

**APPENDIX A**  
**Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Amendment**  
**Environmental Checklist and Environmental Evaluation**

**1.1 CEQA Checklist**

The purpose of the checklist is to evaluate whether the proposed Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Amendment would amend the project in a manner that may cause, or whether there are any changed circumstances or new information of substantial importance that indicate the proposed amendment may cause, a new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect that was not considered in the Specific Plan EIR pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and Guidelines Section 15162.

The questions posed in the checklist come from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. 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 relative to the evaluation of that environmental category as it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the Specific Plan Final EIR certified for the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan project.

**1.2 Explanation of Checklist Evaluation Categories**

The checklist uses a series of categories to evaluate the project’s potential for any changed conditions that may result in a new significant or substantially more severe environmental impact. These categories are defined below.

- 1) Conclusion in Prior EIR and Related Documents.** This column summarizes the conclusion from the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Final EIR.
  
- 2) Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?** Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the revised project will result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the EIR, or whether the changes will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.
  
- 3) New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?** Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates whether there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**4) New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?** Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
- (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 of the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
- (E) If the additional analysis completed as part of this environmental review were to find that the conclusions of the Final EIR remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified impacts are not found to be substantially more severe, or additional mitigation is not necessary, then the question would be answered “no” and no additional environmental document would be required.

**5) Final EIR Mitigation Measures Implemented or Address Impacts.** Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3), this column indicates whether the Final EIR provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category.

These mitigation measures were previously identified to mitigate previously identified impacts and will be implemented with the construction of the project. If “None” is indicated, the final EIR and this initial study conclude that the impact does not occur with this project or is not significant; therefore, no additional mitigation measures are needed.

### 1.3 Checklist Evaluation of Environmental Topics

The following checklist evaluates the project against each of the environmental topics included in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan EIR (Specific Plan EIR). A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category to clarify the response. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the project relates to the issue, and the status of any mitigation that may be required or that has already been implemented. Applicable mitigation measures from the Final EIR that apply to the project are listed under each environmental category. Finally, a conclusion relating to the analysis is contained in each section is provided.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>I. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista that was not already identified.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that involve new aesthetic impacts that weren't already identified.	<b>No.</b> There is no new information requiring new or expanded aesthetic Analysis beyond what was already identified.	3-1
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	<b>No.</b> There are no State designated highways in the Plan area vicinity.	<b>No.</b> There are no State designated highways in the Plan area vicinity.	<b>No.</b> There are no State designated highways in the Plan area vicinity.	None
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The Specific Plan still has provisions that provide reasonable assurances against substantial degradation of the plan area visual character.	<b>No.</b> The Specific Plan still has provisions that provide reasonable assurances against substantial degradation of the plan area visual character.	<b>No.</b> The Specific Plan still has provisions that provide reasonable assurances against substantial degradation of the plan area visual character.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would still be required to submit lighting design measures to ensure protection of surrounding uses from spill over light and glare to the County with future applications involving exterior lighting.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would still be required to submit lighting design measures to ensure protection of surrounding uses from spill over light and glare to the County with future applications involving exterior lighting.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would still be required to submit lighting design measures to ensure protection of surrounding uses from spill over light and glare to the County with future applications involving exterior lighting.	3-2

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that development anticipated in the Specific Plan would result in impacts associated with scenic vistas and light and glare. Mitigation measures were incorporated to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. The EIR further includes a discussion of the Specific Plan’s contribution to the General-Plan identified Countywide Cumulative Impacts on the County Visual character. The General Plan EIR has determined that cumulative development of General Plan-permitted urban land uses throughout Solano County would permanently change views, including valued scenic vistas, throughout the County and would substantially alter the visual character of the County through conversion of agricultural and open space lands to developed urban uses, and while there are provisions for design guidelines and standards that would reduce this visual impact, the conversion of local viewsheds from ag uses to the developed land uses would be significant and unavoidable. The Specific EIR concluded that development in the plan area would be subject to stringent design guidelines and that the vast majority of the plan would be retained in permanent agriculture; however, the EIR found that the Specific Plan would nevertheless contribute to this General Plan identified cumulative impact and would remain significant.

The proposed amendment includes minor adjustments to the location of units, shifts to internal road placement, and a new location for a potential fire station within the plan area. None of the proposed plan amendments alter or exacerbate the previously identified impacts. All previously identified mitigation measures apply and would reduce any impacts to less than significant, with the exception of the project’s contribution to the cumulative impact to the local viewsheds, which will remain significant as identified in the Specific Plan EIR as well as the General Plan EIR.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 3-1:** Prior to County approval of any future plan area subdivision or other discretionary development application, the project applicant/developer shall provide site plan, architectural, landscape and infrastructure design details demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Middle Green Valley Conservancy Design Review Committee, County staff and County Planning Commission that the development design:

- sufficiently protects existing visual access from Green Valley Road and other important plan area vantage points towards foreground and middle-ground rural landscapes and the Western Hills background;
- protects existing intervening landforms and vegetative buffers;
- maintains building rooflines that do not exceed existing intervening landforms and vegetative screening; and
- emphasizes building forms, designs, colors, materials, etc. that are reflective of and conducive to the surrounding rural landscape.

Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 3-2:** To minimize glare and “sky glow” from new outdoor area lighting, prior to County approval of any future plan area subdivision or other discretionary development application that includes exterior lighting, the project applicant/developer shall include in the project application materials lighting design measures that ensure protection of surrounding uses from spillover light and glare, use of low lighting fixtures, use of adequately shielded light sources, use of light sources that provide a natural color rendition, and avoidance of light reflectance off of exterior building walls. Incorporation of these and similar measures by a qualified design professional into the project-specific design would reduce this potential for light and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment project does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the aesthetic impact conclusions of the certified EIR; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>II. Agricultural Resources</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	Significant and Unavoidable	<b>No.</b> The project will not introduce impacts to Prime Farmland that were not already previously identified.	<b>No.</b> There are new circumstances or impacts related to Prime Farmland that were not already previously identified.	<b>No.</b> There is no new information requiring analysis of Prime Farmland.	None
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project will not introduce impacts or conflicts on ag uses or WA Contracts that were not already previously identified.	<b>No.</b> There are new circumstances or impacts related to ag use or WA Contracts that were not already previously identified.	<b>No.</b> There is no new information requiring analysis of ag use or WA Contracts.	4-2.
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	This checklist question did not exist at the time the EIR was certified	<b>No.</b> The project area is not zoned for forest land or timberland.	<b>No.</b> The project area is not zoned for forest land or timberland.	<b>No.</b> The project area is not zoned for forest land or timberland.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	This checklist question did not exist at the time the EIR was certified	<b>No.</b> The project area does not contain forest land.	<b>No.</b> The project area does not contain forest land.	<b>No.</b> The project area does not contain forest land.	None
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	This checklist question did not exist at the time the EIR was certified	<b>No.</b> The project area does not contain forest land.	<b>No.</b> The project area does not contain forest land.	<b>No.</b> The project area does not contain forest land.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that development anticipated in the Specific Plan would result in a significant unavoidable impact for the permanent loss of Prime agricultural land and determined that no mitigation could be identified to the reduce this impact. The EIR also determined that there would be “indirect impacts” upon agricultural lands that are actively farmed within the plan area and provided mitigation that requires “Right to Farm” notifications for all future development.

Two new significance criteria have been added to the CEQA environmental, items d) and e) above, related to forest lands. The Plan Area does not include any designated forest lands; therefore, no new impacts would occur nor do these criteria pose a change in circumstances that warrants additional analysis.

The proposed amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. The amendment relocates units from the foothills and places them within the originally approved footprint of the Elkhorn neighborhood on the valley floor. The amendment does not create new agricultural impacts, nor pose a change circumstance or new information that warrants change to the previously certified analysis.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 4-1:** The DSP would facilitate rural development within the plan area in accordance with the adopted 2008 Solano County General Plan. It has been determined that such development could, over time, permanently remove up to an estimated 123 acres of Prime Farmland from agricultural production. Chapter 19 of this Draft EIR, Alternatives to the Proposed Action, evaluates an alternative Specific Plan land use layout that would avoid all plan area Prime Farmland (Alternative 19.2). The evaluation indicates that the land use layout changes necessary to accommodate the County General Plan-suggested maximum development capacity of up to 400 new primary residential units and up to 100 new secondary residential units in a manner that avoids the 123 acres of plan area Prime Farmland would force more development into sensitive viewsheds and wildlife habitat and corridors, thereby defeating many of the key project objectives listed in section 2.3 of this Draft EIR. Therefore, it has been determined that no feasible mitigation is currently available to avoid this impact, this Specific Plan-related long-term potential for conversion of Prime Farmland in the plan area to urban use would represent a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Mitigation 4-2:** Chapter 2.2 of the Solano County Code protects farm operations from nuisance complaints associated with residential uses located next to active agricultural operations. The County's "right-to-farm ordinance," as it is commonly known, guarantees existing farm owners the right to continue agricultural operations, including, but not limited to, cultivating and tilling the soil, burning agricultural byproducts, irrigating, raising crops and/or livestock, and applying approved chemicals in a proper manner to fields and farmland. The ordinance limits the circumstances under which agriculture may be considered a nuisance. To prevent future residential/agriculture conflicts in the County, notice of this ordinance is currently required to be given to purchasers of real property. Consistent with the Solano County Code, and as a condition of future subdivision and other discretionary development approvals in the plan area, the County shall require the development applicant/developer to provide notification in writing to all prospective purchasers of Residential or Community Services property of the potential nuisances associated with adjacent and nearby farm operations and the existence of the County right-to-farm ordinance.

Implementation of this measure would reduce the potential for project indirect impacts on Prime Farmland to a less-than-significant level.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment project does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the agricultural resource conclusions of the certified EIR; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.



Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>III. Air Quality</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not create increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan than that analyzed previously.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not create increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan than that analyzed previously.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not create increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan than that analyzed previously.	5-3
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Less than Significant with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in any new cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in any new cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in any new cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	5-1
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less than Significant with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	5-1, 5-2

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
e) Result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Less than Significant with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve any land uses that would create objectionable odors.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve any land uses that would create objectionable odors.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve any land uses that would create objectionable odors.	5-1, 5-2

### Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated the potential for air quality impacts as a result of implementing the development anticipated within the Specific Plan. The EIR determined that development anticipated in the Specific Plan may result in a series of impacts of air quality impacts that are summarized below. The following summary is supported by a technical memorandum prepared by LSA Associates (see Appendix A2).

The Specific Plan EIR discusses that construction activities associated with the Specific Plan may include demolition, building renovation or modification, grading, new building construction, and paving. Such construction would generate pollutants intermittently. The Specific Plan EIR identifies the most substantial air pollutant emissions would be dust generated from building demolition or site grading. Construction activities can also generate exhaust emissions from vehicles/equipment and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would affect local air quality. The Specific Plan EIR also found that construction activities are also a source of organic gas emissions. Existing land uses in and around the Plan Area, including residential areas, could be adversely affected by construction emissions. If uncontrolled, such emissions could lead to both health and nuisance impacts. Although temporary, such effects would represent a potentially significant adverse impact on local air quality. As such, the Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 5-1. With implementation of Mitigation 5-1, impacts were considered to be less than significant.

The Specific Plan EIR determined that implementation of the plan would encourage development that could place odor-sensitive land uses near odor-generating land uses. As such, the Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 5-2 to ensure that development complies with the General Plan (the Solano County General Plan includes Implementation Program HS.I-63, which provides for establishment of land use buffers). With implementation of Mitigation 5-2, impacts were considered to be less than significant.

The Specific Plan EIR references BAAQMD's clean air plan to determine if the Specific Plan would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan, which for the Specific Plan EIR was the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy. The Specific Plan EIR found that the development that was not reflected in the 2005 Ozone Strategy, thus resulting in a significant project and cumulative impact. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 5-3; however, impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The Specific Plan EIR found that future traffic increases associated with Specific Plan facilitated development would generate regional emissions increases that would exceed the BAAQMD emission-based threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). The effect of long-term regional emissions associated with MGVSP-facilitated development was therefore considered to be a significant project and cumulative impact. As such, the Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 5-3.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the MGVSP as evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. In addition, the BAAQMD 2017 Clean Air Plan is based on the latest Solano County General Plan land use provisions, which includes development of the Specific Plan. Therefore, the MGVSP and proposed amendment would be consistent with the 2017 Clean Air Plan. The proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for air quality emissions:

- 1) the proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to consistency with applicable clean air plans compared to those previously identified in the MGVSP EIR, and no new mitigation would be required;
- 2) The proposed amendment would reduce the unit count would result in fewer construction emissions than previously assumed this would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for construction air quality emissions. As such, the proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to short-term construction emissions compared to those previously identified in the Specific Plan EIR, and no new mitigation would be required;
- 3) The proposed amendment would not result in an increase in the generation of vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled that would increase air pollutant emissions. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for operational air quality emissions;
- 4) The proposed amendment would not result in an increase in the generation of vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled that would increase air pollutant emissions. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for localized CO hotspots. As such, the proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to localized CO compared to those previously identified in the Specific Plan EIR, and no new mitigation would be required; and

5) The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or exposure to odors compared to those previously identified in the MGVSP EIR.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 5-1:** The County shall require construction contractors to comply with Solano County General Plan Implementation Program HS.I-59 (best management practices) and Implementation Program RS.I-49 (requirements for diesel vehicles). In addition, for all discretionary grading, demolition, or construction activity in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require implementation of the following measures by construction contractors, where applicable:

*Dust (PM<sub>10</sub>) control measures that apply to all construction activities:*

- Water all active construction areas that have ground disturbances at least twice daily and more often during windy periods.

Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

- Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas, and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.

*Enhanced dust (PM<sub>10</sub>) control measures (for construction sites that are greater than four acres, are located adjacent to sensitive receptors, or otherwise warrant additional control measures):*

- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.
- Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.

*Measures to reduce diesel particulate matter and PM<sub>2.5</sub>:*

- Post clear signage at all construction sites indicating that diesel equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate, or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were onsite or adjacent to the construction site.

- Prevent the use of construction equipment with high particulate emissions. Opacity is an indicator of exhaust particulate emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment. The project shall ensure that emissions from all construction diesel-powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40-percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40- percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired or replaced immediately.
- Ensure that contractors install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g. compressors).
- Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.

The above measures are BAAQMD-identified “feasible control measures for construction emissions of PM10.” Implementation of these measures would reduce the construction-related air quality impact to a less-than- significant level.

**Mitigation 5-2:** In reviewing projects proposed in accordance with the Specific Plan, the Middle Green Valley Conservancy and County shall implement Solano County General Plan policies and implementation programs to reduce the potential for odor impacts on sensitive receptors, including Implementation Program HS.I-58 (encouraging agricultural best management practices) and Implementation Program HS.I-63 (establishing buffers). Implementation of these measures would be expected to reduce odor impacts on sensitive receptors to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 5-3:** In addition to the energy-efficiency and other emissions-reducing measures already included in the Specific Plan (e.g., provisions of sidewalks, bicycle lanes, etc.), the County shall require that the Specific Plan include the following requirements:

- Wire each housing unit to allow use of emerging electronic metering communication technology.
- Restrict the number of fireplaces in residences to one per household and/or require residential use of EPA-certified wood stoves, pellet stoves, or fireplace inserts. EPA-certified fireplaces and fireplace inserts are 70- to 90-percent effective in reducing emissions from this source. Also encourage the use of natural gas-fired fireplaces.
- Require outdoor outlets at residences to allow use of electrical lawn and landscape maintenance equipment.
- Make natural gas available in residential backyards to allow use of natural gas-fired barbecues.
- Require that any community services operation in the plan area use electrical or alternatively fueled equipment for maintenance of the areas under its jurisdiction.

These strategies can be expected to reduce Specific Plan-related regional emissions assumed in the air quality analysis by perhaps 5 percent. This amount would fall short of the 23-percent reduction

needed foremissions to fall below the proposed BAAQMD significance threshold for ROG and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The proposed amendments reduce the number of units and therefore reduce the impact, and not cause any new or more severe impacts, compared to the determination made in the Specific Plan EIR.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to air quality; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>IV. Biological Resources</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts related to species not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts related to species not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts related to species not previously disclosed	6-1, 6-6, 6-7, 6-8, 6-9, 6-10, 6-11 6-12,
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts Related to Riparian habitat not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts Related to Riparian habitat not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts Related to Riparian habitat not previously disclosed	6-1, 6-3, 6-4, 6-5, 6-6, 6-7, 6-8, 6-9

<p>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts related to wetlands not previously disclosed</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts related to wetlands not previously disclosed</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts related to wetlands not previously disclosed</p>	<p>6-1, 6-5</p>
<p>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts related to interference with migratory patterns or corridors</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts related to interference with migratory patterns or corridors</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts related to interference with migratory patterns or corridors</p>	<p>6-1, 6-13</p>
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts related local biological policies or ordinances</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts related local biological policies or ordinances</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts related local biological policies or ordinances</p>	<p>6-1, 6-3</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new information or impacts related to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new information or impacts related to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new information or impacts related to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.</p>	<p>6-2, 6-6, 6-7, 6-8, 6-9</p>

Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that development anticipated in the Specific Plan may result in a series of impacts to biological resources, including:

- future individual development projects undertaken in accordance with the DSP may result in potential site-specific impacts on biological resources including sensitive vegetation and aquatic communities, special-status plant species, and special-status wildlife species, due to future individual project-level residential, commercial and mixed- use development, landscaped parkland construction, active open space land uses, and associated road and utility/infrastructure construction activities.
- The Specific Plan includes substantial measures intended to minimize potential conflicts between future individual developments undertaken under the Specific Plan with the policies of the Bureau of Reclamation and Solano County Water Agency's Administrative Draft Solano County Multispecies Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Nevertheless, if future individual project-level development undertaken under the Specific Plan includes aspects, or proposes special-status species impact avoidance, minimization and/or compensatory mitigation measures, that are not consistent with the HCP as ultimately adopted, the individual project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan.
- The Specific Plan includes land use and circulation configurations and associated measures intended to avoid or minimize potential impacts on existing oak woodlands. Nevertheless, future individual project-level development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary and/or indirect impacts on oak woodland communities.
- The Specific Plan includes land use and circulation configurations and associated measures intended to avoid or minimize potential impacts on Green Valley Creek and Hennessey Creek riparian communities. Nevertheless, future, individual project-level development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, indirect impacts on riparian communities in the plan area.
- The Draft Specific Plan includes land use and circulation configurations and associated measures intended to avoid or minimize potential impacts on existing wetlands, streams and ponds. Nevertheless, future, individual project-level development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on wetlands, streams, and ponds in the plan area.
- Development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, or indirect impacts on one special-status plant species observed or known to occur in the plan area, Northern California black walnut, which is a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List 1B species.
- Development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary or indirect impacts on special-status plant species that have not yet been observed or are not yet known to occur, but could potentially occur, based on habitat conditions in the plan area.



- Development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary or indirect impacts on special-status wildlife species observed or known to occur in the plan area.
- Development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may also result in direct, temporary or indirect impacts on special-status species that have not yet been observed or are not yet known to occur, but could potentially occur, based on habitat conditions in the plan area.
- Future, individual project-level development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on nesting and foraging habitat for protected bird species known to occur in the plan area, including Loggerhead Shrike, Lewis's Woodpecker, and Grasshopper Sparrow, as well as other special-status and Migratory Bird Treaty Act-protected bird species with the potential to occur in the plan area.
- Future individual discretionary project-specific development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on Western Pond Turtle and suitable habitat for this species.
- The Specific Plan includes land use and circulation configurations and associated measures intended to avoid or minimize potential direct and indirect impacts on plan area streams and stream habitats. Nevertheless, future individual project-specific discretionary development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on Steelhead in Green Valley Creek, a Federal Threatened Species.
- Compared to other forms of development, the cluster development patterns proposed by the Specific Plan would greatly reduce the potential impact on habitat corridors and linkages, and the proposed preservation of large open space areas would help preserve opportunities for wildlife habitat use and movement. Nevertheless, future individual discretionary project-level development undertaken pursuant to the Specific Plan has the potential to impact wildlife habitat corridors and linkages, through the introduction of barriers to wildlife movement in the form of wider roads with increased traffic and increased development and human presence.
- Development in the Specific Plan area, in combination with other future development elsewhere in the county and subregion, could contribute to cumulative biological resources impacts, including cumulative losses of special-status species, Heritage Trees, and other vegetation and wildlife. These cumulative impacts have been considered in the preparation and adoption of the Solano County General Plan and County-certified General Plan EIR, as well as in similar documents prepared for and adopted in other jurisdictions.

The proposed amendment would be substantially similar to the development evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of

primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the southern access roadway for the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood. The proposed amendments were prompted by site-specific biological studies, including protocol surveys for both special status plants and species in an effort to further reduce potential impacts to biological resources that were previously evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. As such, the proposed amendment would have a minorly reduced impact on the analysis outcome for biological resources. In addition, the proposed amendment would be required to implement Mitigation Measures 6-1 through 6-14.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 6-1:** The County shall encourage avoidance, minimization and compensatory mitigation of identified biological resources, including careful consideration by prospective individual project applicants of the biological resource constraint information provided in this EIR during the pre-application project design phase. In addition, prior to County approval of any future plan area subdivision or other discretionary development application, the project proponent shall submit a biological resources assessment report prepared by a qualified biologist for County review and approval. The biological resources assessment report shall contain a focused evaluation of project-specific impacts on biological resources, including any protocol level surveys for biological resources that have been performed as may be necessary for temporary and indirect impacts, as well as all related biological impact avoidance, minimization, and compensatory mitigation measures included in the project. If the assessment results in a determination that: (a) no oak woodland area, potentially jurisdictional wetland area, or riparian habitat or other stream features would be affected; and (b) no special-status plant or animal species habitat known to occur or potentially occur on or in the vicinity of the project would be affected; no further mitigation would be necessary. If the assessment results in a determination that one or more of these features would be affected, the assessment shall identify associated avoidance, minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation measures shall be consistent with the requirements of corresponding Mitigation 6-2 through 6-13 which follow in this EIR chapter, as well as all other applicable state and federal laws and regulations.

Prior to project approval, the County shall also confirm that project-level development has received the necessary permits, approvals, and determinations from applicable biological resource agencies as identified under Mitigations 6-2 through 6-13 which follow.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-2:** The County shall ensure that, prior to construction, project-level applicants implement (a) multispecies impact avoidance, minimization and compensatory mitigation measures consistent with the Solano HCP (even if the individual project-level application does not require a jurisdictional approval from an HCP implementing agency such as the SCWA, City of Fairfield Municipal Water, or SID); or (b) comparable measures approved by applicable resource agencies. This measure would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level. [Note: This mitigation measure is intended to incorporate the final HCP, once adopted.]

**Mitigation 6-3:** Prior to approval of future individual, site-specific development projects within the plan area, the project proponent shall submit an oak woodland management plan, prepared by a trained arborist or forester, which is consistent with the requirements of the Specific Plan and this EIR (see below). The oak woodland management plan may be integrated into the biological resources assessment report (see Mitigation 6-1).

Direct impacts on oak woodland shall be mitigated by

(a) conservation of oak woodland through the proposed Transfer of Development Rights program (or other method if necessary) at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio by acreage, and (b) replanting of removed heritage oaks at a 1:1 ratio. Transplantation of existing oaks would not require compensatory mitigation, unless subsequent monitoring shows that the transplanted oak has not survived the process.

Implementation of this measure, combined with the detailed mitigation provisions included in the Specific Plan (see below), would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-4:** Proponents of projects that have been determined through Mitigation 6-1 (biological resource assessment report) to involve potential impacts on riparian vegetation communities shall:

- contact the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement is necessary; and
- provide a detailed description of the potential riparian habitat impacts and proposed mitigation program to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) as part of the project's Water Quality Certification application.

Final mitigation for direct and permanent impacts on riparian vegetation/habitat would be subject to jurisdictional agency approval--i.e., approval by the CDFG and Water Board. (The term "jurisdictional agency" as used throughout the mitigation program description in this EIR chapter refers to the federal and state resource agencies with authority pertaining to the subject impact--i.e., the applicable combination of USFWS, Corps, CDFG and/or Water Board, based on the jurisdictional authorities described in sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.3 herein.)

Mitigation shall include: (a) preservation of riparian habitat at the jurisdictional agency-established minimum ratio (or a 1:1 ratio, whichever is more), measured by acreage, either onsite or at an approved mitigation bank; and (b) replanting riparian vegetation in preserved riparian areas at the jurisdictional agency-established minimum ratio (or a 1:1 ratio, whichever is more) as measured by acreage, either onsite or at an approved mitigation bank. Temporary impacts on riparian habitat may be mitigated by replanting of riparian vegetation at the jurisdictional agency-established minimum ratio (or a 1:1 ratio, whichever is more). Preserved riparian habitat areas shall be protected in perpetuity by a conservation easement.

New development lot lines and the edges of cultivated agricultural fields in preserved lands shall be set back from preserved riparian corridors by a minimum of 50 feet for tributaries and a minimum of 100 feet from Green Valley Creek and lower Hennessey Creek.

The potential for introduction of invasive species into riparian communities shall be minimized through use of the planting palettes recommended in the Specific Plan, or a comparable palette approved by the authorized jurisdictional agencies. The use of native plants shall be encouraged.

To provide additional direct mitigation for project impacts on Hennessey Creek riparian vegetation, and potential indirect, in-kind mitigation for riparian impacts elsewhere in the plan area, a Hennessey Creek conceptual restoration plan shall be prepared. This conceptual restoration plan shall be prepared to meet all jurisdictional agency requirements prior to final approval of any future plan area subdivision map or other discretionary approval involving direct impacts on Hennessey Creek riparian communities, or impacts on riparian communities elsewhere in the plan area that may be subject to in-kind mitigation. The plan shall identify steps necessary for implementation, including securing funding from the Conservancy or elsewhere as necessary to carry out the plan.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-5:** Proponents of projects that have been determined through Mitigation 6-1 (biological resources assessment report) to involve potential impacts on wetlands, streams and ponds shall:

- contact the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement is necessary; and
- submit a Section 404 permit application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and a Water Quality Certification application to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board). A jurisdictional Section 404 delineation

must be approved by the Corps before permits can be issued by the above-listed agencies.

Final mitigation for direct and temporary impacts on wetlands, streams, and ponds shall be subject to the approval of the CDFG and Water Board. Mitigation for direct impacts shall include a minimum of (a) preservation of wetland, stream, and/or pond habitat at the jurisdiction agency-established minimum ratio, measured by acreage, either onsite or at an approved mitigation bank; and (b) creation of wetland, stream, and/or pond habitat in preserved areas at the jurisdiction agency-established minimum ratio, either onsite or at an approved mitigation bank. Onsite preserved habitat areas shall be protected in perpetuity by a conservation easement.

New development lot lines and the edges of cultivated agricultural fields in preserved lands shall be set back from preserved wetlands, streams, and ponds by a minimum of 50 feet from tributaries and a minimum of 100 feet from Green Valley Creek and lower Hennessey Creek.

New and expanded road crossings over streams shall be designed and constructed to minimize disturbance to the stream channel by the use of measures such as clear span bridges or arch span culverts when feasible, and minimizing the number and area of footings placed in and at the margins of stream channels.

The Hennessey Creek conceptual restoration area (see Mitigation 6-4) shall be made available to provide for mitigation of direct impacts on Hennessey Creek riparian communities, or potential in-kind mitigation for riparian impacts elsewhere in the plan area.

As indicated in Mitigation 6-4, the potential for introduction of invasive species shall be minimized through use of the planting palettes recommended in the Specific Plan, or a comparable palette approved by the authorized jurisdictional agencies. The use of native plants shall be encouraged.

These measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-6:** Prior to approval of future individual project-level development plans in the plan area, the potential for occurrence of special-status plant species in the proposed project area should be evaluated under Mitigation 6-1 (biological resources assessment report requirements) by a qualified professional biologist and based on the information provided by this EIR and other appropriate literature resources. If suitable habitat for special-status plant species is present in the proposed project area, protocol-level special-status plant surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming period by a qualified professional biologist. The results of the report shall be provided as part of a protocol-level special-status plant survey report, or integrated into other biological documentation.

If special-status plant species are found during protocol-level special-status plant species surveys, the special-status plant species survey report shall provide a discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures as appropriate for each species population. Species observed to be present shall be avoided if feasible. If avoidance of these species is not feasible, the special-status plant species shall be transplanted to suitable habitat areas using techniques most suited for the species based on best available science. This may include seed collection, transplantation, or other appropriate methods depending on the observed plant species.

Potential indirect hydrology impacts shall be evaluated as part of the special-status plant species survey report. If special-status plant species populations could be affected by changes in hydrology as a result of the proposed project, measures such as establishment of appropriate buffers and/or changes to grading contours (if feasible) shall be recommended to maintain preserved and avoided plant species populations.

The potential for introduction of invasive species shall be minimized through use of planting palettes recommended in the Specific Plan or a comparable palette approved by the authorized jurisdictional agencies. The use of native plants is encouraged.

Construction activities shall disturb the minimum area necessary to complete construction work and disturbed areas seeded with a mix containing native species as soon as possible following disturbance. Construction equipment shall be kept clean of vegetative material, and construction traffic shall be restricted to those areas necessary to complete construction.

Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the listing jurisdictional agency would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level. The listing jurisdictional agency is the federal, state and/or local agency--i.e., the USFWS, or CDFG, CNPS, or County--that has recognized (i.e., listed) the species as a special status species deserving special consideration because of its rarity or vulnerability.

**Mitigation 6-7:** Implement Mitigation 6-6. Implementation of this measure as a condition of future individual discretionary project approvals, to the satisfaction of the listing jurisdictional agency (CDFG), would reduce this potential impact to a less-than- significant level.

**Mitigation 6-8:** The biological resources assessment reports submitted by applicants for project-level developments in the plan area shall evaluate the potential for special-status wildlife species to occur in the proposed project areas and shall identify appropriate avoidance, minimization and/or compensatory measures. In accordance with Mitigation 6-2, the biological resources assessment reports shall refer to the anticipated Solano HCP for appropriate avoidance and

minimization measures. Impacts on avian species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) shall be avoided through preconstruction breeding bird surveys and avoidance of occupied nests. Implementation of this measure as a condition of individual discretionary project approval, to the satisfaction of the listing jurisdictional agency(ies), would reduce this potential impact to a less-than- significant level.

**Mitigation 6-9:** Implement Mitigation 6-8. Implementation of this measure as a condition of future individual discretionary project approvals, to the satisfaction of the listing jurisdictional agency (CDFG), would reduce this potential impact to a less-than- significant level.

**Mitigation 6-10:** If construction or other disturbance to suitable nesting habitat for these and other potential special-status bird species is conducted between February 1 and August 31, pre-construction breeding bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no later than 30 days prior to the anticipated start of construction. Construction and removal of suitable nesting vegetation may be initiated without pre- construction surveys if removal and disturbance of suitable nesting habitat is conducted between September 1 and January 31.

If breeding birds are observed during pre-construction surveys, disturbance to active nests shall be avoided by establishment of a buffer between the nest and construction activities. Appropriate buffer distances are species- and project-specific but shall follow the guidelines of the ADHCP: for example, a minimum of 500 feet would be required for Swainson's Hawk and a minimum of 250 feet for Special Management Species (Loggerhead Shrike, Grasshopper Sparrow, and Tricolored Blackbird). For all other special-status bird species, a minimum buffer distance of at least 50 feet shall be required.

The biological resources assessment reports required under Mitigation 6-1 for all individual discretionary development projects in the plan area shall contain analysis of measures that would be used by a proposed development project to minimize and avoid potential indirect impacts on special-status bird species.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-11:** The presence of suitable aquatic and dispersal habitat for WPT shall be evaluated by a qualified biologist as part of the biological resources assessment report required under Mitigation 6-1.

Projects containing suitable aquatic habitat for WPT shall provide an analysis of potential impacts, along with avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for potential impacts on WPT. It is

recommended that final avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures be developed in consultation with CDFG and/or be consistent with the measures outlined in the anticipated Solano HCP.

Direct impacts on WPT habitat shall be mitigated through implementation of the mitigation measures described above for wetlands, streams, and ponds (Mitigation 6-5). Indirect hydrology and water quality impacts on WPT shall be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures recommended in chapter 11, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this EIR.

These measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-12:** Utility crossings and new and expanded road crossings over streams shall be designed and constructed to minimize disturbance to the stream channel by using measures such as clear span bridges or arch span culverts when feasible, and by minimizing the number and area of footings placed in and at the margins of stream channels. Appropriate construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as those recommended in this EIR or in the anticipated Solano HCP to minimize impacts on Steelhead shall also be implemented. Design and minimization measures are subject to approval, and may change, based on consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Riparian vegetation mitigation measures outlined in Mitigation 6-4 shall also be implemented to reduce impacts on riparian vegetation that may affect Steelhead. Mitigation measures for stormwater quality and quantity identified recommended in chapter 11, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this EIR shall be implemented to minimize indirect impacts on Steelhead from stormwater and water quality changes due to construction.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-13:** As part of the biological resources assessment report required under Mitigation 6-1, each project undertaken pursuant to the Specific Plan shall include minimization and mitigation measures for potential impacts on wildlife corridors. Measures may vary based on project location, project design, and habitat types present.

Project-level developments shall maintain the limits of development specified in the Specific Plan to provide adequate buffers for habitat corridors. Stream setbacks specified in Mitigation 6-4 shall be implemented to maintain adequate corridor widths in riparian areas to allow for movement of wildlife.



Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 6-14:** The County shall ensure that Mitigations 6-1 through 6-13 above are implemented. With successful implementation of these measures, the Specific Plan’s contribution to the cumulative biological resources impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to biological resources; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>V. Cultural Resources</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Less than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	8-2
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Less than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	8-1
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	8-3

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that development anticipated in the Specific Plan has the substantial potential to contain buried or obscured prehistoric cultural resources in that agricultural activities and grading activities associated with future individual development projects undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan have the potential to disturb existing unrecorded sensitive archaeological resources in the plan area. In addition, the 55 existing housing units in the plan area, some of which represent historic-period resources, would not be affected by Specific Plan facilitated neighborhood and infrastructure framework. Nevertheless, the EIR found that the future project-specific development in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in substantial adverse changes in the significance of one or more individual potentially significant historic properties in the plan area. If a historic resource were the subject of a future, site-specific development proposal, substantial adverse changes that may potentially occur include physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of one or more of these identified resources, such that the resource is "materially impaired." The EIR concluded that implementation of mitigation measures 8-1 to 8-3 would reduce these impacts to a less than significant.

The proposed amendment would be substantially similar to the development as evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the southern access roadway for the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood. The amendment results in less ground disturbance within the Plan Area. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for cultural resources. In addition, the proposed amendment would be required to implement Mitigation Measures 8-1 through 8-3.

### **Mitigation Measure**

**Mitigation 8-1:** During the County's normal project-specific environmental review (Initial Study) process for all future, discretionary, public improvement and private development projects in the Specific Plan area, the County shall determine the possible presence of, and the potential impacts of the action on, archaeological resources, based on the information provided by this EIR.

For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, the individual project sponsor or environmental consultant shall be required to contract with a qualified archaeologist to conduct a determination in regard to cultural values remaining on the site and warranted mitigation measures. In general, to make an adequate determination, the archaeologist shall conduct a preliminary field inspection to (1) assess the amount and location of visible ground surface, (2) determine the nature and extent of previous impacts, and (3) assess the nature and extent of potential impacts. Such field inspection may demonstrate the need for some form of additional subsurface testing (e.g., excavation by auger, shovel, or backhoe unit), or, alternatively, the need

for onsite monitoring of subsurface activities (i.e., during grading or trenching). To complete the inventory of prehistoric cultural resources, mechanical testing is recommended in areas adjoining Hennessey Creek and Green Valley Creek where ground disturbance may be proposed. In addition, evaluative testing may be necessary to determine whether a resource is eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Places.

If a significant archaeological resource is identified through this field inspection process, the County and project proponent shall seek to avoid damaging effects on the resource. Preservation in place to maintain the relationship between the artifact(s) and the archaeological context is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts on an archaeological site. Preservation may be accomplished by:

- planning construction to avoid the archaeological site;
- incorporating the site within a park, green space, or other open space element;
- covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil; or
- deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement (e.g., an easement administered by the proposed Green Valley Conservancy).

When in-place mitigation is determined by the County to be infeasible, a data recovery plan, which makes provisions for adequate recovery of culturally or historically consequential information about the site, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any additional excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be submitted to the California Historical Records Information System (CHRIS). If Native American artifacts are indicated, the studies shall also be submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on form DPR 422 (archaeological sites). Mitigation measures recommended by these two groups and required by the County shall be undertaken, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction activities.

A data recovery plan and data recovery shall not be required if the County determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the necessary data, provided that the data have already been documented in another EIR or are available for review at the CHRIS (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4[b]).

In the event that subsurface cultural resources are otherwise encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities for a plan area construction activity, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described above.

If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e) shall apply.

**Mitigation 8-2:** Generally, for any future discretionary action within the Specific Plan area that the County determines through the CEQA-required Initial Study review process may cause a “substantial adverse change” to an identified historic resource, the County and applicant shall incorporate measures that would seek to improve the affected resource in accordance with either of the following publications:

- The Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*; or
- The Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Holman & Associates cultural resources inventory, evaluation of the affected resource shall include consideration of (a) the research potential of the property type, (b) the total number of similar resources in the Specific Plan area and potential impacts on the plan area as a whole, and (c) the preservation and study priorities identified in the Holman & Associates inventory. Each site shall be formally recorded on State of California primary record forms (form DPR 523) and applicable attachments. Recording shall consolidate as many of the structures and features as possible into one site (i.e., record form) where there is a clear historical association, despite the frequent dispersal of features across the plan area.

Successful incorporation of these measures would supplement the County's existing General Plan policies and implementation programs and would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4[b]). This mitigation shall be made enforceable by its incorporation into the Specific Plan as a County-adopted requirement to be implemented through subsequent development-specific permits, conditions, agreements, or other measures, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b)(3-5).

For any future discretionary action that would result in the demolition of an identified historic resource, or otherwise cause the significance of the resource to be “materially impaired,” the County shall determine through the Initial Study process that the resulting potential for a significant impact is unavoidable, thereby requiring a project-specific EIR (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5[a] and [b]). In these instances, potentially significant standing structures and/or features shall be evaluated by a qualified architectural historian familiar with the region and its resources. The County shall use this information to formulate a mitigation plan for the resource, including avoiding the structure or feature or moving it to another location and/or donating some features or samples of artifacts to local historical guilds for public interpretation and permanent curation. If standing structures would be moved or destroyed, potential subsurface impacts and the presence/absence of below-ground features, such as buried foundations and filled-in privies and wells, shall be evaluated and addressed. While existing archival information may be sufficient to

address applicable research issues for some resources, focused documentary research and/or oral histories may be required to develop an appropriate

**Mitigation 8-3:** During the County's normal project-specific environmental review (Initial Study) process for all future, discretionary public improvement and private development projects in the Specific Plan area, the County shall determine the possible presence of, and the potential impacts of the action on, paleontological resources. For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, the County shall require individual project applicants to carry out the following measures:

*(1) Education Program.* Project applicants shall implement a program that includes the following elements:

- Resource identification training procedures for construction personnel;
- Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface; and
- Procedures for reporting discoveries and their geologic content.

*(2) Procedures for Resources Encountered.* If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts on paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, "standard" samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to the museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a museum repository for permanent curation and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared. The report and inventory, when submitted to the lead agency, shall signify the completion of the program to mitigate impacts on paleontological resources.

## Conclusion

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to cultural resources; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes InvolveNew Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>VI. Energy</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	Less than Significant	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	None
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	Less than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that the development pattern and energy efficiency guidelines proposed by the Specific Plan would promote compact development and reduce potential energy demands of development within the plan area to levels substantially below demand levels associated with more conventional rural residential development. In particular, the Specific Plan EIR found that the Specific Plan was consistent with applicable renewable energy and efficiency plans and that development in the plan area would not result in land uses or patterns that would cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, or buildings that would have excessive energy requirements because the Specific Plan incorporates development and design energy efficiency guidelines that reiterate and implement the applicable Solano County General Plan energy conservation policies and implementation measures.

**Mitigation Measures**

There are no energy mitigation measures identified.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to energy; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>VII. Geology and Soils</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	None
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	None
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	10-1
iv) Landslides?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	10-1

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	10-1
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	10-1
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	10-2
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.	No Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served with sanitary sewer service.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served with sanitary sewer service.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served with sanitary sewer service.	None
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served with sanitary sewer service.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served with sanitary sewer service.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served with sanitary sewer service.	8-3



## Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would allow for development in areas subject to landslide and erosion hazards, as well as areas of highly expansive soils. The Specific Plan EIR further concluded that the development within the plan mass grading and construction of cuts/fills as part of future development could affect existing patterns of groundwater flow in the plan area. The EIR concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measures 10-1 to 10-3 would reduce these impacts to less than significant.

One new significance criterion has been added to the CEQA environmental checklist, items f) above related to unique geological or paleontological features. This criterion was previously addressed in the Cultural Resources Chapter of the Specific Plan EIR, and it was determined that development within Plan Area does could potentially impact paleontological resources. Mitigation measure 8-3 would reduce this impact to less than significant. There are no known unique geological features within the plan area. The Specific Plan EIR evaluated impacts associated with known features of the Green Valley fault and mapped landslides. No new impacts would occur nor does this criterion pose a change in circumstances that warrants additional analysis.

The proposed amendment would be substantially similar to the MGVSP as evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features. A site-specific fault trench analysis was completed to determine the location of the Green Valley Fault within the plan area, and the proposed amendment includes adjustments to the land use designations along the fault line to accommodate the required 50 foot buffer. The amendment results more precise location of development along the fault line and overall less ground disturbance within the Plan Area itself by relocating units from the Three Creeks foothills to the Elkhorn neighborhood. Additionally, aerial topography has been generated for the entire Specific Plan area to identify specific areas of extreme topography. The precise mapping of topography has led to revisions to the locations of proposed development in the Elkhorn and Three Creek foothills to further minimize development on steep terrain and landslides. As such, the proposed amendment would have a beneficial effect on the analysis outcome for geology and soils. In addition, the proposed amendment would be required to implement Mitigation Measures 10-1 and 10-2.

## Mitigation Measure

**Mitigation 10-1:** At County discretion and consistent with Solano County General Plan policies HS.P-12 through HS.P-15 and HS.P- 17 and implementation programs HS.I-21 and HS.I-22, future subdivision and other discretionary development approvals may be subject to detailed, design-level geotechnical investigations that include analysis of landslide and erosion hazards and

recommend stabilization measures. The County may also require preparation of Preliminary Grading Plans and/or Preliminary Geotechnical Reports, prepared by a licensed Engineering Geologist, before approval of specific developments within the plan area. Under this existing County authority, the investigating Engineering Geologist may be required to determine the extent of any necessary landslide remediation and supervise remediation activities during project construction to ensure that any existing or potential future landslides are fully stabilized. Mitigation measures (e.g., soil replacement, setbacks, retaining walls) shall be required as needed to protect against damage that might be caused by slope failure. Required compliance with these existing Solano County policies, implementation programs and development review procedures to the satisfaction of the County would reduce the potential effects of landsliding and soil erosion to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 10-2:** The detailed, design-level geotechnical investigations required at the County's discretion (see Mitigation 10-1) shall include analysis of expansive soil hazards and shall recommend warranted stabilization measures. The individual project Engineering Geologist shall inspect and certify that any expansive soils underlying individual building pads and all roadway subgrades have been either removed or amended in accordance with County- approved construction specifications, or shall make site-specific recommendations for grading, drainage installation, foundation design, the addition of soil amendments, and/or the use of imported, non-expansive fill materials, as may be required to fully mitigate the effects of weak or expansive soils and prevent future damage to project improvements. These recommendations shall be reviewed and approved by a County-retained registered geologist and incorporated into a report to be included with each building permit application and with the plans for all public and common area improvements.

Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the County, combined with conformance with standard Uniform Building Code and other applicable regulations, would reduce the potential effects of expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 10-3:** Onsite drainage systems shall be regularly maintained to ensure that storm water runoff is directed away from all slope areas. Educational materials that discourage overwatering in landscaped areas shall be furnished to all future lot owners and property managers at the time of purchase and periodically thereafter (perhaps by inclusion with water or tax bills), as part of an effort to control groundwater seepage. Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the County would reduce this potential effect to a less-than-significant level.

## Conclusion

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to geology and soils; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Significant Unavoidable Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase emissions	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase emissions.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase emissions.	7-1
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Significant Unavoidable Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans and policies.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans and policies.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans and policies.	7-1

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated the potential for greenhouse gas impacts as a result of implementing the development anticipated within the Specific Plan. The EIR determined that development anticipated in the Specific Plan may result in a series of impacts of greenhouse gas impacts that are summarized below. The following summary is supported by a technical memorandum prepared by LSA Associates (see Appendix A2).

The Specific Plan EIR includes a detailed discussion of how development within the Specific Plan would involve emissions associated with equipment and vehicles used for demolition, grading, as well as emissions associated with manufacturing materials used to construct projects. The EIR found that construction activities would result in the emission of 66 to 1,443 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Although the BAAQMD had not established thresholds of significance for construction-related GHG emissions, the EIR found impacts to be potentially significant. Thus, the MGVSP EIR identified Mitigation 7-1; however, impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The EIR also determined that the future development would increase GHG emissions associated with residential, commercial, agricultural, and public services in the Plan Area and associated increases in the number of residents, employees, and visitors in the area, thereby increasing the daily vehicle miles traveled associated with the movement of people and goods to and from the Plan Area. The EIR found that implementation of the MGVSP would generate approximately 10,779 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year and 6.65 metric tons per year of CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population (residents plus employees). As identified in the EIR, operational emissions associated with the would exceed the BAAQMD's thresholds of 1,100 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year threshold and 4.6 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year per service population. Therefore, impacts were determined to be potentially significant. Thus, the MGVSP EIR identified Mitigation 7-1; however, impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Finally, the EIR evaluated the MGVSP's consistency with GHG reduction measures identified in the June 2008 Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory, CEQA and Climate Change, Attachment 3: Examples of GHG Reduction Measures. As discussed in the MGVSP EIR, with implementation of Mitigation 7-1, the MGVSP would be generally consistent with the State's GHG reduction measures.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390, which result in a decrease in project related emissions. The proposed amendment would not result in an increase in the generation of vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled that would increase GHG emissions. As such, the proposed amendment would have a minor reduction on the analysis outcome for operational GHG emissions. Furthermore, the proposed amendment would comply with existing State regulations adopted to achieve the overall GHG emissions reduction goals identified in AB 32, the AB 32 Scoping Plan, Executive Order B-30-15, SB 32, and AB 197 and would be consistent with applicable State plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 7-1:** The proposed Specific Plan contains measures to encourage energy efficiency in new Specific Plan-facilitated development. To further ensure that the proposed Specific Plan facilitates growth in a manner that reduces the rate of associated greenhouse gas emissions increase, discretionary approvals for Specific Plan-related individual residential, commercial, agricultural, and public services projects in the Specific Plan Area shall be required to comply with

the Climate Action Plan to be developed and adopted by the County. In the interim, Specific Plan-related discretionary approvals shall incorporate an appropriate combination of the following greenhouse gas emissions reduction measures (from Table 7.3 [of the MGVSP EIR]):

- features in the project design that would accommodate convenient public transit and promote direct access for pedestrians and bicyclists to major destinations;
- adoption of a project design objective for public buildings to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) New Construction "Silver" Certification or better, in addition to compliance with California Code of Regulations Title 24 Energy Efficient Standards;
- planting of trees and vegetation near structures to shade buildings and reduce energy requirements for heating and cooling;
- preservation or replacement of existing onsite trees;
- construction and demolition waste recycling (see Mitigation 16-12 of the MGVSP EIR); and
- preference for replacement of project exterior lighting, street lights and other electrical uses with energy efficient bulbs and appliances.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to greenhouse gas; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>IX Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	15-1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	15-1

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	15-1
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 itcreate a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project is not designated as a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5	<b>No.</b> The proposed project is not designated as a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5nt.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project is not designated as a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5	None
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 and result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	Less than Significant	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified..	None
f) Impair implementation of orphysically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than Significant with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified..	16-8

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildfires?	Less than Significant with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards beyond those previously identified.	16-9, 16-10

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated the potential for hazards material impacts as a result of implementation of the development anticipated in the Specific Plan, including new home construction, mixed use commercial uses, roadways, and other infrastructure. The EIR determined that the Specific Plan area and surrounding vicinity may contain areas of contamination from past agricultural pesticide use or other sources that could pose a safety hazard for workers, residents, school children, or other occupants of the plan area. The plan area and surrounding properties have historically been used for agriculture and therefore may contain chemical residues from agricultural activities. In addition, past or current handling of other types of hazardous materials within the plan area and vicinity may have created soil and/or groundwater contamination, resulting in potential short-term hazards to construction workers during site preparation work. The EIR determined that each developer of a site in the Specific Plan area would be required to comply with all applicable existing state- and county-mandated site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination and compliance with these established requirements would be expected to assure that this possible health and safety impact would be less-than-significant. The EIR further determined that the plan would permit residential development adjoining agricultural uses, some of which may store and/or use pesticides or other hazardous substances and the Specific Plan would also allow development of an elementary school in the northwestern corner of the Nightingale neighborhood, close to but not adjoining agricultural areas. The potential exposure of residents or other site occupants to pesticides or other hazardous substances used in agriculture would represent a potentially significant impact which would be mitigated by mitigation measure 15-1.

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated proximity to airport and applicability of the Airport LUC (criterion e) above) within the Land Use Chapter. The Plan Area is located within Zone D of the Travis Airforce Base Land Use Compatibility Plan. Development anticipated within the plan area does not trigger the review criteria for new development in Zone D (the plan does not include objects over 200 feet in height, wind turbines, commercial scale solar facilities, meteorological towers).

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated interference with adopted emergency response plan and emergency evacuation routes and wildfire risks (criterion f) and g) above) in the Public Services

Chapter. The EIR determined that development in the plan area would result in increased traffic and congestion on Green Valley Road that could possibly delay emergency response and evacuation; however, implementation of mitigation measures identified in the EIR's transportation and circulation chapter would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. The Specific Plan EIR recognized that the development within the plan area would introduce new residential and commercial land within or adjacent to areas where wildland fire danger is "moderate" to "very high" thereby increasing the risk of wildland fires and associated needs for additional fire protection personnel and facilities. The EIR further identified wildfire risks associated with storage and use of flammable fuels and materials during construction within the areas of heightened wildfire risk. Mitigation measures, including compliance applicable California Building Code and California Uniform Fire Code standards (including standards for building materials, construction methods, fire sprinklers, etc.) and all applicable State and County standards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance in adjacent areas were identified to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390, including removal of some of residential units previously identified in the Three Creeks foothills which were located in an area of high fire risk. Lastly, additional emergency vehicle accessways have been added within and in between the foothill neighborhoods to increase circulation for emergency vehicles. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for hazards and hazardous materials.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 15-1:** As an amendment to the proposed Specific Plan (Policy OL-11) and/or as part of the proposed Resource Management Plan and/or Agricultural Business Plan, the County shall require a minimum 200-foot-wide buffer between residential and school uses and agricultural properties within and adjoining the Specific Plan area. In addition, the County shall ensure that agricultural operators within the Specific Plan area comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations regarding hazardous materials, including Solano County General Plan provisions, Solano County Code requirements, and the permitting processes of the Solano County Department of Resource Management and Solano County Agriculture Department.

**Mitigation 16-8:** Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 17, Transportation and Circulation, to reduce the impacts of Specific Plan-related traffic on Green Valley Road and other



local roads. In addition, before approval of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall obtain written verification from the CFPD that proposed emergency access provisions meet CFPD road design and emergency access standards and require any necessary changes as a condition of map approval.

**Mitigation 16-9:** Implement Mitigation 16-7 and Mitigation 16-8. In addition, as a condition of Certificate of Occupancy approval, each individual discretionary development project in the Specific Plan area shall meet all applicable California Building Code and California Uniform Fire Code standards (including standards for building materials, construction methods, fire sprinklers, etc.) and all applicable State and County standards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance in adjacent areas.

**Mitigation 16-10:** As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require that construction contractors conform to all applicable fire-safe regulations in applicable codes, including California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and local requirements for appropriate storage of flammable liquids and prohibition of open flames within 50 feet of flammable storage areas.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to hazard and hazardous materials compared to those previously identified in the EIR, and no new mitigation would be required.

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>X. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	11-1

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified..	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	None
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site? iii) Create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	11-1
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	None

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
e) conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	No Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase impacts beyond those previously identified.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR determined that development within the plan area could degrade the quality of receiving waters in Hennessey Creek, Green Valley Creek and, ultimately, Suisun Bay during construction and also through (a) runoff from new roadways, parking areas, and other paved areas; and (b) herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers used in new agricultural activities and new domestic landscaping. Mitigation measures 11-1 and 11-2 were adopted to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

The EIR also found that a portion of the land designated for development within the Elkhorn, Nightingale and Three Creeks neighborhoods overlap the Solano County General Plan-identified Lakes Madigan & Frey Dam Inundation Area and Green Valley Creek 100-year flood zone, the latter as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate map (FIRM) program and that development of these areas could potentially result in the placement of housing within a dam failure inundation zone or 100-year flood hazard area, with associated risks to public safety and property damage, and could result in the placement of structures in the flood zone which would impede or redirect flood flows. Mitigation measure 11-3 was adopted to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for hydrology and water quality.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 11-1:** The County shall ensure that the developer of each future Specific Plan-facilitated discretionary development in the plan area complies where applicable with all current state, regional, and County water quality provisions, and in particular, complies with the process of

development plan review established in the County's Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), and associated County NPDES permit issuance requirements instituted to address short-term and long-term water quality issues, including construction period activities.

**Mitigation 11-2:** As a condition of future discretionary development approvals in the plan area, the County shall ensure that developers comply with applicable Solano County Storm Water Management Plan and NPDES permit requirements. In addition, as recommended in the County General Plan under Implementation Program RS.I-67, the minimum riparian buffer width to protect water quality and ecosystem function shall be determined according to existing parcel size. For parcels more than 2 acres in size, a minimum 150-foot development setback shall be provided. For parcels of 0.5-2.0 acres, a minimum 50-foot setback shall be provided. For parcels less than 0.5 acre a minimum 20-foot setback shall be provided. Exceptions to these development setbacks apply to parcels where a parcel is entirely within the riparian buffer setback or development on the parcel entirely outside of the setback is infeasible or would have greater impacts on water quality and wildlife habitat.

**Mitigation 11-3:** As a condition of future residential subdivision and other discretionary development approvals in these particular areas, the County shall ensure that project-specific applications comply with Solano County General Plan policies and requirements related to flood hazard protection, including policies HS.P- 5 (appropriate elevation and flood proofing), HS.P-7 (mitigation requirements to bring risks from dam failure inundation to a reasonable level), and HS.I-11 (applicant prepared engineering report requirements for new development for human occupancy in designated dam failure inundation areas).

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to hydrology and water quality; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XI. Land Use</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Physically divide an established community?	Less Than Significant	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not divide an established community.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not divide an established community.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not divide an established community.	None
b) Cause a significant impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less Than Significant	<b>No.</b> The proposed project is consistent with plans and regulations.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project is consistent with plans and regulations.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project is consistent with plans and regulations.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would not divide an established community because it involves new neighborhoods that are located in a rural valley well separated from each other and from the closest existing "communities" in the area--i.e., the Upper Green Valley subdivision areas to the north and the City of Fairfield Hidden Meadows and East Ridge subdivisions to the south and southeast. As a result, the Specific Plan would not "disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the community" and, beyond the potential direct and indirect impacts on farmland identified in the agricultural impact section, the EIR determined the plan would not otherwise be "incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity". The EIR also found that the Specific Plan was considered consistent with County General Plan land use goals, policies and implementation programs. Consistent with the County General Plan, the Draft Specific Plan land use and circulation framework and associated development standards and design guidelines have been formulated to limit the effects of development on the valued rural character of the valley, including viewsheds, wildlife habitat and corridors and agricultural activities. No land use impacts or mitigation measures were identified.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce

the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for land use.

**Mitigation Measure**

There are no land use mitigation measures.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to land use; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XII. Mineral Resources</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR determined that development within the plan area would have a less than significant impact on mineral resources. The Solano County General Plan includes a countywide mineral resources map and associated mineral resource zone (MRZ) classification system mandated by the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA). The most important zone with respect to the potential presence of mineral resources is MRZ-2 (areas where significant minerals are or are highly likely to be present). There are no MRZ-2 designated lands in the plan area or vicinity. Therefore, the EIR determined that the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site and would not otherwise result in a substantial loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have no effect on the analysis outcome for mineral resources.

**Mitigation Measure**

There are no mineral resource mitigation measures.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to mineral resources; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XIII. Noise</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional, or national regulations.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional, or national regulations.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional, or national regulations.	4.6-2
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	None

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not be exposed to aviation noise.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not be exposed to aviation noise.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not be exposed to aviation noise.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated the potential for noise impacts as a result of implementing the development anticipated within the Specific Plan. The EIR determined that development anticipated in the Specific Plan may result in a series of impacts of noise impacts that are summarized below. The following summary is supported by a technical memorandum prepared by LSA Associates (see Appendix A2).

The Specific Plan EIR estimated future traffic noise along Green Valley Road and determined that the future 60 dBA L<sub>dn</sub> noise contour would be located about 100 feet from the near-lane center line of Green Valley Road, and the 65 dBA L<sub>dn</sub> noise contour would be located about 50 feet from the near-lane center line of the road. The Specific Plan EIR found that residential development in the Rural Farm and Agricultural-Residential designations along portions of Green Valley Road may be exposed to traffic noise that exceeds “normally acceptable” levels defined by the Solano County General Plan. As such, impacts were found potentially significant. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 13-1, which reduced impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The Specific Plan EIR found that noise-generating land uses facilitated by the Specific Plan, such as agricultural activities, commercial uses, and the fire station and wastewater treatment plant, may expose noise-sensitive uses such as housing, recreational areas, and the possible future onsite school to noise and/or vibration. Possible noise exposure exceeding State and Solano County standards represents a potentially significant impact. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 13-2 to ensure new noise-sensitive uses developed adjacent to noise-generating uses would be designed to control noise to meet the noise compatibility guidelines, standards, policies, and implementation programs established by the Solano County General Plan.



The Specific Plan EIR determined that construction activities facilitated by the MGVSP could include site grading and preparation, building demolition, building modification and rehabilitation, construction of new buildings, and installation of utilities; and all of activities generate noise, especially during the demolition phase and the construction of project infrastructure when heavy equipment is used. The effects of noise resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors. Although construction noise would be localized to the individual site location, rural residences and other land uses throughout the Plan Area would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout construction. The Specific Plan EIR determined that such effects would represent a potentially significant adverse impact on nearby noise-sensitive land uses. As such, the Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 13-3 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The Specific Plan EIR found that traffic from Specific Plan -facilitated development would increase traffic noise levels on Green Valley Road by 3 to 4 dB above existing levels. While the Specific Plan -related traffic noise increase alone would not represent a significant impact, its contribution to the cumulative traffic noise increase on Green Valley Road south of Eastridge Drive would represent a significant cumulative impact. As such, the Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation 13-4 to reduce traffic noise impacts. However, impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the MGVSP evaluated in the MGVSP EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. The proeposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the noise analysis; specifically:

- The proposed amendment would not result in an increase in the generation of vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled that would increase traffic noise levels.
- Construction activities associated with Specific Plan facilitated development would be located the same distance from existing receptors as previously identified in the Specific Plan EIR; therefore, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on construction noise levels.
- As described above, the proposed amendment would not result in an increase in the generation of vehicle trips or vehicle miles traveled that would increase traffic noise levels. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on cumulative traffic impacts.
- The proposed amendment would shift the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway closer to the existing residences south of Reservoir Lane along Dynasty Drive and Pavilion Drive. This shifted southern access roadway would be located approximately 100 feet from these existing residences. As identified in the Specific Plan EIR, Green Valley Road noise levels of 60 dBA Ldn at 100 feet and 65 dBA Ldn at 50 feet. However, the southern access roadway would serve as an interior access roadway with low traffic volumes, while Green Valley Road is a collector road

that provides County travel with higher traffic volumes. Therefore, it is assumed that the southern access roadway would generate noise levels of approximately 55 dBA Ldn at 100 feet and 60 dBA Ldn at 50 feet. The existing residences would be located approximately 100 feet from the southern access roadway where traffic noise levels would be approximately 55 dBA Ldn at the nearest residences. These residences have a concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall separating the backyards from Reservoir Lane, which would reduce noise levels associated with the southern access roadway by at least 5 dBA. Additionally, a new landscape planter will be installed along the existing wall as part of the development within the plan area. Therefore, the closest sensitive receptors would be exposed to an exterior traffic noise level of approximately 45 dBA Ldn, which would be within the County's normally acceptable noise standard of 60 dBA Ldn or less for residential development. As such, the proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to traffic noise to offsite receptors compared to those previously identified in the Specific Plan EIR, and no new mitigation would be required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 13-1:** For project-specific residential development proposals on sites adjoining Green Valley Road, the County shall require applicants to conduct site-specific noise studies that identify, to County satisfaction, noise reduction measures that would be included in final design to meet State and County noise standards. These measures may include the following:

Minimizing noise in residential outdoor activity areas (i.e., ensuring that noise levels would be below 65 dBA Ldn) by locating the areas at least 50 feet from the center line of Green Valley Road and/or behind proposed buildings.

Providing air conditioning in all houses located within 100 feet of Green Valley Road so that windows can remain closed to maintain interior noise levels below 45 dBA Ldn.

**Mitigation 13-2:** New noise-generating uses facilitated by the Specific Plan shall be subject to the noise compatibility guidelines, standards, policies, and implementation programs established by the Solano County General Plan. In accordance with General Plan Implementation Program HS.I-67, noise analysis and acoustical studies shall be conducted for proposed noise-generating uses, as determined necessary by the County, and noise abatement measures shall be included to County satisfaction to ensure compliance with applicable guidelines and standards.

In addition, new noise-sensitive uses developed adjacent to noise-generating uses shall be designed to control noise to meet the noise compatibility guidelines, standards, policies, and implementation programs established by the Solano County General Plan. In accordance with

General Plan Implementation Program HS.I-67, noise analysis and acoustical studies shall be conducted for proposed noise-sensitive uses, as determined necessary by the County, and noise attenuation features shall be included to ensure compliance with applicable guidelines and standards.

**Mitigation 13-3:** To reduce noise impacts from Specific Plan-related construction activities, the County shall require future project-specific discretionary developments to implement the following measures, as appropriate:

- *Construction Scheduling.* Ensure that noise-generating construction activity is limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and that construction noise is prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.
- *Construction Equipment Mufflers and Maintenance.* Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- *Equipment Locations.* Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project site.
- *Construction Traffic.* Route all construction traffic to and from the construction sites via designated truck routes where possible. Prohibit construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible.
- *Quiet Equipment Selection.* Use quiet construction equipment, particularly air compressors, wherever possible.
- *Noise Disturbance Coordinator.* For larger construction projects, designate a "Noise Disturbance Coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The Disturbance Coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the Disturbance Coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. (The County should be responsible for designating a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and the individual project sponsor should be responsible for posting the phone number and providing construction schedule notices.)

**Mitigation 13-4:** To reduce the traffic noise increase along Green Valley Road, the County should consider the use of noise-reducing pavement, along with traffic calming measures (which could achieve noise reductions of approximately 1 dBA for each 5 mile-per-hour reduction in traffic speed). These measures may not be feasible, however, and may not be directly applicable to the Specific Plan, particularly since the segment of Green Valley Road where the highest traffic noise increase is expected (the northbound segment south of Eastridge Drive) is not within the Specific Plan Area.

### Conclusion

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to noise; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XIV. Population and Housing</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less than significant	<b>No.</b> The proposed project includes fewer residential units than were previously analyzed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project includes fewer residential units than were previously analyzed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project includes fewer residential units than were previously analyzed	None
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	None

### Discussion

The Specific Plan FEIR evaluated population and housing impacts as a result of the planned residential development of 400 new primary housing units, plus new secondary housing units and other proposed uses, such as the chapel, farm stand, recreation center, land conservancy office, and inn. The EIR found that the Specific Plan-generated population, housing, and job increments would be generally consistent with the land use provisions of the Solano County General Plan and in and of themselves would represent a less-than-significant environmental impact and no mitigation was identified. The Specific Plan would not displace any people or housing units. The EIR did recognize that although the construction of new housing and other land uses in the plan area would not have a direct impact; the population that would be generated from these new units would have indirect impacts associated with other topics evaluated in the EIR (see air quality, greenhouse gas, cultural resources, hazardous materials, etc) and individual mitigation measures are incorporated to reduce these indirect population induced impacts.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have no effect on the analysis outcome for population and housing.

**Mitigation Measure**

There are no population and housing mitigation measures.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to population and housing; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XV. Public Services</b>					
<i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>					
a) Fire protection?	Less than significant impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities beyond those previously identified.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities beyond those previously identified.	16-7
b) Police protection?	Less than significant impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	None
c) Schools?	Less than significant impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities.	None
d) Parks?	Less than significant impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
e) Other public facilities?	Less than significant impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded other public facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded other public facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded other public facilities.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR found that development of the Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire protection and that there is potential need for a new fire station. At the time the EIR was prepared, there was another project, Rockville Trails, that included a fire station. The EIR determined that if the Specific Plan development occurs before construction of the proposed new fire station in the Rockville Trails Estates project is assured, then a new station could be needed within the plan area. The Rockville Trails project never came to fruition. The Specific Plan EIR found that there was no need for new or altered police services, nor additional parks. Finally, while development in accordance with the Specific Plan may increase demand for public education services, developer payment of standard school impact fees would under State law represent adequate payment to cover a fair share of any need for new or altered school facilities. As a result, the EIR determined that effect of the Specific Plan on police protection, schools and parks would be considered less-than-significant.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. Also, the amendment relocates the potential location of a fire station from within the Elkhorn neighborhood to the intersection of Mason Road and Green Valley Road as requested by Cordelia Fire Protection District. This CFPD preferred location provides for improved response times to the existing and new residents in the vicinity. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for public services.

**Mitigation Measure**

Mitigation 16-7. Before approval of the first Tentative Subdivision Map application in the Specific Plan area, the County shall obtain written verification from the Cordelia Fire Protection District (CFPD) that either (1) the CFPD’s need for a new fire station in the general vicinity has been met (e.g., by plans for a new station on the Rockville Trails Estates site), or (2) a new fire station is needed within the Specific Plan area. If the latter is verified, the County shall require plans for

construction of a fire station within the plan area as a condition of Tentative Subdivision Map approval, and confirm that any necessary additional environmental review is conducted.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to population and housing; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.



Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XVI. Recreation</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	Less than significant impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the deterioration of existing park lands.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the deterioration of existing park lands.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in the deterioration of existing park lands.	None
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less than significant impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR determined that because the amount of parkland within in the plan area exceeds the County’s General Plan park to resident ratio by approximately 9 acres. As a result of the amount of parkland within the plan area, the EIR determined that implementation of the specific plan would not increase the use of neighborhood parks nor require expansion or construction of recreational facilities elsewhere to accommodate demand for parks that would be generated by new residents within the plan area. Notably, the EIR did find potential impacts associated with construction of trails and included mitigation measures to ensure trails are constructed consistent with applicable trail design standards.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have no effect on the analysis outcome for recreation.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Mitigation 16-11:** As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require written verification that the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council has reviewed and approved final trail design and construction to ensure that trails within the Specific Plan area comply with Bay Area Ridge Trail standards, as appropriate.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to recreation; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XVII. Transportation</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Significant Unavoidable Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not generate more trips than were previously disclosed in the EIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate previously identified impacts.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not generate more trips than were previously disclosed in the EIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate previously identified impacts.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not generate more trips than were previously disclosed in the EIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate previously identified impacts.	17-1, 17-2
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Not included in the EIR	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would screen out of VMT analysis.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would screen out of VMT analysis.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would screen out of VMT analysis.	None
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a Geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less Than Significant Impact	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	None

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts	17-1, 17-2
---	--	--	---	--	------------

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR included a detailed transportation and circulation analysis, including site specific trip generation and Level of Service analysis of individual intersection and roadway segments that would be impacted by new vehicle trips generated from the specific plan. The Specific Plan EIR identified multiple intersections that would require mitigation in order to meet previously identified level of service criteria. The environmental checklist criteria have changed since the Specific Plan EIR was prepared and this type of “Level of Service” analysis is no longer relied upon to determine environmental impacts of any given project. The criteria now rely more on a project’s compatibility with local transportation plans and Vehicle Miles Traveled. Regardless, the impacts and mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR are carried over into this analysis and all mitigation measures will remain applicable with development of the specific plan.

Abrams Associates Traffic Engineering, Inc reviewed the proposed addendum and prepared a memorandum to assist with the analysis in this addendum (Appendix A3).

With respect to trip generation, the proposed amendment to the Specific Plan includes requested changes to the maximum number of units by neighborhood to address inconsistencies within the Specific Plan. The amendment also includes a request to reapportion units from the Three Creeks neighborhood to the Elkhorn neighborhood. As a result, the overall total number of new homes is reduced from 400 to 390. Based on this analysis the proposed amendment to the Specific Plan would result in a net reduction to the overall trip generation of about 7 trips during the AM peak hour and 10 trips during the PM peak hour. Once this difference in traffic is distributed onto the various streets that provide access to the area, the resulting changes would be negligible in relation to the existing and projected traffic volumes in the area.

With respect to VMT, the Office of Planning and Research’s 2018 Technical Advisory includes guidelines for VMT screening specify that small projects that are consistent with the General Plan and “generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day” can be presumed to “cause a less-than-significant impact without conducting a detailed study“. The proposed amendment would qualify for the screening criteria covering small projects since it is forecast to generate a net reduction of about 90 trips per day. Moreover, because the proposed changes reduce the amount of units the difference between this project and the approved Specific Plan is negligible.

The EIR determined that there are no internal site circulation or access issues that would cause a traffic safety problem or any unusual traffic congestion or delay. Both of the proposed project access points on Green Valley Road are proposed to incorporate roundabouts and the two intersections would operate well and have adequate sight distances and could readily

accommodate the estimated traffic volumes. Finally, the EIR adequacy of emergency evacuation (criterion d) above) in the Public Services Chapter. The EIR determined that development in the plan area would result in increased traffic and congestion on Green Valley Road that could possibly delay emergency response and evacuation; however, implementation of mitigation measures 17-1 and 17-2 would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for recreation.

### **Mitigation Measure**

#### **Mitigation 17-1:**

(1) Baseline plus project impacts on this stop sign controlled intersection 5, Green Valley Road at Westlake Drive, would not warrant installation of a traffic signal. It is recommended that the intersection remain in its current configuration, since the project-related significant delay would be limited to the side street left-turn movement in the PM peak hour only (Westlake Drive approach), and alternative routes are available to motorists at this location. This impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable. If the City of Fairfield determines in the future that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, the City and County could agree on a portion of the signal installation cost to be assigned to the plan area, and the County could identify an associated fair share per residential unit contribution as a condition of subsequent individual subdivision map approvals in the plan area.

(2) For project impacts on intersections 7 and 9, future subdivision and other discretionary development approvals in the plan area shall pay a proportionate fair share of the cost of planned interim improvements to the Green Valley Road/I-80 interchange that have been identified by the City of Fairfield, including:

- At signalized intersection 7, Green Valley Road at Business Center Drive, improvement plans are being developed to allow for free right-turn movements on the northbound and southbound approaches to the intersection. The southbound free right-turn would also include construction of a separate right-turn lane for the southbound Green Valley Road approach to Business Center Drive.
- At unsignalized intersection 9, Green Valley Road at the I-80 Westbound onramp, the on ramp leg of the intersection is to be realigned to allow for the addition of a separate left-turn lane for northbound Green Valley Road, along with a new traffic signal.

(3) For project impacts on signalized intersection 10, Green Valley Road at the I-80 Eastbound Ramps, the planned reconstruction of the Green Valley Road/I-80 interchange would ultimately mitigate the anticipated AM and PM peak hour baseline plus project operational impacts;

however, no feasible interim improvements to the interchange have been identified to mitigate these impact (mitigation would ultimately require reconstruction--i.e., widening--of the overpass). Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above for intersections 7 and 9 would substantially reduce the amount of peak hour delay per vehicle at these two intersections, but not to less than significant levels. The projected background plus project peak hour ratings at each of the four study intersections would remain at LOS E or F. In addition, because the County does not have jurisdiction over these intersections (within the City of Fairfield), implementation of the mitigation measures listed above for intersections 7 and 9 is not assured.

**Mitigation 17-2:** The cumulative plus project condition at this intersection would not warrant installation of a traffic signal. It is recommended that this intersection remain in its current unsignalized condition, since the project-related significant delay would be limited to the left-turn movement at the side street (Westlake Drive) approach in the PM peak hour only, and alternative routes are available to motorists at this location.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to transportation and circulation; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources</b>					
<i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>					
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	Not included in prior EIR, new criteria	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts	None
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	Not included in prior EIR, new criteria	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not exacerbate previously identified impacts	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated impacts to tribal cultural resources in the Cultural Resources chapter. As part of the EIR analysis, representatives of the Rumsey Indian Reservation and the Northwest Information Center were consulted to help inform the analysis. The NWIC concluded that, given the character of the plan area hillsides, valley floor, and creek corridors, there is a "high

likelihood" that unrecorded pre-historic period Native American cultural resources exist in the plan area. Native American cultural resources in this part of Solano County have been found at the base of hills, on alluvial flats, on midslope terraces, and near sources of water (including perennial and intermittent streams and springs). The NWIC noted that the plan area contains all three of these environmental features. Mitigation measure 8-1 was identified to reduce impacts to less than significant.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for tribal cultural resources.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 8-1:** During the County's normal project-specific environmental review (Initial Study) process for all future, discretionary, public improvement and private development projects in the Specific Plan area, the County shall determine the possible presence of, and the potential impacts of the action on, archaeological resources, based on the information provided by this EIR.

For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, the individual project sponsor or environmental consultant shall be required to contract with a qualified archaeologist to conduct a determination in regard to cultural values remaining on the site and warranted mitigation measures. In general, to make an adequate determination, the archaeologist shall conduct a preliminary field inspection to (1) assess the amount and location of visible ground surface, (2) determine the nature and extent of previous impacts, and (3) assess the nature and extent of potential impacts. Such field inspection may demonstrate the need for some form of additional subsurface testing (e.g., excavation by auger, shovel, or backhoe unit), or, alternatively, the need for onsite monitoring of subsurface activities (i.e., during grading or trenching). To complete the inventory of prehistoric cultural resources, mechanical testing is recommended in areas adjoining Hennessey Creek and Green Valley Creek where ground disturbance may be proposed. In addition, evaluative testing may be necessary to determine whether a resource is eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Places.

If a significant archaeological resource is identified through this field inspection process, the County and project proponent shall seek to avoid damaging effects on the resource. Preservation in place to maintain the relationship between the artifact(s) and the archaeological context is the

preferred manner of mitigating impacts on an archaeological site. Preservation may be accomplished by:

- planning construction to avoid the archaeological site;
- incorporating the site within a park, green space, or other open space element;
- covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil; or
- deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement (e.g., an easement administered by the proposed Green Valley Conservancy).

When in-place mitigation is determined by the County to be infeasible, a *data recovery plan*, which makes provisions for adequate recovery of culturally or historically consequential information about the site, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any additional excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be submitted to the California Historical Records Information System (CHRIS). If Native American artifacts are indicated, the studies shall also be submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on form DPR 422 (archaeological sites). Mitigation measures recommended by these two groups and required by the County shall be undertaken, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction activities.

A *data recovery plan* and data recovery shall not be required if the County determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the necessary data, provided that the data have already been documented in another EIR or are available for review at the CHRIS (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4[b]).

In the event that subsurface cultural resources are otherwise encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities for a plan area construction activity, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described above.

If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e) shall apply.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to tribal cultural resources; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.



Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XIX. Utilities and Service Systems</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Require or result in the relocation, construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?		<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served by adequate water supplies.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served by adequate water supplies.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served by adequate water supplies.	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that is has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> There is adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the proposed project.	<b>No.</b> There is adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the proposed project.	<b>No.</b> There is adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the proposed project.	16-4, 16-5, 16-6
f) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity.	16-12

Environmental IssueArea	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
g) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	16-12

**Discussion**

Consistent with the Specific Plan, the Specific Plan EIR evaluated four options of receiving water service from the City of Fairfield, groundwater (which the Recirculated Specific Plan EIR looked at in more detail), City of Vallejo, or Solano Irrigation District. The Specific Plan EIR determined that the project would have a demand of 186 acre feet per year (AFY) and that with mitigation the environmental impacts of this water demand would be less than significant. Because the proposed amendments would reduce the water demand by reducing the number of units from 400 to 390 units, the water demand would be less than what was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and therefore the impact to water supply would be negligible.

The Energy analysis chapter of the Specific Plan EIR determined that, beyond the typical local extensions of existing infrastructure, the Specific Plan buildout would not be expected to result in the need for substantial new energy systems or any substantial alterations to existing electrical, natural gas or communications systems; nor would project buildout physically affect or require alteration to known existing major electrical, natural gas or communications systems in the area. Project effects on new energy systems needs and on existing energy infrastructure would therefore be less-than-significant and no mitigation is required.

The Specific Plan EIR determined the project could have impacts related to solid waste generated during construction and adopted mitigation measure 16-12 to reduce this impact.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for utilities and service systems.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation 16-1a:** Prior to subdivision map approval, a Water Master Plan for water supply Option B shall be prepared that describes engineering specifications and other related components necessary for completion of established County and State well and public water system permitting requirements and review procedures. The Water Master Plan shall be approved by Solano County. The Water Master Plan shall contain as one of its components engineering specifications including, but not limited to:

- well locations and depths;
- water pumping, filtration, and disinfection specifications; and
- water storage and distribution facilities and sizing.

The Water Master Plan and its components shall be designed to provide water service only to the Specific Plan designated development areas, so as to preclude any growth-inducing impacts on adjoining designated agricultural and open space lands (pursuant to General Plan Housing Element Policy G.2).

As part of the Water Master Plan process, the applicant shall obtain input from the Cordelia Fire Protection District to ensure that the plan meets District fire flow rate and duration standards (pursuant to General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs PF.I-35, PF.P-38, PF.P-39, HS.P-23, and HS.I-28).

The Water Master Plan shall contain as one of its components the information required for application to the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) for a public water system initial operating permit, which requires demonstration that the proposed water system (including well, pumping, storage, and distribution components) meets State (including Title 22) requirements. The proposed operator of the public water system shall complete the CDPH public water system initial operating permit issuance process. (It is anticipated that the County Services Area [CSA] will need to have been formed prior to or as part of preparation of the Water Master Plan, including completion of the applicable LAFCO review process, for the Water Master Plan to be able to describe the technical, managerial, financial, and other information that the CDPH permit process requires.)

The Water Master Plan shall contain as one of its components the information required for application to the County Environmental Health Services Division for well permits to construct the public water system wells. The applicant or operator shall complete the County well construction permit issuance process.

**Mitigation 16-1b:** Prior to subdivision map approval, the County shall comply with the statutory requirements of SB 221 (Government Code Section 66473.7), which includes preparation of a water supply verification to demonstrate with firm assurances that there is a sufficient water supply for the project.

Implementation of these measures would ensure that, under water supply Option B, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to adequacy of water supply.

**Mitigation 16-2a:** The wells under water supply Option B or Option C1 shall be designed to avoid any potential interference between new Plan wells and (1) other Plan wells, (2) existing nearby private wells, and (3) surface streams. A non-exclusive list of the tools and methods to be used to accomplish avoidance are: appropriate well siting, placement, and spacing; selection of well depths and of equipment for pumping and testing; and monitoring, including testing and monitoring wells.

Based on available water supply, aquifer characteristics, post-project demand, and the number and location of existing wells and surface streams, it is expected that a well design plan could be devised that avoids adverse impacts on neighboring wells and surface streams.

The well design process will also generate additional information in the future. The well design process shall precede, and under industry practice would precede, determination of the engineering specifications for well locations and depths. The engineering specifications for well locations and depths are required to be identified as part of the Water Master Plan specified under Mitigation 16-1a. The Water Master Plan is required to be prepared prior to subdivision map approval (a discretionary approval subject to CEQA). Additional information resulting from the well design process will therefore be available at a time when subsequent activities and approvals are later examined in light of this program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document would then need to be prepared in conformance with the requirements of CEQA. At the latest, additional information resulting from the well design process would be available prior to subdivision map approval by the County, but for purposes of approval of CSA formation or issuance of an operating permit, Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) or CDPH, respectively, may require some or all of the information resulting from the well design process to be available earlier. If the well design process generates new relevant factual information relating to Impact 16-2, that information will be generated at a time when it would be examined in conformance with CEQA's requirements for subsequent review following a program EIR.

Implementation of this measure would provide for avoidance of any potential interference between new Plan wells and (1) other Plan wells, (2) existing nearby private wells, and (3) surface streams, such that any potentially significant effect would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Although Mitigation 16-2a would provide for avoidance sufficient to reduce Impact 16-2 to a less-than-significant level, in response to public concerns expressed to the County regarding potential interference with private water supply wells the County would additionally implement the Mitigation Measure 16-2b in the unlikely event that groundwater pumping associated with the proposed project resulted in adverse effects to existing nearby wells.

**Mitigation 16-2b:** If, in the unlikely event that ongoing monitoring conducted as part of the well design plan or water supply Option B or Option C1 operation reveals potentially significant drawdown may be occurring in existing wells in the vicinity of the new project wells, some or all of the following measures to mitigate those impacts will be implemented by the CSA or SID until subsequent monitoring shows that drawdown is not adversely affecting operations of existing wells to the satisfaction of the County Division of Environmental Health:

- lowering existing pumping equipment within the well structure in affected well(s),
- deepening or replacing the affected well(s),
- altering the amount or timing of pumping from the project well (i.e., shifting some pumpage to another project well and/or drilling a supplemental project well) to eliminate the adverse impact,
- providing replacement project well(s), and/or
- providing a water supply connection for the property/uses served by the affected well(s) to the Option B or Option C1 water supply system, sufficient to provide the property/uses with a substantially similar quality of water and the ability to use water in substantially the same manner that they were accustomed to doing if the project had not existed and caused a decline in water levels of their wells.

**Mitigation Measure 16-2c:** Implement the following:

- SID will not serve any lands located outside the SID boundary. SID service to any lands within the plan area that are outside the existing SID boundary would require annexation to SID. Annexation of land to SID shall conform to the requirements of SID, USBR, and the Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). For any proposed SID annexation, complete the additional analysis deemed necessary by SID to determine whether sufficient capacity is available to serve the proposed annexation area, and satisfy the other annexation requirements of SID, USBR, and LAFCO.
- Per SID Rules and Regulations, a separate water service (turnout) shall be provided to each newly created parcel within the district (i.e., with the current SID boundary or annexed plan area land) at the applicant/ developer's expense. SID and the applicant/ developer will need to determine how, if, and what type of service (agricultural irrigation or municipal landscape irrigation) each separate parcel is to receive. The applicant/developer may be required to pay to have SID's engineer perform an analysis of the existing system to determine if there is sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development.
- Landscape irrigation service to the proposed development would require the design and installation of a municipal-style water system. At a minimum, the applicant/ developer shall provide for a headworks pumping plant, either off one of SID's pipelines or off the USBR Green Valley Conduit, to provide pressurized service to each parcel of the development. Depending on anticipated demand and existing SID system capacity, the applicant/developer may be required to pay for any necessary upgrades to existing SID water facilities required to adequately serve all parcels of the development at the same times, since rotated water service deliveries are impractical and difficult to enforce on municipal-type systems.
- If additional SID agricultural service to the proposed development is required, the design and installation of individual turnouts to each parcel and a rotational service schedule would need to be determined and followed. At a minimum, the applicant/developer shall provide for pipelines and appurtenances to provide service to each parcel of the development. In addition, the applicant/developer may be required to pay for any necessary upgrades to existing SID water facilities required to adequately serve all parcels

of the development at the same time, depending on the proposed demand and system capacity.

- All costs associated with the design and installation of any SID water extension system shall be at the expense of the applicant/ developer. SID shall review and approve the proposed system design prepared by the applicant/developer's engineer.
- System installation shall be to SID's standards. SID would require the applicant/ developer to sign a work order acknowledging and approving all costs associated with the review of the design and to have a SID inspector onsite during system installation.
- Arrangements satisfactory to SID shall be made for the design and construction of the new system before SID will approve a parcel map.
- The applicant/developer shall provide easements for all new pipelines and facilities that would be granted to SID, including all facilities up to and including individual lot meters.
- No permanent structures shall be allowed to be constructed over SID's existing rights-of-way, nor shall any trees be planted within 6 feet of the edge of any SID pipelines.
- SID pipelines shall not be located within any of the proposed residential lots.
- Water that could be provided by SID is non- potable and not for human consumption, and cannot be treated onsite for potable uses. Therefore, before SID provides non-potable water service, the developer shall provide proof of an alternate source of potable water for the property. Since each parcel would be served with both potable and non-potable water, all lines and fixtures connected to SID's non-potable service shall be clearly marked "NON-POTABLE – DO NOT DRINK.
- Upon completion of construction of non-potable service to the subject properties, land owners shall contact SID to establish water service accounts.
- The SID certificate shall be added to all final parcel maps, subdivision maps, and improvements plans in the plan area, and SID shall review, approve, and sign all maps and plans.

**Mitigation 16-3:** Plans for development contiguous to SID, USBR, City of Fairfield, and City of Vallejo easements and facilities, or roadway or utility crossings of these facilities, shall be submitted to and approved by these agencies prior to implementation. Any submittal to the USBR shall be through the SID. No permanent structures shall be located over or within these existing pipeline easements without an alternative route being offered at developer expense. Utility crossings shall provide a minimum of three feet of clearance between the utility and the pipelines. Proposals for roadway crossings of any of these pipes shall include an engineered stress analysis on the pipe to ensure the pipeline would withstand proposed roadway loadings. Residential lots shall not be located within SID, USBR, City of Fairfield, City of Vallejo easements. Wastewater lines and other facilities on residential lots shall be kept clear of SID and USBR easements. Any sewer lines crossing USBR facilities shall be installed in a secondary casing across the USBR right-of-way. The applicant/developer shall sign an "Agreement for Protection of Facilities" before the start of any construction on or contiguous to any SID or USBR facilities. The agreement shall be followed during construction contiguous to or crossing any SID or USBR pipelines and easements. At the applicant/ developer's expense, SID would repair any construction damage to SID or USBR

facilities, and the City of Fairfield or City of Vallejo would repair any construction damage to City facilities.

Implementation of this measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 16-4:** The Specific Plan proposes establishment of a County Service Area (CSA) pursuant to California Government Code section 25210.1 et seq. to provide the financing and management for providing wastewater treatment services to the proposed Specific Plan development areas. Once approved, the CSA would be granted limited funding and management powers and the Board of Supervisors may act as the CSA board. The proposed CSA may issue general obligation bonds or revenue bonds to finance the necessary wastewater and other common infrastructure, which would be funded by development connection and user fees.

Prior to County approval of any future residential subdivision map or substantive discretionary non-residential development application in the plan area under wastewater treatment Options A or C, implement the following:

- establish the Specific Plan-proposed County Services Area (CSA) for the development area;
- formulate and adopt the Specific Plan-proposed Wastewater Master Plan for the development area;
- establish agreement with the FSSD to serve the ultimate development area wastewater treatment need identified in the Wastewater Master Plan; and
- establish associated wastewater system connection and user fees sufficient to fund the ultimate development area wastewater treatment facility needs identified in the Wastewater Master Plan, including purchase of required FSSD treatment capacity and construction of associated sewer system infrastructure--e.g., onsite collection system, offsite parallel municipal sewer main installation, associated capacity upgrades to the Cordelia Pump station, etc. (CSA Responsibility).

Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 16-5:** Prior to County approval of any future residential subdivision map or discretionary non-residential development application in the plan area under wastewater treatment option B or C, implement the following:

- establish the Specific Plan-proposed CSA for the Specific Plan development area;
- formulate and adopt the Specific Plan-proposed Wastewater Master Plan for the proposed development areas (CSA responsibility);
- establish associated wastewater system connection and user fees sufficient to fund ultimate Specific Plan development area wastewater treatment facility needs identified in the Wastewater Master Plan, including construction and ongoing operation, monitoring and maintenance of the onsite wastewater treatment and disposal system (CSA responsibility); and

- complete the RWQCB Discharge Permit process for the proposed irrigation in designated areas, and CDPH permit procedures pursuant to CCR Title 22 standards for the proposed use of tertiary treated wastewater for irrigation (CSA responsibility).

**Mitigation 16-6:** In addition to compliance with California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) groundwater and environmental health protection standards (see Mitigation 16-1-2), any project Wastewater Management Plan proposal to use SID conveyance or delivery components to supplement the project recycling system shall be designed to SID satisfaction or eliminated. One possible approach may involve SID delivery of raw water to a single point in the proposed CSA system, for plan area distribution by a CSA-operated distribution system. Formulation of this Wastewater Master Plan component to SID satisfaction would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation 16-7:** Before approval of the first Tentative Subdivision Map application in the Specific Plan area, the County shall obtain written verification from the Cordelia Fire Protection District (CFPD) that either (1) the CFPD's need for a new fire station in the general vicinity has been met (e.g., by plans for a new station on the Rockville

Trails Estates site), or (2) a new fire station is needed within the Specific Plan area. If the latter is verified, the County shall require plans for construction of a fire station within the plan area as a condition of Tentative Subdivision Map approval and confirm that any necessary additional environmental review is conducted. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a less- than-significant level.

**Mitigation 16-8:** Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 17, Transportation and Circulation, to reduce the impacts of Specific Plan-related traffic on Green Valley Road and other local roads. In addition, before approval of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall obtain written verification from the CFPD and Cal-Fire that proposed emergency access provisions meet CFPD and Cal-Fire road design and emergency access standards and require any necessary changes as a condition of map approval. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce impacts on emergency response, evacuation, and access to a less-than- significant level.

**Mitigation 16-9:** Implement *Mitigation 16-7* and *Mitigation 16-8*. In addition, as a condition of Certificate of Occupancy approval, each individual discretionary development project in the Specific Plan area shall meet all applicable California Building Code and California Uniform Fire Code standards (including standards for building materials, construction methods, fire sprinklers, etc.) and all applicable State and County standards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance in adjacent areas. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**.



**Mitigation 16-10:** As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require that construction contractors conform to all applicable fire-safe regulations in applicable codes, including California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and local requirements for appropriate storage of flammable liquids and prohibition of open flames within 50 feet of flammable storage areas. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**.

**Mitigation 16-11:** As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require written verification that the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council has reviewed and approved final trail design and construction to ensure that trails within the Specific Plan area comply with Bay Area Ridge Trail standards, as appropriate. Incorporation of this measure as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**.

**Mitigation 16-12:** The project shall comply with Solano County General Plan policies and other provisions calling for source reduction and recycling in construction and ongoing operations. As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require the applicant to provide written verification from the appropriate landfill operator that adequate landfill capacity is available to accommodate construction and operation of the project. In addition, the applicant shall be required to prepare and implement a recycling plan for the construction phase of the project.

The recycling plan shall address the major materials generated by project construction and identify means to divert a portion of these materials away from the chosen solid waste landfill.

Incorporation of this measure as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to tribal utilities and service systems; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XX. Wildfire</b>					
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project</i>					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than significant impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed.	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	16-8
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	Less than significant impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	16-9, 16-10
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	Less than significant impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	16-9, 16-10
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	Less than significant impact with mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	<b>No.</b> The project would not introduce any new impacts not previously disclosed	16-9, 16-10

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated wildfire impacts within the Public Services chapter. The EIR recognized and identified that the western portions of the plan area are considered to have "high" to "very high" fire danger and that the normal fire season conditions of warm, dry summer and fall subject vegetation to prolonged periods of moisture stress, causing portions of the plan area and vicinity to be particularly prone to wildland fires. In addition, north-wind-funneling events on steep topography create high fire danger. Wildland vegetation in the upper reaches of the plan area and vicinity, mostly annual grasses and mixed woodlands, is susceptible to fast, wind-driven fires that can spread quickly. The EIR recognized that past fires in the vicinity include a 50-acre fire and a 300-acre fire. The area referred to as "high" and "very high" in the Specific Plan is now referred to as the State Responsibility Area. The Specific Plan EIR recognized that the development within the plan area would introduce new residential and commercial land within or adjacent to areas where wildland fire danger is increased and associated needs for additional fire protection personnel and facilities. The EIR further identified wildfire risks associated with storage and use of flammable fuels and materials within the areas of heightened wildfire risk. Mitigation measures, including compliance with applicable California Building Code and California Uniform Fire Code standards (including current standards for building materials, construction methods, fire sprinklers, etc.) and all applicable State and County standards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance in adjacent areas were identified to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the development evaluated in the EIR. The amendment would result in a reduced development footprint; increase the amount of Open Lands designation; and result in an overall decrease of the total number of primary residential units within the Plan Area. In addition, the proposed amendment would shift the location of land use designations to minimize impacts to physical features, including shifting the Green Valley Road Corridor neighborhood southern access roadway. Overall, the proposed amendment would reduce the total number of units from 400 to 390, including removal of some of residential units previously identified in the Three Creeks foothills which were located in an area of high fire risk. Lastly, additional emergency vehicle accessways have been added within and in between the foothill neighborhoods to increase circulation for emergency vehicles. As such, the proposed amendment would have a negligible effect on the analysis outcome for wildfire.

### **Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation 16-8. Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 17, Transportation and Circulation, to reduce the impacts of Specific Plan-related traffic on Green Valley Road and other local roads. In addition, before approval of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall obtain written verification from the CFPD that proposed emergency access provisions meet CFPD road design and emergency access standards and require any necessary changes as a condition of map approval.

Mitigation 16-9. Implement Mitigation 16-7 and Mitigation 16-8. In addition, as a condition of Certificate of Occupancy approval, each individual discretionary development project in the Specific Plan area shall meet all applicable California Building Code and California Uniform Fire Code standards (including standards for building materials, construction methods, fire sprinklers, etc.) and all applicable State and County standards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance in adjacent areas.

Mitigation 16-10. As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require that construction contractors conform to all applicable fire-safe regulations in applicable codes, including California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and local requirements for appropriate storage of flammable liquids and prohibition of open flames within 50 feet of flammable storage areas.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to wildfire; the conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
<b>XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance</b>					
<i>Would the project:</i>					
<p>a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	Less than Significant	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.</p>	None
<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and</p>	Less than Significant and Significant Unavoidable	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.</p>	Multiple

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	EIR Mitigation Measures
the effects of probable future projects.)					
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings?	Not Previously Analyzed	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project would not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	None

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR determined that the development in the Specific Plan, in combination with other future development elsewhere in the county and subregion, could contribute to cumulative biological resources impacts, including cumulative losses of special-status species, Heritage Trees, and other vegetation and wildlife. These cumulative impacts have been considered in the preparation and adoption of the Solano County General Plan and County-certified General Plan EIR, as well as in similar documents prepared for and adopted in other jurisdictions. The EIR determined that with successful implementation of biological resource measures 6-1 through 6-13, the Specific Plan’s contribution to the cumulative impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The Specific Plan EIR identified the following cumulative impacts:

- Project Contribution to General Plan-Identified Countywide Cumulative Impacts on the Visual Character of the County (see EIR chapter 3, Aesthetics);
- Odor Impacts on "Sensitive Receptors" (see EIR chapter 5, Air Quality);
- Long-Term Regional Air Emissions Increases (see EIR chapter 5, Air Quality);
- Cumulative Impact on Biological Resources (see EIR chapter 6, Biological Resources);
- Specific Plan-Related and Cumulative Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions (see EIR chapter 7, Climate Change);
- Specific Plan-Facilitated and Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts on Green Valley Road (see EIR chapter 13, Noise); and

- Cumulative Plus Project Impacts on Intersection Operations (see EIR chapter 17, Transportation and Circulation).

The Specific Plan EIR recommends mitigation measures that would reduce the project's contribution to these cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels, with the exception of the visual character, long term regional air emissions, greenhouse gas emissions and traffic operations at intersections, which are identified as *significant unavoidable impacts*. The County adopted overriding considerations for these significant unavoidable impacts.

The Specific Plan does not specifically address the question of 'substantial adverse effects on human beings'; however, the EIR does individually address environmental effects on each environmental topic and concluded that implementation of the project would result in only four significant and unavoidable impacts (as noted above). The County adopted overriding considerations based upon the exceptional project benefits.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendment is substantially similar to the Specific Plan. The overall land development pattern remains the same and the amendment would ultimately result in less development than originally anticipated. The amendment does not change the mandatory findings of significance included in the Specific Plan EIR.