



Second Floor
1311 s.f.

Floor Plan
4 Bedrooms + Loft
3 Baths
2300 s.f.





Second Floor
1311 s.f.




First Floor
989 s.f.

Lot Coverage Calculations 3C
 First Floor 989 Sq. Ft.
 Garage 420 Sq. Ft.
 Porch 48 Sq. Ft.
 Total: 1457 Sq. Ft.
 Total Building Coverage 50%



Second Floor
1311 s.f.



First Floor
989 s.f.

Lot Coverage Calculations 3B
 First Floor 989 Sq. Ft.
 Garage 420 Sq. Ft.
 Porch 48 Sq. Ft.
 Total: 1457 Sq. Ft.
 Total Building Coverage 50%

SPANISH COLONIAL
 Characterized by simply articulated
 details and adaptability

DESIGN ELEMENTS



Two Story Massing
 Stucco Exterior Finish
 Villa Shaped Concrete Tile
 Gently Pitched Roofs

ENHANCED DESIGN ELEMENTS

Corbel Details
 Shutters
 Faux Clay Outlookers




Front Elevations - 3A - Spanish Colonial




Right Elevation



Rear Elevation



Left Elevation



Rear at Enhanced Lots



EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS - PLAN 3A

WESTERN FARMHOUSE
 Characterized by an asymmetrical, casual cottage look. It represents a practical and picturesque country home.

DESIGN ELEMENTS



Two Story Massing
 Stucco Exterior Finish
 Flat Concrete Tile
 Steeper Pitched Roofs

ENHANCED DESIGN ELEMENTS

Board and Batt
 Shutters




Front Elevations - 3B - Western Farmhouse




Right Elevation



Rear Elevation



Left Elevation



Rear at Enhanced Lots



Architecture + Planning
 The Leaning Tower Building
 1814 Fremont St., Suite 400
 Oakland, CA, 94612
 510.272.2010
 ktgy.com



CREEKSTONE
 PO BOX 604
 # 20-10-1000

SCHEMATIC DESIGN
 22800 14th St



EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS - PLAN 3B

ITALIAN VILLA
 Characterized by a formal and elegant facade.

DESIGN ELEMENTS


Two Story Massing
 Stucco Exterior Finish
 Villa Shaped Concrete Tile
 Gently Pitched Roofs

ENHANCED DESIGN ELEMENTS


Corbels
 Stone Veneer
 Faux Clay Outlookers



Front Elevations - 3C - Italian Villa




ROOF PLAN 3C
 1/8" = 1'-0"



Right Elevation



Rear Elevation



Left Elevation



Rear at Enhanced Lots



Architecture + Planning
 The Leavenworth Building
 1814 Franklin St., Suite 400
 Oakland, CA 94612
 510.272.2910
 ktgy.com



CREEKSTONE
 105,000 CA # 2014-0016

SCHEMATIC DESIGN
 FEBRUARY 24, 2020



EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS - PLAN 3C




Right Elevation - 3A
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



Rear Elevation - 3A
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



Left Elevation - 3A
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



ROOF PLAN 3A
OPTION 3
12' x 12' x 12'




Right Elevation - 3B
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



Rear Elevation - 3B
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



Left Elevation - 3B
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



ROOF PLAN 3B
OPTION 3
12' x 12' x 12'




Right Elevation - 3C
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



Rear Elevation - 3C
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



Left Elevation - 3C
Opt. Covered Outdoor Room



ROOF PLAN 3C
OPTION 3
12' x 12' x 12'




Architecture + Planning
The Leavenworth Building
1814 Franklin St., Suite 400
Oakland, CA 94612
916.772.2815
ktgy.com



CREEKSTONE
POULSON GA 47018-0988

SCHEMATIC DESIGN
P2888-0774A.001



OPT. OUTDOOR ROOMS - PLAN 3

A3.5

MANUFACTURERS
 Sherwin Williams Paint
 Eagle Roofing
 Eldorado Stone
 Boral Stone
 ORCO Blended Product

	SCHEME 1A	SCHEME 2A	SCHEME 3A	SCHEME 4A	SCHEME 5B	SCHEME 6B	SCHEME 7B	SCHEME 8B
STUCCO BODY	SW 7181 GREY VILLA	SW 7288 STUCCO	SW 7342 NATURAL	SW 7327 MANTUCKET OMBE	SW 7711 NATURAL CHOICE	SW 7541 OREGAN FERRY	SW 7342 NATURAL	SW 7170 ACER
FASCIA / EAVE / GARAGE DOORS / GABLE SIDING / SIDING TRIM / SHUTTERS / ALL TRIMS	SW 7034 BUTTABLE BROWN	SW 7017 PORPOISE	SW 7254 STATUS BRONZE	SW 7380 ATTITUDE GRAY	SW 7081 NIGHT OWL	SW 7383 ROYALTY GRABER	SW 7053 ADAPTIVE SHADE	SW 6208 HERON PLUM
GARAGE DOORS	SW 7034 BUTTABLE BROWN	SW 7017 PORPOISE	SW 7254 STATUS BRONZE	SW 7380 ATTITUDE GRAY	SW 7081 NIGHT OWL	SW 7383 ROYALTY GRABER	SW 6208 HERON PLUM	SW 6208 HERON PLUM
FRONT DOORS	SW 7081 NIGHT OWL	SW 6261 TAMBARA	SW 2841 ROCKWOOD BLUE GREEN	SW 7383 ROYALTY GRABER	SW 7081 NIGHT OWL	SW 2843 ROYALTY GRABER	SW 7053 ADAPTIVE SHADE	SW 6208 HERON PLUM
SHUTTERS	SW 7034 BUTTABLE BROWN	SW 7017 PORPOISE	SW 7254 STATUS BRONZE	SW 7380 ATTITUDE GRAY	SW 7081 NIGHT OWL	SW 7383 ROYALTY GRABER	SW 7053 ADAPTIVE SHADE	SW 7383 ROYALTY GRABER
FAUX CLAY OUTLOOKERS	SW 6261 TAMBARA	SW 6261 TAMBARA	SW 6261 TAMBARA	SW 6261 TAMBARA	SW 7081 NIGHT OWL	SW 7383 ROYALTY GRABER	SW 7053 ADAPTIVE SHADE	SW 7383 ROYALTY GRABER
ROOF MATERIAL - CONCRETE TILE 3" TILE	SW46 CAPSTRAND MARBLE BLEND	SW38 CAPSTRAND PEDESTAL BLEND	SW38B CAPSTRAND TUCSON BLEND	SW48 CAPSTRAND LUNNEY BLEND	SW6 PONDROSA PEPPER BRICK BLEND	SW7 PONDROSA BROWN OAK BLEND	SW5 PONDROSA FAIR GRAY FLASHES	SW2 PONDROSA COCOA BLEND
BRICK / BRICK MORTAR	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK	SW4 BRICK - 2297 BRICK



Architecture + Planning
 The Leaning Tower Building
 1818 Franklin St. Suite 400
 Oakland, CA 94612
 510.272.2019
 www.kitgy.com



CREEKSTONE
 FOLSOM, CA • 916.954.0244

SCHEMATIC DESIGN
 FEBRUARY 24, 2020



COLOR / MATERIAL SCHEMES

A4.0

MANUFACTURERS
 Sherwin Williams Paint
 Eagle Roofing
 Eldorado Stone
 Boral Stone
 ORCO Blended Products

	SCHEME 9C	SCHEME 10C	SCHEME 11C	SCHEME 12C
STUCCO BODY	 SW 7516 KESTREL WHITE	 SW 6157 FAVORITE TAN	 SW 6151 SANDS OF TIME	 SW 7020 CORN WEDGE
FASCIA / EAVES / GARAGE DOORS / GABLE SIDING / SIDING TRIM / BOARDS / ALL TRIMS	 SW 6005 UTRECHT BEIGE	 SW 7013 NORRY LACE	 SW 7516 KESTREL WHITE	 SW 7510 WHITE DUST
GARAGE DOORS	 SW 7018 CALMANT GRAY	 SW 7013 NORRY LACE	 SW 7516 KESTREL WHITE	 SW 7022 ADAPTIVE SHADE
FRONT DOORS	 SW 7000 BLACK FOX	 SW 6201 THUNDEROUS	 SW 7041 VAN DYKE BROWN	 SW 6120 LAMBER BLEND
FAUX CLAY OUTLOOKERS	 SW 6001 TANGAR	 SW 6001 TANGAR	 SW 6001 TANGAR	 SW 6001 TANGAR
ROOF MATERIAL - CONCRETE TILE 3" x 18"	 3600 CAPSTRAND LAMBERT BLEND	 3600 CAPSTRAND LAMBERT BLEND	 3900 CAPSTRAND SUNSET BLEND	 322808 CAPSTRAND TURCOAN BLEND
STONE / STONE MORTAR	 CAST-PT. FRENCH GRAY SMOKE	 LONGITUDE 34- BROADRIFT SOFT WHITE	 CAST-PT. PARCHMENT SMOKE	 LONGITUDE 34- BROADRIFT SOFT WHITE



Architecture + Planning
 The Leaning Tower Building
 1818 Poplar St., Suite 900
 Oakland, CA 94612
 510.272.2519
 ktgy.com



CREEKSTONE
 700 BORN CA © 2014-2008

SCHEMATIC DESIGN
 FEBRUARY 24, 2020



COLOR / MATERIAL SCHEMES

Attachment 8

**Exterior Color/Materials Specifications
Dated January 10, 2020**



CREEKSTONE
FOUSOM, CA

PLANNING SUBMITTAL Exterior Color/Material Design

01.10.2020



AT DESIGN CONSULTING, INC
2211 Michelson Drive Suite 450 Irvine, CA 92612
P: 949.724.1619 WWW.ATDESIGNCONSULTING.COM

© Copyright - AT Design Consulting Inc. www.atdesignconsulting.com



All samples are approximate. All photo images only represent the general characteristics and colors of the materials, but may not satisfactorily represent the actual color/material or availability at the time of construction.

In our continuing efforts to improve our communities, these specifications are subject to change without notice. Some colors on this form may be shown with upgrades.



CREEKSTONE
FOLSOM, CA

Exterior Color/Material Design





Exterior Color + Material Specifications

These color / material specifications and creative design concepts are the intellectual property of AT Design Consulting, a California Corporation.

This creative work is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. The use of these materials is restricted.

These materials are intended for the use within this specific project only during the course of development and may not be used for any other reason without the expressed written authorization of AT Design Consulting, Inc.

AT Design Consulting, Inc. is responsible for aesthetic choices. All colors and materials listed are for color purposes only. Manufacturer for all products will be designated and appointed by Client.

All unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of these materials is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or reproductions will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

© AT Design Consulting, Inc.



TABLE of CONTENTS

Planning Submittal - 01.10.20 | 4

REVISIONS	5
MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS FOR PAINTING	6
EXTERIOR COLOR + MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS	7
Elevation A, Spanish Colonial	7
Scheme 1	7
Scheme 2	8
Scheme 3	9
Scheme 4	10
Elevation B, Western Farmhouse	11
Scheme 5	11
Scheme 6	12
Scheme 7	13
Scheme 8	14
Elevation C, Italian Villa	15
Scheme 9	15
Scheme 10	16
Scheme 11	17
Scheme 12	18

REVISIONS



CREEKSTONE
FOLSOM, CA

Exterior Color/Material Design



MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS for PAINTING

PAINT MANUFACTURER All paint to be Sherwin Williams, unless otherwise stated differently.

PAINT APPLICATION Typical, all paint colors should finish in inside corners.

Fascia boards, overhangs, eaves, headers, etc. should be painted their specifically designated colors with the color being applied on all sides of each item, including the undersides.

NON-DECORATIVE ITEMS All non-decorative items such as meter doors, non-decorative vents, etc. to be painted the same color as the adjacent field color.

ROOFTOP METALS All rooftop metals to be painted to match the darkest color from the roof tile blend from the Color Scheme specified for that particular lot.

EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

Planning Submittal - 01.10.20 | 7

SCHEME 1: Elevation A, Spanish Colonial

Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7551, Greek Villa
Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Corbels, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7054, Suitable Brown
Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7054, Suitable Brown
Front Door	Sherwin Williams	7061, Night Owl
Shutters	Sherwin Williams	7054, Suitable Brown
Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
Windows		White
Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - 3645, Sunrise Blend

TRI Pointe

CREEKSTONE
FOLSOM, CA

Exterior Color/Material Design

AD DESIGN
CONSULTANTS

EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 2: Elevation A, Spanish Colonial

Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7569, Stucco
Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Corbels, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7047, Porpoise
Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7047, Porpoise
Front Door	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
Shutters	Sherwin Williams	7047, Porpoise
Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
Windows		White
Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - 3636, Piedmont Blend

EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 3: Elevation A, Spanish Colonial

Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	6133, Muslin
Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Corbels, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7034, Status Bronze
Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7034, Status Bronze
Front Door	Sherwin Williams	2811, Rookwood Blue Green
Shutters	Sherwin Williams	7034, Status Bronze
Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
Windows		White
Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - SCC8806, Tucson Blend

EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

Planning Submittal - 01.10.20 | 10

SCHEME 4: Elevation A, Spanish Colonial

Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7527, Nantucket Dune
Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Corbels, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7060, Attitude Gray
Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7060, Attitude Gray
Front Door	Sherwin Williams	7048, Urbane Bronze
Shutters	Sherwin Williams	7060, Attitude Gray
Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
Windows		White
Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - 3646, Sunset Blend

TRI Pointe


CREEKSTONE
FOLSOM, CA

Exterior Color/Material Design




EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 5: Elevation B, Western Farmhouse

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7011, Natural Choice
	Board & Batten	Sherwin Williams	7061, Night Owl
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7011, Natural Choice
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7011, Natural Choice
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	2814, Rookwood Antique Gold
	Shutters	Sherwin Williams	7061, Night Owl
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile (Shake)	Eagle Roofing	Ponderosa - 5690, Pewter Bronze Blend
MASONRY	Brick	Boral Brick, Insignia Series	Stags Creek Crest, Queen
	Brick Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Soft White
	 <p>Brick Lay-Up</p> <p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for brick installation.</p> <p>Brick Lay-Up: Brick to be laid in running bond. Unless otherwise directed differently on architectural drawings.</p> <p>Brick Joints: Brick joints should be 1/2". Mortar should be flush with face of brick with minor obscuring of bricks edge detail. Joints should be brushed and sponged to bring out the sand in the mortar.</p> <p>Brick Face: DO NOT cover brick face with mortar. Continually use clean water to brush or sponge the mortar. Brick face should remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged.</p> <p>See sample image to left.</p>		


EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 6: Elevation B, Western Farmhouse

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7541, Grecian Ivory
	Board & Batten	Sherwin Williams	2843, Roycroft Brass
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7551, Greek Villa
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	2843, Roycroft Brass
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	7710, Brandywine
	Shutters	Sherwin Williams	2843, Roycroft Brass
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile (Shake)	Eagle Roofing	Ponderosa - 5502, Arcadia Canyon Brown
MASONRY	Brick	Eldorado Stone	Tundra Brick - Latigo
	Brick Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Soft White
	Brick Lay-Up	 <p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for brick installation.</p> <p>Brick Lay-Up: Brick to be laid in running bond. Unless otherwise directed differently on architectural drawings.</p> <p>Brick Joints: Brick joints should be 1/2". Mortar should be flush with face of brick with minor obscuring of bricks edge detail. Joints should be brushed and sponged to bring out the sand in the mortar.</p> <p>Brick Face: DO NOT cover brick face with mortar. Continually use clean water to brush or sponge the mortar. Brick face should remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged.</p> <p>See sample image to left.</p>	


EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 7: Elevation B, Western Farmhouse

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7542, Naturel
	Board & Batten	Sherwin Williams	7053, Adaptive Shade
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	6385, Dover White
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7053, Adaptive Shade
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	7055, Enduring Bronze
	Shutters	Sherwin Williams	7055, Enduring Bronze
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile (Shake)	Eagle Roofing	Ponderosa - 5582, Fawn Gray Flashed
MASONRY	Brick	Eldorado Stone	Tundra Brick - Chalk Dust
	Brick Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Soft White
	Brick Lay-Up	 <p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for brick installation.</p> <p>Brick Lay-Up: Brick to be laid in running bond. Unless otherwise directed differently on architectural drawings.</p> <p>Brick Joints: Brick joints should be 1/2". Mortar should be flush with face of brick with minor obscuring of bricks edge detail. Joints should be brushed and sponged to bring out the sand in the mortar.</p> <p>Brick Face: DO NOT cover brick face with mortar. Continually use clean water to brush or sponge the mortar. Brick face should remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged.</p> <p>See sample image to left.</p>	


EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 8: Elevation B, Western Farmhouse

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	9170, Acier
	Board & Batten	Sherwin Williams	6070, Heron Plume
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, Window Trim, Garage Man-Door, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	6070, Heron Plume
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	6070, Heron Plume
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	0006, Taile Red
	Shutters	Sherwin Williams	7069, Iron Ore
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile (Shake)	Eagle Roofing	Ponderosa - 5679, Light Gray Range
MASONRY	Brick	Eldorado Stone	Tundra Brick - Ashland
	Brick Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Chloe
	Brick Lay-Up		<p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for brick installation.</p> <p>Brick Lay-Up: Brick to be laid in running bond. Unless otherwise directed differently on architectural drawings.</p> <p>Brick Joints: Brick joints should be 1/2". Mortar should be flush with face of brick with minor obscuring of bricks edge detail. Joints should be brushed and sponged to bring out the sand in the mortar.</p> <p>Brick Face: DO NOT cover brick face with mortar. Continually use clean water to brush or sponge the mortar. Brick face should remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged.</p> <p>See sample image to left.</p>


EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 9: Elevation C, Italian Villa

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7516, Kestrel White
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	6080, Utterly Beige
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7019, Gauntlet Gray
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	7020, Black Fox
	Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - 3605, San Benito Blend
MASONRY	Stone	Boral Stone (Cultured Stone)	Cast-Fit - French Gray
	Stone Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Smoke
	Stone Lay-Up		<p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for stone installation.</p> <p>Stone Lay-Up: Stones should be laid in a horizontal orientation. Stone offset should be 50%.</p> <p>Stone Joints: Stone joints should be 1/4".</p> <p>Stone Face: Stone face must remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged. Use only clean water to sponge off the mortar from face of stone. DO NOT cover stone face and edge with mortar.</p> <p>See sample Lay-Up image to left.</p>


EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 10: Elevation C, Italian Villa

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	6157, Favorite Tan
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7013, Ivory Lace
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7013, Ivory Lace
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	6201, Thunderous
	Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - 3645, Sunrise Blend
MASONRY	Stone	Eldorado Stone	Longitude24 - Snowdrift
	Stone Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Soft White
	Stone Lay-Up		<p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for stone installation.</p> <p>Stone Lay-Up: Stones should be laid in a horizontal orientation. Stone offset should be 50%.</p> <p>Stone Joints: Stone joints should be 1/4".</p> <p>Stone Face: Stone face must remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged. Use only clean water to sponge off the mortar from face of stone. DO NOT cover stone face and edge with mortar.</p> <p>See sample Lay-Up image to left.</p>


EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 11: Elevation C, Italian Villa

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	6101, Sands of Time
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7516, Kestrel White
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7516, Kestrel White
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	7041, Van Dyke Brown
	Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - 3646, Sunset Blend
MASONRY	Stone	Boral Stone (Cultured Stone)	Cast-Fit - Parchment
	Stone Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Smoke
	 <p>Stone Lay-Up</p>	<p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for stone installation.</p> <p>Stone Lay-Up: Stones should be laid in a horizontal orientation. Stone offset should be 50%.</p> <p>Stone Joints: Stone joints should be 1/4".</p> <p>Stone Face: Stone face must remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged. Use only clean water to sponge off the mortar from face of stone. DO NOT cover stone face and edge with mortar.</p> <p>See sample Lay-Up image to left.</p>	

EXTERIOR COLOR/MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

SCHEME 12: Elevation C, Italian Villa

	Item	Manufacturer	Color # & Name
	Main Body (Stucco)	Sherwin Williams	7539, Cork Wedge
	Trim (Wood Trim, Fascia Boards, etc.)	Sherwin Williams	7010, White Duck
	Garage Door	Sherwin Williams	7053, Adaptive Shade
	Front Door	Sherwin Williams	9100, Umber Rust
	Faux Clay Outlookers	Sherwin Williams	6061, Tanbark
	Gutters & Downspouts	Sherwin Williams	Paint to match adjacent surface
	Windows		White
	Concrete Roof Tile ("S"-Tile)	Eagle Roofing	Capistrano - SCC8806, Tucson Blend
MASONRY	Stone	Eldorado Stone	Longitude24 - Snowdrift
	Stone Mortar	ORCO Blended Products (OBP)	Soft White
	Stone Lay-Up	 <p>Bonding Surface: All surfaces must be clean, free of any dirt and loose debris to create an even and flat surface for stone installation.</p> <p>Stone Lay-Up: Stones should be laid in a horizontal orientation. Stone offset should be 50%.</p> <p>Stone Joints: Stone joints should be 1/4".</p> <p>Stone Face: Stone face must remain clean, not mortar washed or sponged. Use only clean water to sponge off the mortar from face of stone. DO NOT cover stone face and edge with mortar.</p> <p>See sample Lay-Up image to left.</p>	

Attachment 9

CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

CITY OF FOLSOM

**CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis
for Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)**

1. Application No: PN 16-026
2. Project Title: Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)
3. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
4. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Scott Johnson, AICP, Planning Manager
Community Development Department
(916) 355-7222

Steven Banks, Principal Planner
(916) 355-7385
5. Project Location:
9.88 acres located south of Mangini Parkway and east of East Bidwell Street
APN: 072-3370-013 (9.88 acres, Mangini Improvement Company, Inc.)
6. Project Applicant's/Sponsor's Name and Address:

Mangini Improvement Company, Inc.
c/o Bill Bunce, Managing Member
4370 Town Center Boulevard, Suite 100
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
7. General Plan Designation: MLD
8. Zoning: SP-MLD
9. Other public agencies whose approval may be required or agencies that may rely on this document for implementing project:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (for Section 1602 agreement)
Capital Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Folsom-Cordova Unified School District
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	3
A.	PROJECT OVERVIEW	3
B.	PROJECT LOCATION	4
C.	EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS	4
D.	PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND FPASP OBJECTIVES.....	4
E.	PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS.....	4
1.	Small Lot Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map.....	5
2.	Circulation.....	5
3.	Water, Sewer, and Storm Drainage Infrastructure	6
III.	EXEMPTION AND STREAMLINING ANALYSIS.....	6
A.	Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan.....	6
B.	Documents Incorporated by Reference.....	7
C.	Introduction to CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Provisions	9
1.	Exemption provided by Government Code, § 65457, and CEQA Guidelines, § 15182	9
2.	Streamlining provided by Public Resources Code, § 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines, § 15183..	10
D.	Environmental Checklist Review.....	10
1.	Where Impact Was Analyzed.....	11
2.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	11
3.	Any New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?.....	12
4.	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification? ...	12
5.	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which the Project is Consistent?	13
6.	Are There Effects Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?.....	13
7.	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	15
8.	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts That Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan, Or Zoning Action?15	
9.	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?.....	16
10.	Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.....	16
E.	Checklist and Discussion	18
1.	AESTHETICS.....	18
	Discussion:	19
2.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.....	20
	Discussion:	21

3.	AIR QUALITY.....	22
	Discussion:	24
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	26
	Discussion:	29
5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	31
	Discussion:	32
6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	33
	Discussion:	36
7.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	37
	Discussion:	38
8.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	39
	Discussion:	43
9.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	45
	Discussion:	49
10.	LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	50
	Discussion:	52
11.	MINERAL RESOURCES.....	53
	Discussion:	54
12.	NOISE.....	55
	Discussion:	58
13.	POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	60
	Discussion:	61
14.	PUBLIC SERVICES.....	62
	Discussion:	64
15.	RECREATION.....	65
	Discussion:	66
16.	TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC.....	67
	Discussion:	71
17.	UTILITIES.....	73
	Discussion:	76
18.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	78
	Discussion:	80
	The City finds that:.....	80
F.	Conclusion.....	81
IV.	REFERENCES.....	82

I. INTRODUCTION

The Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1, Lot 10) development proposal is located in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP). As discussed later in this document, the project is consistent with the FPASP.

As a project that is consistent with an existing Specific Plan, the Creekstone Phase 1 development is eligible for the exemption from review under the California Environmental Quality Act¹ ("CEQA") provided in Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines² section 15182, subdivision (c), as well as the streamlining provisions in Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183.

Because the Project is exempt from CEQA, the City is not required to provide the following CEQA analysis. Nonetheless, the City provides the following checklist exploring considerations raised by sections 15182 and 15183 to disclose the City's evidence and reasoning for determining the project's consistency with the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan ("FPASP") and eligibility for the claimed CEQA exemption.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Creekstone Phase 1 project proposes the development of 71 single-family residential lots on 7.25 acres of the 9.88-acre project area.

The requested land use entitlements for the Creekstone Phase 1 project are:

- (1) a Vesting Tentative Small Lot Subdivision Map;
- (2) a Minor Administrative Amendment – Transfer of Development Rights to designate a new location in the Specific Plan at which these units will be built; and
- (3) a Planned Development Permit Residential Architecture and Development Standards.

The holding capacity under existing plans and zoning for this parcel is 86 dwelling units. The 15 residential units not proposed to be built at this site ($86 - 71 = 15$) are the subject of the proposed Minor Administrative Amendment – Transfer of Development Rights. No change to the overall FPASP unit allocation, total population, will occur. The proposed project does not affect the overall amount of non-residential development in the FPASP.

The Project will connect to the City's infrastructure.
Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)
CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

December 2019

The Creekstone Phase 1 project is located within the Folsom Ranch Central District and is designed to comply with the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines (approved 2015, amended 2018).

¹ California Environmental Quality Act, Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq. (hereafter “CEQA”).

² The Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq. (hereafter “CEQA Guidelines” or “Guidelines”).

B. PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site consists of a 9.88-acre parcel in the FPASP plan area that is within the Westland Eagle Specific Plan Amendment Area, south of U.S. Highway 50 and west of Placerville Road. The project site has been known as Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10.

The FPASP is a 3,513.4-acre comprehensively planned community that creates new development patterns based on the principles of smart growth and transit-oriented development.

See the Creekstone Phase 1 Project Narrative for the regional location of the project site. The narrative includes maps depicting the project location and surrounding land uses.

C. EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Currently, the 9.88 acres of the Project site is undeveloped, but was pad-graded as part of the Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Grading Plan.

The Specific Plan zoning for the Project site is Multi-Family Low Density (SP-MLD).

D. CONSISTENCY WITH THE FPASP

The Project is consistent with and aims to fulfill the specific policies and objectives in the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan. An analysis of the proposed project’s consistency with the FPASP is provided in Exhibit 3, the Applicant’s FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis.

1. Land Use Designation and Unit Types

The proposed small lot vesting tentative subdivision map would subdivide 7.25 acres of the parcel into 71 residential lots suited for single-family dwellings. The residential density achieved is 9.84 du/acre, which is within the range allowed for the MLD zone (range of 7-12 du/acre). The site plan includes 0.81 acres of Backbone Landscape Corridor on Lots A, B, & C along East Bidwell Street and Mangini

Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)

CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

December 2019

Parkway. The site plan also includes 1.82 acres of Backbone Right-of-Way.

The vesting small lot tentative subdivision map proposes to create 71 residential lots on the parcel. The Creekstone Phase 1 project site is designated for Multi-family Low Density (SP-MLD) land uses by the FPASP.

Creekstone Phase 1 proposes to create 71 residential lots for detached single-family dwellings.) The FPASP defines the MLD residential designation to include “**single family dwellings** (small lot detached, zero-lot-line and patio homes), two-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings.” (FPASP, p. 4-14, emphasis added.) Therefore, land which is designated SP-MLD can be subdivided into residential lots suited for single-family dwellings in conformance with the FPASP.

The single-family homes proposed by the Creekstone Phase 1 Project are permitted uses as shown on Table 4.3 of the FPASP. (See also FPASP DEIR, Table 3A.10-4.)

In summary, the proposed land uses and the density of residential uses in the small lot vesting tentative map are consistent with the FPASP and the Westland Eagle FPASP Plan Amendment.

2. Circulation

Creekstone Phase 1 includes a street pattern, which includes a primary connection (“A” Drive) between East Bidwell Street at the south-west corner of the parcel and Mangini Parkway at the north-east corner of the parcel. A second street (“B” Drive) creates an interior loop by connecting to “A” Drive in two places, as depicted on the site plan. Two entries are provided: (a) a north-western entry located off Mangini Parkway, and (b) a south-eastern entry located at East Bidwell Street.

The street sections used in the Plan include the same pavement widths as specified in the FPASP and the Folsom Municipal Code. As depicted in the Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, most of the sidewalks on one side of the street frontages on “A” Drive and “B” Drive have been removed due to site grading constraints (large slope bank resulting from the development of approved subdivision to the east). Lots A, B, and C provide Backbone Landscape Corridors along East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway.

Traffic signals are planned at the intersection of East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway.

Creekstone Phase 1 is located on a planned Transit Corridor, as identified in the FPASP. The Project is located south and east of the Transit Corridor. This design complements the downtown core of the FPASP land use plan and provides a compact development pattern near transit opportunities.

Every single-family dwelling will have a standard two-car garage and a typical full-length driveway, accommodating two off-street parking spaces per unit. On-street parking is provided on both sides of the internal streets.

The proposed project is consistent with roadway and transit master plans for the FPASP.

3. Water, Sewer, and Storm Drainage Infrastructure

Water infrastructure

Creekstone Phase 1 is being served by Zone 3 water from the north via Mangini Parkway and from the west via East Bidwell Street. The project is located within the Zone 3 pressure zone. Water mains are provided within the perimeter streets, including Mangini Parkway and East Bidwell Street, along project frontage in order to serve the site.

Sewer infrastructure

Creekstone Phase 1 will be served by the sewer infrastructure within Mangini Parkway and East Bidwell Street.

Storm drainage infrastructure

Creekstone Phase 1 will connect to the existing storm drain infrastructure within Mangini Parkway and East Bidwell Street.

The proposed project is consistent with planned infrastructure for the FPASP.

III. EXEMPTION AND STREAMLINING ANALYSIS

A. Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan

The City adopted the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan on June 28, 2011 (Resolution No. 8863).

The City of Folsom and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers prepared a joint environmental impact report/environmental impact statement ("EIR/EIS" or "EIR") for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project ("FPASP"). (See FPASP EIR/EIS, SCH #2008092051). The Draft EIR/EIS (DEIR) was released on June 28, 2010. The City certified the Final EIR/EIS (FEIR) on June 14, 2011 (Resolution No. 8860). For each impact category requiring environmental analysis, the EIR provided two separate analyses: one for the "Land" component of the FPASP project, and a second for the "Water" component. (FPASP DEIR, p. 1-1 to 1-2.) The analysis in this document is largely focused on and cites to the "Land" sections of the FPASP EIR.

On December 7, 2012, the City certified an Addendum to the EIR for the FPASP for purposes of analyzing an alternative water supply for the project. The revisions to the "Water" component of the FPASP project included: (1) Leak Fixes, (2) Implementation of Metered Rates, (3) Exchange of Water
Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)
CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

December 2019

Supplies, (4) New Water Conveyance Facilities. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-1 to 3-4.) The City concluded that, with implementation of certain mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR's "Water" sections, the water supply and infrastructure changes would not result in any new significant impacts, substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed impacts or involve any of the other conditions related to changed circumstances or new information that can require a subsequent or supplemental EIR. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21166; Guidelines, § 15162.) The analysis in portions of the FPASP EIR's "Water" sections that have not been superseded by the Water Addendum are still applicable.

The FPASP includes the Westland Eagle development, which is located in the central portion of the FPASP flanking Scott Road and Easton Valley Parkway. Since approval of the FPASP, the Westland Eagle development was transferred to new owners: Westland Capital Partners, Eagle Commercial Partners (applicant), and Eagle Office Properties. The new owners subsequently evaluated the approved land use plan and determined that many of the assumptions underlying the type and distribution of retail commercial and residential land uses in this area needed to be reevaluated to respond to current and future market conditions for retail commercial and residential development. Accordingly, the applicants proposed an amendment to the FPASP that would significantly reduce the area of commercial retail land use in the Westland Eagle plan area and increase the number of allowed residential dwelling units. The City adopted an amendment to the FPASP for the Westland Eagle Properties in June 2015 (Westland/Eagle SPA) that reduced the amount of commercial, industrial/office park and mixed-use acreage from 451.8 acres to 302.3 acres and the potential building area from approximately 4.5 million square feet to approximately 3.4 million square feet. The Westland/Eagle SPA also increased the number of proposed residential dwelling units from 9,895 to 10,817.

B. Documents Incorporated by Reference

The analysis in this document incorporates by reference the following environmental documents that have been certified by the Folsom City Council:

- i. Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project EIR/EIS and Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, certified by the Folsom City Council on June 14, 2011, a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday).
- ii. CEQA Addendum for the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan Project- Revised Proposed Off-site Water Facility Alternative prepared November, 2012, ("Water Addendum"), certified by the Folsom City Council on December 11, 2012, a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday);
- iii. South of Highway 50 Backbone Infrastructure Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative

Declaration (Backbone Infrastructure MND), dated December 9, 2014, adopted by the City Council on February 24, 2015, a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday).

- iv. CEQA Addendum and Environmental Checklist for the Westland Eagle Specific Plan Amendment, dated June 2015, (“Westland Eagle Addendum”), a copy of which is available for viewing at the City of Folsom Planning Public Counter located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall Building at 50 Natoma Street in Folsom, CA (from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday).

Each of the environmental documents listed above includes mitigation measures imposed on the FPASP and activities authorized therein and in subsequent projects to mitigate plan-level environmental impacts, which are, therefore, applicable to the proposed project. The mitigation measures are referenced specifically throughout this document and are incorporated by reference in the environmental analysis. The Applicant will be required to agree, as part of the conditions of approval for the proposed project, to comply with each of those mitigation measures.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3, subdivision (c), the City will make a finding at a public hearing that the feasible mitigation measures specified in the FPASP EIR will be undertaken.

Moreover, for those mitigation measures with a financial component that apply plan-wide, the approved Public Facilities Financing Plan and Amended and Restated Development Agreement bind the Applicant to a fair share contribution for funding those mitigation measures.

The May 22, 2014, Record of Decision (ROD) for the Folsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project—City of Folsom Backbone Infrastructure (Exhibit 2) by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is also incorporated by reference.

All impacts from both on-site and off-site features of the Creekstone Phase 1 project have been analyzed and addressed in the CEQA analysis and other regulatory permits required for the Creekstone Phase 1 project and/or the Backbone Infrastructure project.

C. Introduction to CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Provisions

The City finds that the Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1, Lot 10) development proposal is consistent with the FPASP and therefore exempt from CEQA under Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182, subdivision (c), as a residential project undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with a specific plan.

The City also finds that the Creekstone Phase 1 project is eligible for streamlined CEQA review provided in Public Resources Code section 21083.3, and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 for projects

Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)
CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

December 2019

consistent with a community plan, general plan, or zoning. Because the Project is exempt from CEQA, the City is not required to provide the following streamlined CEQA analysis. Nonetheless, the City provides the following checklist exploring considerations raised by sections 15182 and 15183 because the checklist provides a convenient vehicle for disclosing the City's substantial evidence and reasoning underlying its consistency determination.

As mentioned above, the City prepared an addendum to the FPASP EIR in December 2012 for purposes of analyzing an alternative water supply for the FPASP. Although this Water Addendum was prepared and adopted by the City after the certification of the FPASP EIR/EIS, it would not change any of the analysis under Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 because it gave the Plan Area a more feasible and reliable water supply.

The City also prepared an addendum to the FPASP EIR in June 2015 for the purposes of analyzing the effects of an increase in residentially-designated land and a substantial decrease in commercially-designated land in the Westland Eagle development area. The Westland Eagle Addendum supplemented and updated the analysis in the FPASP EIR that is relevant to the Creekstone Phase 1 Project.

The City has prepared or will be completing site-specific studies pursuant to the requirements set forth in the mitigation measures and conditions of approval adopted for the FPASP under the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum for subsequent development projects. (See Exhibits 4 [Noise Assessment] and 5 [Transportation/ Trip Generation Consistency Letter Memo].) These studies support the conclusion that the Creekstone Phase 1 development proposal would not have any new significant or substantially more severe impacts (CEQA Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (CEQA Guidelines, § 15183).

1. Exemption provided by Government Code, § 65457, and CEQA Guidelines, § 15182, subdivision (c)

Government Code section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines section 15182, subdivision (c) exempt residential projects that are undertaken pursuant to a specific plan for which an EIR was previously prepared if the projects are in conformity with that specific plan and the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 (relating to the preparation of a supplemental EIR) are not present. (Gov. Code, § 65457, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15182, subd. (c), 15162, subd. (a).)

The Applicant's FPASP Policy Consistency Analysis attached as Exhibit 3 provides exhaustive analysis that supports the determination that the Project is undertaken pursuant to and in conformity with the FPASP.

2. Streamlining provided by Public Resources Code, § 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines, § 15183

Public Resources Code section 21083.3 provides a streamlined CEQA process where a subdivision map application is made for a parcel for which prior environmental review of a zoning or planning approval was adopted. If the proposed development is consistent with that zoning or plan, any further environmental review of the development shall be limited to effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior EIR or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior EIR. Effects are not to be considered peculiar to the parcel or the project if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the city, which were found to substantially mitigate that effect when applied to future projects.

CEQA Guidelines section 15183 provides further detail and guidance for the implementation of the exemption set forth in Public Resources Code section 21083.3.

D. Environmental Checklist Review

The row titles of the checklist include the full range of environmental topics, as presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

The column titles of the checklist have been modified from the Appendix G presentation to assess the Project's qualifications for streamlining provided by Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15183, as well as to evaluate whether the conditions described in Guidelines section 15162 are present.

Pursuant to Guidelines section 15162, one of the purposes of this checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any "changed condition" (i.e. changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a different environmental impact significance conclusion. If the situations described in Guidelines section 15162 are not present, then the exemption provided by Government Code section 65457 and Guidelines section 15182 can be applied to the Project. Therefore, the checklist does the following: a) identifies the earlier analyses and states where they are available for review; b) discusses whether proposed changes to the previously-analyzed program, including new site specific operations, would involve new or substantially more severe significant impacts; c) discusses whether new circumstances surrounding the previously-analyzed program would involve new or substantially more severe significant impacts; d) discusses any substantially important new information requiring new analysis; and e) describes the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project. (Guidelines, § 15162, subd. (a).)

The checklist serves a second purpose. Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and its parallel Guidelines provision, section 15183, provide for streamlined environmental review for projects consistent with the development densities established by existing zoning, general plan, or community plan policies for which an EIR was certified. Such projects require no further environmental review except as might be necessary to address effects that (a) are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which **Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)**
CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

December 2019

the project would be located, (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in the prior EIR, (c) are potentially significant off-site impacts or cumulative impacts not discussed in the prior EIR, or (d) were previously identified significant effects but are more severe than previously assumed in light of substantial new information not known when the prior EIR was certified. If an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the project, has been addressed as a significant impact in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the prior environmental documents approved for the zoning action, general plan, or community plan. The environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist since the Creekstone Phase 1 project does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the conclusion of the FPASP EIR.

The purpose of each column of the checklist is described below.

1. Where Impact Was Analyzed

This column provides a cross-reference to the pages of the environmental documents for the zoning action, general plan, or community plan where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

2. Do Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether the changes represented by the proposed project will result in new significant impacts not disclosed in the prior EIR or negative declaration or that the proposed project will result in substantial increases the severity of a previously identified significant impact. A yes answer is only required if such new or worsened significant impacts will require “major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration.” If a “yes” answer is given, additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be needed.

3. Any New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether changed circumstances affecting the proposed project will result in new significant impacts not disclosed in the prior EIR or negative declaration or will result in substantial increases the severity of a previously identified significant impact. A yes answer is only required if such new or worsened significant impacts will require “major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration.” If a “yes” answer is given, additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be needed.

4. Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new

information “of substantial importance” is available requiring an update to the analysis of a previous EIR to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigations remain valid. Any such information is only relevant if it “was not known and could not have been known with reasonable diligence at the time of the previous EIR.” To be relevant in this context, such new information must show one or more of the following:

- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
- (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
- (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This category of new information may apply to any new regulations, enacted after certification of the prior EIR or adoption of the prior negative declaration, which might change the nature of analysis of impacts or the specifications of a mitigation measure. If the new information shows the existence of new significant effects or significant effects that are substantially more severe than were previously disclosed, then new mitigation measures should be considered. If the new information shows that previously rejected mitigation measures or alternatives are now feasible, such measures or alternatives should be considered anew. If the new information shows the existence of mitigation measures or alternatives that are (i) considerably different from those included in the prior EIR, (ii) able to substantially reduce one or more significant effects, and (iii) unacceptable to the project proponents, then such mitigation measures or alternatives should also be considered.

5. Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which the Project is Consistent?

Pursuant to Section 15183, subdivision (b)(1), of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there are project-specific significant effects that are peculiar to the project or its site. Although neither section 21083.3 nor section 15183 defines the term “effects on the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project,” a definition can be gleaned from what is now the leading case interpreting section 21083.3, *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. City of Turlock* (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 273 (*Wal-Mart Stores*). In that case, the court upheld the respondent city’s decision to adopt an ordinance banning discount “superstores.” The city appropriately found that the adoption of the ordinance was wholly exempt from CEQA review under CEQA Guidelines section 15183 as a zoning action consistent with the general plan, where there were no project-specific impacts – of any kind – associated with the

ordinance that were peculiar to the project. The court concluded that “a physical change in the environment will be peculiar to [a project] if that physical change belongs exclusively and especially to the [project] or it is characteristic of only the [project].” (*Id.* at p. 294.) As noted by the court, this definition “illustrate[s] how difficult it will be for a zoning amendment or other land use regulation that does not have a physical component to have a sufficiently close connection to a physical change to allow the physical change to be regarded as ‘peculiar to’ the zoning amendment or other land use regulation.” (*Ibid.*)

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has effects peculiar to the project relative to the environmental category that were not discussed in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

6. Are There Effects Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?

Sections 21083.3 and 15183 include a separate, though complementary, means of defining the term “effects on the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project.” Subdivision (f) of section 15183 provides as follows:

An effect of a project on the environment shall not be considered peculiar to the project or the parcel for the purposes of this section if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the city or county with a finding that the development policies or standards will substantially mitigate that environmental effect when applied to future projects, unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect. The finding shall be based on substantial evidence which need not include an EIR.

This language explains that an agency can dispense with CEQA compliance for environmental impacts that will be “substantially mitigated” by the uniform application of “development policies or standards” adopted as part of, or in connection with, previous plan-level or zoning-level decisions, or otherwise – unless “substantial new information” shows that the standards or policies will not be effective in “substantially mitigating” the effects in question. Section 15183, subdivision (f), goes on to add the following considerations regarding the kinds of policies and standards at issue:

Such development policies or standards need not apply throughout the entire city or county, but can apply only within the zoning district in which the project is located, or within the area subject to the community plan on which the lead agency is relying. Moreover, such policies or standards need not be

Creekstone Phase 1 (Mangini Ranch Phase 1 Lot 10)
CEQA Exemption and Streamlining Analysis

December 2019

part of the general plan or any community plan, but can be found within another pertinent planning document such as a zoning ordinance. Where a city or county, in previously adopting uniformly applied development policies or standards for imposition on future projects, failed to make a finding as to whether such policies or standards would substantially mitigate the effects of future projects, the decision-making body of the city or county, prior to approving such a future project pursuant to this section, may hold a public hearing for the purpose of considering whether, as applied to the project, such standards or policies would substantially mitigate the effects of the project. Such a public hearing need only be held if the city or county decides to apply the standards or policies as permitted in this section.

Subdivision (g) provides concrete examples of “uniformly applied development policies or standards”: (1) parking ordinances; (2) public access requirements; (3) grading ordinances; (4) hillside development ordinances; (5) flood plain ordinances; (6) habitat protection or conservation ordinances; (7) view protection ordinances.

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has effects peculiar to the project relative to the environmental category that were not discussed in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan and that cannot be mitigated through application of uniformly applied development policies or standards that have been previously adopted by the agency. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

7. Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?

Pursuant to Section 15183, subdivision (b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there are any effects that were not analyzed as significant effects in the prior EIR for the zoning action, general plan, or community plan with which the project is consistent.

This provision indicates that, if the prior EIR for a general plan, community plan, or zoning action failed to analyze a potentially significant effect then such effects must be addressed in the site-specific CEQA analysis.

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has effects relative to the environmental category that were not analyzed as significant effects in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

8. Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts and Cumulative Impacts That Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan, Or Zoning Action?

Pursuant to Section 15183, subdivision (b)(3), of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there are any potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action with which the project is consistent.

Subdivision (j) of CEQA Guidelines section 15183 makes it clear that, where the prior EIR has adequately discussed potentially significant offsite or cumulative impacts, the project-specific analysis need not revisit such impacts:

This section does not affect any requirement to analyze potentially significant offsite or cumulative impacts if those impacts were not adequately discussed in the prior EIR. If a significant offsite or cumulative impact was adequately discussed in the prior EIR, then this section may be used as a basis for excluding further analysis of that offsite or cumulative impact.

This provision indicates that, if the prior EIR for a general plan, community plan, or zoning action failed to analyze the “potentially significant offsite impacts and cumulative impacts of the [new site-specific] project,” then such effects must be addressed in the site-specific CEQA analysis. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.3, subd. (c); see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15183, subd. (j).)

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has potentially significant off-site impacts or cumulative impacts relative to the environmental category that were not discussed in the prior environmental documentation for the zoning action, general plan or community plan. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

9. Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?

Pursuant to Section (b)(4) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether there are previously identified significant effects that are now determined to be more severe than previously assumed based on substantial information not known at the time the EIR for the zoning action, general plan or community plan was certified.

This provision indicates that, if substantial new information has arisen since preparation of the prior EIR for a general plan, community plan, or zoning action with respect to an effect that the prior EIR identified as significant, and the new information indicates that the adverse impact will be more severe, then such effects must be addressed in the site-specific CEQA analysis.

A “yes” answer in the checklist indicates that the project has significant impacts relative to the environmental category that were previously identified in the prior environmental documentation for

the zoning action, general plan or community plan but, as a result of new information not previously known, are now determined to be more severe than previously assumed. A “yes” answer will be followed by an indication of whether the impact is “potentially significant”, “less than significant with mitigation incorporated”, or “less than significant”. An analysis of the determination will appear in the Discussion section following the checklist.

10. Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3, this column indicates whether the prior environmental document and/or the findings adopted by the lead agency decision-making body provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. In some cases, the mitigation measures have already been implemented. A “yes” response will be provided in either instance. If “NA” is indicated, this Environmental Review concludes that the impact does not occur with this project and therefore no mitigations are needed.

Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 21083.3 further limits the partial exemption for projects consistent with general plans, community plans, and zoning by providing that:

[A]ll public agencies with authority to mitigate the significant effects shall undertake or require the undertaking of any feasible mitigation measures specified in the prior [EIR] relevant to a significant effect which the project will have on the environment or, if not, then the provisions of this section shall have no application to that effect. The lead agency shall make a finding, at a public hearing, as to whether those mitigation measures will be undertaken.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.3, subd. (c).) Accordingly, to avoid having to address a previously identified significant effect in a site-specific CEQA document, a lead agency must “undertake or require the undertaking of any feasible mitigation measures specified in the prior [EIR] relevant to a significant effect which the project will have on the environment.” (Pub. Resources Code, § 21083.3, subd. (c).) Thus, the mere fact that a prior EIR has analyzed certain significant cumulative or off-site effects does not mean that site-specific CEQA analysis can proceed as though such effects do not exist. Rather, in order to take advantage of the streamlining provisions of section 21083.3, a lead agency must commit itself to carry out all relevant feasible mitigation measures adopted in connection with the general plan, community plan, or zoning action for which the prior EIR was prepared. This commitment must be expressed as a finding adopted at a public hearing. (See *Gentry v. City of Murrieta* (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 1359, 1408 [court rejected respondent city’s argument that it had complied with this requirement because it made a finding at the time of project approval “that the Project complied with all ‘applicable’ laws”; such a finding “was not the equivalent of a finding that the mitigation measures in the [pertinent] Plan EIR were actually being undertaken”].)

E. Checklist and Discussion

1. AESTHETICS

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
1. Aesthetics. Would the Project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.1-1 to -34									
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	pp. 3A.1-24 to -25	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.1-1
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	pp. 3A.1-26 to -27	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No feasible MM
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	pp. 3A.1-27 to -30	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.1-1 3A.7-4 3A.1-4
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would	pp. 3A.1-31 to -33	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.1-5

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed in a Prior EIR Or The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which the Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects in A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
1. Aesthetics, Would the Project adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.1-1 to -34									
<p>Discussion: The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following aesthetic and visual impacts to less than significant levels: Impact 3A.1-1 (Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista); Impact 3A.1-2 (Damage to Scenic Resources Within a Designated Scenic Corridor); Impact 3A.1-4 (Temporary, Short-Term Degradation of Visual Character for Developed Project Land Uses During Construction); Impact 3A.1-6 (New Skyglow Effects); and impacts from the off-site improvements constructed in areas under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties (Impacts 3A.1-4 and 3A.1-5). (FEIR, pp. 1-15 to 1-19; DEIR, p. 3A.1-34.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to aesthetic resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.1-2a, MM 3B.1-2b, MM 3B.1-3a, and MM 3B.1-3b. (Water Addendum, p. 3-5.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to aesthetic resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.1-1, MM 3A.1-4, MM 3A.1-5. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.1-4.3.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with landscaping policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to aesthetic and visual impacts. (Exh. 3, p. 27.) See Exhibit 1 (the Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines) for more discussion of the architectural design guidelines and landscape design guidelines that apply to the Project. (Exh. 1, pp. 15-94.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.1-1 • MM 3A.1-4 • MM 3A.1-5 • MM 3A.7-4 • MM 3B.1-2a • MM 3B.1-2b • MM 3B.1-3a • MM 3B.1-3b <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe aesthetic impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
2. Agriculture. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49									
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	p. 3A.10-29	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	pp. 3A.10-41 to -43	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No feasible MM
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature,	p. 3A.10-29	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
2. Agriculture. Would the project could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that there were no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the two agriculture impacts to less than significant levels. Impacts 3A.10-3 (Cancellation of Existing On-Site Williamson Act Contracts) and 3.10-4 (Potential Conflict with Existing Off-Site Williamson Act Contracts) remain significant and unavoidable. (FEIR, pp. 1-123 to 1- 124; DEIR, pp. 3A.10-41 to -43.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to agricultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.10-5. (Water Addendum, p. 3-12.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to agricultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.4-4.5.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with open space policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to agriculture and forest resources impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 3, 12-14.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3B.10-5 <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe agriculture and forest resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183)</p>										

3. AIR QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
3. Air Quality. Would the project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.2-1 to -63									
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	pp. 3A.2-23 to -59	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.2-1a 3A.2-1b 3A.2-1c 3A.2-1d 3A.2-1e 3A.2-1f 3A.2-1g 3A.2-1h 3A.2-2 3A.2-4a 3A.2-4b 3A.2-5
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents,	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
3. Air Quality. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.2-1 to -63									
applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?										
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	pp. 3A.2-59 to -63	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.2-6

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
3. Air Quality. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.2-1 to -63									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following air quality impacts to less than significant levels: temporary short-term construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors (Impact 3A.2-1, for <i>PM₁₀</i> concentrations); long-term operation-related, regional emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors (Impact 3A.2-2); exposure to TACs (Impact 3A.2-4); and exposure to odorous emissions from construction activity (Impact 3A.2-6, for construction diesel odors and for corporation yard odors); and exposure to odorous emissions from operation of the proposed corporation yard (Impact 3A.2-6). (FEIR, pp. 1-22 to 1-34; DEIR, p. 3A.2-63.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to air quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.2-1a, MM 3B.2-1b, MM 3B.2-1c, MM 3B.2-3a, MM 3B.2-3b. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-5 to 3-6.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to air quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.2-1a, MM 3A.2-1b, MM 3A.2-1c, MM 3A.2-1f, MM 3A.2-2, MM 3A.2-4a, MM 3A.2-4b, MM 3A.2-5, MM 3A.2-6. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4-6-4.17.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with air quality, energy efficiency, and environmental quality policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to air quality impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 24, 27-29, 31-32.) The land use mix in the Creekstone Phase 1 project is consistent with the FPASP, and the mitigation measures in the MMRP for the FPASP EIR are applicable to and will be implemented for the Creekstone Phase 1 development. Mitigation</p> <p>Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.2-1a • MM 3A.2-1b • MM 3A.2-1c • MM 3A.2-1d • MM 3A.2-1e • MM 3A.2-1f • MM 3A.2-1g • MM 3A.2-1h • MM 3A.2-2 • MM 3A.2-4a • MM 3A.2-4b • MM 3A.2-5 • MM 3A.2-6 • MM 3B.2-1a 										

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
3. Air Quality. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A 2-1 to -63									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * MM3B.2-1b * MM3B.2-1c * MM3B.2-3a * MM3B.2-3b <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe air quality impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
4. Biological Resources. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94									
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	pp. 3A.3-50 to -72	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.3-1a 3A.3-1b 3A.3-2a 3A.3-2b 3A.3-2c 3A.3-2d 3A.3-2g 3A.3-2h 3A.3-3
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans.	pp. 3A.3-72 to -75	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.3-1a 3A.3-1b 3A.3-4a 3A.3-4b

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
4. Biological Resources. Would the project policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94									
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	pp. 3A.3-28 to -50	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.3-1a 3A.3-1b
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife	pp. 3A.3-88 to -93	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Discussed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan, Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
4. Biological Resources. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94									
species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?										
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	pp. 3A.3-75 to -88 (oak woodland and trees)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.3-5
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	pp. 3A.3-93 to -94	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
4. Biological Resources. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following biological resources impacts to less than significant levels: impacts on jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands (Impact 3A.3-1); cumulative impacts on aquatic resources, oak woodlands, nesting and foraging habitat for raptors, including Swainson's hawk, and potential habitat for special-status plant species (Impact 3A.3-2); impacts on blue oak woodlands and on trees protected under Folsom Municipal Code and County Tree Preservation Ordinance (Impact 3A.3-5); as well as the impacts of off-site improvements which would be located in the jurisdiction of El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Caltrans. (FEIR, pp. 1-38 to 1-63; DEIR, p. 3A.3-94)</p> <p>The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to biological resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.3-1a, MM 3B.3-1b, MM 3B.3-1c, MM 3A.3-1a, and MM 3B.3-2. (Water Addendum, p. 3-7.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to biological resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures that include updated versions of some mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR as well as new mitigation measures: MM 3A.3-1a, MM 3A.3-1b, MM 3A.3-2c, MM 3A.3-2d, MM 3A.3-2h, MM 3A.3-4a, MM 3A.3-4b, MM 3A.3-5, MM 4.4-1, MM 4.4-3, MM 4.4-4, MM 4.4-5, MM 4.4-6, and MM 4.4-7. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.18-4.30.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with wetlands and wildlife policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to biological resources impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 15-18.)</p> <p>There are ongoing efforts to complete the South Sacramento HCP, which is referenced in the FPASP EIR. But the South Sacramento HCP is not relevant to the Creekstone Phase 1 Project because the City did not choose to participate in the HCP and the project site is outside of the boundaries of the proposed HCP plan area. (See South Sacramento HCP, available at https://www.southsacchcp.com/shcp-chapters-final.html (last visited June 13, 2019).)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.3-1a • MM 3A.3-1b • MM 3A.3-2a • MM 3A.3-2b • MM 3A.3-2c • MM 3A.3-2d • MM 3A.3-2e • MM 3A.3-2f • MM 3A.3-2g 										

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
4. Biological Resources. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.3-1 to -94									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MM 3A.3-2h ▪ MM 3A.3-3 ▪ MM 3A.3-4a ▪ MM 3A.3-4b ▪ MM 3A.3-5 ▪ MM 3B.3-1a ▪ MM 3B.3-1b ▪ MM 3B.3-1c ▪ MM 3A.3-1a ▪ MM 3B.3-2 ▪ MM 4.4-1 ▪ MM 4.4-2 ▪ MM 4.4-3 ▪ MM 4.4-4 ▪ MM 4.4-5 ▪ MM 4.4-6 ▪ MM 4.4-7 <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Wetland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe biological resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
5. Cultural Resources. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.5-1 to -25									
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	pp. 3A.5-17 to -23	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.5-1a 3A.5-1b 3A.5-2
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside the formal cemeteries?	pp. 3A.5-23 to -24	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.5-3

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
5. Cultural Resources. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.5-1 to -25									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following cultural resources impacts to less than significant levels: impacts on identified and previously undiscovered cultural resources (Impacts 3A.5-1 and 3A.5-2); and impacts from off-site improvements constructed in areas under the jurisdiction of El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Caltrans (Impacts 3A.5-1 through 3A.5-3). (FEIR, pp. 1-81 to 1-86; DEIR, p. 3A.5-25.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to cultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3A.5-1a, MM 3A.5-1b, MM 3A.5-2, MM 3A.5-3. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-8 to 3-9.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to cultural resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR, some of which have been updated in the Westland Eagle Addendum: MM 3A.7-10, MM 3A.5-1a, MM 3A.5-1b, MM 3A.5-2, MM 3A.5-3. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.31-4.39.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with cultural resources policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to cultural resources impacts. (Exh. 3, p. 21.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.5-1a • MM 3A.5-1b • MM 3A.5-2 • MM 3A.5-3 <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe cultural resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan, Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40									
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. 2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	pp. 3A.7-24 to -28	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.7-1a 3A.7-1b

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40									
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?										
4. Landslides?										
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	pp. 3A.7-28 to -31	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.7-3
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	pp. 3A.7-31 to -34	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.7-1a 3A.7-4 3A.7-5
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994).	pp. 3A.7-34 to -35	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.7-1a 3A.7-1b

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
6. Geology and Soils. Would the project creating subetantial risks to life or property?	PPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40									
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	pp. 3A.7-35 to -36	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
6. Geology and Soils. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following geology impacts to less than significant levels: impacts from off-site elements under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans. (FEIR, pp. 1-89 to 1-95; DEIR, p. 3A.7-40.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to geology and soils resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.7-1a, MM 3B.7-1b, MM 3B.7-4, MM 3B.7-5. (Water Addendum, p. 3-10.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to geology and soils when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.7-1a, MM 3A.7-1b, MM 3A.7-3, MM 3A.7-4, MM 3A.7-5 (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.40-4.43.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with floodplain protection policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to geology and soils impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 22-24.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.7-1a • MM 3A.7-1b • MM 3A.7-3 • MM 3A.7-4 • MM 3A.7-5 • MM 3B.7-1a • MM 3B.7-1b • MM 3B.7-4 • MM 3B.7-5 <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe geology and soils impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.4-1 to -49									
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment??	pp. 3A.4-13 to -30	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.2-1a 3A.2-1b 3A.4-1 3A.2-2 3A.4-2a 3A.4-2b
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	pp. 3A.4-10 to -13	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Discussed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.4-1 to -49									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that FPASP project's incremental contributions to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from project-related construction (Impact 3A.4-1) and from long-term operation (Impact 3A.4-2) are cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable. (FEIR, pp. 1-70 to 1-79; DEIR, pp. 3A.4-23, 3A.4-30.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to CHG emissions and climate change when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.4-1a, MM 3B.4-1b. (Water Addendum, p. 3-8.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or fewer impacts to GHG emissions and climate change when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.4-1, MM 3A.4-2a, MM 3A.4-2b. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.44-4.52.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with energy efficiency policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to GHG emissions and climate change impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 27-29.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.2-1a • MM 3A.2-1b • MM 3A.4-1 • MM 3A.2-2 • MM 3A.4-2a • MM 3A.4-2b • MM 3B.4-1a • MM 3B.4-1b <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe GHG emissions and climate change impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Documents Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36									
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	pp. 3A.8-19 to -20	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	pp. 3A.8-20 to -22	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.8-2 3A.9-1

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR Or The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
b. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36									
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	pp. 3A.8-31 to -33	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.8-6
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	pp. 3A.8-22 to -28	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.8-3a 3A.8-3b 3A.8-3c
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where	pp. 3A.8-18 to -19	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36									
such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?										
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on the project area?	pp. 3A.8-18 to -19	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	p. 3A.8-29	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which the Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36									
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	pp. 3A.8-18 to -19	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None require

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.8-1 to -36									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all hazards and hazardous materials impacts to less than significant levels, except for the impacts from off-site elements that fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties (Impacts 3A.8-2, 3A.8-3, 3A.8-5, 3A.8-7). (FEIR, pp. 1-99 to 1-108; DEIR, pp. 3A.8-35 to -36.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts. The DEIR also analyzes Impact 3A.8-7 related to mosquito and vector control. (See pp. 3A.8-33 to -35; MM 3A.8-7.)</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less hazards and hazardous materials impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.8-1a, MM 3B.8-1b, MM 3B.16-3a, MM 3B.16-3b, MM 3B.8-5a, MM 3B.8-5b. (Water Addendum, pp. 3-10 to 3-11.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced hazards and hazardous materials impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.8-2, MM 3A.8-3, MM 3A.8-7. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.53-4.57.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.8-2 • MM 3A.8-1 • MM 3A.8-6 • MM 3A.8-3a • MM 3A.8-3b • MM 3A.8-3c • MM 3A.8-7 • MM 3B.8-1a • MM 3B.8-1b • MM 3B.16-3a • MM 3B.16-3b • MM 3B.8-5a • MM 3B.8-5b <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, <u>Creekstone Phase 1</u> would not have any new significant or substantially more severe hazards and</p>										

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.6-1 to -36									
hazardous materials impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).										

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
9. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to -61									
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	pp. 3A.9-24 to -28	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM3A.9-1
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have	pp. 3A.9-45 to -50	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
9. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project be granted?	FPASF Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to-51									
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	pp. 3A.9-24 to -28	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.9-1
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	pp. 3A.9-28 to -37	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.9-2

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
9. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to -51									
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	pp. 3A.9-28-42 Also see generally Backbone Infrastructure MND	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.9-1 MM 3A.9-2
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	See generally pp. 3A.9-1 to -51	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	p. 3A.9-45	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which:	p. 3A.9-45	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents,	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
9. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project would impede or redirect flood flows?	PPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to -51									
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	pp. 3A.9-43 to -44	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM3A.9-4
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Not relevant	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
9. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the Project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.9-1 to -51									
<p>Discussion: The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all hydrology and water quality impacts to less than significant levels, except for the impacts from off-site elements that fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans (Impacts 3.10-1, 3.10-2, 3.10-3, 3.10-5) (FEIR, pp. 1-113 to 1-118; DEIR, p. 3A.9-51.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to hydrology and water quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.9-1a, MM 3B.9-1b, MM 3A.3-1a, MM 3A.3-1b, MM 3B.9-3a, MM 3B.9-3b (Water Addendum, pp. 3-11 to 3-12) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to hydrology and water quality when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A.9-1, MM 3A.9-2, MM 3A.9-3 MM 3A.9-4. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.58-4.62.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with water efficiency and floodplain protection policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to hydrology and water quality impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 21-24)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.9-1 • MM 3A.9-2 • MM 3A.9-4 • MM 3B.9-1a • MM 3B.9-1b • MM 3A.3-1a • MM 3A.3-1b • MM 3B.9-3a • MM 3B.9-3b <p>Conclusion: With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe hydrology and water quality impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49									
a. Physically divide an established community?	p. 3A.10-29	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	pp. 3A.10-34 to -41	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None require

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp.3A.10-1 to -49									
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	pp. 3A 3-93 to -94	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
d. Contribute to the decay of an existing urban center?	Not relevant; also see Palsom South of U.S. Highway 50 Specific Plan Project's CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, pp. 361-363	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.10-1 to -49									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that the following land use impacts were less than significant and no mitigation was required: Impacts 3A.10-1 (Consistency with Sacramento LAFCo Guidelines) and 3.10-2 (Consistency with the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint). (FEIR, pp. 1-123 to 1-124; DEIR, pp. 3A.10-36, 3A.10-39.) But impacts from off-site elements that fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans would be potentially significant and unavoidable. The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to land use when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.10-5. (Water Addendum, p. 3-12.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to land use when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.63-4.64.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with land use policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to land use impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 1-5.) The Folsom Ranch Central District Design Guidelines (Exhibit 1) is a complementary document to the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan and the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan Community Guidelines.</p> <p>There are ongoing efforts to complete the South Sacramento HCP, which is referenced in the FPASP EIR. But the South Sacramento HCP is not relevant to the Creekstone Phase 1 Project because the City did not choose to participate in the HCP and the project site is outside of the boundaries of the proposed HCP plan area. (See South Sacramento HCP, available at https://www.southsachcp.com/sshcp-chapters-final.html (last visited June 13, 2019).) In any event, the Creekstone Phase 1 Project would not impede the implementation of the South Sacramento HCP.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM 3B.10-5 <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe land use impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
11. Mineral Resources. Would the Project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40									
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	pp. 3A.7-36 to -38	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.7-9
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
11. Mineral Resources. Would the Project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.7-1 to -40									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except one of the Impacts to mineral resources to less than significant levels. Impact 3A.7-9 (Possible Loss of Mineral Resources-Kaolin Clay) remains significant and unavoidable. (FEIR, pp. 1-89 to 1-95; DEIR, pp. 3A.7-37 to -38.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to mineral resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR and that no mitigation measures were necessary to address the water supply and water facilities aspect of the FPASP project. (Water Addendum, p. 3-13.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to mineral resources when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, p. 4.65.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe mineral resources impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

12. NOISE

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposal Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
12. Noise. Would the project result in:	PPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to -32									
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	pp. 3A.11-30 to -31	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.11-4
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	pp. 3A.11-33 to -35	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.11-3
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	pp. 3A.11-36 to -46	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.11-4 3A.11-5

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
12. Noise. Would the project result in:	FPASP Draft EIR pp 3A.11-1 to -32									
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	pp. 3A.11-Z7 to -35	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.11-1 3A.11-3
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	pp. 3A.11-Z7 and 3A.11-49	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
12. Noise. Would the project result in:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to-52									
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	pp. 3A.11-27	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
12. Noise. Would the project result in:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to -52									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following noise impacts to less than significant levels: temporary, short-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased equipment noise and groundborne noise and vibration from project construction (Impacts 3A.11-1, 3A.11-3); long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to increased operational traffic noise levels from project operation (Impact 3A.11-4); and impacts from off-site elements that are under the jurisdiction of El Dorado County, Sacramento County, or Caltrans. (FEIR, pp. 1-127 to 1-132; DEIR, pp. 3A.11-31 to -52.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less noise impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.11-1a, MM 3B.11-1b, MM 3B.11-1c, MM 3B.11-1d, MM 3B.11-1e, and MM 3B.11-3. (Water Addendum, p. 3-14.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced noise impacts when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR and one additional mitigation measure from the Westland Eagle Addendum: MM 3A.11-1, MM 3A.11-3, MM 3A.11-4, MM 3A.11-5, MM 4.12-1. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.66-4.74.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with noise policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to noise impacts. (Exh. 3, p. 25)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.11-1 • MM 3A.11-3 • MM 3A.11-4 • MM 3A.11-5 • MM 3B.11-1a • MM 3B.11-1b • MM 3B.11-1c • MM 3B.11-1d • MM 3B.11-1e • MM 3B.11-3 • MM 4.12-1 <p>The August 15, 2019 Noise Study completed by Bollard Acoustical Consultants (attached as Exhibit 4) found that, consistent with the noise impact analysis in the FPASP EIR, a portion of the Creekstone Phase 1 Residential Development project site will be exposed to future traffic noise levels in excess of the City of Folsom's 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. The impacts analyzed in the Noise Study are of the same type, scope, and scale as those impacts addressed in the FPASP EIR. In other words, the Noise Study did not find any new impacts, any effects that are peculiar to the project or project site, or any substantially more severe impacts than those analyzed in the FPASP EIR. The Noise Study provides</p>										

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
12. Noise. Would the project result in:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.11-1 to -52									
<p>recommendations for how to implement the FPASP EIR's mitigation measures to achieve compliance with the City's exterior and interior noise standards. These recommendations, which are listed below, are consistent with the mitigation measures in the FPASP EIR and simply add new details about noise barriers (e.g., required height and materials) and building materials required in the previously adopted mitigation measures.</p> <p>The following Noise Study recommendations for how to implement the FPASP EIR's mitigation measures will be required as conditions of approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the first row of homes located along East Bidwell Street, the north-, west-, and south-facing upper-floor building facades should maintain minimum window assembly STC ratings of 32. Figure 2 illustrates the facades requiring improved STC rated windows. Mechanical ventilation (air conditioning) should be provided for all residences in this development to allow the occupants to close doors and windows as desired to achieve compliance with the applicable interior noise level criteria. (Exh. 4, p. 16.) Additionally, Bollard noted that its conclusions were based in part on proposed Project Design Features, including 6-foot noise barriers along East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway. (Exh. 4, p. 12.) <p>Conclusions:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe noise impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
13. Population and Housing, Would the Project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.13-1 to -16									
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	pp. 3A.13-11 to -15	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	p. 3A.13-16	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
13. Population and Housing. Would the Project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.13-1 to -16									
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	p. 3A.13-16	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that all population, employment and housing impacts are less than significant and do not require mitigation. (FEIR, pp. 1-137 to 1-138; DEIR, p. 3A.13-16.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to population and housing when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR and, thus, no new mitigation was required. (Water Addendum, p. 3-15.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to population and housing when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4-75-4-76.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with housing policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to population and housing impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 6-8.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None required <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe population and housing impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Actian, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
14. Public Services	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.14-1 to -30									
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any the public services:	pp. 3A.14-12 to -13	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM3A.14-1
Fire protection?	pp. 3A.14-13 to -20	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM3A.14-2 3A.14-3

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
14. Public Services.	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.14-1 to -30									
Police protection?	pp. 3A.14-20 to -23	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
Schools?	pp. 3A.14-24 to -30	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
Parks?	pp. 3A.12-14 to -17 (in Parks and Recreation chapter, not the Public Services chapter)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
Other public facilities?	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Discussed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
14. Public Services	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.14-1 to -30									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all public services impacts to less than significant levels, except for impacts from off-site elements constructed in areas under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans (Impact 3A.14-1). (FEIR, pp. 1-138 to 1-141; DEIR, p. 3A.14-30.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to public services when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR and, thus, no new mitigation was required. (Water Addendum, p. 3-16.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to public services when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the following mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR: MM 3A-14-1, MM 3A.14-2, MM 3A.14-3. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4-77-4-78.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with public services policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to public services impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 32-33.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.14-1 • MM 3A.14-2 • MM 3A.14-3 <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe public services impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

15. RECREATION

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
15. Recreation.	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.12-1 to -17									
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	pp. 3A.12-12 to -17	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
15. Recreation.	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.12-1 to -17									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that all parks and recreation impacts are less than significant and, thus, no mitigation was necessary. (FEIR, p. 1-136; DEIR, p. 3A.12-17.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less impacts to recreation when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measure: MM 3B.12-1. (Water Addendum, p. 3-15.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to recreation when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR. (Westland Eagle Addendum, p. 4.79.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with parks and open space policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to recreation impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 3-4, 12-15.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM 3B.12-1 <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe recreation impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15183).</p>										

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
16. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157									
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ration on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	pp. 3A.15-25 to -157	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM3A.15-1a 3A.15-1b 3A.15-1c 3A.15-1f 3A.15-1l 3A.15-1j 3A.15-1i 3A.15-1o 3A.15-1p 3A.15-1q 3A.15-1r 3A.15-1s 3A.15-1u 3A.15-1v 3A.15-1w 3A.15-1x 3A.15-1y 3A.15-1z 3A.15-1aa 3A.15-1dd 3A.15-1ee 3A.15-1ff 3A.15-1gg 3A.15-1hh 3A.15-1il 3A.15-2a 3A.15-2b

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Discussed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
16. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157									
										3A.15-3 3A.15-4a 3A.15-4b 3A.15-4c 3A.15-4d 3A.15-4f 3A.15-4g 3A.15-4i 3A.15-4j 3A.15-4k 3A.15-4l 3A.15-4m 3A.15-4n 3A.15-4o 3A.15-4p 3A.15-4q 3A.15-4r 3A.15-4s 3A.15-4t 3A.15-4u 3A.15-4v 3A.15-4w 3A.15-4x 3A.15-4y
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the	Same as (a) above	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Same as (a) above

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
16. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157									
county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?										
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	Not relevant; no changes to air traffic would result from the Project	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No significant traffic hazards were identified in the EIR	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	3A.14-12 to -13 (in Public Services chapter, not Transportation chapter)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	MM 3A.14-1

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts.
16. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157									
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	Development will be required to follow City parking standards	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	3A.15-27	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None required

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed In Prior Environmental Documents.	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project Is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Impacts That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
16. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157									
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The FPASP EIR concluded that implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR would reduce all except the following traffic and transportation impacts to less than significant levels: Impacts 3A.15-1j, 3A.15-1k, 3A.15-1l, 3A.15-1m, 3A.15-1n, 3A.15-1o, 3A.15-1p, 3A.15-1q, 3A.15-1r, 3A.15-1s, 3A.15-1t, 3A.15-1u, 3A.15-1v, 3A.15-1w, 3A.15-1x, 3A.15-1y, 3A.15-1z, 3A.15-1aa, 3A.15-1ad, 3A.15-1ee, 3A.15-1ff, 3A.15-1gg, 3A.15-1hh, 3A.15-1ii, 3A.15-2, 3A.15-4b, 3A.15-4d, 3A.15-4l, 3A.15-4m, 3A.15-4n, 3A.15-4o, 3A.15-4p, 3A.15-4r, 3A.15-4s, 3A.15-4t, 3A.15-4u, 3A.15-4v, 3A.15-4w, 3A.15-4x, 3A.15-4y. (FEIR, pp. 1-142 to 1-175.) These impacts include intersection impacts, such as the intersections at Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street and East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road; and impacts at roadway segments, such as on eastbound U.S. 50, including the Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard segment, the Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue segment, and the Folsom Boulevard to Prairie City Road segment. (DEIR, pp. 3A.15-157.) The pages indicated in the table above contain the relevant analysis of the potential impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, the 2012 Water Addendum includes a short discussion of how the changes to the water facilities aspects of the FPASP project would have the same or less transportation and traffic impacts when compared to the PPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR after implementation of the following mitigation measures: MM 3B.15-1a, MM 3B.15-1b. (Water Addendum, p. 3-16.) The 2015 Westland Eagle Addendum also includes a discussion of how project amendments would have the same or reduced impacts to transportation and traffic when compared to the FPASP project as analyzed in the 2011 EIR with implementation of the mitigation measures from the FPASP EIR listed below, as well as two new mitigation measures: MM 4.16-1, MM 4.16-2. (Westland Eagle Addendum, pp. 4.80-4.90.)</p> <p>See Exhibit 3 for discussion of the Creekstone Phase 1 project's consistency with circulation policies in the FPASP that may be relevant to traffic and transportation impacts. (Exh. 3, pp. 8-12.)</p> <p>The September 6, 2019 Supplemental Traffic Evaluation Memo by Kimley-Horn (attached as Exhibit 5) updates the intersection and roadway segment analysis performed for the Mangini Phase 1 project, approved in 2013, and determined that the addition of the Creekstone Phase 1 project would not result in any additional significant impacts. (Exh. 5, p. 3.) The Kimley-Horn Memo reached this conclusion, in part, based on already constructed improvements to lane geometry at the intersections of East Bidwell Street and Mangini Parkway, and East Bidwell Street and White Rock Road. (Exh. 5, p. 3.) The memo also performed a signal warrant analysis, which found that, with the addition of the Creekstone Phase 1 project, a.m. peak hour traffic at the intersection of East Bidwell Street and White Rock Road warranted signalization. (Exh. 5, pp. 2-3, 5.) This is not a new significant impact, however, because that intersection already warranted signalization, without the addition of the project, based on p.m. hour peak traffic. (Exh. 5, pp. 2-3, 5.) Thus, Creekstone Phase 1 would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant transportation and traffic impacts. (Exh. 5, p. 3.)</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.15-14-1 • MM 3A.15-1a through MM 3A.15-1c • MM 3A.15-1f • MM 3A.15-1i through MM 3A.15-1j • MM 3A.15-1l • MM 3A.15-1o through MM 3A.15-1s • MM 3A.15-1u through MM 3A.15-1z • MM 3A.15-1aa 										

Environmental Issue Area	Where Impact Was Analyzed in Prior Environmental Documents	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Circumstances Involving New Significant Impacts or Substantially More Severe Impacts?	Any New Information of Substantial Importance Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project Or The Parcel On Which The Project Would Be Located That Have Not Been Disclosed In a Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan, Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Effects That Are Peculiar To The Project That Will Not Be Substantially Mitigated By Application Of Uniformly Applied Development Policies Or Standards That Have Been Previously Adopted?	Are There Effects That Were Not Analyzed As Significant Effects In A Prior EIR On The Zoning Action, General Plan Or Community Plan With Which The Project is Consistent?	Are There Potentially Significant Off-Site Impacts And Cumulative Impacts Which Were Not Discussed In The Prior EIR Prepared For The General Plan, Community Plan Or Zoning Action?	Are There Previously Identified Significant Effects That, As A Result Of Substantial New Information Not Known At The Time The EIR Was Certified, Are Now Determined To Have A More Severe Adverse Impact?	Prior Environmental Document's Mitigation Measures Addressing Impacts
16. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:	FPASP Draft EIR pp. 3A.15-1 to -157									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM 3A.15-1dd through MM 3A.15-1ii • MM 3A.15-2a through MM 3A.15-2b • MM 3A.15-3 • MM 3A.15-4a through MM 3A.15-4d • MM 3A.15-4f through MM 3A.15-4g • MM 3A.15-4i through MM 3A.15-4y • MM 3B.15-1a • MM 3B.15-1b • MM 4.16-1 • MM 4.16-2 <p>Conclusion: With implementation of the above mitigation measures identified in the FPASP EIR, Water Addendum, and Westland Eagle Addendum, Creekstone Phase 1 would not have any new significant or substantially more severe transportation/traffic impacts (Guidelines, § 15162), nor would it result in any new significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or its site (Guidelines, § 15103).</p>										