 CCR 15064.5).

As previously mentioned, the HRER identified three cultural resources within the APE and determined them to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, which includes Bridge No. 24C0269 (which carries Figueroa Street over the Riley Ravine Creek), the commercial building at 701 Sutter Street/302 Riley Street (P-34-000962), and the Quonset hut at 701 Bidwell Street. However, all three resources are located outside of the project's ADE. The proposed project improvements would not result in an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and this exception to a Categorical Exemption would not apply to the proposed project.

PRC SECTION 21080.25 STATUTORY EXEMPTION DETERMINATION

Senate Bill (SB) 288, signed in 2020, created PRC Section 21080.25, which establishes Statutory Exemptions for projects related to the institution or increase of public mass transit, including bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, and passenger rail, or commuter services, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This list of projects established in PRC Section 21080.25(b) have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and, as a result, are exempt from further review under CEQA. Specifically, PRC Section 21080.25(b)(1) states that CEQA shall not apply to "pedestrian and bicycle facilities that improve safety, access, or mobility, including new facilities, within the public right-of-way." Bicycle facilities include, but is not limited to, bicycle parking, bicycle sharing facilities, and bikeways, as defined in Section 890.4 of the Streets and Highways Code. Section 890.4 of the Streets and Highways Code defines these facilities as all facilities that provide primarily for, and promote bicycle travel (e.g., Class I bikeways [bike paths], Class II bikeways [bike lanes], Class III bikeways [bike routes], and Class IV bikeways [cycle tracks]).

The proposed project would improve pedestrian safety, ADA accessibility, and connectivity along a key residential and commercial corridor that links the FHD, Central Business District, and Sutter Middle School. The proposed project would establish a Class II bike lane along the entire corridor, rehabilitate or reconstruct pavement along Riley Street, and construct sidewalks and other pedestrian safety features to enhance transportation infrastructure and promote mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Due to its nature, the project qualifies for a Statutory Exemption under PRC Section 21080.25(b)(1) and, as a result, would not have a significant effect on the environment.

Statutory Exemption Criteria

In addition to meeting the definition of statutorily exempt projects established in PRC Section 21080.25, the project must meet specific criteria stipulated in PRC Sections 21080.25(c), (d), and (e), in order to meet a Statutory Exemption under PRC Section 21080.25(b)(1). However, the criteria listed in PRC Sections 21080.25(d) and (e) apply to projects that exceed one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) and fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000), respectively, based on the project engineer's cost estimate at the time the local agency takes an action. As the cost of the proposed project would not exceed approximately twenty three million dollars (\$23,000,000), these two criteria do not apply to the project and are not discussed further in this document. In the discussion below, each of the three criterion under PRC Section 21080.25(c) is followed by an explanation as to why the proposed project would meet it.

Criterion 21080.25(c)(1):

(A) A local agency is carrying out the project and is the lead agency for the project; and

(B) The lead agency shall take an action to approve a project as follows:

(i) The lead agency's governing board shall take an action at a public meeting.

(ii) Notwithstanding clause (i), if a lead agency has an alternative project approval process for a project subject to subdivision (b), it may instead follow that alternative process.

Local agencies include a public transit operator, city, county, city and county, special district, joint powers authority, local or regional transportation agency, or congestion management agency. The City of Folsom is the local agency for the proposed project and is the CEQA lead agency. The City of Folsom City Council is the governing board that will take action to approve the proposed project at a regularly scheduled City Council meeting. Following project approval, the City will file a Notice of Exemption with the State Clearinghouse and Sacramento County Clerk's office. Therefore, the proposed project would meet this criterion pursuant to PRC Section 21080.25(c)(1), subsections (A) and (B).

Criterion 21080.25(c)(2):

(2) The project does not induce single-occupancy vehicle trips, add additional highway lanes, widen highways, or add physical infrastructure or striping to highways except for minor modifications needed for the efficient and safe movement of transit vehicles, bicycles, or high-occupancy vehicles, such as extended merging lanes, shoulder improvements, or improvements to the roadway within the existing right of way. The project shall not include the addition of any auxiliary lanes.

The proposed project would improve pedestrian safety, ADA accessibility, and connectivity along a key residential and commercial corridor that links the FHD, Central Business District, and Sutter Middle School. The proposed project would establish a Class II bike lane along the entire corridor, rehabilitate or reconstruct pavement along Riley Street, and construct sidewalks and other pedestrian safety features to enhance transportation infrastructure and promote mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. The proposed improvements and modifications to Riley Street would not induce single-occupancy vehicle trips, would not create additional vehicle lanes, and would not include the addition of other infrastructure that would increase automobile capacity along the project alignment. Therefore, the proposed project would meet this criterion pursuant to PRC Section 21080.25(c)(2).

Criterion 21080.25(c)(3):

(3) The construction of the project shall not require the demolition of affordable housing units.

The project would not require the demolition of affordable housing units or other structures within the project alignment. Therefore, the proposed project would meet this criterion pursuant to PRC Section 21080.25(c)(3).

CONCLUSION

Based on substantial evidence and the analysis above, none of the exceptions to a Categorical Exemption set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(a) through (f) would apply to the proposed project. The proposed project would meet the criteria for a Statutory Exemption set forth in PRC Section 21080.25(c). Therefore, the proposed project is exempt from environmental review under CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 and PRC Section 21080.25.

REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2026. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Accessed May 11 at:

<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/eqzapp/>.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2026. EnviroStor Map. Accessed May 11 at:

<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Riley+Street%2C+Folsom>.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2026. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed May 11 at:

<https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>.

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2026. GeoTracker Map. Accessed May 11 at:

<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Riley+Street+Folsom>.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2026. National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Layer.

Accessed May 11 at: <https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd>.

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.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX). 2026a. Arborist Inventory and Biological Resources Evaluation. March 17.

2026b. Historical Resources Evaluation Report. May.

2026c. Archaeological Survey Report. May.

2026d. Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. June 25.

2026e. Air Quality Conformity and Impact Assessment. June 25.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. February. Available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/cnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf>.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020a. SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance Table. Revised April. Available at: <https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/CH2ThresholdsTable4-2020.pdf>.

2020b. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County Chapter 4, Operational Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions. Available at: <https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch4OperationalFinal10-2020.pdf>.

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

2016. Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County Chapter 7, Odors. Available at: <https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/Ch7Odors%20FINAL6-2016.pdf>.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2026. Superfund National Priorities List (NPL) Where You Live Map. Accessed May 11 at: <https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=33cebcdfdd1b4c3a8b51d416956c41f1>.

*This page is intentionally left blank
to facilitate double-sided printing
and minimize paper use.*



CITY OF
FOLSOM
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE