ERRATTA

The following changes represent various errata noted verbally to the Solano County Planning commission at their meeting of September 1, 2022:

The Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map Conditions of Approval, dated September 1, 2022, are revised as follows:

1. Revise Condition No 4. F as follows: A Community Facilities District (CFD) shall be formed by the County prior to the filing of the ~~Large~~ Small Lot Final Map. The Applicant shall be responsible for all expenses related to the formation of the CFD.

2. Revise Condition No 5.I. paragraphs 1-3, which provides as follows, to be stand-alone condition, not dependent on the ultimate water supplier to the project. The Vallejo water main will need to be relocated under either water supplier scenario.

    (1) The existing Vallejo water main that runs through the developed shall be relocated to Mason Road and Street L as shown on the June 15, 2022, exhibits. The final alignment and pipe size shall be determined by the City of Vallejo Water Department and shall be constructed to City of Vallejo Standards. Relocated sections of the Vallejo transmission main not located in Mason Road or Street L shall have an all-weather access road not less than 12 feet with approved turn arounds for maintenance. The watermain shall be installed under an approved pavement design by the City of Vallejo Water Department.
    (2) The easement for the relocated water main shall be recorded by separate instrument easement prior to the recording of the first final map. The water main easement shall be 30-foot-wide and non-exclusive to the City of Vallejo Water Department.
    (3) The applicant shall reimburse the City of Vallejo Water Department for planning, engineering plan review, inspection, and construction management of the relocation of the water main. The initial fee deposit is S percent of the engineer's construction estimate for the relocated pipe.

3. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) pertinent to the subdivision maps should be attached, (Attachment A).

4. Add the following conditions:

    (1) Prior to entering into any sale or lease of such land, the property owner or developer shall provide the buyer or lessee with a disclosure

statement regarding the ongoing agricultural uses in the area and the County's Right To Farm ordinance.

(2) Individual project applicants and their construction contractors (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction) that all air quality mitigation measures have been or will be implemented during project construction.

(3) Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, California Native Plant Society and National Marine Fisheries as applicable.

ANNOTATED Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for MGVSP

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
AESTHETICS							
Impact 3-1: Impacts on Scenic Vistas. Prominent views from the plan area of the Western Hills have been identified in the Solano County General Plan as one of the County's important "scenic vistas." The Draft Specific Plan (DSP) neighborhood and open lands framework (DSP section 3.2.1) and associated visual resource protection policies, development standards, and design guidelines (DSP sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4, and 5.1 through 5.9) have been specifically formulated with the intent to ensure that future plan area land use and development under the Specific Plan remains compatible with, benefits from, enhances and protects the rural character and unique scenic features of Middle Green Valley, including views of the Western Hills, as well as views of plan area riparian corridors, meadows and foothills. The DSP calls for establishment of a system of environmental stewardship (section 3.3.4) to implement the plan's visual and agricultural landscape preservation and enhancement goals, to be applied in conjunction with a plan area Neighborhood Design Code and associated Design Review Process. The Design Code would identify project-specific design submittal requirements for all future discretionary development. The proposed plan area Design Review Process is intended to supplement the requirements of the standard County development review process with a newly- established Middle Green Valley Conservancy Design Review Committee. Nevertheless, until individual project-specific applications are submitted with associated detailed design information sufficient to verify to Green Valley Conservancy Design Review Committee and County staff satisfaction adequate protection of scenic vistas and adequate visual screening from Green Valley Road, it is assumed that future individual development projects undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may disrupt views of the Western Hills and plan area riparian, meadow and foothill features, from Green Valley Road and other important vantage points.In particular, development within the DSP-designated neighborhood areas nearest Green Valley Road wouldhave the potential to alter foreground and middle- ground views from Green Valley Road. This possible Specific Plan effect on scenic vistas represents a **potentially significant impact**.	**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 areavantage points towards foreground and middle- ground rural landscapes and the Western Hills background; ▪ protects existing intervening landforms andvegetative buffers; ▪ maintains building rooflines that do not exceedexisting intervening landforms and vegetative screening; and ▪ emphasizes building forms, designs, colors, materials, etc. that are reflective of and conducive tothe surrounding rural landscape. Implementation of this measure would reduce thispotential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			The Tentative map applications demonstrates locations of new roadways and a future lotting pattern within the valley neighborhoods (and portions of Three Creeks) that is consistent with the MGVSP.. At the time specific development is proposed by a project applicant, review of architectural, landscape and infrastructure design details demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Middle Green Valley Conservancy Design Review Committee and County staff will occur with the Design Review process outlined in the MGVSP.
Impact 3-2: Increase in Nighttime Lighting and Glare. The DSP includes a streetscape lighting description (section 5.7.6) that suggests, but does not mandate, "low-level lighting."…"where nighttime events may warrant a lighted trail or path of travel for safety" and "directional and/or facility identification signs" that "may integrate low levels of light for visibility." The DSP also indicates that "All fixtures used in the landscape will be full-cut-off fixtures that will help maintain the dark nighttime sky." (DSP page 5-113). Nevertheless, although the degree of darkness experienced in Middle Green Valley and views of stars and other features in the nighttime sky would not be substantially diminished as a result of Specific Plan implementation, project-specific new development permitted by the Specific Plan in the four designated neighborhoods, as well as the farmstand envisioned along Green Valley Road immediately north of Mason Road, would include new sources of exterior lighting in an otherwise rural setting that could result in localized "light trespass" into the nighttime sky (i.e., new sources of sky-glow) or towards Green Valley Road, Mason Road, or other plan area travel routes. In addition, development of neighborhood facilities such as the anticipated school and firehouse could include new exterior lighting features with noticeable and potentially adverse light and glare effects. The possible Specific Plan light and glare effects represent a **potentially significant impact**	**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. County shall ensure that any project level application complies with the Model Lighting Ordinance (2011), as amended ("MLO"); that the MLO Lighting Zone standard, "LZO" or the equivalent are used for land use designations OL-N, OL-R, AG-WS, and AG-P; that the MLO Lighting Zone standard, "LZ1" is used for all other land use designations – AG-R, RF, RM, RN, RC, CS, PS; and that street lights within the Plan Area are limited to only the lights that are shown on Figure 5-82 of the Specific Plan, as amended. The County shall also require planting of native trees (per Appendix D of the Specific Plan) with a preference for non-deciduous native trees along the north side of the Three Creeks Neighborhood to reduce glare from building within the Three Creeks Neighborhood. 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**	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This application does not include any exterior lighting other than specific streetlights as identified on MGVSP Figure 5-82. At the time specific development is proposed by a project applicant, exterior lights associated with new construction will be reviewed as part of the Design Review process outlined in the MGVSP.
Impact 3-3: Project Contribution to 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. The General Plan EIR notes that, although implementation of General Plan- required project-specific comprehensive design guidelines and architectural standards would reduce project-specific impacts on aesthetic resources, "there is no mechanism to allow implementation of development projects while avoiding the conversion of the local	**Mitigation 3-3:** No mitigation has been identified which would be sufficient to eliminate the project contribution; therefore the project contribution to this impact would be **significant and unavoidable.**	--	--	--			Determined SU with no mitigation; no mitigation requirements for TMAP or any other discretionary approvals.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
viewsheds from agricultural land uses and open spaces to urban…development." The General Plan EIR has also determined that no feasible mitigation measures or policies are available that could fully preserve existing visual qualities countywide while allowing development of urban uses under the adopted General Plan, and "Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable"** (General Plan Draft EIR page 4.11-9). Existing vegetative screening would block views of Draft Specific Plan-designated neighborhood development from Green Valley Road. The Draft Specific Plan land use and open space framework and associated stringent development standards and design guidelines would also minimize project visual impacts. The Draft Specific Plan would also retain about 78 percent of the plan area in permanent agricultural and open space use. In addition, the Draft Specific Plan includes detailed development standards and form-based design guidelines that would serve to substantially reduce the aesthetic impacts of development within the various Specific Plan- designated neighborhood areas. Nevertheless, the project contribution to this General Plan-identified cumulative impact would not be "de minimis" (the commonly-used CEQA term for an effect so small or minimal in difference to the status quo that it does not constitute an environmental impact). Therefore, under CEQA, the project contribution to this General Plan-identified significant unavoidable cumulative impact would be **significant**.							
AGRICULTURAL AND MINERAL RESOURCES							
Impact 4-1: Impact on Prime Farmland. The 2008 Solano County General Plan indicates that the county included approximately 365,650 acres of agricultural land in 2007, including approximately 157,740 acres of "Important Farmland." This "Important Farmland" included state-designated "Prime Farmland" (farmland considered to have the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields) and "Farmland of Statewide Importance" (farmland similar to "Prime Farmland," but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes, etc.). The plan area includes approximately 700 acres of Prime Farmland. A principal goal of the Draft Specific Plan (DSP), implemented through the DSP-proposed Green Valley Agricultural Conservancy, Agricultural Business Plan, Resource Management Plan, and Transfer of Development Rights program, is to return the substantial portion of this 700-acre total that has not been in recent cultivation back to cultivated agricultural use. Nevertheless, the DSP-designated Elkhorn, Nightingale and Three Creeks neighborhood areas overlap some areas of Prime Farmland in the plan area. The DSP- designated Agriculture Residential (5-acre minimum residential lots) and Rural Farm (2 to 5 acres per unit) land use categories within these three neighborhoods, totaling roughly 66 acres, would not preclude continued primary use for sustained high-yield agricultural production. However, the DSP-designated Rural Neighborhood (1 to 4 units per acre) and Rural Mixed- Use Center (4 to 8 units per acre) categories within these neighborhoods, totaling roughly 123 acres, would preclude continued high-yield agricultural production. The DSP would therefore, over time, convert up to approximately 123 acres of Prime Farmland to non- agricultural use. Although this DSP-related Prime Farmland loss would constitute a small (0.08 percent) portion of the County's total "Important Farmland" inventory, and would be offset by the DSP measures to return other plan area Prime Farmlands to high-yield agricultural production, it would nevertheless represent a **significant environmental impact** under CEQA.	**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.**	--	--	--			Determined SU with no mitigation; no mitigation requirements for TMAP or any other discretionary approvals.
Impact 4-2: Indirect Impacts on Prime Farmland. DSP-facilitated development in the Elkhorn, Nightingale and Three Creeks neighborhoods could cause conflicts between new, project-facilitated Residential or Community Services (e.g., private school) uses and adjacent or nearby Prime Farmland agricultural activity. The large size of most DSP-proposed residential lots would allow substantial building setbacks from this property line, which would reduce the possibility for conflicts. Nevertheless, the introduction of new residential uses near existing Prime Farmland operations could result in land use compatibility problems for the existing farmland operations, such as nuisance complaints from new residents, livestock disturbance by domestic pets, trespassing, and vandalism. Nuisance complaints can potentially cause farm operators to curtail operations, and can deter additional investment in farm-related improvements that support the county's agriculture economy. This potential conflict between DSP-	**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	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires that the County condition the approval of "future subdivision and other discretionary development approvals…" to provide notification of the County's right to farm ordinance Staff shall include a specific COA to address the Right to Farm Notification

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
facilitated existing farmland operations, residential development and existing agricultural uses represents a **potentially significant impact**.	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**.						
AIR QUALITY							
Impact 5-1: Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts. Construction or demolition activities permitted and/or facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan may generate construction-period exhaust emissions and fugitive dust that could temporarily but noticeably affect local air quality. This would represent a **potentially significant impact.**	**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 (PM10) 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 (PM10) 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 15miles per hour. ▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly aspossible. ▪ Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site. *Measures to reduce diesel particulate matter and $PM_{2.5}$:* ▪ Post clear signage at all construction sites indicatingthat 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 adjacentto the construction site. ▪ Prevent the use of construction equipment with highparticulate 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 electricalservice whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g. compressors). ▪ Properly tune and maintain equipment for lowemissions. The above measures are BAAQMD-identified "feasiblecontrol measures for construction emissions of PM_{10}." Implementation of these measures would reduce the construction-related air quality impact to a **less-than- significant level**.	Individual project applicants and their constructioncontractors (mustdemonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County	Condition of subdivision map approval;verified duringindividual project construction.			At the time specific development is proposed by a project applicant this mitigation measure will be implemented This measure requires that the County condition the approval of "future subdivision and other discretionary development approvals…" to comply with dust control measures Staff shall include a specific COA to address compliance with AQ BMPs
Impact 5-2: Odor Impacts on "Sensitive Receptors."Specific Plan-facilitated development in the plan area may expose sensitive receptors, such as housing and potentially a	**Mitigation 5-2.** In reviewing projects proposed in accordance with the Specific Plan, the Middle GreenValley Conservancy and County shall implement Solano County General Plan policies and implementation programs to reduce the	MGV Conservancy and County- implemented	MGV Conservancy and County- implemented	Ongoing inspection/ monitoring of ag.			At the time specific development is proposed by a project applicant will implement. Compliance with this measure are two-part: 1) staff will include a COA to address buffering of land uses to protect future

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
school, to odors. This effect is considered to be a **potentially significant project and cumulative impact.**	potential forodor 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**.	education program; individual project applicant implemented development design measures.	ongoing monitoring program (for best mgmt. practices MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County verification of adequate buffering through design review (for buffer requirement).	operations by MGV Conservancy and County to advocate best management practices; condition of subdivision map approval (for buffering).			development of schools and residences from odors; and 2) on-going inspections will occur once future uses are developed within the plan area.
Impact 5-3: Long-Term Regional Air Emissions Increases. Specific Plan-facilitated development is notreflected in the latest applicable Clean Air Plan (CAP).In addition, future traffic increases associated with Specific Plan-facilitated development would generate regional emissions increases that would exceed the latest proposed BAAQMD emission-based threshold ofsignificance for reactive organic gases (ROG). The effect of long-term regional emissions associated with Specific Plan-facilitated development is therefore considered to be a **significant project and cumulative impact.**	**Mitigation 5-3.** In addition to the energy-efficiency and other emissions-reducing measures already included inthe Specific Plan (e.g., provisions of sidewalks, bicycle lanes, etc.), the County shall require that the SpecificPlan include the following requirements: ▪ Wire each housing unit to allow use of emergingelectronic metering communication technology. ▪ Restrict the number of fireplaces in residences to one per household and/or require residential use ofEPA-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 useof electrical lawn and landscape maintenance equipment. ▪ Make natural gas available in residential backyardsto allow use of natural gas-fired barbecues. ▪ Require that any community services operation inthe plan area use electrical or alternatively fueledequipment 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. The finding of a significant impact is based primarily on inconsistencies among the land use projections used in various plans (i.e., the proposed Specific Plan, the recently adopted Solano County General Plan, and the 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy). As a result, the Specific Plan's inconsistency with the CAP is primarily an administrative effect, in that the CAP is out-of-date and does not reflect current planning projections. The BAAQMD is likely to adopt an updated CAP that would include the latest County projections, including proposed development in the Specific Plan area. Until the current CAP is updated to reflect changed assumptions regarding the County General Plan and Specific Plan projections, adoption and implementation of the Specific Plan would remain technically inconsistent with the current CAP. In addition, however, Specific Plan-facilitated development would likely exceed the proposed BAAQMD significance threshold for ROG, should that threshold be adopted. Since no additional feasible full mitigation has been identified, the Specific Plan's effecton long-term regional emissions increases, as reflectedin these administrative provisions, would therefore represent a **significant and unavoidable impact**.	County, by incorp. these requirements into Specific Plan; individual project applicants, by incorp. into project designs.	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure tasked the county with making clarifications in the MGVSP regarding energy efficiency AND this measure also tasks individual applicants to incorporate these measures into the project design. The County included the following in the approved MGVSP: Page 5-53, "all fireplaces and outdoor firepits (or similar) are to comply with local air pollution standards and building codes. Page 5-59 "It is intended that all homes utilize natural gas for clothes dryers, cooking stoves, heating, central air furnaces, water heaters and/or boilers." At the time specific development is proposed by a project applicant these measures will be implemented. The County can continue to implement this measure by reviewing applications for new home construction for compliance with this measure.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES							
Impact 6-1: General Areawide Impacts on BiologicalResources. The Draft Specific Plan (DSP) neighborhood and open lands framework (DSP sections 3.2.1 and 3.3.2), street network (DSP section 3.4.3) and associated environmental stewardship provisions and habitat protection objectives (DSP sections 3.3.4 and 5.5.6) have been formulated with the intent to avoid and protect mixed oak woodland forest, grassland pockets, and Hennessey Creek and Green Valley Creek riparian corridors, and to minimize biological resource impacts in general. The Draft Specific Plan also specifically acknowledges the framework that would be established by the Bureau of Reclamation and Solano County Water Agency's proposed Solano Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) (DSP	**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 orother discretionary development application, the project proponent shall submit a *biological resources assessment report* prepared by a qualified biologist forCounty review and approval. The *biological resources assessment report* shall be in accordance with DFW, CNPS, USFWS, or NOAA/NMFS survey	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction) .	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Compliance with this measure includes: 1) Submission of a Biological Assessment to the County prior to approval of the proposed Subdivision Map applications. 2) Issuance of any required Resource Agency approvals (per the Biological Assessment) will be secured and copies will be provided to the County prior to issuance of improvement plans or initial ground disturbance.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
section 2.4.3) for complying with federal and state regulations for special-status species while accommodating future urban growth. In addition, the tree and habitat protection objectives identified in the DSP (section 5.5.6) specifically call for the protection of existing mature hardwood and oak trees; preservation, conservation and enhancement of open lands that provide wildlife habitat; minimization of tree and shrub removal in foothill areas; and repair of environmental degradation that has previously occurred. Nevertheless, based on the evaluation of biological resources occurring or potentially occurring within or in the vicinity of the DSP-designated development areas by the EIR consulting biologist, it has been determined that future individual development projects undertaken in accordance with the DSP may result in potential site-specific impacts on biological resources including sensitive vegetation andaquatic communities, special-status plant species, andspecial-status wildlife species, due to future individual project-level residential, commercial and mixed- use development, landscaped parkland construction, activeopen space land uses, and associated road and utility/infrastructure construction activities. This possibility represents a **potentially significant impact.**	protocols and guidelines. It 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 vicinityof 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 wouldbe 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 confirmthat project-level development has received the necessary permits, approvals, and determinations fromapplicable biological resource agencies as identified under Mitigations 6-2 through 6-13 which follow. Implementation of these measures would reduce thepotential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.						
Impact 6-2: Potential Conflict with Solano County Multispecies Habitat Conservation Plan. The Draft Specific Plan includes substantial measures intended to minimize potential conflicts between future individualdevelopments undertaken under the Specific Plan withthe 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 wouldconflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. This possibility represents a **potentially significant impact.**	**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.]*	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Prior to construction within the plan area, a future developer will have to demonstrate compliance that the projects is in compliance with all necessary jurisdictional approvals.
Impact 6-3: Impact on Oak Woodlands. The Draft 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-leveldevelopment undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary and/or indirect impacts on oak woodland communities, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**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 *Mitigation6-1*). 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**	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Prior to construction within the plan area, a future developer will have to demonstrate compliance that the projects is in compliance with all necessary oak woodland management plans.
Impact 6-4: Impacts on Riparian Communities. TheDraft 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, indirectimpacts on riparian communities in the plan area, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 6-4.** Proponents of projects that have been determined through *Mitigation 6-1* (biological resourceassessment report) to involve potential impacts on riparian vegetation communities shall: (a) contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement is necessary; and (b) 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 WaterQuality 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	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Compliance with this measure includes 3 distinct requirements: 1. Project applicants shall get permits from agencies for anticipated riparian impacts. As identified in MM 6-1, the applicants have provided the Biological Assessment and Resource Agency approvals will be finalized prior to issuance of improvement plans/grading permits. 2. This measure also requires setbacks of 50' from tributaries and 100' from Hennesey and Green Valley

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	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 or NOAA, Corps, CDFW 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). The entire lengths of Hennessey Creek and Green Valley Creek in the Specific Plan area (preserved riparian habitat areas) shall be protected in perpetuity by a conservation easements except along road crossings or other areas as may be required to be excluded from conservation easements by the state and federal agencies. New development lot lines and the edges of cultivatedagricultural fields in preserved lands shall be set backfrom preserved riparian corridors by a minimum of 50 feet for tributaries and a minimum of 100 feet fromGreen Valley Creek and lower Hennessey Creek and maybe subject to state and federal agency recommendations. The potential for introduction of invasive species into riparian communities shall be minimized through use ofthe 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. Invasive species shall be discouraged on all conservation easements, including but not limited to tamarisk (Tamarix ramosissima) and Russian Olive (Elaeagnus angusfifolia), eucalyptus, giant reed, pepper grass, Himalayn blackberry and palm trees. Conifers and Eucalyptus shall be discouraged. 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 onriparian 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. Any future public access trails developed along the riparian corridors of Hennessey and Green Valley Creeks shall be managed to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts to protected species. Boardwalks and prohibitions on dogs off leash may be required in area to avoid damage to sensitive vegetation. Implementation of these measures would reduce thepotential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.						creek. The Tentative Maps included with this application fully comply with these setbacks 3. Finally, this measure requires preparation of a Hennesey Creek conceptual restoration plan for projects that have impacts upon Hennesey Creek. The proposed project does not impact Hennesey Creek.
Impact 6-5: Impact on Wetlands, Streams, and Ponds. The 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 undertakenin accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on wetlands,streams, and ponds in the plan area, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 6-5.** Proponents of projects that have been determined through *Mitigation 6-1* (biological resourcesassessment report) to involve potential impacts on wetlands, streams and ponds shall: (a) contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement is necessary; and (b) 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 fordirect impacts shall include a minimum of (a) preservation of wetland, stream, and/or pond habitat atthe jurisdiction agency-established minimum ratio,	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure is very similar to MM6-4. It has 3 distinct requirements: 1. Project applicants shall get permits from agencies for anticipated riparian impacts. As identified in MM 6-1, the applicants have provided the Biological Assessment and Resource Agency approvals will be finalized prior to issuance of improvement plans/grading permits. 2. This measure also requires setbacks of 50’ from tributaries and 100’ from Hennesey and Green Valley creek. The Tentative Maps included with this application fully comply with these setbacks 3. Finally, this measure requires preparation of a Hennesey Creek conceptual restoration plan for projects that have impacts upon

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	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 toa **less-than-significant level**.						Hennesey Creek. The proposed project does not impact Hennesey Creek.
Impact 6-6: Impact on Special-Status Plant Species Observed or Known to Occur in the Plan Area. Development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, or indirectimpacts on one special-status plant species observed or known to occur in the plan area, Northern Californiablack walnut, which is a California Native Plant Society(CNPS) List 1B species. This possibility represents a **potentially significant impact.**	**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 assessmentreport requirements) by a qualified professional biologist and based on the information provided by thisEIR 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 duringthe appropriate blooming period by a qualified professional biologist. The results of the report shall beprovided as part of a protocol-level *special-status plantsurvey report*, or integrated into other biological documentation. If special-status plant species are found during protocol level special-status plant species surveys, thespecial-status plant species survey report shall providea discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigationmeasures 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.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires mitigation for sensitive plant species. There are multiple compliance steps in this measure: 1. The measure requires protocol plant surveys. These surveys have been completed and are incorporated into a Biological Resources Assessment. 2. The measure requires agency permitting and associated mitigation for plant removal, as required by the plant survey results and summarized in the Biological Assessment. All agency permits will be secured prior to issuance of improvement plans or grading permits. 3. The measure includes use of native plants as part of the plan area's plant palette. There is no construction or landscaping proposed with this application submittal; compliance with planting materials will be reviewed as part of the Design Review process outlined in the MGVSP.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	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 asa special status species deserving special consideration because of its rarity or vulnerability.						
Impact 6-7: Impacts on Special-Status Plant Species with Potential Habitat in the Plan Area. Development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary or indirectimpacts 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, including CNPS List 1B species (Alkali milk-vetch, Big-scale balsamroot, Big tarplant, Narrow-anthered California brodiaea, Mt. Diablo fairy lantern, Tiburon paintbrush, Holly-leaved ceanothus, Pappose tarplant, Western leatherwood, Adobe lily, Diablo helianthella, Brewer's westernflax, Robust monardella,Baker's navarretia, Snowy Indian clover, and Saline clover) and CNPS List 2 species (Dwarf downingia, Rayless ragwort, and Oval-leaved viburnum). This possibility represents a **potentially significant impact.**	**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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure simply refers back to measure 6-6, please see discussion above. .
Impact 6-8: Impacts on Special-Status Wildlife Species Observed or Known to Occur in the Plan Area. Development undertaken in accordance with theSpecific Plan may result in direct, temporary or indirectimpacts on special-status wildlife species observed orknown to occur in the plan area, including CDFG Species of Special Concern (Loggerhead Shrike, Grasshopper Sparrow, and Western Pond Turtle), a USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern (Lewis's Woodpecker), a Federal Threatened Species (Steelhead) and a CDFG Protected Species (MonarchButterfly). This possibility represents a **potentially significant impact.**	**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 *Mitigation6-2*, 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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires a Biological Assessment to address impacts to wildlife species, please refer to the Biological Assessment for a summary of wildlife species impacts. All Resource Agency permits required for potential impacts to wildlife species will be secured prior to approval of improvement plans/grading permits (which authorize initial project disturbance/construction).
Impact 6-9: Impacts on Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential Habitat 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, including CDFG Species of Special Concern (Pallid Bat, various Western Bat species, American Badger, and Northern Harrier), CDFG Fully Protected Species (Golden Eagle and White-Tailed Kite), State Threatened Species (Swainson's Hawk) and a USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern (Golden Eagle). This possibility represents a potentially significant impact.	**Mitigation 6-9.** Implement *Mitigation 6-8*. Implementation of this measure as a condition of futureindividual discretionary project approvals, to the satisfaction of the listing jurisdictional agency (CDFG), would reduce this potential impact to a **less-than- significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure simply refers back to measure 6-8, please see discussion above.
Impact 6-10: Impact on Loggerhead Shrike, Lewis'sWoodpecker, Grasshopper Sparrow and Other Protected Bird Species. 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, representing a **potentially significant impact**.	**Mitigation 6-10.** If construction or other disturbance tosuitable 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 biologistno 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 thepotential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval			This measure requires the Biological Assessment to address bird species and provide mitigation measures as needed. The measure also outlines construction level requirements for disturbance during nesting season. The proposed project will address this MM by addressing bird species impacts and provide mitigation as appropriate in the Biological Assessment. All Resource Agency permits required for potential impacts to bird species will be secured prior to approval of improvement plans/grading permits (which authorize initial project disturbance/construction).

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
Impact 6-11: Impact on Western Pond Turtle. Futureindividual 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, representing a **potentially significant impact**.	**Mitigation 6-11.** The presence of suitable aquatic anddispersal habitat for WPT and CRLF 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 and/or CRLF shall provide an analysis of potential impacts, along with avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for potential impacts on WPT and/or CRLF. Final avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate agencies and be consistent with the measures set forth in the Solano HCP, as finalized and as may be amended. Direct impacts on WPT and CRLF 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. Implementation of these measures, would reduce this potential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires the BRA to address western pond turtle and provide mitigation measures as needed. All Resource Agency permits required for potential impacts to WPT will be secured prior to approval of improvement plans/grading permits (which authorize initial project disturbance/construction).
Impact 6-12: Impact on Steelhead. The Draft SpecificPlan 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, futureindividual 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, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 6-12.** Central Coast California ("CCC") Steelhead are present in Green Valley Creek. Some have reported observations of Chinook salmon in Green Valley Creek as recently as winter or spring 2016. 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. County shall ensure monitoring of Green Valley Creek consistent with the GVRCO. A qualified fisheries biologist shall monitor the Creek for managing species that it determines reside in the creek., which may include wild steelhead. The monitoring may include data an analysis of temperature, water flow, and water quality surveys (i.e. data pH, conductivity, sedimentation and dissolved oxygen) as determined by the biologist. These types of measurements shall be done as recommended by a qualified fisheries biologists that specialized in salmonids. County shall ensure that these measurements are part of an adaptive management plan for salmonids. Best available science shows harm to salmonids (and amphibians) from various known chemicals. Accordingly, County shall encourage a no spray zone for chemicals known to be problematic for salmonids and/or amphibians for at least 1,000 feet from any creek, stock pond, or wetland in the Plan area for the following chemicals: Chlorpyifors, diazinon, malathlon, carbaryl, carbofuran, methomyl, bensulide, dimethoate, ethroprop, methidathion, naled, phorate, phosmet, 2,4-D, chlorothalonil, diuron, oryzalin, pendimethanlin, and trifluralin, 1,3-D (Telone), Bromoxynil (Bronate), Difludenzuron (Dimilin), Fednbutatin-oxid (Vendex/Promite), Prometryn (Caparol/Vegetable Pro), Propargite (Comite/Omite), Racemic metholachlor (Me-Too-Lachlor, Parallel, Stalwart, acephate, aziphos-methyl, carbaryl, dicofol, disulfoton, endosulfan, esfenvalerate, fenamiphos, glyposate, malathion, mancozeb, methamidophos, Methoprene naled paraquat, permethrin, phosmet, polycyclic aromatic hyrdocarbons, pyethrins, rotenone, strychnine, triclopyr and trifluralin.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires the BRA to steelhead, but also stipulates compliance with BMPs from the EIR and the Solano County HCP, as well as measures posed by NMFS. The proposed project will comply with this measure by addressing steelhead in the Biological Assessment, including mitigation like the BMPs addressed in the EIR and HCP. All Resource Agency permits required for potential impacts to steelhead will be secured prior to approval of improvement plans/grading permits (which authorize initial project disturbance/construction).

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	Organic agriculture practices in accordance with USDA standards shall be encouraged. Implementation of these measures would reduce thepotential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.						
Impact 6-13: Impact on Wildlife Habitat Corridors and Linkages. Compared to other forms of development, the cluster development patterns proposed by the Specific Plan would greatly reduce thepotential impact on habitat corridors and linkages, andthe 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, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 6-13.** The Solano County HCP identifies wildlife habitat corridors and linkages in the Plan area**.** As part of the *biological resources assessment report* required under *Mitigation 6-1*, eachproject undertaken pursuant to the Specific Plan shall include avoidance, 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 in consultation with state and federal listing agencies. Stream setbacks specified in Mitigation 6-4, as may be modified after consultation with the state and federal listing agencies, shall be implemented to maintain adequate corridor widths in riparian areas to allow for movement of wildlife. Implementation of these measures would reduce thepotential impact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires the Biological Assessment to address impacts and mitigation for wildlife corridors. The measure also cites back to MM 6-4 which includes setbacks from the creeks and tributaries. The proposed project will comply with this MM by addressing wildlife corridors in the BRA. All Resource Agency permits required for potential impacts to wildlife corridors will be secured prior to approval of improvement plans/grading permits (which authorize initial project disturbance/construction).
Impact 6-14: Cumulative Impact on Biological Resources. Development in the Specific Plan area, incombination with other future development elsewhere in the county and subregion, could contribute to cumulative biological resources impacts, including cumulative losses of special-status species, HeritageTrees, 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 Specific Plan's potential contribution to cumulative effects on biological resources would represent a **potentially significant cumulative impact**.	**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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).					This measure refers back to Bio MM 6-1 to 6-13, please see discussion above.
CLIMATE CHANGE							
Impact 7-1: Specific Plan-Related and Cumulative Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Construction and ongoing operation of Specific Plan- facilitated development would result in a net increase in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. The Specific Plan contains guidelines and principles for encouraging energy efficiency in new development within the plan area. In addition, Specific Plan- facilitated new building construction and other improvements would be required to meet California Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, helping to reduce associated future energy demand and associated Specific Plan contributions to cumulative regional greenhouse gas emissions. Nevertheless, conservatively assuming construction emissions of 66 to 1,443 tons per year and an estimated ongoing "worst case" net increase in greenhouse gas emissions of approximately 10,779 metric tons per year (or 6.65 metric tons per year per capita), the proposed Specific Plan could be expectedto result in a significant project and cumulative global climate change impact.	**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): ▪ features in the project design that would accommodate convenient public transit and promote direct access for pedestrians and bicycliststo major destinations; ▪ adoption of a project design objective for residentialand commercial 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 toshade buildings and reduce energy requirementsfor heating and cooling; ▪ preservation or replacement of existing onsite trees; ▪ construction and demolition waste recycling (seeMitigation 16-12 of this EIR); and ▪ preference for replacement of project exterior lighting, street lights and other electrical uses with energy efficient bulbs and appliances. Implementation of appropriate combinations of these mitigation measures in individual Specific Plan-relateddevelopments would substantially reduce Specific Plan-related greenhouse gas emissions impacts. However, because the effectiveness of this mitigation program in reducing the Specific Plan-related contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions in the	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This MM requires that development in the Plan Area comply with the County's Climate Action Plan. The County adopted a CAP in 2011. The proposed project will comply with this measure by demonstrating compliance with the applicable CAP reduction measures and actions.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	region cannot be reasonably quantified, it has been determined that the Specific Plan, when combined with anticipated overall cumulative development in the region as a whole, would potentiallyproduce a substantial net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, representing a **significant unavoidable project and cumulative climate change impact.**						
CULTURAL, HISTORIC AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES							
Impact 8-1: Disturbance of Archaeological Resources. The Draft Specific Plan (DSP) neighborhood and open lands framework (DSP sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2), streetwork (DSP section 3.4.3) and associated environmental stewardship objectives (DSP section 3.3.4) have been formulated with the intent to preserve and protect archaeological resources. The DSP proposes development of housing, community/public service uses, "agricultural tourism uses," and neighborhood commercial uses clustered around four neighborhoods, with the remaining 78 percent of the plan area preserved as open land. The DSP-proposed Green Valley Conservancy, a non-profit conservation organization, would oversee these preserved areas. Nevertheless, DSP-designated development and agricultural areas have the substantial potential to contain buried or obscured prehistoric cultural resources, as verified by the EIR consulting archaeologist. Agricultural activitiesand grading activities associated with future individual development projects undertaken in accordance with the DSP may disturb existing unrecorded sensitive archaeological resources in the plan area. This possibility represents a **potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 8-1.** During the County's normal project- specific environmental review (Initial Study) process forall 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 substantialground 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 archaeologicalsite; ▪ incorporating the site within a park, green space, orother open space element; ▪ covering the site with a layer of chemically stablesoil; or ▪ deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement (e.g., an easement administered by theproposed Green Valley Conservancy). When in-place mitigation is determined by the Countyto 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 additionalexcavation 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 twogroups 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.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Ongoing inspection/ monitoring during construction.			This measure requires compliance with specific procedures related to finding archaeologocial features during project construction. This measure applies to the proposed projects because the proposed project involves "substantial ground disturbance". The County should include a COA to include monitoring during initial ground disturbance to ensure the measures identified in this MM are met.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 5064.5(e) shall apply. Implementation of this measure would supplement the County's existing General Plan policies and implementation programs and would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.						
Impact 8-2: Destruction/Degradation of Historic Resources. The planning process for the Draft Specific Plan (DSP) included consideration of the Secretary of the Interior's standards and other provisions for protecting historic resources. In addition,the 55 existing housing units in the plan area--some ofwhich represent historic-period resources--would not be affected by DSP-facilitated neighborhood and infrastructure framework. Nevertheless, 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." A historic resource is considered to be "materially impaired" when a project demolishes or materially alters the physical characteristics that justify the determination of its significance (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5[b]). Such an adverse change to a CEQA-defined historic resource would constitute a **potentially significantimpact.**	**Mitigation 8-2.** Generally, for any future discretionaryaction 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 Countyand applicant shall incorporate measures that would seek to improve the affected resource in accordancewith either of the following publications: ▪ The Secretary of the Interior's Standards *for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines forPreserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings;* or ▪ The Secretary of the *Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for RehabilitatingHistoric 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 resourcesin 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 Stateof California primary record forms (form DPR 523) andapplicable attachments. Recording shall consolidate asmany 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 offeatures 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 <u>demolition</u> 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 contextual framework for interpretation and evaluation of other resources.	County (CEQA- required Initial Study responsibility) and individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit.			The proposed project does not include demolition of any identified historic resources. Implementation of the project may result in findings of unknown paleo or archeo resources, which are handled in the MM 8-1 and 8-3
Impact 8-3: Destruction/Degradation of Paleontological Resources. Development facilitated by the Specific Plan could disturb existing known or unrecorded paleontological resources in the plan area.This possibility represents a **potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 8-3.** During the County's normal project- specific environmental review (Initial Study) process forall 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 projectapplicants to carry out the following measures: *(1) Education Program.* Project applicants shallimplement a program that includes the followingelements:	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Ongoing inspection/ monitoring during construction.			This measure requires an educational program and treatment measures for any paleo items encountered during construction. The proposed project includes a a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for the majority of the plan area. This measure should apply to these maps such that the county includes COA to ensure this measure is addressed during construction.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	▪ Resource identification training procedures forconstruction personnel; ▪ Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitorof all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface; and ▪ Procedures for reporting discoveries and theirgeologic content. *(2) Procedures for Resources Encountered.* If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered,excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources andthe 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 andcost 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. Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**.						
GEOLOGY AND SOILS							
Impact 10-1: Landslide and Erosion Hazards. TheSpecific Plan would allow development in areas that may be subject to landslide and erosion hazards, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**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 andother 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 ofPreliminary Grading Plans and/or Preliminary Geotechnical Reports, prepared by a licensed Engineering Geologist, before approval of specific developments within the plan area. Under this existingCounty 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 compliancewith 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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires preparation of a Preliminary Geotechnical Report to address potential landslide and erosion hazards. A Preliminary Geotech Report was prepared by ENGEO. The report includes detailed analysis and suggested construction design measures where needed. The County may include a COA to cite compliance with this report.
Impact 10-2: Expansive Soil Hazards. Most of the areas proposed for development under the Specific Plan have "moderate" to "high" shrink-swell potential. The plan area's moderately to highly expansive soils would be expected to undergo repeated cycles of shrinking and swelling in response to changes in soil moisture. Utility lines, road and building foundations, and sidewalks and concrete flatwork constructed on top of naturally occurring expansive soils, or based onfills that contain a high percentage of expansive soils,would be subject to long-term damage, representing a**potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 10-2.** The *detailed, design-level geotechnical investigations* required at the County's discretion (see *Mitigation 10-1*) shall include analysis ofexpansive 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	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires preparation of a Preliminary Geotechnical Report to address potential expansive soil hazards. A Preliminary Geotech Report was prepared by ENGEO and was submitted with this application for subdivision. The report includes detailed analysis and suggested construction design measures where needed. The County may include a COA to cite compliance with this report.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	regulations, would reduce the potential effects of expansive soils to a **less-than-significant level**.						
Impact 10-3: Groundwater Impacts. Mass grading, construction of cuts and fills, redirection of existing drainage patterns, and installation of landscaping irrigation as part of future development allowed by theSpecific Plan could affect existing patterns of groundwater flow in the plan area, resulting in slope instabilities that would represent a **potentially significant impact.**	**Mitigation 10-3.** Onsite drainage systems shall be regularly maintained to ensure that storm water runoffis directed away from all slope areas. Educational materials that discourage overwatering in landscapedareas shall be furnished to all future lot owners and property managers at the time of purchase and periodically thereafter (perhaps by inclusion with wateror tax bills), as part of an effort to control groundwaterseepage. Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the County would reduce this potential effect to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).					This measure requires educational pamphlets to be provided to new home owners and property managers to discourage over watering. This measure will be triggered by sale of new homes and commercial properties. The proposed project does not trigger compliance of this measure.
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY							
Impact 11-1: Construction-Period Impacts on WaterQuality. Surface water pollutants associated with Specific Plan-facilitated construction activity, including soil disturbance associated with grading activities, could significantly degrade the quality of receiving waters in Hennessey Creek, Green Valley Creek and, ultimately, Suisun Bay, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**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 reviewestablished in the County's Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), and associated County NPDES permit issuance requirements instituted to address short-termand long-term water quality issues, including construction period activities. Implementation of this requirement would reduce this impact to a **less-than- significant level.**	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			The proposed project is designed to handle storm water run off, consistent with the applicable county requirements (basins, treatment areas, etc) The County could include a COA that requires a SWMP to be submitted with the improvement plans
Impact 11-2: Ongoing Impacts on Water Quality. Ongoing activities associated with project-facilitated development could increase the level of contaminants in receiving waters. Sources of pollutants could include (a) runoff from new roadways, parking areas, and other paved areas; (b) increased soil disturbance, erosion and sedimentation in surface waters due to expanded and new agricultural activities; and (c) herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers used in expanded and new agricultural activities and new domestic landscaping. These factors could combine to significantly reduce drainage channel capacities and degrade the quality of receiving waters in Hennessey Creek, Green Valley Creek, and ultimately, Suisun Bay, representing a **potentially significant impact.**	**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, including implementationof erosion and sediment control measures for farming activities in accordance with Solano County storm water management requirements and best management practices. 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 parcelis 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. Implementation of thismeasure would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level.**	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Compliance with this measure requires the County to include a COA to address compliance with County Storm Water Mgmt Plans and NPDES requirements.
Impact 11-3: Flooding Impacts. For the most part, theSpecific Plan-designated development areas avoid identified creek and dam failure inundation areas. Nevertheless, a limited number of Specific Plan- designated Agricultural-Residential (5-acre minimumlots), Rural Farm (1 to 5 acres per unit) and Rural Neighborhood (1 to 4 units per acre) land use designations in the proposed 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. Since there are as yet no specific development proposals associated with these residential land use designations, direct flooding impacts cannot be determined. Nevertheless, these Specific Plan-designated residential development area overlaps 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. These possible effects represent a **potentially significant environmental impact.**	**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 requirementsrelated 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). Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Compliance with this measure requires the County to include a COA to address compliance with County policies for flood hazard protection.
NOISE							
Impact 13-1: Impact of Green Valley Road Traffic Noise on Specific Plan-Facilitated Residential Development. The Draft Specific Plan (DSP) designated neighborhood framework (DSP section 3.2.1) has been formulated with the intent to separatenoise sensitive land uses from Green Valley Road.	**Mitigation 13-1.** For project-specific residential development proposals on sites adjoining Green ValleyRoad, 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:	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires site specific noise analysis for new homes along green valley road to ensure outdoor areas meet county noise standards. There are no new homes proposed with this application.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
Nevertheless, DSP-designated residential development in the Three Creeks Neighborhood alongGreen Valley Road may be exposed to traffic noise thatexceeds "normally acceptable" levels established by the Solano County General Plan (i.e., noise greater than 60 dBA L_{dn}), representing a **potentially significant impact.**	▪ Minimizing noise in residential outdoor activity areas(i.e., ensuring that noise levels would be below 65 dBA L_{dn}) 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 locatedwithin 100 feet of Green Valley Road so that windows can remain closed to maintain interiornoise levels below 45 dBA L_{dn}. Implementation of these measures would reduce theimpact to a **less-than-significant level.**						The proposed project does not propose new home construction, and specific outdoor areas are not identified in this current application. Noise analysis for new construction shall be completed along side proposals for new home construction
Impact 13-2: Effect of Proposed Noise-GeneratingLand Uses on Noise-Sensitive Land Uses. Noise- generating land uses facilitated by the Draft Specific Plan, such as agricultural activities, commercial uses,and the possible fire station and wastewater treatmentplant, 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**.	**Mitigation 13-2.** New noise-generating uses facilitatedby 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 PlanImplementation 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 compliancewith applicable guidelines and standards. In addition, new noise-sensitive uses developed adjacent to noise-generating uses shall be designed tocontrol 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 studiesshall 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. Implementation of these measures would reduce thisimpact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires noise analysis for proposed "noise generating land uses" This proposed project does not propose any specific land uses; compliance with this measure will occur once new construction and proposed noise generating land uses are requested.
Impact 13-3: Specific Plan-Facilitated Construction Noise. Existing and future rural residential and other potential noise-sensitive land uses throughout the Specific Plan area could be intermittently exposed to noise from Specific Plan-facilitated future, project- specific construction activity, representing a **potentiallysignificant impact.**	**Mitigation 13-3.** To reduce noise impacts from SpecificPlan-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 betweenthe 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 adjoinor are near a construction project site. ▪ *Construction Traffic.* Route all construction traffic toand from the construction sites via designated truckroutes where possible. Prohibit construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible. ▪ *Quiet Equipment Selection.* Use quiet constructionequipment, particularly air compressors, whereverpossible. ▪ *Noise Disturbance Coordinator.* For largerconstruction projects, designate a "Noise Disturbance Coordinator" who would be responsiblefor 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 schedulenotices.) Implementation of these measures would reduce thisimpact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure outlines specific construction noise mitigation measures. This measure is triggered during construction.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
Impact 13-4: Specific Plan-Facilitated and Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts on Green ValleyRoad. 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 onGreen Valley Road south of Eastridge Drive would represent a **significant cumulative impact**.	**Mitigation 13-4.** To reduce the traffic noise increase along Green Valley Road, the County should considerthe 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. The Specific Plan's contribution to the cumulative traffic noise increase along Green Valley Road is therefore considered a **significant unavoidable impact**.	County.	County.	None.			This measure requires the County to consider "noise reducing pavement and speed reductions" along GVR to reduce noise impacts from future traffic increases.
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY							
Impact 15-1: Future Storage and Use of AgriculturalChemicals. In all four Draft Specific Plan-designated neighborhoods, the plan would permit residential development adjoining agricultural uses, some of which may store and/or use pesticides or other hazardous substances. Agricultural uses allowed by the Draft Specific Plan would also adjoin certain offsiteresidential areas, such as the upper Green Valley neighborhood north of the Specific Plan area and the Hidden Meadows subdivision south of the plan area. Inaddition, in the proposed Nightingale Neighborhood, the Specific Plan would also allow development of an elementary school in the northwestern corner of the neighborhood, close to but not adjoining agricultural areas. The potential exposure of residents or other site occupants to pesticides or other hazardous substancesused in agriculture would represent a **potentially significant impact**	**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 andschool uses and locations on agricultural properties within and adjoining the Specific Plan area where agricultural pesticides or other hazardous substances may be stored or used. 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 AgricultureDepartment. These measures would reduce the impactto a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires the County to edit the MGVSP to require specific buffers between school and/or residential uses and the storage of hazardous chemicals. This edit was incorporated in 2017.
Impact 15-2: Hazardous Materials from Proposed Onsite Wastewater Treatment Plant (Wastewater Options B and C). Operation of the proposed wastewater treatment plant within the Specific Plan area under proposed Wastewater Option B (Onsite Treatment) and Wastewater Option C (Fairfield-SuisunSewer District Connection/ Onsite Treatment Combination) would involve regular handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes during thecourse of normal operations. In addition, the onsite wastewater treatment plant would create the potential for release of raw or treated sewage or other stored hazardous materials through mishandling or an emergency situation. These potential hazards would represent a **potentially significant impact**.	**Mitigation 15-2.** Implement *Mitigation 16-5*. In addition,after the wastewater treatment plant and associated collection system have been installed, the County shallconfirm that a full environmental regulatory compliancereview has been conducted to verify that, based on theactual equipment stalled and specific quantities of hazardous materials handled, used, and disposed, the facility is operating in compliance with applicable environmental laws and regulations. These measures would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure addresses the potential on-site wastewater treatment plant that was evaluated in the MGVSP. The proposed project does not include an on-site wastewater treatment plant. This measure does not apply.
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES							
Impact 16-1: Water Supply Adequacy to Meet Project Domestic Demands--Option B (Onsite Groundwater). The proposed Specific Plan would result in an increased demand for water supplies. Studies indicate that sufficient groundwater supplies are available to meet existing and projected future demands in addition to the proposed project through 2035 under all water year types (e.g., normal, single- dry, and multiple-dry years). However, without implementation of established County and State watersystem regulations and review procedures, this wouldbe a **potentially significant impact** related to adequacy of water supply.	**Mitigation 16-1a**: Prior to subdivision map approval, aWater Master Plan for water supply Option B shall be prepared that describes engineering specifications andother 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 approvedby Solano County. The Water Master Plan shall contain as one of its components engineering specifications including, butnot limited to: ▪ well locations and depths; ▪ water pumping, filtration, and disinfectionspecifications; 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	MGV County Service Area or Solano Irrigation District.	County.	Under Water Supply Option B (Onsite Groundwater): Monitoring and reporting procedure shall be established to County satisfaction prior to approval of first subdivision map.			This measure addresses ground water impacts associated with Water Option B, Onsite Ground Water. The proposed project does not include use of this Water Option and this measure does not apply.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	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 tothe 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 requirementsof 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 ina **less-than-significant impact** related to adequacy of water supply.						
Impact 16-2: Project Domestic Water Facilities Impacts on Existing Wells and Stream Habitats-- Option B (Onsite Groundwater) and Option C1 (Solano Irrigation District [SID] Surface Water and Onsite Groundwater). Implementation of water supplyOption B or Option C1 would involve the extraction of groundwater from the aquifer system in the Suisun- Fairfield Valley Groundwater Basin via the use of at least three new groundwater wells (or at least one wellunder Option C1). Under water supply Options B or C1, placement and use of at one or more new groundwaterwells could, if improperly placed, contribute to underperformance or failure of existing nearby domestic wells and could have substantial adverse effects on stream hydrology or riparian habitat. Until the proposed well locations are identified and tested, analyzed, and monitored, this impact would be potentially significant.	**Mitigation 16-2a**: The wells under water supply OptionB or Option C1 shall be designed to avoid any potentialinterference 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 isexpected that a well design plan could be devised thatavoids adverse impacts on neighboring wells and surface streams. The well design process will also generate additional information in the future. The well design process shallprecede, and under industry practice would precede, determination of the engineering specifications for welllocations 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 avoidancesufficient 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 Countywould 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 ongoingmonitoring conducted as part of the well design plan orwater 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	MGV County Service Area or Solano Irrigation District.	County.	Under Water Supply Option B (Onsite Groundwater) or Option C1 (SID Surface Water and Onsite Groundwater): Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval. Ongoing inspection/ monitoring of operations.			The proposed project is not exercising the on-site ground water option. This measure is not required.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	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 wellstructure 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 anotherproject 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 notexisted and caused a decline in water levels of theirwells.						
Impact: SID System Adequacy to Meet Project Agricultural Irrigation Demands--Options A (Municipal Connection), B (Onsite Groundwater), and C (SID Surface Water). The project would increase the demand for agricultural irrigation water, which would be supplied by SID, consistent with its current practice of supplying water for agricultural irrigation needs within its boundaries. Because SID has confirmed it has sufficient water supply to meet this increased demand, this impact would be less than significant.	*Although this impact is determined appropriately to be less than significant in the Final EIR, in comments on the Notice of Preparation in 2009, SID indicated that a developer should expect that some additional facilities may be needed because the existing agricultural distribution system in the Plan Area may be serving at or near its capacity. SID also indicated that SID has a number of district development requirements concerning facilities, such as a requirement that a separate "turnout" be provided at the developer's expense for each newly created parcel that would receive agricultural water service within the District, a requirement that an SID inspector be onsite during system installation, and similar matters reflected below in Mitigation 16-2c. Including the following SID district development requirements within the requirements for the project will help ensure that any required facilities are prepared according to SID's requirements.* *Implementation of SID's district development requirements will further help to ensure that any additional system features that may be needed will be provided in an appropriate manner.* **Mitigation Measure 16-2c:** Implement the following: 1. 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. 2. 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. 3. 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.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County	Under Water Supply Option A (Municipal Connection), Option B (Onsite Groundwater) or Option C (SID Surface Water): Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			The proposed project anticipates use of Option C (SID surface water) treated by City of Fairfield. This measure outlines typical SID design standards that the project would comply with as part of the improvement plan review.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	4. 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. 5. 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. 6. 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. 7. Arrangements satisfactory to SID shall be made forthe design and construction of the new system before SID will approve a parcel map. 8. The applicant/developer shall provide easementsfor all new pipelines and facilities that would be granted to SID, including all facilities up to and including individual lot meters. 9. 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 edgeof any SID pipelines. 10. SID pipelines shall not be located within any of theproposed 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 waterservice, 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." 11. Upon completion of construction of non-potable service to the subject properties, land owners shallcontact SID to establish water service accounts. 12. The SID certificate shall be added to all final parcel maps, subdivision maps, and improvements plans in the plan area, and SIDshall review, approve, and sign all maps and plans						
Impact 16-3: Project Construction Impacts on Existing SID, USBR, City of Fairfield, and City of Vallejo Facilities in the Plan Area--Options A (Municipal Connection), B (Onsite Groundwater), and C (SID Surface Water). Construction activity associated with buildout under the proposed Specific Plan, including general development activity as well asSpecific Plan-proposed water and wastewater facilitiesconstruction, may affect existing Solano Irrigation District (SID), U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), City of Fairfield, and City of Vallejo water easements and facilities in the plan area, representing a **potentially significant environmental impact**.	**Mitigation 16-3:** Plans for development contiguous to SID, USBR, City of Fairfield, and City of Vallejo easements and facilities, or roadway or utility crossingsof 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 pipesshall include an engineered stress analysis on the pipeto ensure the pipeline would withstand proposed roadway loadings. Residential lots shall not be locatedwithin SID, USBR, City of Fairfield, City of Vallejo easements. Wastewater lines and other facilities on residential lots shall be kept clear of SID and USB R 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,	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Under Water Supply Option A (Municipal Connection), Option B (Onsite Groundwater) or Option C (SID Surface Water): Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires applicants to secure any easements necessary for work in or contiguous to existing Agency facilities. The language in this measure clearly states that compliance is triggered at construction.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	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 thisimpact to a **less-than-significant level**.						
Impact 16-4: Potential Project Exceedance of FSSDWastewater Treatment System Capacity--Options A(FSSD Connection) and C (FSSD Connection/OnsiteTreatment Combination). Specific Plan wastewater treatment Option A would involve connection of the proposed Specific Plan development area to the Fairfield Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) via an existing City of Fairfield conveyance system. The proposed Specific Plan development program would generate anestimated approximately 135 acre feet per year of wastewater treatment demand not specifically accounted for in current FSSD wastewater management planning, including the current FSSD Master Plan. The adequacy of the FSSD treatment plant, Cordelia Pump Station and associated City of Fairfield collection mains to accommodate the project contribution to anticipated cumulative future treatment demands has not been determined. The project-plus-cumulative demands for wastewater treatment may therefore exceed future City of Fairfield conveyance and FSSD treatment capacity, representing a potentially significant project and cumulative environmental impact.	**Mitigation 16-4:** The Specific Plan proposes establishment of a County Service Area (CSA) pursuant to California Government Code section25210.1 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. Theproposed CSA may issue general obligation bonds orrevenue 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, implementthe following: 1. establish the Specific Plan-proposed County Services Area (CSA) for the development area; 2. formulate and adopt the Specific Plan-proposed Wastewater Master Plan for the development area (CSA responsibility); 3. establish agreement with the FSSD to serve the ultimate development area wastewater treatment need identified in the Wastewater Master Plan; and 4. 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 associatedsewer system infrastructure--e.g., onsite collectionsystem, 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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary			This measure addresses FSSD capacity to treat wastewater in the plan area. FSSD has updated their master plan since this EIR was adopted. The applicants are working with FSSD to confirm that the Master Plan included treatment of the plan area (consistent with AB 530). The proposed project will comply with this measure by ensuring adequate capacity prior to approval of the proposed T Maps
Impact 16-5: Potential Project Inconsistency with State Tertiary Wastewater Discharge Standards-- Options B (Onsite Treatment) and C (FSSD Connection/Onsite Treatment Combination). Underproposed wastewater service Option B (onsite wastewater treatment system), Wastewater from the Specific Plan development areas would be collected and treated onsite using a local collection system similar to Option A, but instead of a connection to the FSSD, the collected wastewater would be conveyed toan onsite Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) package wastewater treatment plant that would treat the collected wastewater to tertiary recycled water standards. The tertiary treated wastewater would then be reused onsite for agricultural irrigation, ornamental landscaping irrigation, park and playing field landscaping irrigation, toilet flushing, and other jurisdictionally permitted uses. Although the Specific Plan proposes to treat all collected wastewater to County and State tertiary cycled water standards, until the Specific Plan proposed Master Wastewater Plan for Options B and C, including complete engineering specifications for the onsite treatment system, are completed to County satisfaction and the associated recycled wastewater reuse aspect is approved by the RWQCB and CDPH, it is assumed that Options B and C may not comply with the wastewater treatment water quality and environmental health protection standards, and ongoing monitoring and reporting. requirements of these two state agencies, representinga potentially significant environmental impact.	**Mitigation 16-5:** Prior to County approval of any futureresidential subdivision map or discretionary non- residential development application in the plan area under wastewater treatment option B or C, implement the following: 1. establish the Specific Plan-proposed CSA for theSpecific Plan development area; 2. formulate and adopt the Specific Plan-proposedWastewater Master Plan for the proposed development areas (CSA responsibility); 3. 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 constructionand ongoing operation, monitoring and maintenance of the onsite wastewater treatmentand disposal system (CSA responsibility); and 4. complete the RWQCB Discharge Permit process for the proposed irrigation in designated areas, andCDPH permit procedures pursuant to CCR Title 22standards for the proposed use of tertiary treated wastewater for irrigation (CSA responsibility).	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			The proposed project does not include connection to an on-site treatment plant. This measure does not apply.
Impact 16-6: Potential Project Inconsistencies withSID Standards--Options B (Onsite Treatment) and C(FSSD Treatment Combination/Onsite Treatment). The Specific Plan proposes that, under wastewater treatment Options B or C, tertiary-treated wastewater would be reused onsite for agricultural and domestic irrigation purposes in conjunction with Solano Irrigation District (SID) water. The Solano Irrigation District (SID)may determine that delivery of tertiary effluent from the onsite MBR treatment plant via the	**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), anyproject 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 theproposed CSA system, for	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			The proposed project does not include connection to an on-site treatment plant. This measure does not apply.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
existing SID conveyance system for agricultural and domestic irrigation purposes may be unsuitable for certain typesof irrigation and therefore undesirable to the District. This proposed aspect of Wastewater treatment OptionsB and C may therefore be infeasible, representing a **potentially significant impact**.	plan area distribution by a CSA-operated distribution system. Formulation of this Wastewater Master Plan component to SID satisfactionwould reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant level**.						
Impact 16-7: Project Impact on Fire Protection andEmergency Medical Services. Development in accordance with the Specific Plan may increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services sufficiently to create a need for new or alteredfacilities, representing a **potentially significant impact**.	**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, theCounty 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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			The proposed project application materials include a letter from CFPD stating that a fire station is needed. Consistent with this letter, and direction from CFPD, the MGVSP was recently amended to show a potential fire station location at the corner of Mason Rd and GVR, instead of the internally located station within the Elkhorn neighborhood. Compliance with this measure will include a COA on the TMap that requires preparation of a plans for construction of a CFPD station.
Impact 16-8: Project Impacts on Emergency Response, Evacuation, and Access. Development inaccordance with the Specific Plan would cause traffic increases and congestion on Green Valley Road, possibly delaying emergency response and evacuation, representing a **potentially significant impact**.	**Mitigation 16-8.** Implement mitigation measures identified in chapter 17, Transportation and Circulation,to reduce the impacts of Specific Plan-related traffic onGreen 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-Fireroad 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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			The proposed project shall comply with related transportation MMs and shall also secure written verification of emergency access standards
Impact 16-9: Project Wildfire Hazard Impact-- Ongoing. The Specific Plan would introduce residential (Rural Meadow, Rural Neighborhood and Agriculture-Residential) and residential/commercial (Rural Neighborhood/ Community Service) land within or adjacent to areas where wildland fire danger is "moderate" to "very high." Specific Plan-facilitated development within or abutting these areas would create an "urban/wildland interface," increasing the riskof wildland fires and associated needs for additional fire protection personnel and facilities. Failure to sufficiently reduce this urban/wildland interface fire hazard through appropriate fuel management and other fire suppression techniques and/or provide the necessary fire equipment access, emergency evacuation, and additional fire protection personnel and facilities, could result in substantial safety hazard and impair CFPD response time and evacuation efforts, representing a **potentially significant impact**.	**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 Countystandards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance inadjacent areas. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to County issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.			The measure points back to MMs 16-7 and 16-8, see discussion above. This measure also requires compliance with building standards etc at CofO, which is not required at this time.
Impact 16-10: Project Wildfire Hazards-- Construction Period. Construction in Specific Plan-designated development areas may involve handlingand storage of fuels and other flammable materials, creating temporary fire hazards in the "urban/wildlandinterface" and representing a **potentially significant impact**.	**Mitigation 16-10.** As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the Countyshall 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 flammablestorage areas. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant level**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires the county to add a COA to the TMaps that requires OSHA compliance, etc This measure will be complied with by incorporating at COA as identified in the measure
Impact 16-11: Impact of Specific Plan Proposed Trails on Bay Area Ridge Trail Plan. Unless subsequent trail implementation plans are coordinatedwith the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council, proposed trailswithin the Specific Plan area may not meet Bay Area Ridge Trail standards, representing a **potentially significant impact**.	**Mitigation 16-11.** As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the Countyshall require written verification that the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council has reviewed and approved final trail design and construction to ensure that trails withinthe 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**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			There are no trails proposed outside of the neighborhood boundaries (along neighborhood streets and within neighborhood green spaces). This measure does not apply.
Impact 16-12: Project Construction-Period andLong-Term Solid Waste Impact on Landfills. Construction and operation of land uses proposed by the Specific Plan would generate solid waste that would require disposal at a landfill. While landfill capacity is currently expected to be adequate to serve this development, the situation could change over the life of the Specific Plan, particularly if the currently pending Potrero Hills Landfill expansion proposal is notapproved before the scheduled landfill closure date of January 1, 2011. Any potential for inadequate landfill capacity or the potential need for new facilities would represent a **potentially significant impact**.	**Mitigation 16-12.** The project shall comply with SolanoCounty 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.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			This measure requires the county to add a COA to the TMaps that requires confirmation of landfill capacity and preparation of recycling plans for construction debris and waste. This measure will be complied with by incorporating at COA as identified in the measure

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	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 policywould reduce the impact to a **less-than-significantlevel**.						
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION							
Impact 17-1: Baseline Plus Project Impacts on Intersection Operations. The project would contributesignificantly to baseline level of services impacts (i.e., intersection turning movement volumes) at the following local intersections during typical weekday peak hours: *Weekday AM Peak Hour:* (Intersection #9) Green Valley Road at the I-80 Westbound On-Ramp (project-generated traffic wouldexacerbate already unacceptable baseline operations [LOS F] by increasing the overall intersection traffic volume by more than one percent at this stop-sign controlled intersection) (Intersection #10) Green Valley Road at the I-80 Eastbound Ramps (project-generated traffic would exacerbate already unacceptable baseline operations [LOS F] by increasing the overall intersection traffic volume by more than one percent at this signalized intersection) *Weekday PM Peak Hour:* (Intersection #5) Green Valley Road at Westlake Drive(project-generated traffic would result in an LOS change from C under baseline conditions to E under baseline plus project conditions at this stop sign controlled intersection) (Intersection #7) Green Valley Road at Business Center Drive (project-generated traffic would result in an LOS change from E under baseline conditions to F under baseline plus project conditions at this signalized intersection) (Intersection #9) Green Valley Road at the I-80 Westbound On-Ramp (project-generated traffic would exacerbate already unacceptable baseline operations [LOS F] by increasing the overall intersection traffic volume by more than one percent at this stop-sign controlled intersection) (Intersection #10) Green Valley Road at the I-80 Eastbound Ramps (project-generated traffic would result in an LOS change from E under baseline conditions to F under baseline plus project conditions at this signalized intersection) These project-generated intersection LOS changeswould represent a **significant impact**.	**Mitigation 17-1:** 1. Baseline plus project impacts on this stop sign controlled intersection 5, Green Valley Road at Westlake Drive, would trigger the need for mitigation sufficient to bring project-plus-baseline operations back to LOS B and C in the AM and PMpeak hours respectively. If the City of Fairfield determines in the future that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, the City and Countyshall agree on a fair-share portion of the signal installation cost to be assigned to the plan area, and the County shall identify an associated fair share per residential unit contribution as a condition of subsequent individual subdivision mapapprovals in the plan area. Implementation of this measure would reduce thisparticular intersection impact to a **less-than- significant level**. 2. For project impacts on intersections 7 and 9, the City and County shall agree on 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 to be assigned to future subdivision and other discretionary development approvals in the plan area, including: ▪ At signalized intersection 7, Green Valley Road atBusiness 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 aseparate right-turn lane for the southbound GreenValley Road approach to Business Center Drive. ▪ At unsignalized intersection 9, Green Valley Road atthe I-80 Westbound on-ramp, the on ramp leg of theintersection 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. The County and City shall agree on a fair-share cost tobe assigned to the plan area for these improvements, and the County shall identify an associated fair share per residential unit contribution as a condition of subsequent individual subdivision map approvals in theplan area. 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 theanticipated AM and PM peak hour baseline plus project operational impacts; however, no feasible interim improvements to the interchange have been identified to mitigate this 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 study intersections 7, 9, and 10 would remain at LOS E or F. In addition, because the Countydoes not have jurisdiction over any of these study intersections within the City of Fairfield, implementationof the mitigation measures listed above for intersections 5, 7 and 9 cannot be assured. Therefore,until the proposed City/County fair-share funding program for intersections 5, 7 and 9 is established, and the planned I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Improvement Project (the planned reconstruction of thel-80/I-680/SR 12 and Green Valley Road interchange, as described in section 17.1.3 herein) is funded and implemented, the projected interim baseline plus project	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Compliance with this measure includes: The County and City shall agree on a fair-share cost to be assigned to the plan area for improvements listed in the measure for intersection 7 (GVR and Business Center) and intersection9 (GVR and 80W on ramp) and the County shall identify an associated fair share per residential unit contribution as a condition of subsequent individual subdivision map approvals in the plan area.

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	intersection impacts on intersections (5), (7), (9)and (10) are considered to be **significant and unavoidable**.						
Impact 17-2: Cumulative Plus Project Impacts on Intersection Operations. Under projected cumulative(2030) plus project conditions, the project would contribute significantly to further deterioration of traffic operations at intersection 5, Green Valley Road at Westlake Drive, in the PM peak hour, reducing operations from LOS C to LOS E. This intersection LOS change would represent a **potentially significantcumulative impact**.	**Mitigation 17-2:** The cumulative plus project conditionat 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 theleft-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. This impact is therefore considered to be **significant and unavoidable**.	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			Determined SU with no mitigation; no mitigation requirements for TMAP or any other discretionary approvals.