



Solano County

675 Texas Street
Fairfield, California 94533
www.solanocounty.com

Agenda Submittal

Agenda #:	17	Status:	Public Hearing
Type:	Report	Department:	Resource Management
File #:	22-792	Contact:	Matt Walsh, 784-6765
Agenda date:	10/04/2022	Final Action:	
Title:	Conduct a noticed public hearing and consider taking actions necessary to approve Major Subdivision Application No. S-21-01 (Wagner) that proposes a Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map to divide 410.9 acres into 27 separate parcels, and a subsequent Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map to divide 137.2 acres into 322 separate residential parcels and multiple additional parcels for right-of-way, parks and open space, village green, community service uses, and stormwater detention areas, near the intersection of Green Valley Road and Mason Road north of the City of Fairfield within the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan area in unincorporated Solano County		
Governing body:	Board of Supervisors		
District:	All		
Attachments:	A - Resolution - Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map B - Exhibit 1 - Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map Conditions of Approval C - Resolution - Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map D - Exhibit 1 - Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map Conditions of Approval E - Links to Sept. 1, 2022 Planning Commission Staff Report and Errata F - September 1, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes - Draft G - Sept. 1, 2022 Planning Commission Public Concerns and Responses H - Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Timeline I - Key Infrastructure Components of Project J - General Plan and Zoning Consistency K - Public Notice		

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Resource Management recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Conduct a noticed public hearing to consider the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan (MGVSP) Large Lot and Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps for Major Subdivision Application, S-21-01 (Wagner), near the intersection of Green Valley Road and Mason Road within the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan area in unincorporated Solano County north of the City of Fairfield; and
2. Consider adopting a resolution approving the Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map of Major Subdivision S-21-01 to divide 410.9 acres into 27 separate parcels, subject to the recommended conditions of approval (Attachments A and B); and
3. Consider adopting a resolution approving the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map of Major Subdivision S-21-01 to divide 137.2 acres into 322 separate residential parcels and multiple additional parcels for right-of-way, parks and open space, village green, community service uses, and stormwater detention areas, subject to the recommended conditions of approval (Attachments C and D).

SUMMARY:

The Middle Green Valley Specific Plan (MGVSP) encompasses approximately 1,900 acres north of the City of Fairfield city limits, near Green Valley and Mason Roads. The goal of the MGVSP is to provide a comprehensively planned, high quality, residential development of varying densities that honors and protects the ongoing agricultural activities and rural feel of the area. In accordance with the 2008 Solano County General Plan (General Plan), the MGVSP accomplishes this by clustering development and utilizing transfers of development rights to limit the effects of residential development on the rural character of the valley, including protection of the existing viewsheds, wildlife habitat, and agricultural activities. This results in approximately 415 acres, or about 22 percent, of the MGVSP area being designated for development of up to 390 homes in a "*neighborhood framework*" within one of four proposed neighborhood areas having an informal pattern of rural roads, residential building types, neighborhood commercial uses, and community buildings. The MGVSP also provides unique detailed design guidelines and development standards to accomplish its goal of maintaining its rural feel and aesthetic. The remaining approximately 1,490 acres, or about 78 percent of the MGVSP area is designated as permanent open land, of which approximately 440 acres would be preserved as working agriculture in perpetuity through agricultural conservation easements.

The proposed Major Subdivision Application S-21-01 contains two specific entitlements to begin implementation of the MGVSP: a Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (Large Lot Map) and a Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (Small Lot Map). These maps are described in more detail below. The Large Lot Map subdivides a portion of the property into 27 large lots for the purpose of sale and financing only. The Large Lot Map also results in the creation of parcels for public parks, rights-of-way for streets, and future development purposes through the Small Lot Subdivision Tentative Map. The Small Lot Map proposes the creation of 322 residential lots and will serve as the basis for design and construction of the future homes, infrastructure, open space, and other aspects of the project, including transition to the agricultural conserved areas consistent with the MGVSP. No specific development is requested at this time; it is expected that a home developer would acquire the project in the future to construct the actual development. The County believes that the proposed Large and Small Lot Maps are fully consistent with the intent and configurations identified in the MGVS Specific Plan and its amendments.

The Planning Commission voted 3-1 to recommend approval of the Major Subdivision Application S-21-01, including the errata identified containing revisions to the conditions of approval, after holding a noticed public hearing on September 1, 2022. Additional details on the Planning Commission hearing and public comment are described in more detail below and in Attachments E, F, and G.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION:

The Board has taken previous actions related to this application. This includes the following:

- August 5, 2008 - Board adopts the 2008 General Plan Update, which identified the Middle Green Valley (MGV) as a Specific Study Area. The 2008 General Plan was then ratified by Solano County voters on November 4, 2008.
- July 27, 2010 - Board certifies the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and adopts the MGVS Specific Plan and Master Development Agreement.
- November 25, 2014 - Board certifies a revised EIR, which included additional analysis on use of groundwater to serve the development and adopted a revised Specific Plan, which included additional water supply Option C, use of Solano Irrigation District surface water. This action was necessary following the finding from the Superior Court on May 22, 2012 that the environmental analysis of potable water options in the EIR was inadequate. The Board also re-approved the Master Development Agreement and Sales Participation Agreement.

- October 25, 2016 - Board certifies a revised EIR, which included additional biological analysis, and reaffirmed the 2015 findings and Specific Plan adoption following direction from the Superior Court to provide such updated analysis in the EIR.
- March 30, 2017 - The Chair of the Board executes a settlement agreement to resolve any remaining issues related to the adequacy of the revised EIR, resulting in Superior Court action on April 12, 2017 ending further court action on the certified EIR.
- July 25, 2017 - Board adopts revisions to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- August 8, 2017 - Board approves revisions to the MGV Specific Plan.
- September 28, 2021 - Board approves MGV Specific Plan Amendment SP-20-01 that included relocating future units from the foothills to the valley floor to avoid landslide and topography constraints, and to make minor adjustments to the land use boundaries within the Plan area.

A summary of the history of actions by the Board and Planning Commission is included as Attachment H.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no direct fiscal impact associated with consideration and/or action on the proposed major subdivision application. The costs associated with preparing the agenda and processing the application are covered by the fees paid to the County by the applicant at the time the application was filed and through reimbursement for services rendered.

DISCUSSION:

Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (Attachment E - Links to Planning Commission Agenda)

The Large Lot Map will create 27 large lots for the purposes of sale or transfer to developers for future subdivision. The Large Lot Map is not intended to include improvement plans or development but serves to provide the path forward for future development through the Small Lot Map. Access easements are included as necessary to ensure every parcel created has road access and is not land locked.

Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (Attachment E - Links to Planning Commission Agenda)

Two larger neighborhoods are the focus of the Small Lot Tentative Map: the Elkhorn and Nightingale neighborhoods. The Elkhorn Neighborhood, generally located west of Mason Road, will include 200 homes. The Nightingale Neighborhood, located south of Mason Road and northwest of Reservoir Lane, will have 112 homes. The Nightingale Neighborhood is located on the valley floor and will provide a transition to the agricultural uses of the project. In addition to these two neighborhoods, four large parcels will be created along the Green Valley corridor and six parcels in the Three Creeks neighborhood will be created, including two parcels greater than five-acres, as well as a four-unit subdivision on an unnamed court off Mason Road.

The Project provides for a variety of home types on varying lot sizes. For example, courtyard homes will be zero lot line homes clustered around courtyards. Bungalows are smaller single-family homes. Farmsteads are envisioned to be larger single-family detached homes that provide a transition to the larger agricultural uses and reinforce the rural character of the area. A full description of each of the residential housing types can be found in Chapter 5.4 of the Specific Plan ([Solano County - Middle Green Valley Specific Plan](https://www.solanocounty.com/depts/rm/planning/middle_green_valley_specific_plan.asp)) [<https://www.solanocounty.com/depts/rm/planning/middle_green_valley_specific_plan.asp>](https://www.solanocounty.com/depts/rm/planning/middle_green_valley_specific_plan.asp). Specific to the Project, the Elkhorn Neighborhood will include 76 smaller lot courtyard homes, 89 bungalows and 35 farmstead homes. The Nightingale Neighborhood will have 70 bungalow homes and 42 farmstead homes. A unique feature of this neighborhood is that the street system is designed around several village greens that will provide a focal point, open space, and areas for walking/gathering in the neighborhood.

No specific design is proposed at this time. It is envisioned home builder(s) will develop the Project in the future. At the time specific development is proposed, the design of the units will be subject to the design standards outlined in the Specific Plan and will be subject to approval by the County and Middle Green Valley Conservancy Design Review Committee.

The lot sizes generally range from 4,000 square feet to 13,000 square feet in the subdivision, with some parcels in the farmstead areas being as large as 49,000 square feet.

As envisioned in the General Plan and MGVSP, municipal services will be provided for most of the proposed lots. Potable water will either be provided by the Solano Irrigation District, after treatment by the City of Fairfield, or by the City of Vallejo. A single water purveyor must be chosen prior to Final Map approval. The Fairfield Suisun Sewer District will provide sewage treatment for the future development. An HOA, backed by a Community Facilities District, will operate the sewer lines within the development. On-site sewage disposal and water wells will be used on the larger lots created outside the Nightingale and Elkhorn neighborhoods. Infrastructure and roadways are discussed in additional detail in Attachment I.

Conditions of Approval

Conditions of approval have been prepared for both the Large Lot Map (Attachment B) and Small Lot Map (Attachment D).

General Plan and Zoning Consistency

As conditioned, the subdivision maps will create parcels consistent with the General Plan and zoning land uses identified in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan including residential, commercial services, community services, agriculture and open space and the maps are therefore consistent with the General Plan, MGVSP, and zoning. See Attachment J for additional details.

Environmental Analysis

The County has reviewed the environmental checklist analysis submitted by the applicant documenting that there are no new impacts from implementing the tentative maps and concurs that the Project is exempt from additional environmental review as provided in CEQA Guidelines 15168(c). The proposal does not result in new significant impacts and no additional environmental review is required.

The Applicant will be required, as part of the conditions of approval (No. 12D) for the Project, to comply with each of the mitigation measures outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). This includes sensitive species pre-construction surveys, tree mitigation, and securing any necessary regulatory permits (Army Corps 404 Permit for wetlands, Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for impacts to creek crossings, etc.).

Planning Commission

On September 1, 2022, the Planning Commission considered the application at a noticed public hearing. After closing the public hearing and considering all written and oral comments regarding the application, the Planning Commission voted 3-1 to recommend the Board approve S-21-01, subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in Attachments B and D of this report, which incorporate errata identified during the Planning Commission meeting and subsequent non-substantive edits. Several people spoke in favor of the project stating that they had been involved since the beginning of the MGVSP planning process, and that the project was well planned and provides for the preservation of open space and ongoing agricultural activities.

Others that spoke in opposition expressed concern over traffic, school impacts, the formation of a community

facilities district (CFD), and whether the holder of the conservation easements required by the Specific Plan must be a private accredited land trust rather than a qualified public entity, among other issues. The Planning Commission modified staff's recommended conditions of approval to require that the conservation easement holder be an accredited land trust. Attachment G contains a list of general concerns that were brought up to the Planning Commission, and the current response by staff including options for the Board to consider regarding the Planning Commission modification to require only an accredited land trust as the conservation easement holder (see Attachment G).

Public Notice

In accordance with the Solano County Subdivision Ordinance, a notice of public hearing (Attachment K) was published at least 10-days prior to the scheduled hearing in the Fairfield Daily Republic. In addition, all property owners of real property as shown on the latest equalized assessment roll within 300 feet of the property were mailed a written notice. 290 parcels were identified within the 300-foot radius, resulting in 238 mailings after duplicates were removed.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board may consider modifying the Planning Commission recommendation, amend the conditions of approval, or deny the project. However, this is not recommended as the Board has already approved the Specific Plan. The Planning Commission found that this subdivision application is consistent with the Specific Plan and ultimately serves as a significant step in implementing the Specific Plan.

The Board may also consider expanding on the Planning Commission's modification to the conservation easement holder requirement. The Specific Plan requires the conservation easement holder to be a type of entity qualified under the California Civil Code to hold such easements, while the Planning Commission modified this to require only an accredited land trust serve as the conservation easement holder. The Board may consider reverting back and expanding this to allow any of the various types of qualified conservation easement holders as defined in the Specific Plan.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

Various agencies were involved in reviewing and providing conditions for this Project. These include the Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District, City of Vallejo, Solano Irrigation District, City of Fairfield, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, San Francisco Bay Water Quality Control Board, and various Solano County Departments

The Green Valley Agricultural Conservancy and the Green Valley Landowners Association have submitted letters in support of the proposed amendments (see Attachment F - Letters from GVLA and GVAC of Attachment E).

County Counsel has reviewed this item and concurs with the recommendations.

CAO RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-_____

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF SOLANO COUNTY
APPROVING A LARGE LOT TENTATIVE MAP FOR
MAJOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION S-21-01,
THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SUBDIVISION PROJECT**

WHEREAS, the Solano County Board of Supervisors has duly considered, in public hearing, an application requesting approval of a Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide approximately 410.9 acres of predominately undeveloped land into twenty-seven parcels, twenty-three of which will be utilized as open space, agricultural, and rural home site parcels and four of which, consisting of approximately 137.2 acres, to be further subdivided by a Small Lot Tentative Map into 322 residential parcels together with additional parcels for right-of-way, parks and open space, village green, community service uses, and related stormwater retention areas, with all twenty-seven parcels to be consistent with the policies and regulations set forth in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, the property to be subdivided ("Subdivision Property") is located near the intersection of Green Valley and Mason Road, within the unincorporated portion of Solano County, north of the City of Fairfield; and

WHEREAS, the Subdivision Property and surrounding area is designated "Specific Project Area" in the General Plan and is planned and regulated by the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan, which established multiple zoning districts within the Subdivision Property that allow a range of land uses, including residential, agriculture, open lands, and agritourism; and

WHEREAS, the Board has reviewed the applicant's submittal and the staff report of the Department of Resource Management, considered the conditions recommended by the Department to be imposed on the Large Lot Tentative Map and attached hereto as Exhibit 1, read and considered the minutes and resolution of the Planning Commission, and heard and considered all comments and testimony regarding the application at the duly noticed public hearing held on October 4, 2022; and

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified for the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Project on October 25, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the potential environmental impact of the Large Lot Tentative Map in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and finds that the Large Lot Tentative Map, as proposed to be conditioned, is consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report certified on October 25, 2016, together with the addendums adopted on August 8, 2017, and September 28, 2021, (collectively "Specific Plan EIR"); and

WHEREAS, as proposed to be conditioned, the Large Lot Tentative Map will implement all mitigation measures recommended by the Specific Plan EIR and included in the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan that can be imposed at this step of the residential development project analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the question and finds that approval of the Large Lot Tentative Map, as proposed to be conditioned, would not trigger any of the circumstances described in section 21166 of CEQA, and therefore no further review of the MGV Subdivision under CEQA is required; and

WHEREAS, after due consideration, the Board makes the following findings, pursuant to the criteria described in the Subdivision Map Act and the Solano County Subdivision Ordinance, regarding the proposed Large Lot Tentative Map together with the recommended conditions of approval:

1. The proposed map is consistent with the Solano County General Plan and Middle Green Valley Specific Plan.
2. The design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Solano County General Plan and the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan.
3. The site is physically suitable for the proposed type of development.
4. The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development.
5. The design of the subdivision will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.
6. The design of the subdivision will not cause serious public health problems.
7. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvements will not conflict with any public easements for access through or use of the property.
8. The subdivision is consistent with regulations adopted by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Sections 4290 and 4291 of the Public Resources Code.
9. Structural fire protection and suppression services will be available for the subdivision through the Cordelia Fire Protection District.

RESOLVED, the Solano County Board of Supervisors approves the Large Lot Tentative Map of Major Subdivision Application No. S-21-01, subject to the conditions of approval described in Exhibit 1, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Passed and adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors at its meeting on October 4, 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS _____

NOES: SUPERVISORS _____

EXCUSED: SUPERVISORS _____

JOHN M. VASQUEZ, Chair
Solano County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
BILL EMLLEN, Clerk
Solano County Board of Supervisors

By: _____
Alicia Draves, Chief Deputy Clerk

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN
LOCATED NORTHWEST OF GREEN VALLEY ROAD
LARGE LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
1.	<p><i>Final Map</i> The Applicant shall submit the final map to the Department of Resource Management and the map shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map dated July 20, 2022. • Middle Green Valley Specific Plan, adopted August 8, 2017, as amended. 	M	RM (E) (P)
2.	<p><i>Development Rights</i> Per Section 3.1 of the Development Agreement, the approval and recording of the Large Lot Final Map shall not convey any additional right to develop.</p>	M	RM (PW) (P)
3.	<p><i>The following note shall be added to the Final Map:</i> Lots 1-4 are being created solely for purposes of financing and sale and each lot is not intended to be developed prior to further subdivision of that lot. Prior to recordation of a final map or parcel map for any of Lots 1-4, no development shall be approved for any such lot until a Conditional Certificate of Compliance is obtained for the lot.</p>	M	RM (E) (P)
4.	Prior to or concurrent with recording of the Final Map, easements shall be granted for ingress and egress to a public road for lots for Lots 5, 10, and 11.	M	RM (E) (P)
5.	This Large Lot Tentative subdivision map was approved, and a finding of site suitability was made based on the representation of the subdivider that they have or are currently negotiating for and will acquire, the property rights necessary to (1) provide legal access, with the width given in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan from a County maintained road to the subdivision, (2) provide the necessary Public Utility easements and (3) make all required offsite improvements. Without this representation, the subdivision would not have been approved. If the subdivider is unable to provide such proof, then this condition shall be deemed to have not been met and no subdivision map shall be recorded. The subdivider understands and agrees that the County will not exercise its power of eminent domain to condemn any of the above-described property rights.	M	(PW)
6.	<p><i>Public Right-of-Way Dedication</i> As provided for in the Development Agreement and the First Amendment thereto, the Owner/Applicant shall dedicate all rights-of-way and corresponding public utility easements such that public access is provided to each, and every lot as shown on the latest version of the Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map.</p>	M	RM (E) (P)
7.	<p><i>Single Phase</i> The Large Lot Final Map shall be recorded in one phase.</p>	M	RM (E)

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN
LOCATED NORTHWEST OF GREEN VALLEY ROAD
LARGE LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
8.	<p><i>Offers of Dedication</i> A. In addition to the Irrevocable Offers of Dedication (IOD) shown on the Tentative Map, the Large Lot Final Map shall also include irrevocable offers of dedication for Public Service Easements (PSEs) and other necessary utility, access, and grading easements to the satisfaction of the County Engineering Manager and County Surveyor. This shall include easements along existing portions of Mason, Green Valley and other roads within the boundaries on the Large Lot tentative Map. B. The IOD for the right-of-way for “Section 3” shall be widened to 60 feet as shown in the cross section on the Tentative Map.</p>	M	RM (PW)
9.	<p><i>Grading</i> The grading for the Three Creeks parcel (Lot 3) will be required to conform grading onto Lot 24. Grading easements sufficient to accommodate this grading on Lot 24 shall be recorded prior to or as part of the Large Lot Final Map.</p>	M	PW
10.	<p><i>Urban/Wildland Interface</i> The design of all elements along the Urban/Wildland Interface shall be designed and constructed as required by the Cordelia Fire Protection District.</p>	RM	RM (PW) (P)
11.	<p><i>Validity</i> Pursuant to Government Code Section 66452.6, this approval shall be valid for a minimum term equal to the remaining term of the Development Agreement for the project, or for a period of twenty-four months, whichever is longer, but in no event for a shorter period than the maximum period of time permitted by the Subdivision Map Act.</p>	M	RM (E)
12.	<p><i>Final Map</i> The following notes shall be placed on the final map: (1) “Future development of the lots shown on this map may be subject to additional Fire Safe regulations.” (2) Future development of Lots 1-4 shall be subject to compliance with the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps Conditions of Approval.</p>	M	RM (E)
13.	<p><i>Road Names</i> The un-named roadways offered for dedication by this map shall be named. The Public Works Engineering Division shall approve the road names.</p>	M	RM (E)
14.	<p>A. <i>Indemnity for County</i> The Applicant shall protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers</p>		

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN
LOCATED NORTHWEST OF GREEN VALLEY ROAD
LARGE LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the County or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative body concerning the project, which claim, action or proceeding is brought within the time period provided therefore in Government Code Section 66499.37 or other applicable statutes of limitation. The County will promptly notify the applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the County should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers, and employees, pursuant to this condition. The County may, within its unlimited discretion, participate in the defense of any such claim, action or proceeding if both of the following occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and • The County defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith <p>The applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement of such claim, action or proceeding unless the settlement is approved by the applicant. The applicant’s obligations under this condition shall apply regardless of whether a Final Map is ultimately recorded with respect to this project.</p>		

CONDITION DEFINITIONS

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT		WHEN REQUIRED	
RM	Resource Management Dept.	I	Prior to approval of Improvement Plans
(P)	Planning Division	M	Prior to approval of Final Map
(E)	Engineering Division	B	Prior to issuance of first Building Permit
(B)	Building Division	O	Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit
(F)	Fire Department	G	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit
PW	Public Works Division	DC	During construction
CC	County Counsel		

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN
LOCATED NORTHWEST OF GREEN VALLEY ROAD
LARGE LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
1.	<p><i>Final Map</i> The Applicant shall submit the final map to the Department of Resource Management and the map shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map dated July 20, 2022. • Middle Green Valley Specific Plan, adopted August 8, 2017, as amended. 	M	RM (E) (P)
2.	<p><i>Development Rights</i> Per Section 3.1 of the Development Agreement, the approval and recording of the Large Lot Final Map shall not convey any additional right to develop.</p>	M	RM (PW) (P)
3.	<p><i>The following note shall be added to the Final Map:</i> Lots 1-4 are being created solely for purposes of financing and sale and each lot is not intended to be developed prior to further subdivision of that lot. Prior to recordation of a final map or parcel map for any of Lots 1-4, no development shall be approved for any such lot until a Conditional Certificate of Compliance is obtained for the lot.</p>	M	RM (E) (P)
4.	<p>Prior to or concurrent with recording of the Final Map, easements shall be granted for ingress and egress to a public road for lots for Lots 5, 10, and 11.</p>	M	RM (E) (P)
5.	<p>This Large Lot Tentative subdivision map was approved, and a finding of site suitability was made based on the representation of the subdivider that they have or are currently negotiating for and will acquire, the property rights necessary to (1) provide legal access, with the width given in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan from a County maintained road to the subdivision, (2) provide the necessary Public Utility easements and (3) make all required offsite improvements. Without this representation, the subdivision would not have been approved. If the subdivider is unable to provide such proof, then this condition shall be deemed to have not been met and no subdivision map shall be recorded. The subdivider understands and agrees that the County will not exercise its power of eminent domain to condemn any of the above-described property rights.</p>	M	(PW)
6.	<p><i>Public Right-of-Way Dedication</i> As provided for in the Development Agreement and the First Amendment thereto, the Owner/Applicant shall dedicate all rights-of-way and corresponding public utility easements such that public access is provided to each, and every lot as shown on the latest version of the Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map.</p>	M	RM (E) (P)
7.	<p><i>Single Phase</i> The Large Lot Final Map shall be recorded in one phase.</p>	M	RM (E)

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN
LOCATED NORTHWEST OF GREEN VALLEY ROAD
LARGE LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
8.	<p><i>Offers of Dedication</i> A. In addition to the Irrevocable Offers of Dedication (IOD) shown on the Tentative Map, the Large Lot Final Map shall also include irrevocable offers of dedication for Public Service Easements (PSEs) and other necessary utility, access, and grading easements to the satisfaction of the County Engineering Manager and County Surveyor. This shall include easements along existing portions of Mason, Green Valley and other roads within the boundaries on the Large Lot tentative Map. B. The IOD for the right-of-way for “Section 3” shall be widened to 60 feet as shown in the cross section on the Tentative Map.</p>	M	RM (PW)
9.	<p><i>Grading</i> The grading for the Three Creeks parcel (Lot 3) will be required to conform grading onto Lot 24. Grading easements sufficient to accommodate this grading on Lot 24 shall be recorded prior to or as part of the Large Lot Final Map.</p>	M	PW
10.	<p><i>Urban/Wildland Interface</i> The design of all elements along the Urban/Wildland Interface shall be designed and constructed as required by the Cordelia Fire Protection District.</p>	RM	RM (PW) (P)
11.	<p><i>Validity</i> Pursuant to Government Code Section 66452.6, this approval shall be valid for a minimum term equal to the remaining term of the Development Agreement for the project, or for a period of twenty-four months, whichever is longer, but in no event for a shorter period than the maximum period of time permitted by the Subdivision Map Act.</p>	M	RM (E)
12.	<p><i>Final Map</i> The following notes shall be placed on the final map: (1) “Future development of the lots shown on this map may be subject to additional Fire Safe regulations.” (2) Future development of Lots 1-4 shall be subject to compliance with the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps Conditions of Approval.</p>	M	RM (E)
13.	<p><i>Road Names</i> The un-named roadways offered for dedication by this map shall be named. The Public Works Engineering Division shall approve the road names.</p>	M	RM (E)
14.	<p>A. <i>Indemnity for County</i> The Applicant shall protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers</p>		

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN
LOCATED NORTHWEST OF GREEN VALLEY ROAD
LARGE LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the County or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative body concerning the project, which claim, action or proceeding is brought within the time period provided therefore in Government Code Section 66499.37 or other applicable statutes of limitation. The County will promptly notify the applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the County should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers, and employees, pursuant to this condition. The County may, within its unlimited discretion, participate in the defense of any such claim, action or proceeding if both of the following occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and • The County defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith <p>The applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement of such claim, action or proceeding unless the settlement is approved by the applicant. The applicant’s obligations under this condition shall apply regardless of whether a Final Map is ultimately recorded with respect to this project.</p>		

CONDITION DEFINITIONS

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT		WHEN REQUIRED	
RM	Resource Management Dept.	I	Prior to approval of Improvement Plans
(P)	Planning Division	M	Prior to approval of Final Map
(E)	Engineering Division	B	Prior to issuance of first Building Permit
(B)	Building Division	O	Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit
(F)	Fire Department	G	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit
PW	Public Works Division	DC	During construction
CC	County Counsel		

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-_____

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF SOLANO COUNTY
APPROVING A SMALL LOT TENTATIVE MAP FOR
MAJOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION S-21-01,
THE MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SUBDIVISION PROJECT**

WHEREAS, the Solano County Board of Supervisors has duly considered, in public hearing, an application requesting approval of a Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide approximately 410.9 acres of predominately undeveloped land into twenty-seven parcels, twenty-three of which will be utilized as open space, agricultural, and rural home site parcels and four of which, consisting of approximately 137.2 acres, to be further subdivided by a Small Lot Tentative Map into 322 residential parcels together with additional parcels for right-of-way, parks and open space, village green, community service uses, and related stormwater retention areas, with all twenty-seven parcels to be consistent with the policies and regulations set forth in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, the property to be subdivided ("Subdivision Property") is located near the intersection of Green Valley and Mason Road, within the unincorporated portion of Solano County, north of the City of Fairfield; and

WHEREAS, the Subdivision Property and surrounding area is designated "Specific Project Area" in the General Plan and is planned and regulated by the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan, which established multiple zoning districts within the Subdivision Property that allow a range of land uses, including residential, agriculture, open lands, and agritourism; and

WHEREAS, the Board has reviewed the applicant's submittal and the staff report of the Department of Resource Management, considered the conditions recommended by the Department to be imposed on the Small Lot Tentative Map and attached hereto as Exhibit 1, read and considered the minutes and resolution of the Planning Commission, and heard and considered all comments and testimony regarding the application at the duly noticed public hearing held on October 4, 2022; and

WHEREAS, a Final Environmental Impact Report was certified for the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Project on October 25, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the potential environmental impact of the Small Lot Tentative Map in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and finds that the Small Lot Tentative Map, as proposed to be conditioned, is consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report certified on October 25, 2016, together with the addendums adopted on August 8, 2017, and September 28, 2021, (collectively "Specific Plan EIR"); and

WHEREAS, as proposed to be conditioned, the Small Lot Tentative Map will implement all mitigation measures recommended by the Specific Plan EIR and included in the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan that can be imposed at this step of the residential development project analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the question and finds that approval of the Small Lot Tentative Map, as proposed to be conditioned, would not trigger any of the circumstances described in section 21166 of CEQA, and therefore no further review of the MGV Subdivision under CEQA is required; additionally, because the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan is a specific plan for a residential development project, the Small Lot Tentative Map is exempt from further environmental impact review under CEQA pursuant to section 65457 of the Government Code; and

WHEREAS, after due consideration, the Board makes the following findings, pursuant to the criteria described in the Subdivision Map Act and the Solano County Subdivision Ordinance, regarding the proposed Small Lot Tentative Map together with the recommended conditions of approval:

1. The proposed map is consistent with the Solano County General Plan and Middle Green Valley Specific Plan.
2. The design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Solano County General Plan and the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan.
3. The site is physically suitable for the proposed type of development.
4. The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development.
5. The design of the subdivision will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.
6. The design of the subdivision will not cause serious public health problems.
7. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvements will not conflict with any public easements for access through or use of the property.
8. The subdivision is consistent with regulations adopted by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Sections 4290 and 4291 of the Public Resources Code.
9. Structural fire protection and suppression services will be available for the subdivision through the Cordelia Fire Protection District.

RESOLVED, the Solano County Board of Supervisors approves the Small Lot Tentative Map of Major Subdivision Application No. S-21-01, subject to the conditions of approval described in Exhibit 1, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

* * * * *

Passed and adopted by the Solano County Board of Supervisors at its meeting on October 4, 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS _____

NOES: SUPERVISORS _____

EXCUSED: SUPERVISORS _____

JOHN M. VASQUEZ, Chair
Solano County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
BILL EMLLEN, Clerk
Solano County Board of Supervisors

By: _____
Alicia Draves, Chief Deputy Clerk

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
1.	<p><i>Final Map and Development Plans</i></p> <p>A. The applicant shall submit final site development plans, including final map and improvement plans to the Department of Resource Management that shall substantially conform to the exhibits referenced below and as modified in these Conditions of Approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Small-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map dated June 15, 2022. (2) Preliminary Grading, Drainage, and Utility Plan dated June 15, 2022. (3) Phasing Plan dated June 15, 2022. (4) The Middle Green Valley Specific Plan dated August 2021. (5) Middle Green Valley Final Environmental Impact Report. <p>B. The Small-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map is approved for the development of 322-unit single-family residential subdivision and 7.1-acre commercial services and approximately 14.7-acres of park and open space development consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan. Implementation of the project shall be consistent with the above referenced items and these conditions of approval.</p> <p>C. The applicant shall coordinate the planning, development, and completion of this project with the various utility agencies (i.e., Solano Irrigation District, City of Vallejo, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), etc.). The applicant shall provide the County with written confirmation of public utility service prior to approval of the final map.</p> <p>D. The applicant shall provide easements and rights-of-way as required for all public utilities and appurtenances. This shall include areas as required for maintenance and service.</p> <p>E. Prior to the approval of any Final Map, the applicant shall enter into a subdivision improvement agreement with the County, identifying all required improvements, if any, to be constructed with each proposed phase of development. The applicant shall provide security acceptable to the County, guaranteeing construction of the improvements.</p> <p>F. The Small-Lot Tentative Subdivision map is expressly conditioned upon compliance with all environmental mitigation measures identified in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program, as amended (Attachment A).</p> <p>G. No final maps associated with the Small Lot Tentative Map shall be recorded until the Large Lot Final Map has been recorded.</p> <p>H. Applicable Design and Construction Standards. All public and commonly maintained infrastructure including but not limited to streets, drainage, water, sewer, lighting, and landscaping shall be designed and constructed in conformance with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan, State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulation</p>	G, I, B	RM (PW) (E)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>Standards, and County Roadway Improvement Standards. Any items or elements thereof whose design standards are not defined by County Roadway Improvement Standards, shall be designed to City of Fairfield Standards. All other public utility infrastructure shall be governed by the individual agency standards.</p> <p>(1) In the event the Director of Resource Management (Director) determines that conflicts exist between the City of Fairfield Design and Construction Standards and the Specific Plan, the requirements of the Specific Plan shall prevail. However, State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulation Standards will be the superseding standard for portions of the project within the State Responsibility Area.</p> <p>(2) Director shall determine appropriate standard where conflicts occur.</p> <p>I. Validity This approval of the Small-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map shall be valid for a period of twenty-four (24) months pursuant to the Solano County Subdivision Ordinance and the Subdivision Map Act (SMA). Extensions may be filed consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and SMA.</p> <p>J. Development Rights The approval of this Small-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map, and subsequent recording of the Final Map conveys the right to develop. As noted in these conditions of approval for the Small-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map, the County has identified improvements necessary to develop the subject parcels. These improvements include on and off-site roadways, water, sewer, storm drainage, landscaping, sound walls, and other improvements.</p> <p>K. Development Agreement The applicant shall refer to the Development Agreement (“DA”), including all subsequent amendments, for additional provisions for project improvements. The requirements and/or conditions found within the DA, including those as otherwise amended by the Solano County Board of Supervisors, shall govern over these conditions of development in the event that there is a conflict found between the two documents.</p> <p>L. Indemnity for County The Applicant shall protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval by the County or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, agents, officers, employees, or legislative body concerning the project, which claim, action or proceeding is brought within the time period provided therefore in Government Code Section 66499.37 or other applicable statutes of limitation. The County will promptly notify the applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding, and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the County should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers, and employees, pursuant to this condition. The County may, within its unlimited discretion, participate in the defense of any such claim, action or proceeding if both of the following occur:</p>		

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>(1) The County bears its own attorney’s fees and costs; and (2) The County defends the claim, action or proceeding in good faith</p> <p>The applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement of such claim, action or proceeding unless the settlement is approved by the applicant. The applicant’s obligations under this condition shall apply regardless of whether a Final Map is ultimately recorded with respect to this project.</p> <p>M. Homeowners Association/r CC&Rs. A Homeowner’s Association (HOA) shall be established for all land designated for residential development within the Project Area. No Final Map shall be approved by the County until the HOA has been established. No subsequent final maps shall be approved by the County until the applicant has demonstrated that the entire area has been annexed into the HOA.</p> <p>Concurrent with submitting an application for the first Final Map on the Property that includes residential units, the applicant submitting such application shall submit a set of Master Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions ("Master CC&Rs") to apply to the entire Property, together with proposed Association Governing Documents for a Master Homeowners' Association. The Master CC&Rs and Association Governing Documents shall be reviewed and approved by the applicant and the County Counsel prior to or concurrent with recordation of the first Final Map.</p> <p>The draft Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R's) and a copy of a typical deed shall be submitted for review and approval by the County. The approved CC&R's shall be recorded concurrently with the final map and a recorded copy provided to the County. A copy of the deed for the first dwelling unit shall be submitted to the County prior to granting of a final inspection and Certificate of Occupancy.</p> <p>The duties and obligations of the HOA shall include, but not be limited to the maintenance and operation of improvements, landscaping, structures, and facilities, that benefit HOA residents consisting of the following:</p> <p>(1) Maintenance of all common areas which are designed and intended for use by residents including landscape corridors, trails, private streets, private alleys, and private driveways. Maintenance of all walls and fences that are not maintained by private property owners. (2) Maintenance of all landscaping, lighting and walkways within the “Pedestrian Realm” of all streets. (3) Maintenance of water quality features. (4) Maintenance of the sewer infrastructure. (5) Maintenance of the storm drain infrastructure including water quality, siltation, and detention basins.</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>N. <i>Building Permits and Certificates of Occupancy.</i> Developer shall construct improvements providing at least two points of emergency vehicle access (“EVA”) to the site from existing public right-of-way prior to being issued the first Building permit.</p> <p>O. <i>Phased Construction and Fire Department Access:</i> Within each individual phase, no building permits shall be issued, and no wood or other combustible building materials may be stored on the site until all water and other utility work is completed and all streets are finish paved. In addition, no certificates of occupancy for any structure in the project area shall be issued until the following items have been completed to the satisfaction of the Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Installation and energizing for streetlights, (2) Installation of sidewalks, and (3) Installation of traffic signs and striping. <p>P. <i>Irrevocable Offers of Dedication (IODs).</i> The Final Map shall include IODs to the County for all public utilities and streets, drainage, landscaping, parks, sidewalks, sewer, lighting and other common improvements to be maintained by the HOA sufficient in the opinion of the Director and County Counsel to allow the County to fund the maintenance of these facilities through a Community Facilities District (CFD) or other means if the HOA is dissolved.</p>		
2.	<p>Improvement Plans and-Submittal</p> <p>A. Improvement plans for the required public and private subdivision improvements necessary to serve any and all phases of development shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Resource Management prior to approval of a Final Map. All civil engineering, improvement, landscape and irrigation, and other plans shall be submitted for review and approval to ensure conformance with this approval and with relevant codes, policies, standards, and other requirements of Solano County.</p> <p>B. All common and public infrastructure shall be designed and constructed as outlined in the Specific Plan. Any items or elements thereof whose design standards are not defined by the Specific Plan, shall be designed to County or City of Fairfield Standards. In the case of conflict, applicable standards shall be determined by the Director.</p> <p>C. Submittals shall be organized and complete and include all information, studies, reports, maps, plans, calculations, and other information necessary in the sole opinion of the County Engineering Manager to facilitate a complete and timely review of the submittal package. Incomplete submittals will be rejected.</p> <p>D. As provided for in the Development Agreement, the Applicant shall provide fully executed grant deeds, legal descriptions, and plats for all necessary Infrastructure to serve the project, including but not limited to lands,</p>	G, I	RM (P) (E)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>public rights of way, public utility easements, public water main easements, public sewer easements, irrevocable offers of dedication and temporary construction easements. All required easements as listed necessary for the infrastructure shall be reviewed and approved by the County and recorded with the Solano County Recorder pursuant to the timing requirements set forth in the Development Agreement, and any amendments thereto.</p> <p>E. Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures shall be listed on the plan sheets of the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>F. The applicant’s Geotechnical Engineer shall prepare a Master Grading Plan for the entire project area and shall submit this for review prior to, or concurrent with, the first Final Subdivision Map. The purpose of the master plan is to allow phased development and grading operations in an orderly and cost-effective way that addresses both interim and ultimate grading and drainage considerations. The Master Grading Plan shall be prepared in advance of individual site grading plans and shall be subject to review and approval by the County Engineering Manager. All phased grading plans shall be consistent with the Master Grading Plan. The Geotechnical Engineer shall provide comprehensive designs for all slope improvements and any slide repairs. All necessary details shall be included in the grading plans and approved by the applicant's Geotechnical Engineer.</p> <p>G. The applicant’s Civil Engineer shall provide, with final subdivision package approval, AutoCAD files containing water, storm, and sewer utility layouts as shown on the approved submittal. AutoCAD files shall be provided in a file format approved by the County Engineering Manager.</p> <p>H. Coordination with County GIS Prior to the Final Map, the location of all water meters, storm drains, water lines and conveyances, and sanitary sewer lines shall be provided to the County GIS in a format and accuracy consistent with the County’s GIS system and requirements.</p>		
3.	<p>Taxes, Fees and Financing</p> <p>A. The applicant shall pay all applicable taxes, fees and charges for the project at the rate and amount required by the Public Facilities Financing Plan and Development Agreement.</p> <p>B. Financial Master Plan The project shall be financially self-sufficient. Prior to the recordation of the first Final Map, the Applicant shall prepare a Financial Master Plan to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Resource Management that identifies all publicly and commonly maintained infrastructure, determines the cost to operate, maintain and replace said infrastructure over its life with a maximum replacement interval of 30-years including administrative, design, inspection and other associated soft costs. The Financial Master Plan shall also determine the cash flow and requirements to fund these and any other identified items</p>	M	RM (P) (E) CC

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS
October 4, 2022

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>C. Assessments If applicable, the applicant shall pay off any existing assessments against the property, or file necessary segregation request and pay applicable fees.</p> <p>D. Development Impact Fees The Applicant shall be subject to all Specific Plan Area development impact fees in place at the time of approval or subsequently adopted consistent with the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP), Development Agreement and amendments thereto, unless exempt by previous agreement.</p> <p>E. Consultant Services If the County utilizes the services of consultants to prepare special studies or provide specialized design review or inspection services for the project, the County shall provide notice to the applicant of the outside consultant selected, the scope of work and hourly rates, and the applicant shall reimburse the county for actual costs incurred and documented in utilizing these services, including administrative costs for personnel. A deposit for these services shall be provided prior to initiating review of the Grading Plan, Final Map, improvement plans, or beginning inspection, whichever is applicable.</p> <p>F. A Community Facilities District (CFD) shall be formed by the County prior to the filing of the Small Lot Final Map. The Applicant shall be responsible for all expenses related to the formation of the CFD.</p> <p>G. CFD Formation. The Applicant shall file an application, together with an initial deposit, to establish a Community Facilities District (CFD) for all phases of the project pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Act of 1982 in order to have a CFD in place in the event that the Master HOA is rescinded or abolished and therefore unable to satisfy its on-going maintenance obligations. The area of the CFD shall include all neighborhoods included in the Master HOA. The application and fee shall be submitted a minimum of six (6) months prior to recordation of the first Final Map, and the CFD shall be established prior to recordation of the first Final Map approval or issuance of building permits, whichever occurs first. The CFD shall be established upon the subject property within the Project to provide funding for the following services that would otherwise be provided by the HOA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operation and maintenance of all common areas which are designated and intended for use by residents, including landscape corridors, trails, private streets, and private alleys. 2. Operation and maintenance of all walls and fences that are not maintained by private property owners. 3. Operation and maintenance of all landscaping, lighting, and walkways within the pedestrian realm of all streets. 4. Operation and maintenance of water quality features. 5. Operation and maintenance of in-tract sanitary sewer infrastructure serving the project area. 6. Operation and maintenance of storm drain infrastructure, including water quality, siltation, and detention basins. 		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>An annual special tax shall be levied upon each parcel or lot in an amount to be determined, but only in the event that the HOA is rescinded or abolished, or is otherwise not able to function, or if any of the services to be provided by the HOA are cancelled or eliminated, and subject to an irrevocable offer of dedication (IOD) to, and acceptance by, the County of the facilities to be operated and maintained with funds collected through the CFD. It is anticipated that the annual special tax will be collected along with semi-annual property tax payments. The County shall be the sole lead agency in the formation of any CFD. Contact the Department of Resource Management to initiate the CFD application process.</p> <p>Applicants shall prepare a plan for dissemination to prospective homebuyers of information relating to the establishment of the CFD. Said information shall be included in model homes sales literature and as part of required Department of Real Estate (DRE) disclosure documents. County Counsel and the Department of Resource Management shall approve the plan for dissemination of information prior to CFD formation.</p> <p>Applicants shall pay all of the costs to form the CFD. Applicants shall deposit a lump sum amount predetermined by the County to adequately fund the cost of retaining various public finance consultants and attorneys, as well as the cost of County staff, needed to prepare analyses, documents, and resolutions to create the CFD.</p> <p>Additionally, separate from the CFD requirement outlined above, the Applicant may, at its discretion, form a CFD for the express purpose of financing public improvements.</p>		
4.	<p>Traffic and Roads Standards which govern roads within the Middle Green Valley Tentative Subdivision map are as detailed in 1.H. and as follows: -</p> <p>A. The applicant shall supply a bond or other security acceptable to Solano County to warranty the cost of maintaining public and private improvements for the period of one year after the acceptance of the improvements by the Director.</p> <p>B. For any of the required road improvements not completed prior to Final Map approval, Applicant shall enter into a secured Agreement with the County prior to Final Map approval, which shall guarantee completion of said improvements and comply with the following terms, and as may be additionally required by the County.</p> <p>(1) Deferment of said construction shall be accepted only if reasonable and necessary, as determined by the Director; and</p> <p>(2) All required road improvements shall be completed by the applicant to the satisfaction of Solano County Public Works Engineering Division within 2 years from the execution of the Agreement; and</p>	G	RM (E)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>(3) No building permit for any residential lot within the subdivision shall be issued by the County until all required road improvements have been completed by the Applicant to the satisfaction of Solano County Public Works Engineering Division. This restriction shall be disclosed in writing by the Applicant to all new lot owners within the subdivision, prior to lot sales, until all road, bridge, and stormwater management infrastructure improvements have been completed to the satisfaction of the County; and</p> <p>(4) The agreement shall be secured as required pursuant to Article XI of the Solano County Subdivision Ordinance, for all incomplete road improvements; and</p> <p>(5) The applicant shall notify the purchasers of the lots of the nature, extent, and requirements for all incomplete road improvements. The notice shall be subject to the approval of Solano County Public Works Engineering Division; and</p> <p>(6) The form and content of the Agreement shall be approved by Solano County Counsel prior to execution.</p> <p>C. Prior to the approval of the Final Map, the acceptance of subdivision improvement plans, or the issuance of grading or building permits, a Financing District shall be formed, or a Financial Master Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Resource Management, which shall have the authority and responsibility for maintenance, repair and replacement (perpetual operation) of all commonly maintained public and private infrastructure including roads, landscaping, drainage facilities, water, and sewer system within the subdivision. Formation of the Financing District shall be solely the responsibility of the applicant, but the County will cooperate with the applicant in the district formation process.</p> <p>The first Final Map shall not be approved without the prior establishment of a Financing District to maintain, on behalf of the County, each of the following types of improvements required to develop the subdivision:</p> <p>(1) Public streets within the Middle Green Valley Subdivision, including landscaping and irrigation.</p> <p>(2) Public drainage and storm water facilities, including detention/ retention pond(s), bypass channel, siltation basin(s), embankment(s), culvert(s) roadside drainage ditches, and related storm water drainage improvements.</p> <p>D. Prior to construction of the road improvements, the applicant shall submit improvement plans prepared by a civil engineer for the development to Solano County Public Works Engineering. The improvement plans shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate official from Solano County Public Works Engineering. The plans shall be submitted to Public Works Engineering for approval in both hard copy and electronic form, in a format approved by the Director. The applicant shall pay a deposit to cover the plan check and inspection costs of the improvements.</p> <p>E. Design drawings for the traffic circle at Eastridge shall be submitted to the City of Fairfield Public Works</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS
October 4, 2022

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>Department for review and approval. Proposed traffic circles shall follow the City’s Roundabout Design Guidelines and be designed to the satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer and Fairfield Fire Marshal, including, but not limited to: truck apron design, multi-use path to bicycle lane transitions, adequate turning templates with design.</p> <p>F. Applicant shall secure an Encroachment Permit prior to commencing any improvements within an existing public right of way.</p> <p>G. Any changes to street alignments and grades, including the change of any existing or proposed street alignment and grade, shall be approved by the Director.</p> <p>H. The Final Maps shall not be approved and recorded until the improvement plans and all related documents have been approved by all necessary regulatory agencies and the Director.</p> <p>I. If the improvement plans require excavation in any public road right-of-way, the applicant shall apply for an encroachment permit and place a cash deposit with the Solano County Public Works Engineering Division to ensure that any damage to the existing roadway is repaired in a timely manner. Applicant shall apply for, secure, and abide by the conditions of an encroachment permit for any work within the public right-of-way. Driveways must be maintained in such a manner as to prevent soil, rocks, and debris from tracking onto public roads.</p> <p>J. All lot grading shall conform with California Residential Building Code lot grading requirements. Applicant shall apply for, secure, and abide by the conditions of a grading permit for the construction of the private access improvements, parking areas, as well as any on-site grading.</p> <p>K. The installation (if required) of all gas, electric, sewer, and water lines and any other below surface utilities is to take place before the installation of any concrete curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and the surfacing of the streets.</p> <p>L. The Director shall approve all street names prior to approval of the Final Maps.</p> <p>M. All required subdivision improvements shall be completed by the applicant in accordance with the County-approved final phasing plans and consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan; and Phasing shall be consistent with the Phasing Plan dated March 2022 and the Phasing Narrative dated June 2022, unless otherwise approved by the Director.</p> <p>N. All street intersections shall comply with City of Fairfield Standard Drawing T1, Intersection Sight Distance Assessment. The sight distance triangle shall be shown on the landscaping and improvement plans. Within the sight distance triangle: a. No mounds, fences, or landscaping are allowed over 3 feet of the street pavement grade. b. No trees are permitted with a mature trunk diameter over 6 inches and all branches must be trimmed to a height of 10 feet above the ground.</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS
October 4, 2022

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>O. Wherever a dead-end road is permitted, an adequate turning area shall be provided, per Section 1-2.10 of the County’s Road Improvement Standards and Land Development & Subdivision Requirements and/or the California Fire Code (whichever is greater).</p> <p>P. Streets A, F, L, R and Mason Road shall be dedicated as public Roads. All other roads, alleys, driveways and other accesses within the project shall be maintained by the HOA.</p> <p>Q. Prior to construction, a Traffic Control Plan for roadways and intersections affected by construction shall be prepared by the applicant. The Traffic Control Plan prepared by the applicant shall, at minimum, include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Maintaining the maximum amount of travel lane capacity possible during non-construction periods, , and advanced notice to drivers through the provision of construction signage. (2) Maintaining alternate one-way traffic flow past the lay down area and site access when feasible. (3) Heavy trucks and other construction transport vehicles shall avoid the busiest commute hours (7 a.m. to 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays). (4) A minimum 72-hour advance notice of access restrictions for residents, businesses, and local emergency response agencies. This shall include the identification of alternative routes and detours to enable for the avoidance of the immediate construction zone. <p>R. Gutters shall be required along all roadway edges to collect and convey drainage away from the pavement edge unless otherwise approved by the Director.</p> <p>S. The width of the access from Street A to Parcel 38 shall be widened as required to accommodate a minimum width of 28 feet between face of curb.</p> <p>T. The minimum width of Mason Road shall be 28 feet from face of curb to face of curb (FC to FC).</p> <p>U. All streets shall have Public Service Easements (PSE’s) on both sides with a minimum width of 8 feet unless otherwise approved by the Director.</p> <p>V. Where future roads and/or widening and improvements of existing roads impact existing SID facilities, such facilities will need to be relocated by the applicant as approved by the district (and new easements granted as appropriate) such that they can be operated and maintained efficiently and support traffic loads. One example is the Green Valley Conduit and valving located at the intersection of Green Valley Road and Mason Road where the proposed traffic circle will significantly impact the ability of the district to operate and maintain the Green Valley Conduit.</p> <p>W. The applicant shall be responsible for replacing any and all damaged or hazardous public sidewalk, curb and gutter, bicycle trail facilities, and/or any other public improvements along the site frontage and/or boundaries,</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>including pre-existing conditions and construction damage, to the satisfaction of the Department of Resource Management.</p> <p>X. A geotechnical report shall be prepared, and the conclusions and recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineer shall be incorporated into the improvement plans as required by Solano County Public Works Engineering.</p> <p>Y. The applicant shall offer for dedication to the County of Solano all Public Roads and the adjacent_PSEs.</p> <p>Z. The subdivider shall offer for dedication to the County of Solano all Public Roads and Public Service Easements.</p> <p>AA. The private roads created by this map shall also be Public Service Easements. The private roads and adjacent public service easements will also be offered as Irrevocable Offers of Dedication to Solano County.</p> <p>BB. If the interior roads are not accepted by Solano County as public roads, then the subdivider shall dedicate access and utility easements for these areas. The dedications shall be to a minimum width of 50 feet plus any additional width necessary for all utilities, together with any additional easement area required for the cul-de-sacs at the ends of the roads and for cuts or fills.</p> <p>CC. On the Final Map, roads shall not be shown as separate parcels, and gross and net acreages for each lot shall be specified.</p>		
5.	<p>Water</p> <p>A. There shall only be one potable water provider to serve new development within the Specific Plan.</p> <p>B. The Applicant shall prepare a Water System Master Plan, which shall be approved by the Director, public agency water purveyor and Cordelia Fire Protection District prior to the approval and recordation of the initial Small Lot Final Map. This Water System Master Plan shall identify water supply and reliability, and determine sizing and location for storage (location, elevation, size and geotechnical suitability) and trihalomethane treatment (as required), transmission and distribution facilities, fire hydrant locations including considerations for protection of the Project’s wild land interfaces and include studies and modeling necessary to substantiate the Water System Master Plan and its various elements. The Water System Master Plan shall meet the requirements for the latest edition of the City of Fairfield Standard Specifications and Details and the standards of the public agency water purveyor. In the event of differing standards, Water System Master Plan shall meet the higher standard, unless otherwise approved by the Director and the public agency water purveyor.</p>	I	RM (PW)

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS
October 4, 2022**

Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>C. Water facilities including storage reservoirs, trihalomethane remediation, and pump stations may be required to serve the project and may be required to be located outside the boundary. Prior to recordation of the first Small Lot Final Map, the applicant shall acquire sufficient and suitable property acceptable to the Director and the public water purveyor to provide for the access, construction, operation, and maintenance of these facilities and include irrevocable offers of dedication for all such property within and outside the boundaries of the Project, prior to, or as part of the Small Lot Final Map.</p> <p>D. The County shall not approve the improvement plans until the public agency water purveyor has approved the water master plan. The identified public agency water purveyor shall be included as signatories to all final maps associated with the Project.</p> <p>E. Unless otherwise approved by the Director and the public agency water purveyor, all water mains shall be looped.</p> <p>F. Streets “U” and “T” shall have water mains along both sides of the common area. Water services for residential lots shall not be run across the common area.</p> <p>G. The locations of the water mains shown at the various roundabouts shall be determined by the Director during the plan review stage. Generally, running these mains under large concrete elements is not permitted.</p> <p>H. The existing Vallejo water main that runs through the development shall be relocated to Mason Road and Street L as shown on the June 15, 2022, exhibits.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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 		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>I. In the event that Solano Irrigation District (SID or “District”) becomes the public water purveyor, the following conditions shall apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Per the District’s Rules and Regulations, the applicant is required to provide water service to all newly created parcels, either Agricultural water or potable water as appropriate and determined by the District. (2) Per the District’s Rules and Regulations, for lands that are included within the District boundary, the District must review, place its certificate on and sign the Final Maps and improvement Plans by the Applicant. (3) The Applicant will have entered into binding legal agreements satisfactory to SID and the County of Solano providing for the construction, installation, testing, repair, and reserves for maintenance, operation and reconstruction of the water storage, distribution, and other facilities and apparatus reasonably required to distribute water for use by the Development’s occupants and users. Because the terms of those agreements will provide for the design, construction, and installation of the facilities to provide those services to a point or points within the Development and the facilities will be required to operate at that capacity from the date of first availability of water service, even though development and the payment for service by consumers within the Development may not occur for a substantial period after the date of installation and those costs are required to be paid before actual service may commence. The Applicant/Applicant will be required upon terms satisfactory to SID and the County of Solano that all of the financial obligations for service or availability of service of water are secured and the cash flow requirements of those obligations are reasonably available and will not become a lien upon the real property or assessments upon the real property or improvements by SID and/or the County of Solano. The authority to add to the County of Solano assessments upon interests in real property and improvements delinquent assessments, standby charges, or other charges of SID and the participation by SID and the County of Solano in programs providing for payment by the County of Solano to SID of delinquent assessment and charge amounts of SID from other funds of the County of Solano shall not be deemed security for those payments since those programs may be altered or become infeasible. (4) All existing Point of Entry (non-public water system) customers in the vicinity of the Project, including those off-site, shall be included and provided a service from the future potable water system. (5) Private pipelines shall be constructed outside of existing District easements. 		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>(6) Private pipeline easements shall be recorded by separate document if private pipelines must run through adjacent parcel. The District will require dedication of land sufficient and acceptable to the District’s Director of Engineering to accommodate all required facilities including pumping plants, a potential future tank, laydown area, and/or disinfection byproduct remediation, appurtenances. The minimum size shall be 1.5 acres and the locations shall be determined by the District’s Director of Engineering based on the approved Water System Master Plan and SID standards.</p> <p>(7) The District will require dedication of land sufficient and acceptable to the District’s Director of Engineering to accommodate all required facilities including pumping plants, a potential future tank, laydown area, and/or disinfection by product remediation, appurtenances. The minimum size shall be 1.5 acres and the location(s) shall be determined by the District’s Director of Engineering based on the approved Water System Master plan and SID standards.</p> <p>(8) The Applicant shall fulfill the requirements of the conditional will serve letter dated April 18, 2018. Based on current information, the District and Applicant are pursuing Scenario 1, Fairfield-SID Partnership to Treat and Wheel Potable Water to the Project.</p> <p>(9) The Applicant shall sign a District work order and keep such work order current throughout the project as the means of paying all fees and charges and fully reimbursing the district for staff, materials, consultant and other costs associated with the district’s review, processing and approvals of all items related to their approval and the construction of the project.</p> <p>(10) Unless otherwise approved in writing by the District’s Director of Engineering, all work that could affect the operation of District agricultural facilities shall be performed outside of irrigation season which generally runs from April 1 to October 15.</p> <p>(11) Per the District’s Rules and Regulations, the District must review, place its certificate on and sign the Final Maps and improvement Plans by the Applicant.</p> <p>(12) All areas located outside the district boundary must annex to the district prior to receiving water service. Annexations will require the construction of a potable well(s) to provide groundwater for water service to those lands located outside the existing g boundary. Property of suitable size and location must be identified as part of the Water master Plan and dedicated for the well(s) on the final map(s) or in advance as separate instruments.</p> <p>(13) In some instances, on-site private storage tanks and/or pumps may be required for future commercial development shall be owned, operated and maintained by the property owner.</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>(14) Electronic AutoCAD files are required upon the completion of the project showing “as-builts” for electronic archiving.</p> <p>J. In the event that City of Vallejo becomes the water purveyor, the following conditions shall apply:</p> <p>(1) A Water Master Plan shall be submitted to the City of Vallejo Water Department for review and approval prior to the submittal of the First Improvement Plan submittal or first phase of the Final Map review. The Water Master Plan shall be site specific and to industry standard prepared by a licensed professional engineer.</p> <p>(2) Based on the approved Water Master Plan, the City of Vallejo Water Department will include the parameters of the finding of the Water Master Plan into the system model to determine the required off-site improvements and provide additional conditions of approval of the water supply and distribution for the development. The applicant shall reimburse the City of Vallejo Water Department for all the cost for the review of the water master plan and added modeling and engineering support.</p> <p>(3) The developer, County and City shall coordinate efforts to permit, and process all required off-site and on-site water facilities consistent with the terms of the JEPA.</p> <p>(4) Based on the review of the water master plan, the City of Vallejo will generate additional conditions of approval for on-site and off-site water supply and distribution. All water facilities improvements shall be installed as required by the City of Vallejo Water Department based on the requirements at the time of the improvement plan submittal and shall be constructed within 2 years of the date of the final map approval.</p> <p>(5) The applicant shall reimburse the City of Vallejo Water Department for planning, engineering plan review, inspection, and construction management of the off-site and on-site water facilities. The initial fee deposit is 5 percent of the engineer’s construction estimate for the proposed off-site and on-site water facilities.</p> <p>(6) All parcels receiving water service from Vallejo shall detach from SID boundaries, except Agricultural parcels that are currently in SID boundaries may remain in the SID boundary and continue to be eligible for SID agricultural water service. Existing SID POE customers may remain in SID boundaries and receive agricultural water from SID provided their domestic use is connected to the public potable water system when the backbone infrastructure is installed.</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
6.	<p>Water and Sewer Infrastructure</p> <p>A. Per the agreement with Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) to serve this area, no sewer infrastructure upstream of the point of connection to FSSD’s existing (E) sewer main will be owned, operated, or maintained by FSSD. All sewer infrastructure shall be privately owned by the applicant and/or HOA up to the point of connection to FSSD’s (E) sewer system. All sewer easements related to sewer system shall be private sanitary sewer easements to the benefit of the HOA or other private entity/entities. All sewer infrastructure shall be designed and constructed to City of Fairfield standards.</p> <p>B. The Applicant shall provide sewer and water main easements in accordance with City of Fairfield easement requirements.</p> <p>C. A 24/7 all-weather access road with turnaround shall be designed and constructed to allow for the operations, maintenance and replacement of the public water or sewer line along the entire water and/or sewer line alignment.</p> <p>D. Provisioning of Water for lots proposing use of on-site water wells. Proposed lots #321 and #322 in the Three Creeks area fall within the “A” and “B” water scarce zones, as described on the USGS Water Bearing Rock Map dated 1972 and shall submit water quantity test results prior to recordation of the final map or parcel map which demonstrate that ample well water for domestic purposes is available on each lot, as specified in Solano County Code Ch. 26-80. The test shall conform to methods specified in the Solano County Water Supply Standards.</p> <p>E. Identification of existing water wells. The location of existing water wells shall be provided to the County in a GIS layer. Water wells which are no longer in use shall be destroyed under permit. Water wells that are retained shall conform to all cross-connection control requirements of the water district.</p> <p>F. Water Meter Fixed Network System. The applicant shall pay for, furnish and install all infrastructure associated with the water meter fixed network system for any water meter within the project.</p>	I	RM (E)
7.	<p>Sewer Services</p> <p>A. Prior to approval of the improvement plans, the applicant shall provide a sewer master plan for review and approval by the Department of Resource Management. The Sewer Master Plan shall be consistent with the initial sewer design shown in the project application materials and said design shall be further refined to demonstrate compliance with all applicable County standards, rules, and requirements. When the County does not have specific standards identified, the Sewer Master Plan shall default to the City of Fairfield standards. All sewer improvements shall be placed within the street right of way whenever feasible.</p>	I	RM (PW)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>B. In-tract sanitary sewer mains shall be privately owned and maintained by the Master Homeowner’s Association. The applicant shall install a standard sanitary sewer manhole at the point of connection to the public sanitary sewer system to demarcate the ownership of the public and private sewer systems. The HOA’s Financial Master Plan shall include the costs for periodic routine CCTV inspection, operation and maintenance including regular cleaning, and replacement & rehabilitation program to ensure sewer system reliability in perpetuity. The terminology shall be submitted to the County for review and approval.</p> <p>C. Downstream sanitary sewer lines and other facilities outside the limits of the proposed development may need to be upsized in order to provide adequate capacity to serve the development. Any upsizing of downstream pump stations, sewer lines or construction of parallel sewer lines in order to provide capacity to serve the development shall be designed and constructed per Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) standards by the applicant at the applicant’s sole expense. Downstream pump station capacity improvements, if required, shall be implemented by FSSD at the applicant’s expense. No sewer connections shall be made until all required downstream sewer improvements are complete and operational to the satisfaction of FSSD.</p> <p>D. Any lots proposed for development, including lots #321 and #322 in the Three Creeks area, that propose the use of on-site wastewater treatment systems (OWTS) for sewage disposal, shall have a site and soil evaluation performed under Environmental Health permit to determine septic feasibility. Soil testing shall be performed on each of the proposed parcels to designate and map the primary and reserve area leach fields for each of the proposed parcels. All existing septic systems shall be mapped and included on the tentative parcel map as existing leach fields and existing leach field reserve areas. The mapping must include the location of all existing water wells in the vicinity, to allow for verification that septic system to water well setbacks are being met. If the primary or reserve leach field areas for the proposed parcels require the use of an alternative type of septic system, a declaration shall be recorded with the final map that states the soil testing data submitted to date requires the use of an alternative type of septic system, and that such a system must be operated, monitored, and maintained in accordance with the standards set forth Solano County Code Chapter 6.4: Sewage Standards. The declaration shall state which lots soil testing indicates an alternative system is necessary. All on-site wastewater treatment systems must be operated, monitored, and maintained in accordance with the standards set forth Solano County Code Chapter 6.4: Sewage Standards.</p> <p>E. All provisions of the Agreement Regarding Sewer Service in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Area dated March 22, 2021, between the County and FSSD shall apply to the development associated with this application. The applicant shall be solely responsible for all costs associated with implementing the terms of this Agreement.</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
8.	<p>Drainage and Water Quality</p> <p>A. The applicant's civil engineer shall prepare a conceptual storm drain master plan for the project and all upstream watersheds and shall submit this for review prior to, or concurrent with, the first Final Subdivision Map application. The conceptual master plan shall show capacity calculations, pipe sizes and slopes and storm drain system layout. Detention basin location and sizing and flood routing analysis shall be included as necessary. The master plan shall be approved by the County prior to approval of the improvement plans.</p> <p>B. The Stormwater Master Plan shall be consistent with the initial stormwater treatment design shown in the project application materials, or as modified and approved by the Director and said design shall be further refined to demonstrate compliance with all applicable County standards, rules and requirements. Where the County does not have specific standards identified, the Stormwater Master Plan shall default to the City of Fairfield standards.</p> <p>C. The Large Lot Tentative Map denotes a Pooling and Ponding Easement (Easement) benefitting the City of Fairfield, recorded in an Easement Agreement dated October 3, 2008 (Solano County Recorders Doc No. 20090000780), located at the southern boundary of Large Lot 2. As defined in the Easement Agreement, the Easement is “a non-exclusive temporary easement for Pooling and Ponding” that is set to terminate once a new drainage bypass facility is constructed. The Easement allows for flooding and siltation. Prior to filing of the first Small Lot Final Map, the subdivider shall either a) modify the existing Ponding and Pooling Easement so that the proposed easement does not encumber the Street A right-of-way, or b) obtain a Minor Modification to the tentative maps modifying the proposed Street A roadway alignment to avoid these easements. In the event that the subdivider proposes to modify the existing Easement, the developer’s licensed civil engineering design professional shall work with City Public Works Department staff and submit adequate analyses, designs, and supporting documents defining any proposed new easement limits to the County for review and approval. Information and studies shall be to the satisfaction of the City Engineer of the City of Fairfield. Any easement modifications shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Fairfield, and recorded at Solano County, prior to approval of the associated Small Lot Final Map. In the event that the subdivider proposes to modify the roadway alignment, the modified alignment shall be as shown in the South Entry Road Exhibit dated August 2022 and approved by the Director. This option also requires adjustment of parcel lines of lots 19 - 23 as shown on the recorded</p>	I	RM (E) (PW)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>large lot subdivision map. Street “A” shall avoid the Easement area and such modification will be considered to be in substantial conformance with the approved maps.</p> <p>D. All drainage features serving more than one lot/parcel shall be dedicated to and maintained by the Master HOA.</p> <p>E. On-site stormwater detention will be required as part of the proposed development. Detention facilities shall be designed to reduce post-development peak flows to 90 percent of pre-development peak flows for the 15, 25 and 100-yr storm events. The storm water detention system shall be designed to detain the 100-year, 24-hour duration storm with a minimum of 1-foot freeboard. Detention basins shall drain in 72 hours or less, based on Solano County Mosquito Abatement District regulations. Detention basin shall include an all-weather access road and fencing around the entire perimeter, and all-weather access to the basin bottom</p> <p>F. The applicant's civil engineer shall demonstrate through hydrology maps and hydraulic calculations that the existing downstream storm drain system has adequate capacity to serve the development. To the extent that the existing downstream storm drain system has inadequate capacity, it shall be upsized or improved to handle the additional storm drainage from the development, or a detention basin shall be designed and constructed by the applicant. All costs associated with studying, designing and constructing storm drain capacity improvements shall be borne by the applicant.</p> <p>G. The storm drain improvement plans shall be designed and constructed to provide for “Best Management Practices” that meet the requirements of the water quality standards of the County’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>H. In addition to compliance with County ordinances, the applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that comply with the General Construction Stormwater Permit from the RWQCB, to reduce water quality effects during construction.</p>		
9.	<p>Other Public and Private Utilities</p> <p>A. All future communications and utility lines lower than 69 KV that are to be built within the project shall be placed underground within and along the perimeter of the project at the applicant’s cost. The applicant shall dedicate to PG&E or other utility provider as applicable all necessary underground easements for the electrical facilities or communications that will be necessary to service development of the project.</p>	M	PW

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>B. It shall be the applicant's responsibility to coordinate the location of all utility equipment with PG&E or other utility provider. Final locations of all above ground equipment must be approved by PG&E or other utility provider, and the Department of Resource Management.</p> <p>C. The Applicant shall dedicate public utility easements for underground facilities on properties adjacent to the public and private streets. A minimum of twelve and one-half-foot (12.5') wide Public Utility Easements for underground facilities (i.e., SID, Vallejo, PG&E, cable television, telephone) shall be dedicated adjacent to all public and private street rights-of-way. The Applicant shall dedicate additional width to accommodate extraordinary facilities as determined by the County. The width of the public utility easements adjacent to public and private right of way may be reduced with prior approval from public utility companies.</p>		
10.	<p>Construction Operations/ Solid Waste</p> <p>A. At the time specific development is proposed, 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.</p> <p>B. In addition, the applicant shall be required to prepare and implement a recycling plan for the construction phase of the project. Copies shall be provided to Environmental Health.</p> <p>C. During Construction, the applicant shall be responsible for litter control and sweeping of all paved surfaces in accordance with County standards. All on-site storm drains shall be cleaned immediately before the official start of the rainy season (October 15).</p> <p>D. Construction contractors conform to all applicable fire-safe regulations in applicable codes, including California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and local requirements for appropriate storage of flammable liquids and prohibition of open flames within 50 feet of flammable storage areas.</p>	G, B	RM (PW) (EH)
11.	<p>Landscaping, Lighting and Fencing</p> <p>A. The applicant of all project phases shall submit a lighting plan for the project to the Department of Resource Management. The Lighting Plan shall be consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan requirements, as well as the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Shield or screen lighting fixtures to direct the light downward and prevent light spill on adjacent properties. (2) Place and shield or screen flood and area lighting needed for construction activities, and/or security so as not to disturb adjacent residential areas and passing motorists. (3) For public lighting in residential neighborhoods, prohibit the use of light fixtures that are of unusually high intensity or that blink or flash. 	I	RM (P)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>(4) Use appropriate building materials (such as low-glare glass, low-glare building glaze or finish, neutral, earth toned colored paint and roofing materials), shielded or screened lighting, and appropriate signage in the office/commercial areas to prevent light and glare from adversely affecting motorists on nearby roadways; and</p> <p>(5) Design exterior on-site lighting as an integral part of the building and landscaping design in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Area. Lighting fixtures shall be architecturally consistent with the overall site design. Lights used on signage should be directed to light only the sign face with no off-site glare.</p> <p>(6) All lights shall be light emitting diodes. The color temperature shall be less than or equal to 2700 kelvins.</p> <p>(7) Intersection safety lighting shall comply with the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America Guidelines.</p> <p>B. Final landscape plans and specifications shall be prepared by a registered landscape architect and approved by the County prior to the approval of the first building permit. Said plans shall include all on-site landscape specifications and details including a tree planting exhibit demonstrating sufficient diversity and appropriate species selection to the satisfaction of the Resource Management Department. The tree exhibit shall include all street trees, accent trees, parking lot shading trees, and mitigation trees proposed within the development. Said plans shall comply with all State and local rules, regulations, Governor’s declarations and restrictions pertaining to water conservation and outdoor landscaping.</p> <p>C. Landscaping shall meet shade requirements as outlined in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan where applicable. The landscape plans shall comply and implement water efficient requirements as adopted by the State of California (Assembly Bill 1881) (State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) until such time the county adopts its own Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance at which time the applicant shall comply with any new ordinance. Shade and ornamental trees shall be maintained according to the most current American National Standards for Tree Care Operations (ANSI A-300) by qualified tree care professionals. Tree topping for height reduction, view protection, light clearance or any other purpose shall not be allowed. Specialty-style pruning, such as pollarding, shall be specified within the approved landscape plans and shall be implemented during a 5-year establishment and training period. The Applicant shall comply with any state or local rules and regulations relating to landscape water usage and landscaping requirements necessitated to mitigate for drought conditions on all landscaping in the Subdivision project.</p> <p>D. All fencing shall be privately owned and maintained by either the Homeowner’s Association or individual property owners and meet the standards in the Specific Plan. No fencing shall be owned and maintained by the County.</p>		

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
12.	<p>Miscellaneous Environmental Measures</p> <p>A. State and Federal Permits The applicant shall obtain all required State and Federal permits and provide evidence that said permits have been obtained, or that the permit is not required, subject to staff review prior to approval of any grading or improvement plan.</p> <p>B. Landslide /Slope Failure The applicant shall retain an appropriately licensed engineer during all grading grading activities to identify existing landslides and potential slope failure hazards. The said engineer shall be notified a minimum of two days prior to any site clearing or grading to facilitate meetings with the grading contractor in the field.</p> <p>C. Right to Farm Notification All prospective purchasers of Residential or Community Services property shall be informed of the potential nuisances associated with adjacent and nearby farm operations and the existence of the County right-to- farm ordinance.</p> <p>D. Mitigation Monitoring The mitigation monitoring and reporting measures identified in the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan EIR have been incorporated into these conditions of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. These mitigation monitoring and reporting measures are identified in the mitigation measures (Attachment A to these Conditions). Applicant shall fund on a Time and Materials basis all mitigation monitoring (e.g., staff and consultant time).</p> <p>E. Air Quality Construction contractors shall comply with Solano County General Plan Implementation Program HS.I-59 (best management practices) and Implementation Program RS.I-49 (requirements for diesel vehicles).</p> <p>F. Biological Resource Permitting 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.</p> <p>G. Existing trees shall be retained whenever possible. All existing trees to be impacted by development or construction related activities shall be identified on the site plan, grading plan, irrigation plan. Trees to be preserved shall be protected by temporary fencing installed around the tree drip line for the duration of the project to prevent soil compaction, soil removal or deposit. Fencing shall be removed after project completion.</p> <p>H. Trees removed shall be replaced consistent with Public Works standards.</p> <p>I. Cultural Resource Monitoring At the time specific development is proposed that involves earth moving, as identified in Mitigation Measure 8-1, 8-2 and 8-3. the individual project sponsor or environmental consultant shall contract with a qualified archaeologist to determine the presence of cultural, historic or paleontological resources and warranted mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the County Department of Resource Management..</p>	M, G, I, B, OG	RM (P) (E)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<p>J. Geotechnical Reports At the time specific development is proposed, Mitigation measures 10-1, and 10-2 (e.g., soil replacement, setbacks, retaining walls) geotechnical reports shall be required by Solano County as needed to protect against damage that might be caused by erosion, slope failure, earthquakes etc.</p> <p>K. Noise Reports At the time specific residential development is proposed, consistent with Mitigation 13-1, 13-2 and 13-3 the applicant shall 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.</p> <p>L. Design Review Consistent with Section 5.9 of the Specific Plan Design Review, individual projects will be required to be approved by the Conservancy Design Committee and administratively by Solano County.</p> <p>M. Conservation Easements. Consistent with the Development Agreement, Conservation Easements shall be held by an accredited land trust.</p> <p>N. Prior to recordation of any of the Small Lot Final Maps, submit the Transfer Fee Covenant and Transfer Fee Notice to County Counsel for review and compliance with the Middle Green Valley Development Agreement. The Notice shall be recorded on the subject property and Advisory Note shall be placed on the final maps indicating that the properties are subject to the Transfer Fee Covenant upon sale or transfer of residential or commercial properties as required by the Middle Green Valley Development Agreement.</p> <p>O. Consistent with the Development Agreement, prior to issuance of each building permit for a new primary residential unit, the landowner applying for such new residential unit (s) shall pay the per unit County Reimbursement Amount, multiplied by the applicable Interest Rate, as those terms are defined and calculated in Exhibit H of the Development Agreement to the Solano County Department of Resource Management.</p> <p>P. 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.</p> <p>Q. 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.</p>		
13.	<p>Public Safety</p> <p>A. The Applicant shall consult with the Sheriff’s Department in order to incorporate all reasonable crime prevention measures. The following security/safety measures shall be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A security guard on-duty at all times at the site or a 6-foot security fence shall be constructed around the perimeter of construction areas. 	G, I, B	RM, SD, F

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAPS October 4, 2022			
Condition No.	Condition/Mitigation Measure	When Required	Responsible Department
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security measures for the safety of all construction equipment and unit appliances. • Landscaping shall not cover exterior doors or windows, block line-of-sight at intersections or screen overhead lighting. <p>B. The County shall require plans for construction of a fire station to the satisfaction of the Cordelia Fire Protection District (CFPD), unless the District determines that alternative methods are appropriate to satisfy the increased demand on fire services (i.e., consolidation of fire resources result in funding of services and/or construction elsewhere to increase efficiency and service response times).</p> <p>C. The County shall obtain written verification from the Cordelia Fire Protection District and Cal-Fire that proposed emergency access provisions meet CFPD and Cal-Fire road design and emergency access standards and require any necessary changes as a condition of map approval.</p> <p>D. Construction contractors conform to all applicable fire-safe regulations in applicable codes, including California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) and local requirements for appropriate storage of flammable liquids and prohibition of open flames within 50 feet of flammable storage areas.</p> <p>E. At the time of specific development as a condition of Certificate of Occupancy approval, each individual discretionary development project in the Specific Plan area shall meet all applicable California Building Code and California Uniform Fire Code standards (including standards for building materials, construction methods, fire sprinklers, etc.) and all applicable State and County standards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance in adjacent areas.</p>		

CONDITION DEFINITIONS

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT		WHEN REQUIRED	
RM	Resource Management Dept.	I	Prior to approval of Improvement Plans
(P)	Planning Division	M	Prior to approval of Final Map
(E)	Engineering Division	B	Prior to issuance of first Building Permit
(EH)	Environmental Health	O	Prior to approval of Occupancy Permit
(B)	Building Division	G	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit
PW	Public Works Division	DC	During construction
CC	County Counsel		
SD	Sheriff's Department		
F	Fire Department		

ANNOTATED Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for MGVSF

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
AESTHETICS							
<p>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.</p> <p>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 would have 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.</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ sufficiently protects existing visual access from Green Valley Road and other important plan area vantage points towards foreground and middle- ground rural landscapes and the Western Hills background; ▪ protects existing intervening landforms and vegetative buffers; ▪ maintains building rooflines that do not exceed existing intervening landforms and vegetative screening; and ▪ emphasizes building forms, designs, colors, materials, etc. that are reflective of and conducive to the surrounding rural landscape. <p>Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>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 MGVSF..</p> <p>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 MGVSF.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This application does not include any exterior lighting other than specific streetlights as identified on MGVSF Figure 5-82.</p> <p>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 MGVSF.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>	--	--	--			<p>Determined SU with no mitigation; no mitigation requirements for TMAP or any other discretionary approvals.</p>

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>							
AGRICULTURAL AND MINERAL RESOURCES							
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	--	--	--			Determined SU with no mitigation; no mitigation requirements for TMAP or any other discretionary approvals.
<p>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-</p>	<p>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</p>	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: <i>Dust (PM10) control measures that apply to all construction activities:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <i>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):</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 as possible. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site. <i>Measures to reduce diesel particulate matter andPM_{2.5}:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 for odor impacts on sensitive receptors, including Implementation Program HS.I-58 (encouraging agricultural best management practices) and Implementation Program HS.I-63 (establishing buffers). Implementation of these measures would be expected to reduce odor impacts on sensitive receptors to a less-than-significant level .	education program; individual project applicant implemented development design measures.	ongoing monitoring program (for best mgmt. practices MGVC Conservancy Design Review Committee and County verification of adequate buffering through design review (for buffer requirement).	operations by MGVC 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 not reflected 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 of significance 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 .	<p>Mitigation 5-3. In addition to the energy-efficiency and other emissions-reducing measures already included in the Specific Plan (e.g., provisions of sidewalks, bicycle lanes, etc.), the County shall require that the Specific Plan include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wire each housing unit to allow use of emerging electronic metering communication technology. Restrict the number of fireplaces in residences to one per household and/or require residential use of EPA-certified wood stoves, pellet stoves, or fireplace inserts. EPA-certified fireplaces and fireplace inserts are 70- to 90-percent effective in reducing emissions from this source. Also encourage the use of natural gas-fired fireplaces. Require outdoor outlets at residences to allow use of electrical lawn and landscape maintenance equipment. Make natural gas available in residential backyards to allow use of natural gas-fired barbecues. Require that any community services operation in the plan area use electrical or alternatively fueled equipment for maintenance of the areas under its jurisdiction. <p>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 for emissions to fall below the proposed BAAQMD significance threshold for ROG.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 effect on long-term regional emissions increases, as reflected in these administrative provisions, would therefore represent a significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	County, by incorporating these requirements into Specific Plan; individual project applicants, by incorporating into project designs.	MGVC Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure tasked the county with making clarifications in the MGVCSP regarding energy efficiency AND this measure also tasks individual applicants to incorporate these measures into the project design.</p> <p>The County included the following in the approved MGVCSP:</p> <p>Page 5-53, "all fireplaces and outdoor firepits (or similar) are to comply with local air pollution standards and building codes.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>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.</p>
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES							
Impact 6-1: General Areawide Impacts on Biological Resources. 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 or other discretionary development application, the project proponent shall submit a <i>biological resources assessment report</i> prepared by a qualified biologist for County review and approval. The <i>biological resources assessment report</i> shall be in accordance with DFW, CNPS, USFWS, or NOAA/NMFS survey	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction)	MGVC Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>Compliance with this measure includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of a Biological Assessment to the County prior to approval of the proposed Subdivision Map applications. 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	
<p>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 and aquatic communities, special-status plant species, and special-status wildlife species, due to future individual project-level residential, commercial and mixed-use development, landscaped parkland construction, active open space land uses, and associated road and utility/infrastructure construction activities. This possibility represents a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>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 vicinity of the project would be affected; no further mitigation would be necessary. If the assessment results in a determination that one or more of these features would be affected, the assessment shall identify associated avoidance, minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation measures shall be consistent with the requirements of corresponding Mitigation 6-2 through 6-13 which follow in this EIR chapter, as well as all other applicable state and federal laws and regulations.</p> <p>Prior to project approval, the County shall also confirm that project-level development has received the necessary permits, approvals, and determinations from applicable biological resource agencies as identified under Mitigations 6-2 through 6-13 which follow.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>						
<p>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 individual developments undertaken under the Specific Plan with the policies of the Bureau of Reclamation and Solano County Water Agency's Administrative Draft Solano County Multispecies Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Nevertheless, if future individual project-level development undertaken under the Specific Plan includes aspects, or proposes special-status species impact avoidance, minimization and/or compensatory mitigation measures, that are not consistent with the HCP as ultimately adopted, the individual project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. This possibility represents a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>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. <i>[Note: This mitigation measure is intended to incorporate the final HCP, once adopted.]</i></p>	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.
<p>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-level development 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.</p>	<p>Mitigation 6-3. Prior to approval of future individual, site-specific development projects within the plan area, the project proponent shall submit an <i>oak woodland management plan</i>, prepared by a trained arborist or forester, which is consistent with the requirements of the Specific Plan and this EIR (see below). The <i>oak woodland management plan</i> may be integrated into the <i>biological resources assessment report</i> (see <i>Mitigation 6-1</i>).</p> <p>Direct impacts on oak woodland shall be mitigated by</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>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</p>	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.
<p>Impact 6-4: Impacts on Riparian Communities. The Draft Specific Plan includes land use and circulation configurations and associated measures intended to avoid or minimize potential impacts on Green Valley Creek and Hennessey Creek riparian communities. Nevertheless, future, individual project-level development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, indirect impacts on riparian communities in the plan area, representing a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 6-4. Proponents of projects that have been determined through <i>Mitigation 6-1</i> (biological resource assessment report) to involve potential impacts on riparian vegetation communities shall:</p> <p>(a) contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement is necessary; and</p> <p>(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 Water Quality Certification application.</p> <p>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</p>	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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Hennessey and Green Valley

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	<p>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.)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>New development lot lines and the edges of cultivated agricultural fields in preserved lands shall be set back from preserved riparian corridors by a minimum of 50 feet for tributaries and a minimum of 100 feet from Green Valley Creek and lower Hennessey Creek and maybe subject to state and federal agency recommendations.</p> <p>The potential for introduction of invasive species into riparian communities shall be minimized through use of the planting palettes recommended in the Specific Plan, or a comparable palette approved by the authorized jurisdictional agencies. The use of native plants shall be encouraged. Invasive species shall be discouraged on all conservation easements, including but not limited to tamarisk (<i>Tamarix ramosissima</i>) and Russian Olive (<i>Elaeagnus angustifolia</i>), eucalyptus, giant reed, pepper grass, Himalayn blackberry and palm trees. Conifers and Eucalyptus shall be discouraged.</p> <p>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 <i>Hennessey Creek conceptual restoration plan</i> shall be prepared. This conceptual restoration plan shall be prepared to meet all jurisdictional agency requirements prior to final approval of any future plan area subdivision map or other discretionary approval involving direct impacts on Hennessey Creek riparian communities, or impacts on riparian communities elsewhere in the plan area that may be subject to in-kind mitigation. The plan shall identify steps necessary for implementation, including securing funding from the Conservancy or elsewhere as necessary to carry out the plan. 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.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>						<p>creek. The Tentative Maps included with this application fully comply with these setbacks</p> <p>3. Finally, this measure requires preparation of a Hennessey Creek conceptual restoration plan for projects that have impacts upon Hennessey Creek. The proposed project does not impact Hennessey Creek.</p>
<p>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 undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on wetlands, streams, and ponds in the plan area, representing a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 6-5. Proponents of projects that have been determined through <i>Mitigation 6-1</i> (biological resources assessment report) to involve potential impacts on wetlands, streams and ponds shall:</p> <p>(a) contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement is necessary; and</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>Final mitigation for direct and temporary impacts on wetlands, streams, and ponds shall be subject to the approval of the CDFW and Water Board. Mitigation for direct impacts shall include a minimum of (a) preservation of wetland, stream, and/or pond habitat at the jurisdiction agency-established minimum ratio,</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure is very similar to MM6-4.</p> <p>It has 3 distinct requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Hennessey and Green Valley creek. The Tentative Maps included with this application fully comply with these setbacks 3. Finally, this measure requires preparation of a Hennessey 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	
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>These measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>						Hennessey Creek. The proposed project does not impact Hennessey Creek.
<p>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 indirect impacts on one special-status plant species observed or known to occur in the plan area, Northern California black walnut, which is a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List 1B species. This possibility represents a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>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 <i>Mitigation 6-1</i> (biological resources assessment report requirements) by a qualified professional biologist and based on the information provided by this EIR and other appropriate literature resources. If suitable habitat for special-status plant species is present in the proposed project area, protocol-level special-status plant surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming period by a qualified professional biologist. The results of the report shall be provided as part of a protocol-level <i>special-status plant survey report</i>, or integrated into other biological documentation.</p> <p>If special-status plant species are found during protocol level special-status plant species surveys, the special-status plant species survey report shall provide a discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures as appropriate for each species population. Species observed to be present shall be avoided if feasible. If avoidance of these species is not feasible, the special-status plant species shall be transplanted to suitable habitat areas using techniques most suited for the species based on best available science. This may include seed collection, transplantation, or other appropriate methods depending on the observed plant species.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure requires mitigation for sensitive plant species. There are multiple compliance steps in this measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 MGVSF.

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 as a 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 indirect impacts on special-status plant species that have not yet been observed or are not yet known to occur, but could potentially occur, based on habitat conditions in the plan area, 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 <i>Mitigation 6-6</i> . 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 the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary or indirect impacts on special-status wildlife species observed or known to occur in the plan area, 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 (Monarch Butterfly). This possibility represents a potentially significant impact .	Mitigation 6-8. The <i>biological resources assessment reports</i> 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 <i>Mitigation 6-2</i> , the <i>biological resources assessment reports</i> 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 <i>Mitigation 6-8</i> . 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 6-8, please see discussion above.
Impact 6-10: Impact on Loggerhead Shrike, Lewis's Woodpecker, 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 to suitable nesting habitat for these and other potential special-status bird species is conducted between February 1 and August 31, pre-construction breeding bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no later than 30 days prior to the anticipated start of construction. Construction and removal of suitable nesting vegetation may be initiated without pre- construction surveys if removal and disturbance of suitable nesting habitat is conducted between September 1 and January 31. If breeding birds are observed during pre-construction surveys, disturbance to active nests shall be avoided by establishment of a buffer between the nest and construction activities. Appropriate buffer distances are species- and project-specific but shall follow the guidelines of the ADHCP: for example, a minimum of 500 feet would be required for Swainson's Hawk and a minimum of 250 feet for Special Management Species (Loggerhead Shrike, Grasshopper Sparrow, and Tricolored Blackbird). For all other special-status bird species, a minimum buffer distance of at least 50 feet shall be required. The biological resources assessment reports required under Mitigation 6-1 for all individual discretionary development projects in the plan area shall contain analysis of measures that would be used by a proposed development project to minimize and avoid potential indirect impacts on special-status bird species. Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level .	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	
<p>Impact 6-11: Impact on Western Pond Turtle. Future individual discretionary project-specific development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on Western Pond Turtle and suitable habitat for this species, representing a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 6-11. The presence of suitable aquatic and dispersal 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures, would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure requires the BRA to address western pond turtle and provide mitigation measures as needed.</p> <p>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).</p>
<p>Impact 6-12: Impact on Steelhead. The Draft Specific Plan includes land use and circulation configurations and associated measures intended to avoid or minimize potential direct and indirect impacts on plan area streams and stream habitats. Nevertheless, future individual project-specific discretionary development undertaken in accordance with the Specific Plan may result in direct, temporary, and/or indirect impacts on Steelhead in Green Valley Creek, a Federal Threatened Species, representing a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Chlorpyrifors, diazinon, malathion, 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 hydrocarbons, pyethrins, rotenone, strychnine, triclopyr and trifluralin.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>

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 the potential 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 the potential impact on habitat corridors and linkages, and the proposed preservation of large open space areas would help preserve opportunities for wildlife habitat use and movement. Nevertheless, future individual discretionary project-level development undertaken pursuant to the Specific Plan has the potential to impact wildlife habitat corridors and linkages, through the introduction of barriers to wildlife movement in the form of wider roads with increased traffic and increased development and human presence, 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 <i>biological resources assessment report</i> required under <i>Mitigation 6-1</i> , each project 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 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.			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, in combination with other future development elsewhere in the county and subregion, could contribute to cumulative biological resources impacts, including cumulative losses of special-status species, Heritage Trees, and other vegetation and wildlife. These cumulative impacts have been considered in the preparation and adoption of the Solano County General Plan and County-certified General Plan EIR, as well as in similar documents prepared for and adopted in other jurisdictions. The 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 <i>Mitigations 6-1 through 6-13</i> 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 expected to 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): <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ features in the project design that would accommodate convenient public transit and promote direct access for pedestrians and bicyclists to major destinations;▪ adoption of a project design objective for residential and 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 to shade buildings and reduce energy requirements for heating and cooling;▪ preservation or replacement of existing onsite trees;▪ construction and demolition waste recycling (see Mitigation 16-12 of 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-related developments 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 potentially produce a substantial net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, representing a significant unavoidable project and cumulative climate change impact .						
CULTURAL, HISTORIC AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES							
<p>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 activities and 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.</p>	<p>Mitigation 8-1. During the County’s normal project- specific environmental review (Initial Study) process for all future, discretionary, public improvement and private development projects in the Specific Plan area, the County shall determine the possible presence of, and the potential impacts of the action on, archaeological resources, based on the information provided by this EIR. For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, the individual project sponsor or environmental consultant shall be required to contract with a qualified archaeologist to conduct a determination in regard to cultural values remaining on the site and warranted mitigation measures.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Preservation may be accomplished by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ planning construction to avoid the archaeological site; ▪ incorporating the site within a park, green space, or other open space element; ▪ covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil; or ▪ deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement (e.g., an easement administered by the proposed Green Valley Conservancy). <p>When in-place mitigation is determined by the County to be infeasible, a <i>data recovery plan</i>, which makes provisions for adequate recovery of culturally or historically consequential information about the site, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any additional excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be submitted to the California Historical Records Information System (CHRIS). If Native American artifacts are indicated, the studies shall also be submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on form DPR 422 (archaeological sites).</p> <p>Mitigation measures recommended by these two groups and required by the County shall be undertaken, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction activities.</p> <p>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]).</p> <p>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.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Ongoing inspection/ monitoring during construction.			<p>This measure requires compliance with specific procedures related to finding archaeological features during project construction.</p> <p>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.</p>

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>						
<p>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 of which 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]).</p> <p>Such an adverse change to a CEQA-defined historic resource would constitute a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 8-2. Generally, for any future discretionary action within the Specific Plan area that the County determines through the CEQA-required Initial Study review process may cause a "substantial adverse change" to an identified historic resource, the County and applicant shall incorporate measures that would seek to improve the affected resource in accordance with either of the following publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings</i>; or ▪ The Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings</i>. <p>In accordance with the recommendations of the Holman & Associates cultural resources inventory, evaluation of the affected resource shall include consideration of (a) the research potential of the property type, (b) the total number of similar resources in the Specific Plan area and potential impacts on the plan area as a whole, and (c) the preservation and study priorities identified in the Holman & Associates inventory. Each site shall be formally recorded on State of California primary record forms (form DPR 523) and applicable attachments. Recording shall consolidate as many of the structures and features as possible into one site (i.e., record form) where there is a clear historical association, despite the frequent dispersal of features across the plan area.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	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.			<p>The proposed project does not include demolition of any identified historic resources.</p> <p>Implementation of the project may result in findings of unknown paleo or archeological resources, which are handled in the MM 8-1 and 8-3</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Mitigation 8-3. During the County's normal project-specific environmental review (Initial Study) process for all future, discretionary public improvement and private development projects in the Specific Plan area, the County shall determine the possible presence of, and the potential impacts of the action on, paleontological resources. For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, the County shall require individual project applicants to carry out the following measures:</p> <p>(1) <i>Education Program.</i> Project applicants shall implement a program that includes the following elements:</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Ongoing inspection/ monitoring during construction.			<p>This measure requires an educational program and treatment measures for any paleo items encountered during construction.</p> <p>The proposed project includes 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.</p>

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resource identification training procedures for construction personnel; ▪ Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface; and ▪ Procedures for reporting discoveries and their geologic content. <p>(2) <i>Procedures for Resources Encountered.</i> If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts on paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, "standard" samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to the museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a museum repository for permanent curation and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared. The report and inventory, when submitted to the lead agency, shall signify the completion of the program to mitigate impacts on paleontological resources.</p> <p>Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>						
GEOLOGY AND SOILS							
<p>Impact 10-1: Landslide and Erosion Hazards. The Specific Plan would allow development in areas that may be subject to landslide and erosion hazards, representing a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 10-1. At County discretion and consistent with Solano County General Plan policies HS.P-12 through HS.P-15 and HS.P- 17 and implementation programs HS.I-21 and HS.I-22, future subdivision and other discretionary development approvals may be subject to <i>detailed, design-level geotechnical investigations</i> that include analysis of landslide and erosion hazards and recommend stabilization measures. The County may also require preparation of Preliminary Grading Plans and/or Preliminary Geotechnical Reports, prepared by a licensed Engineering Geologist, before approval of specific developments within the plan area. Under this existing County authority, the investigating Engineering Geologist may be required to determine the extent of any necessary landslide remediation and supervise remediation activities during project construction to ensure that any existing or potential future landslides are fully stabilized. Mitigation measures (e.g., soil replacement, setbacks, retaining walls) shall be required as needed to protect against damage that might be caused by slope failure. Required compliance with these existing Solano County policies, implementation programs and development review procedures to the satisfaction of the County would reduce the potential effects of landsliding and soil erosion to a less-than-significant level.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure requires preparation of a Preliminary Geotechnical Report to address potential landslide and erosion hazards.</p> <p>A Preliminary Geotech Report was prepared by ENGEO. The report includes detailed analysis and suggested construction design measures where needed.</p> <p>The County may include a COA to cite compliance with this report.</p>
<p>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 on fills that contain a high percentage of expansive soils, would be subject to long-term damage, representing a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 10-2. The <i>detailed, design-level geotechnical investigations</i> required at the County's discretion (see <i>Mitigation 10-1</i>) shall include analysis of expansive soil hazards and shall recommend warranted stabilization measures. The individual project Engineering Geologist shall inspect and certify that any expansive soils underlying individual building pads and all roadway subgrades have been either removed or amended in accordance with County-approved construction specifications, or shall make site-specific recommendations for grading, drainage installation, foundation design, the addition of soil amendments, and/or the use of imported, non-expansive fill materials, as may be required to fully mitigate the effects of weak or expansive soils and prevent future damage to project improvements. These recommendations shall be reviewed and approved by a County-retained registered geologist and incorporated into a report to be included with each building permit application and with the plans for all public and common area improvements.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the County, combined with conformance with standard Uniform Building Code and other applicable</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure requires preparation of a Preliminary Geotechnical Report to address potential expansive soil hazards.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The County may include a COA to cite compliance with this report.</p>

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 the Specific 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 runoff is directed away from all slope areas. Educational materials that discourage overwatering in landscaped areas shall be furnished to all future lot owners and property managers at the time of purchase and periodically thereafter (perhaps by inclusion with water or tax bills), as part of an effort to control groundwater seepage. Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the County would reduce this potential effect to a less-than-significant level .	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 Water Quality. 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 review established in the County's Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), and associated County NPDES permit issuance requirements instituted to address short-term and long-term water quality issues, including construction period activities. 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 implementation of 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 parcel is entirely within the riparian buffer setback or development on the parcel entirely outside of the setback is infeasible or would have greater impacts on water quality and wildlife habitat. 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 Storm Water Mgmt Plans and NPDES requirements.
Impact 11-3: Flooding Impacts. For the most part, the Specific Plan-designated development areas avoid identified creek and dam failure inundation areas. Nevertheless, a limited number of Specific Plan-designated Agricultural-Residential (5-acre minimum lots), 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 requirements related to flood hazard protection, including policies HS.P-5 (appropriate elevation and flood proofing), HS.P-7 (mitigation requirements to bring risks from dam failure inundation to a reasonable level), and HS.I-11 (applicant-prepared engineering report requirements for new development for human occupancy in designated dam failure inundation areas). 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 separate noise sensitive land uses from Green Valley Road.	Mitigation 13-1. For project-specific residential development proposals on sites adjoining Green Valley Road, the County shall require applicants to conduct site-specific noise studies that identify, to County satisfaction, noise reduction measures that would be included in final design to meet State and County noise standards. These measures may include the following:	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	
<p>Nevertheless, DSP-designated residential development in the Three Creeks Neighborhood along Green Valley Road may be exposed to traffic noise that exceeds “normally acceptable” levels established by the Solano County General Plan (i.e., noise greater than 60 dBA L_{dn}), representing a potentially significant impact.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 located within 100 feet of Green Valley Road so that windows can remain closed to maintain interior noise levels below 45 dBA L_{dn}. <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>						<p>The proposed project does not propose new home construction, and specific outdoor areas are not identified in this current application.</p> <p>Noise analysis for new construction shall be completed along side proposals for new home construction</p>
<p>Impact 13-2: Effect of Proposed Noise-Generating Land 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 treatment plant, may expose noise-sensitive uses such as housing, recreational areas, and the possible future onsite school to noise and/or vibration. Possible noise exposure exceeding State and Solano County standards represents a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 13-2. New noise-generating uses facilitated by the Specific Plan shall be subject to the noise compatibility guidelines, standards, policies, and implementation programs established by the Solano County General Plan. In accordance with General Plan Implementation Program HS.I-67, noise analysis and acoustical studies shall be conducted for proposed noise-generating uses, as determined necessary by the County, and noise abatement measures shall be included to County satisfaction to ensure compliance with applicable guidelines and standards.</p> <p>In addition, new noise-sensitive uses developed adjacent to noise-generating uses shall be designed to control noise to meet the noise compatibility guidelines, standards, policies, and implementation programs established by the Solano County General Plan. In accordance with General Plan Implementation Program HS.I-67, noise analysis and acoustical studies shall be conducted for proposed noise-sensitive uses, as determined necessary by the County, and noise attenuation features shall be included to ensure compliance with applicable guidelines and standards.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure requires noise analysis for proposed “noise generating land uses”</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>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 potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 13-3. To reduce noise impacts from Specific Plan-related construction activities, the County shall require future project-specific discretionary developments to implement the following measures, as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction Scheduling. Ensure that noise-generating construction activity is limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and that construction noise is prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. Construction Equipment Mufflers and Maintenance. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. Equipment Locations. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project site. Construction Traffic. Route all construction traffic to and from the construction sites via designated truck routes where possible. Prohibit construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible. Quiet Equipment Selection. Use quiet construction equipment, particularly air compressors, wherever possible. Noise Disturbance Coordinator. For larger construction projects, designate a “Noise Disturbance Coordinator” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The Disturbance Coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the Disturbance Coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. (The County should be responsible for designating a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and the individual project sponsor should be responsible for posting the phone number and providing construction schedule notices.) <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	MGV Conservancy Design Review Committee and County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>This measure outlines specific construction noise mitigation measures. This measure is triggered during construction.</p>

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 Valley Road. Traffic from Specific Plan-facilitated development would increase traffic noise levels on Green Valley Road by 3 to 4 dB above existing levels. While the Specific Plan-related traffic noise increase alone would not represent a significant impact, its contribution to the cumulative traffic noise increase on Green Valley Road south of Eastridge Drive would represent a significant cumulative impact .	Mitigation 13-4. To reduce the traffic noise increase along Green Valley Road, the County should consider the use of noise-reducing pavement, along with traffic calming measures (which could achieve noise reductions of approximately 1 dBA for each 5 mile-per-hour reduction in traffic speed). These measures may not be feasible, however, and may not be directly applicable to the Specific Plan, particularly since the segment of Green Valley Road where the highest traffic noise increase is expected (the northbound segment south of Eastridge Drive) is not within the Specific Plan area. 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 Agricultural Chemicals. 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 offsite residential areas, such as the upper Green Valley neighborhood north of the Specific Plan area and the Hidden Meadows subdivision south of the plan area. In addition, 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 substances used 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 and school 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 Agriculture Department. 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 requires the County to edit the MGVP 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-Suisun Sewer District Connection/ Onsite Treatment Combination) would involve regular handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes during the course 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 <i>Mitigation 16-5</i> . In addition, after the wastewater treatment plant and associated collection system have been installed, the County shall confirm that a full environmental regulatory compliance review has been conducted to verify that, based on the actual 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 MGVP. 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 water system regulations and review procedures, this would be a potentially significant impact related to adequacy of water supply.	Mitigation 16-1a: Prior to subdivision map approval, a Water Master Plan for water supply Option B shall be prepared that describes engineering specifications and other related components necessary for completion of established County and State well and public water system permitting requirements and review procedures. The Water Master Plan shall be approved by Solano County. The Water Master Plan shall contain as one of its components engineering specifications including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ well locations and depths; ▪ water pumping, filtration, and disinfection specifications; and ▪ water storage and distribution facilities and sizing. The Water Master Plan and its components shall be designed to provide water service only to the Specific Plan designated development areas, so as to preclude any growth-inducing impacts on adjoining designated agricultural and open space lands (pursuant to General Plan Housing Element Policy G.2). As part of the Water Master Plan process, the applicant shall obtain input from the Cordelia Fire Protection District to ensure that the plan meets District fire flow rate and duration standards (pursuant to General Plan Policies and Implementation Programs PF.I-35, PF.P-38, PF.P-39, HS.P-23, and HS.I-28). The Water Master Plan shall contain as one of its components the information required for application to the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) for a public water system initial operating permit, which requires demonstration that the proposed water system (including well, pumping, storage, and distribution components) meets State (including Title 22) requirements. The proposed operator of the public water system shall complete the CDPH public water system initial operating permit issuance process. (It is anticipated that the County	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	
	<p>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.)</p> <p>The Water Master Plan shall contain as one of its components the information required for application to the County Environmental Health Services Division for well permits to construct the public water system wells. The applicant or operator shall complete the County well construction permit issuance process.</p> <p>Mitigation 16-1b: Prior to subdivision map approval, the County shall comply with the statutory requirements of SB 221 (Government Code Section 66473.7), which includes preparation of a water supply verification to demonstrate with firm assurances that there is a sufficient water supply for the project.</p> <p>Implementation of these measures would ensure that, under water supply Option B, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to adequacy of water supply.</p>						
<p>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 supply Option 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 well under Option C1). Under water supply Options B or C1, placement and use of at one or more new groundwater wells 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.</p>	<p>Mitigation 16-2a: The wells under water supply Option B or Option C1 shall be designed to avoid any potential interference between new Plan wells and (1) other Plan wells, (2) existing nearby private wells, and (3) surface streams. A non-exclusive list of the tools and methods to be used to accomplish avoidance are: appropriate well siting, placement, and spacing; selection of well depths and of equipment for pumping and testing; and monitoring, including testing and monitoring wells. Based on available water supply, aquifer characteristics, post-project demand, and the number and location of existing wells and surface streams, it is expected that a well design plan could be devised that avoids adverse impacts on neighboring wells and surface streams.</p> <p>The well design process will also generate additional information in the future. The well design process shall precede, and under industry practice would precede, determination of the engineering specifications for well locations and depths. The engineering specifications for well locations and depths are required to be identified as part of the Water Master Plan specified under Mitigation 16-1a. The Water Master Plan is required to be prepared prior to subdivision map approval (a discretionary approval subject to CEQA). Additional information resulting from the well design process will therefore be available at a time when subsequent activities and approvals are later examined in light of this program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document would then need to be prepared in conformance with the requirements of CEQA. At the latest, additional information resulting from the well design process would be available prior to subdivision map approval by the County, but for purposes of approval of CSA formation or issuance of an operating permit, Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) or CDPH, respectively, may require some or all of the information resulting from the well design process to be available earlier. If the well design process generates new relevant factual information relating to Impact 16-2, that information will be generated at a time when it would be examined in conformance with CEQA's requirements for subsequent review following a program EIR.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Although Mitigation 16-2a would provide for avoidance sufficient to reduce Impact 16-2 to a less-than- significant level, in response to public concerns expressed to the County regarding potential interference with private water supply wells the County would additionally implement the Mitigation Measure 16-2b in the unlikely event that groundwater pumping associated with the proposed project resulted in adverse effects to existing nearby wells.</p> <p>Mitigation 16-2b: If, in the unlikely event that ongoing monitoring conducted as part of the well design plan or water supply Option B or Option C1 operation reveals potentially significant drawdown may be occurring in existing wells in the vicinity of the new project wells, some or all of the following measures to mitigate those impacts will be implemented by the CSA or SID until subsequent monitoring</p>	<p>MGV County Service Area or Solano Irrigation District.</p>	<p>County.</p>	<p>Under Water Supply Option B (Onsite Groundwater) or Option C1 (SID Surface Water and Onsite Groundwater):</p> <p>Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.</p> <p>Ongoing inspection/ monitoring of operations.</p>			<p>The proposed project is not exercising the on-site ground water option. This measure is not required.</p>

IDENTIFIED IMPACT	RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING			VERIFICATION		TMAP APPLICATION COMPLIANCE
		Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date	
	<p>shows that drawdown is not adversely affecting operations of existing wells to the satisfaction of the County Division of Environmental Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 						
<p>Impact: SID System Adequacy to Meet Project Agricultural Irrigation Demands-- Options A (Municipal Connection), B (Onsite Groundwater), and C (SID Surface Water).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 16-2c: Implement the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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):			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	
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7. Arrangements satisfactory to SID shall be made for the design and construction of the new system before SID will approve a parcel map.</p> <p>8. The applicant/developer shall provide easements for all new pipelines and facilities that would be granted to SID, including all facilities up to and including individual lot meters.</p> <p>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 edge of any SID pipelines.</p> <p>10. SID pipelines shall not be located within any of the proposed residential lots.</p> <p>Water that could be provided by SID is non-potable and not for human consumption, and cannot be treated onsite for potable uses. Therefore, before SID provides non-potable water service, the developer shall provide proof of an alternate source of potable water for the property. Since each parcel would be served with both potable and non-potable water, all lines and fixtures connected to SID's non-potable service shall be clearly marked "NON-POTABLE – DO NOT DRINK."</p> <p>11. Upon completion of construction of non-potable service to the subject properties, land owners shall contact SID to establish water service accounts.</p> <p>12. The SID certificate shall be added to all final parcel maps, subdivision maps, and improvements plans in the plan area, and SID shall review, approve, and sign all maps and plans</p>						
<p>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 as Specific Plan-proposed water and wastewater facilities construction, 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.</p>	<p>Mitigation 16-3: Plans for development contiguous to SID, USBR, City of Fairfield, and City of Vallejo easements and facilities, or roadway or utility crossings of these facilities, shall be submitted to and approved by these agencies prior to implementation. Any submittal to the USBR shall be through the SID. No permanent structures shall be located over or within these existing pipeline easements without an alternative route being offered at developer expense. Utility crossings shall provide a minimum of three feet of clearance between the utility and the pipelines.</p> <p>Proposals for roadway crossings of any of these pipes shall include an engineered stress analysis on the pipe to ensure the pipeline would withstand proposed roadway loadings. Residential lots shall not be located within SID, USBR, City of Fairfield, City of Vallejo easements. Wastewater lines and other facilities on residential lots shall be kept clear of SID and USBR easements. Any sewer lines crossing USBR facilities shall be installed in a secondary casing across the USBR right-of-way.</p> <p>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,</p>	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 this impact 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 an estimated 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 section 25210.1 et seq. to provide the financing and management for providing wastewater treatment services to the proposed Specific Plan development areas. Once approved, the CSA would be granted limited funding and management powers and the Board of Supervisors may act as the CSA board. The proposed CSA may issue general obligation bonds or revenue bonds to finance the necessary wastewater and other common infrastructure, which would be funded by development connection and user fees. Prior to County approval of any future residential subdivision map or substantive discretionary non- residential development application in the plan area under wastewater treatment Options A or C, implement the following: 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 associated sewer system infrastructure--e.g., onsite collection system, offsite parallel municipal sewer main installation, associated capacity upgrades to the Cordelia Pump station, etc. (CSA Responsibility). Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level .	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 to an 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 recycled 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, representing a potentially significant environmental impact.	Mitigation 16-5: Prior to County approval of any future residential subdivision map or discretionary non- residential development application in the plan area under wastewater treatment option B or C, implement the following: 1. establish the Specific Plan-proposed CSA for the Specific Plan development area; 2. formulate and adopt the Specific Plan-proposed Wastewater 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 construction and ongoing operation, monitoring and maintenance of the onsite wastewater treatment and disposal system (CSA responsibility); and 4. complete the RWQCB Discharge Permit process for the proposed irrigation in designated areas, and CDPH permit procedures pursuant to CCR Title 22 standards for the proposed use of tertiary treated wastewater for irrigation (CSA responsibility).	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 with SID 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), any project Wastewater Management Plan proposal to use SID conveyance or delivery components to supplement the project recycling system shall be designed to SID satisfaction or eliminated. One possible approach may involve SID delivery of raw water to a single point in the proposed CSA system, for	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 types of irrigation and therefore undesirable to the District. This proposed aspect of Wastewater treatment Options B 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 satisfaction would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level .						
Impact 16-7: Project Impact on Fire Protection and Emergency 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 altered facilities, 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, the County shall require plans for construction of a fire station within the plan area as a condition of Tentative Subdivision Map approval, and confirm that any necessary additional environmental review is conducted. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level .	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 MGVP 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 in accordance 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 on Green Valley Road and other local roads. In addition, before approval of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall obtain written verification from the CFPD and Cal-Fire that proposed emergency access provisions meet CFPD and Cal-Fire road design and emergency access standards and require any necessary changes as a condition of map approval. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce impacts on emergency response, evacuation, and access to a less-than-significant level .	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 risk of 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 <i>Mitigation 16-7</i> and <i>Mitigation 16-8</i> . In addition, as a condition of Certificate of Occupancy approval, each individual discretionary development project in the Specific Plan area shall meet all applicable California Building Code and California Uniform Fire Code standards (including standards for building materials, construction methods, fire sprinklers, etc.) and all applicable State and County standards (including Solano County General Plan policies) for fuel modification and/or brush clearance in adjacent areas. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level .	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 handling and storage of fuels and other flammable materials, creating temporary fire hazards in the "urban/wildland interface" and representing a potentially significant impact .	Mitigation 16-10. As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require that construction contractors conform to all applicable fire-safe regulations in applicable codes, including California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and local requirements for appropriate storage of flammable liquids and prohibition of open flames within 50 feet of flammable storage areas. Incorporation of these measures as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level .	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 coordinated with the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council, proposed trails within 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 County shall require written verification that the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council has reviewed and approved final trail design and construction to ensure that trails within the Specific Plan area comply with Bay Area Ridge Trail standards, as appropriate. Incorporation of this measure as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level .	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 and Long-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 not approved 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 Solano County General Plan policies and other provisions calling for source reduction and recycling in construction and ongoing operations. As a condition of each Tentative Subdivision Map in the Specific Plan area, the County shall require the applicant to provide written verification from the appropriate landfill operator that adequate landfill capacity is available to accommodate construction and operation of the project. In addition, the applicant shall be required to prepare and implement a recycling plan for the construction phase of the project.	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	
	<p>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.</p> <p>Incorporation of this measure as Specific Plan policy would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>						
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION							
<p>Impact 17-1: Baseline Plus Project Impacts on Intersection Operations. The project would contribute significantly to baseline level of services impacts (i.e., intersection turning movement volumes) at the following local intersections during typical weekday peak hours:</p> <p><i>Weekday AM Peak Hour:</i></p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(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)</p> <p><i>Weekday PM Peak Hour:</i></p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>These project-generated intersection LOS changes would represent a significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation 17-1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 PM peak hours respectively. If the City of Fairfield determines in the future that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, the City and County shall 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 map approvals in the plan area. <p>Implementation of this measure would reduce this particular intersection impact to a less-than- significant level.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At signalized intersection 7, Green Valley Road at Business Center Drive, improvement plans are being developed to allow for free right-turn movements on the northbound and southbound approaches to the intersection. The southbound free right-turn would also include construction of a separate right-turn lane for the southbound Green Valley Road approach to Business Center Drive. At unsignalized intersection 9, Green Valley Road at the I-80 Westbound on-ramp, the on ramp leg of the intersection is to be realigned to allow for the addition of a separate left-turn lane for northbound Green Valley Road, along with a new traffic signal. <p>The County and City shall agree on a fair-share cost to be 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 the plan area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For project impacts on signalized intersection 10, Green Valley Road at the I-80 Eastbound Ramps, the planned reconstruction of the Green Valley Road/I-80 interchange would ultimately mitigate the anticipated AM and PM peak hour baseline plus project operational impacts; however, no feasible interim improvements to the interchange have been identified to mitigate this impact (mitigation would ultimately require reconstruction--i.e., widening--of the overpass). <p>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 County does not have jurisdiction over any of these study intersections within the City of Fairfield, implementation of 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 the I-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</p>	Individual project applicants (must demonstrate compliance to County satisfaction).	County.	Prior to any subdivision or other discretionary approval.			<p>Compliance with this measure includes:</p> <p>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 intersection 9 (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.</p>

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

The following documents can be accessed via the links in the list below, in addition to being on file with the Clerk of the Board.

- A. [S-21-01 \(Wagner\) Staff Report](#)
[Attachment A - Draft Planning Commission Resolution](#)
[Attachment B - Large Lot Tentative Map](#)
[Attachment C - Small Lot Tentative Map](#)
[Attachment D - Phasing Plan](#)
[Attachment E - Preliminary Financing Plan](#)
[Attachment F - Letters from GVLA and GVAC](#)
[Attachment G - Realigned Roadway](#)
[Attachment H - Residential Land Use Table](#)
[Attachment I - Lands to be Conserved in Project Area](#)
[Attachment J - Vicinity Map](#)

- B. [September 1, 2022 Planning Commission Errata including Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program](#)



Solano County

675 Texas Street
Fairfield, California 94533
www.solanocounty.com

Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Thursday, September 1, 2022

7:00 PM

Board of Supervisors Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

The Solano County Planning Commission met on September 1, 2022, in regular session in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers at the Solano County Government Center, 675 Texas Street, Fairfield, California at 7:00 p.m.

Solano County staff members present were Resource Management Director Terry Schmidtbauer and Assistant Director James Bezek, Deputy County Counsel Jim Laughlin, Planning Services Manager Allan Calder, County Surveyor Stephen Fredericks, Engineering Manager Matt Tuggle, Senior Civil Engineer Pejman Mehrfar, Principal Planner Matt Walsh, Contract Planner Kathy Pease and Clerk Marianne Richardson.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Paula Bauer, Kay Cayler, Michael Reagan and Chairperson Kelly Rhoads-Poston.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion by Commissioner Bauer, and seconded by Commissioner Reagan, the agenda was approved by affirmation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

There were no minutes for approval.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston invited members of the public to speak on items not listed in the agenda. Hearing no comments, the public comment hearing was closed.

REGULAR CALENDAR

[PC 22-030](#)

Conduct a noticed public hearing, to consider and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding Major **Subdivision Application No. S-21-01 (Wagner)** for the **Middle Green Valley Specific Plan**. The application proposes a **Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map** to divide

410.9 acres into 27 separate parcels, and a subsequent **Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map** to divide 137.2 acres into 322 separate residential parcels and multiple additional parcels for right-of-way, parks and open space, Village Green, Community Service uses, and stormwater detention areas. The property is located near the intersection of Green Valley and Mason Road, within the unincorporated portion of Solano County, north of the City of Fairfield. The property is designated "Specific Project Area" in the General Plan. The property is located within the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan and contains multiple zoning districts that allow a range of land uses, including residential, agriculture, open lands and agritourism. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides that residential Projects which are consistent with an approved Specific Plan for which an EIR was prepared are exempt from a requirement to prepare additional environmental analysis. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the subdivision is consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan and is within the scope of the certified Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Program EIR, which adequately describes the activity for purposes of CEQA, and no new environmental document is required.

Attachments: [A - Draft Planning Commission Resolution](#)
[B - Large Lot Tentative Map](#)
[C - Small Lot Tentative Map](#)
[D - Phasing Plan](#)
[E - Preliminary Financing Plan](#)
[F - Letters from Green Valley Landowners Association and Green Valley Agri](#)
[G - Realigned Roadway](#)
[H - Proposed Residential Land Use Table](#)
[I - Lands to be Conserved in Project Area](#)
[J - Vicinity Map](#)

Principal Planner Matt Walsh presented the major subdivision application to the Commission and discussed the handout Errata sheet revisions to the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map Conditions of Approval including addition of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to Attachment A.

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston invited the applicant to speak.

Charity Wagner of Wagner Enterprises, representing six (6) landowners, presented an overview of the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan (MGVSP) process to date, review of proposed large and small lot subdivision maps, Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program in relation to land conservation easements, and the next steps in the MGVSP implementation.

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston opened the public hearing.

1. Glen Langstaff of Tartan Way spoke in support of the project citing thoughtful development of roadways, housing, landscaping and commercial businesses over the past few decades. He further stated awareness of increased traffic from this development, however he has witnessed the evolution of collaborative planning of the MGVSP.

2. Roger Merrill, Vice President of the Green Valley Landowners Association

(GVLA), spoke in support of the project. He stated that the GVLA was hesitant of the MGVSP development approach back in 2006, and through collaboration with landowners and developers and rigorous review of proposed revisions, the GVLA approved and offered support of the MGVSP in 2017 and 2021.

3. Mark Sievers of Siebe Drive spoke in support of the project. He has participated in all the (MGVSP) planning public meetings and does have concerns and skepticisms but is in support of the thoughtful design. He commented that ABAG has long commented on the need for housing and this project is a thoughtful way to contribute.

4. Michael Fortney of Fox Hollow Circle spoke in support of the project stating he participated on the Citizens Advisory Committee in 2006. He spoke of the many landowners, committees, hearing bodies and registered voters that have approved the MGVSP. He also spoke of the compatible residential development plan without urban encroachment that supports and sustains agriculture far into the future.

5. Herb Hughes of Green Valley Road spoke in support of the project having served on the GVLA, Green Valley Agricultural Conservancy (GVAC), and the neighbor citizen committee in 2004. He stated the plan incorporates the objectives and guidelines of the MGVSP including approximately 1,500 acres of protected/agriculture land, and that the TDR is foundational to the MGVSP.

6. Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins of Green Valley Road spoke of her personal experience with the GVAC and County permitting process for a pool. She stated it is unacceptable and socially irresponsible to use public process to institutionalize what she could only describe as a "good old boys" network. She stated support for responsible development but cited concern that the County is taking direction from landowners regarding development for others, and that having a process forcing citizens to plant flowers and change outdoor lighting is unacceptable.

7. Joshua Paulson of Vintage Lane within the MGVSP spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of school capacity and resources stating the elementary school is already oversubscribed and under resourced. He encouraged Commissioners to consider a pause rather than moving ahead at this time.

8. Nora Dizon of Ramsgate Court spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of the project's use of city water and sewer utilities for dense urban development that will negatively impact area residents. She commented that the new residents will be very affluent and will unfairly be using the taxes from the less affluent Fairfield residents. She requested this project be paused.

9. Michelle DePass of Vintage Lane within the MGVSP area spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of school capacity, pressure on infrastructure, rising temperatures and water crisis, noting the plan was not subject to a full environmental impact study and felt it allowed the project to breeze through issues like fire, traffic and schools. She asked for a pause on this project.

10. Alicia Minyen of Cornell Court stated she had no opinion of the project but cited concerns and questions of the financing plan to extend water/sewer, use

of a Community Facilities District (CFD), indemnification clause language, presumptions used to support the financial analysis, annexing of other developments, and noted errors in owner names on the map (exhibit).

11. Marilyn Farley of United Circle stated she is not opposed to the project but was concerned of technical issues that should be corrected. She stated the conservation easement is to be held by an accredited land trust and asked that language be included in condition 12.M.1. She stated the definition section refers to conservation easements being based on Department of Fish & Wildlife which should be corrected, the amount of conservation acreage does not match up, and a large parcel on Green Valley Road is not included in a chart which should be in the conservation easement.

12. Stephanie Fox on Spring Lane spoke in opposition of the project citing concerns of school capacity, environmental and traffic/safety impacts including evacuations. Further stating the plan does not consider the apartment complex currently in construction. She is concerned with the plan with Fairfield water, which has been trying to annex the area, that should be considered by all stakeholders.

13. Liz Fickner of Green Valley Road spoke in opposition citing concerns of school capacity, water and crime. She requested a pause so all can feel good about the project.

After hearing no further public comments, Chairperson Rhoads-Poston closed the public hearing and thanked those in attendance and via teleconference for their comments and participation.

Commissioner Reagan motioned to adopt the resolution for an approval recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Bauer stated she had questions to discuss with staff. Hearing no second, the motion failed.

Responding to questions by Commissioner Bauer, Mr. Walsh provided the following:

- 1) A traffic study was completed in 2008/2009 and took into consideration Fairfield's General Plan (build-out) of the I-80/Green Valley Road area.
- 2) The water supplier has not been decided; however, both the City of Vallejo and SID have submitted will-serve documentation that they have capacity to supply this development.
- 3) It is confusing how the MGVSP deals with the accreditation of the easement holder. There are MGVSP sections stating it needs to be an accredited non-profit organization, but the development agreement cross references to a MGVSP section that does not state that provision. The Commission can recommend this inclusion in the condition.
- 4) Confirmation that the staff report exhibit outlining the areas within the application boundary do contain discrepancies in the Assessor Parcel Number and owner names. However, the intent of the exhibit is to map the lands to be under conservation easements resulting from this application, to which the exhibit does illustrate.
- 5) He believes the discrepancy of conservation easement acreage is due to this application building out 322 units of the total 390 units of the MGVSP. There will be 1,100+ acres going under conservation easement with this specific application, and more acreage will be added when future developers bring in their subdivision applications.

Responding to a question by Commissioner Bauer, Contract Planner Kathy Pease stated there is no CFD proposed at this time. There will be a menu of options or mechanisms for developers to fund improvements. The only CFD currently proposed is part of a condition to ensure a back stop for the sewer service, and it would be a dormant CFD at this point.

Ms. Pease stated as part of the environmental impact report, they looked at public services and school generation, noting that 322 units does not generate 322 students at one time (student generation rate starts about 58 K-12 kids). The development will gradually build out over time, noting they will be contributing funds to help schools.

Responding to a question by Chairperson Rhoads-Poston, Ms. Pease stated the Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District is aware of this development and can use the approved MGVSF in their planning for future school facilities.

Commissioner Bauer commented she agrees with the public requesting a pause until we can get answers to some of the issues before moving forward.

Chairperson Rhoads-Poston asked County Counsel Jim Laughlin to discuss the indemnification clause. Mr. Laughlin stated that a subdivision project is subject to rules and regulations by the Subdivision Map Act which states exactly how the indemnification provisions must be written, and the conditions in this project match exactly with the requirements.

On a motion made by Commissioner Reagan, and seconded by Commissioner Cayler, the Commission adopted a resolution for the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Large Lot and Small Lot Tentative Map Major Subdivision application S-21-01 (Wagner) with Errata sheet revisions, and forward a recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors to adopt resolutions for the Tentative Maps. Chairperson Rhoads-Poston amended the motion to modify condition of approval 12.M to state the conservation easements will be held by an accredited land trust. So ordered by 3-1 vote.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

Mr. Calder stated he believed an item is scheduled for the September 15, 2022 meeting.

ADJOURN

This meeting of the Solano County Planning Commission adjourned at 8:39 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2022.

**September 1, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting on Major Subdivision Application S-21-01 (Wagner):
Public Comments & subsequent Staff Responses**

1. Traffic Impacts

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern about increased traffic, asking for additional, current analysis on this matter given the buildout in the City of Fairfield.

Staff Response: Traffic was analyzed in the original EIR for the MGVSP and included a cumulative analysis that considered future buildout of Solano County and the City of Fairfield in the area near the project. Therefore, no additional analysis is required. The roadways have been sized to adequately meet the needs of the project.

2. School Impacts

Comment: Concern was expressed regarding overcrowding of the elementary school and how this Project would further impact the school district.

Staff Response: Development of the area is expected to take some time before it reaches buildout, especially since no builder/developer has been currently identified. It could be five years or more before the necessary infrastructure is constructed and homes are available for sale. The MGVSP EIR analyzed school impacts associated with 400 residential units and determined that the Project would result in a less than significant impact. Since the original approval of the Specific Plan, the MGVSP has been reduced to 390 residential units with amendments in the fall of 2021, and this application, Major Subdivision S-21-01, proposes 322 homes, resulting in less impact than evaluated in the MGVSP EIR.

School impact fees will be required to be paid at the time of building permit issuance, which will assist with funding the construction/expansion of schools. School impact fees are capped by state law. As of April 2022, the fees are currently 4.79 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.78 per square foot for commercial construction. Therefore, the Project will adequately mitigate its school impacts.

3. Community Facilities Districts (CFDs)

Comment: One commenter expressed concern about adopting CFDs as part of the project and how that would impact existing residents.

Staff Response: CFDs are one of several funding mechanisms that can be used to fund the Project. No specific CFD is proposed at this time, except for a CFD to be put in place as a back-up should it be needed to provide sewer service should the Homeowners Association (HOA) become defunct. If CFDs are used for the Project they will only be put in place within the boundaries of the Project site and would not impact the residents of Fairfield or surrounding properties. Only those landowners within the boundary of the CFD would vote on the CFD's formation and terms and be impacted by any assessments from the CFD.

4. Solano Irrigation District (SID) Water Treated by City of Fairfield

Comment: Concern was raised regarding water supply from SID treated by the City of Fairfield setting a precedent for providing municipal potable water in the unincorporated area and leading to growth inducement and additional growth in unincorporated County, and impact of

the Project since there is a drought. Additional concern that City of Fairfield residents would be subsidizing water for the Project if the City of Fairfield treated the water.

Staff Response: The MGVSP strategically focuses development into specific areas and anticipates the need for municipal services for water and sewer to serve the focused development. The Small Lot Map, as conditioned, provides for two possible water providers: SID, supplying raw water to the City of Fairfield and receiving back an equal amount of treated potable water for SID to distribute, and the City of Vallejo supplying treated water directly from their municipal water treatment plants. The MGVSP EIR adequately addressed water supply for several options including SID water. SID has stated that it can adequately serve the Project and both agencies have agreed to enter into a water service agreement. Providing water to the Project would not result in growth inducement since SID water lines are located nearby and were analyzed in the MGVSP EIR. In addition, water to the Project site would provide opportunities for flushing the City's system which would help reduce water quality issues to City residents. Additionally, any agreement between the City and SID is anticipated to recover all costs to the City.

Water for the project was analyzed extensively in the MGVSP EIR. The location is not within a moderate, high or very high-risk groundwater basin requiring additional groundwater sustainability planning. Based on this, drought impacts are not anticipated.

5. Indemnity of County

Comment: The indemnity clause is not properly worded and does not protect the County.

Staff Response: State law provides the specific wording allowed on maps for indemnification. As written, the indemnity clause is consistent with state law and is protective of County interests. In addition, pursuant to the Master Development Agreement, the landowners previously agreed to indemnify the County against all claims arising from the approval or implementation of the MGVSP project.

6. Use of the Conservancy's Design Review process

Comment: One commenter, who lives within the MGVSP area, was not satisfied with the procedures involving the design review of proposed new construction.

Staff Response: The use of design review for new development in the Plan area ensures consistency with the MGVSP and is a key component of that plan. The process of review by the Conservancy Design Review Committee (CRC), and interaction between the CRC and the County, has improved since its initial formation and processing of building permits using this methodology is also anticipated to continue to improve.

7. Accredited Land Trust

Comment: One commenter wanted the County to ensure that any Conservation Easements, required under this application, were held by an accredited land trust. The commenter indicated that the Development Agreement references a section of the Specific Plan where it does not specify that the easement holder must be accredited.

Staff Response: Under the Transfer of Development Rights Program required by the Specific Plan, development rights are transferred from "sending areas" to "receiving area" with further

development of the sending areas then limited or precluded by conservation easements placed on the property. The Specific Plan requires the conservation easement holder to be a type of entity qualified under the California Civil Code to hold such easements. These entities include certain types of tax-exempt non-profits, state or local governmental entities, or federally recognized tribes. If the easement holder is a tax-exempt non-profit, the Specific Plan further requires that it be an accredited land trust. The commenter requested that the subdivision be conditioned to allow only an accredited land trust to be the easement holder, rather than a governmental entity or federally recognized tribe. The Planning Commission recommended that Condition 12M of the Small Lot Tentative Map be revised to require that the easement holder be an accredited land trust. The Board could follow the Planning Commission's recommendation on this condition or revert back to the version originally proposed to the Planning Commission by staff, which would allow any of the various types of qualified conservation easement holders as defined in the Specific Plan.

Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Timeline

August 5, 2008: Solano County adopts the 2008 General Plan Update, which includes identifying the Middle Green Valley (MGV) area as a “Specific Project Area” in need of a future Specific Plan (ratified by voters on November 4, 2008).

February 2009-May 2010: Citizens Advisory Committee, appointed by the Board, held twelve publicly noticed meetings with staff and consultants to develop a specific plan.

May 20, 2010: Planning Commission holds a publicly noticed meeting and recommends approval of the Specific Plan to the Board.

July 27, 2010: Board certifies the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and adopts the MGV Specific Plan and Master Development Agreement.

May 22, 2012: Writ of Mandate issued by Superior Court, finding inadequacy in the County’s environmental analysis of potable water options in the EIR for MGV.

November 25, 2014: Board certified a revised EIR, which included additional analysis on use of groundwater and adopted a revised Specific Plan, which included additional water supply Option C, use of Solano Irrigation District surface water; Board also re-approved the Master Development Agreement and Sales Participation Agreement.

September 24, 2015: Superior Court denied County’s request to discharge Writ of Mandate, stating that the revised EIR needed to include additional biological analysis of potential impacts resulting from use of groundwater.

October 25, 2016: Board certified a revised EIR, which included additional biological analysis, and reaffirmed the 2015 findings and Specific Plan adoption.

March 30, 2017: The Chair of the Board executes a settlement agreement, ending further court action on the Board certified EIR.

April 12, 2017: After the County entered into a Settlement Agreement with the petitioner to resolve any remaining issues related to the adequacy of the revised EIR, the Superior Court discharged the Writ of Mandate.

July 6, 2017: At a noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission considered minor revisions to the Specific Plan and recommended approval by the Board.

July 25, 2017: Revisions to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, were approved by the Board.

August 8, 2017: At a noticed public hearing, the Board considered and approved minor revisions to the Specific Plan.

August 19, 2021: At a noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission considered a landowner sponsored Specific Plan amendment application (SP-20-01) which proposed minor revisions to the Plan, including relocating future units from the foothills to the valley floor to

avoid landslide and topography constraints, and to make minor adjustments to the land use boundaries within the Plan area. Planning Commission recommend that the Board approve SP-20-01.

September 28, 2021: At a noticed public hearing, the Board considered and approved Specific Plan Amendment SP-20-01.

September 1, 2022: At a noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission considered Major Subdivision Application S-21-01 (Wagner), and recommended that the Board approve the application for subdivision.

Key Components of the Major Subdivision Application S-21-01

(Attachments referenced below are located within Attachment E - Links to Planning Commission Documents from the September 1, 2022 Agenda)

Access

The Specific Plan includes a unique set of standards specific to the project including roadway cross sections. The subdivision uses public and private street right-of-way dimensions, including an internal roadway system with pedestrian pathways consistent with the Specific Plan.

Primary access to the development will be from two roadways off Green Valley Road. Roadway improvements will include roundabouts at a southerly access road and Mason Road. The southerly access Road will be aligned to cross Green Valley Creek (parallel to existing Reservoir Lane) and avoid an existing U.S Bureau of Reclamation easement. Reservoir Lane will remain but will dead end within the project area. Another internal roundabout is proposed in the Nightingale neighborhood at the entrance to the subdivision where streets A and Q intersect.

Street names for the internal streets have not been identified at this time. As a condition of approval, the Public Works Engineering Division shall approve all street names prior to approval of the Final Maps

The upper area of the Project area (Three Creeks neighborhood) is within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) for wildfires. Street widths will be required to meet the State of California Department of Forestry (Section 4290 of the Public Resources Code) minimum requirements for fire access within the SRA.

Improvements

Standards for all improvements will be based on a hierarchical approach as detailed in the Small Lot Subdivision Condition 1H. In summary, improvements will be based on standards contained in the MGVSP or Development Agreement, and if none then will be based on the County's Standards, such as the County's Road Improvement Standards, or if no county standard, standards from the City of Fairfield. State Responsibility Area standards will govern those roads located in the SRA. Finally, public utilities must also meet the requirements of the specific agency providing the service. This approach will ensure that an appropriate standard and design is in place for all improvements.

Water Supply

There are multiple options for supplying water to the site which were analyzed in the EIR. Currently, Solano Irrigation District (SID) provides agricultural water to the area. Both the Solano Irrigation District (SID) and the City of Vallejo have stated that they can serve the project with potable water. The Applicant has not selected a water provider at this time. Therefore, Condition #5 requires that a water provider be selected, and a master water plan be prepared, prior to the recording of the Final Small Lot Subdivision Map. Condition #5 of the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map also contain the specific requirements provided by each potential water purveyor that will need to be met once the selection is made by the applicant. Further, the Project will be subject to the Development Agreement that is in place between Solano County and the landowners, which runs with the land, and ensures that all future owners must work together to install all improvements, including water.

The City of Vallejo has an existing water line that runs through the middle of the Project area and will need to be realigned regardless of the water purveyor selected. This line would be relocated in Mason Road.

Sewer Service

Sewer services to the site would be provided by the Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD). However, FSSD has indicated that they do not provide services for in-tract improvements for sewer lines under 12-inches in size. Lines within the Project would be 8-10-inches; therefore, it is recommended that the applicant's proposed Homeowners' Association (HOA) will maintain the sewer lines. Conditions # 6 and 7 sets up a mechanism to ensure that sewer service to the Project is maintained by the HOA. Condition #3 requires that a Community Facilities District (CFD) be established should the Master HOA is rescinded or abolished in the future, and therefore unable to maintain the sewer system.

Storm Water/Drainage Facilities

Parcel 20 is a 9.9-acre parcel proposed as a stormwater detention basin located on the northeast corner of Reservoir Lane and Street A. The Project is designed to ensure that pre- and post-construction flows are maintained. A Stormwater Master Plan will be required prior to the filing of the first Final Small Lot Map. A water quality basin is located immediately adjacent to the stormwater basin.

Bypass Channel – Ponding Easement

The City of Fairfield has an easement over a portion of the project to allow for inundation due to storm runoff from Hennessey Creek (i.e. Pooling and Ponding Easement (PPE)). The PPE affects portions of Lots 2, 20, and 21 on the Large Lot Tentative Map. In accordance with Fairfield's Agreement with the property owner, this PPE would be relinquished in favor of a Facilities Easement to provide for the construction, operation and maintenance of a siltation basin in the future if such a facility can receive the environmental and other permits required for construction.

Portions of Street "A" and the Water Quality Detention basin on the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map lie within the PPE but are outside of the Facilities Easement. The applicant is aware of Fairfield's easement and has met with the City of Fairfield to discuss the completion of the permitting and construction of the siltation basin. The applicant has expressed willingness to cooperate with Fairfield towards the completion of the siltation basin. Staff has conditioned the project to proceed with one of two alternatives depending upon the status of construction of the siltation basin.

Condition #8C requires that the Applicant either a) modify the existing PPE so that the proposed Street A improvements do not conflict with the easement or b) modify the project and proposed Street A roadway alignment to avoid the easement limits. The Applicant has provided an exhibit showing that the roadway alignment can be situated to avoid the easement (Attachment G to Exhibit E).

Financing Plan

Infrastructure will be required to extend utilities and roadways to the site. The Applicant has prepared a preliminary financing Plan (Attachment E to Attachment E). County obligations for maintenance includes public roadways. Private roads, alleys, shared driveways, landscaping, open space, lighting, and trails will not be the responsibility of the County and will be maintained by the HOA. Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) may be formed to help fund costs or serve as a backstop for the HOA.

Agriculture Conservation Easements

Conservation of the open lands within the Specific Plan area and support of ongoing agricultural uses are key components of the Specific Plan. Condition #12M, will require that conservation easements be acquired consistent with the Development Agreement. Build out of the subdivision cannot occur unless these conservation easements are put in place. This will ensure that agricultural uses are protected in perpetuity.

Phasing

A phasing Plan has been developed to ensure all infrastructure is constructed and available to serve each phase. In summary, the phasing plan is as follows:

Phase 1 includes construction of the two roundabouts on Green Valley Road. Roadway improvements to Mason Road and construction of the southern access road (including creek crossing) and all internal roadways serving the Nightingale neighborhood are also included in this first phase. All utilities (sewer, water, storm drain and dry utilities) will be constructed within the southern access road, Middle Green Valley Road, Mason Road and the detention basin and creek outfall and bypass would be required.

Phase 2 includes construction of the roadways to serve the Elkhorn neighborhood and the four lots in the Green Valley Corridor neighborhood, including improvements to Mason Road. All internal roadways serving the Elkhorn neighborhood are included in this phase. All utilities (sewer, water, storm drain and dry utilities) will be constructed within the Elkhorn neighborhood roads, Green Valley Corridor roads, Mason Road, and the connection access road that connects the Nightingale and Elkhorn neighborhoods. The existing Vallejo water line is relocated in this phase.

Phase 3 includes construction of roadways to serve the four lots in the Three Creeks neighborhood, including reconstruction and improvements to Mason Road (north of Elkhorn). All utilities (sewer, water, storm drain and dry utilities) will be constructed within Mason Road and the Three Creeks internal roads to serve the proposed Three Creeks lots.

Phase 4 is a limited phase as it only includes the extension of Mason Road and development of two 5-acre parcels.

General Plan and Zoning Consistency:

The primary goal of the General Plan for this area is to maintain the rural character of Middle Green Valley while allowing opportunities for compatible residential development in accordance with the Plan's goals and policies. The General Plan directs that land use tools, such as clustering and transfers of development rights are to be utilized to limit the effects of residential development on the rural character of the valley, including protection of the existing viewsheds, wildlife habitat, and agricultural activities.

The subject site is designated as "Specific Project Area" on the County's General Plan Land Use Diagram, and the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan was developed and adopted consistent with the General Plan. The intent of the Specific Plan has always been to guide the long-term vision of the Middle Green Valley area in which conservation of agriculture is accomplished along with the development of connected and sustainable rural neighborhoods. The Plan was the result of community, landowner, and County consensus building and cooperation, recognizing the need to protect the unique rural qualities of the area, while providing the means for strategic site development to take place.

The Specific Plan was originally adopted in 2010 along with the certification of an EIR. The EIR was challenged in court and, as a result of the court's direction, the County updated the EIR and conducted additional environmental analysis on the options for supplying the area with potable water. A Revised Recirculated EIR was certified in 2016 that included an evaluation of water options and the potential for impact on riparian vegetation. Minor revisions were further approved to the Specific Plan in 2017 and again in 2021.

Environmental Background and Analysis

Several previous environmental documents have been prepared in relation to the MGVSP. The documents are available for review online:

- Recirculated Draft (June 2016) and Final EIR (August 2017) for Middle Green Valley Specific Plan EIR and other supporting documents are available online at [Solano County - Middle Green Valley Specific Plan](#)

The applicant submitted an environmental checklist documenting that there are no new impacts from implementing the tentative maps.

CEQA Guidelines section 15168 (c) (2) provides specific criteria to determine whether a subsequent EIR would be needed, and that the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and that no new environmental document would be required. The County has reviewed the analysis and concurs that the Project is exempt from additional environmental review as provided in CEQA Guidelines 15168 (c). The proposal does not result in new significant impacts and no additional environmental review is required.

DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT



**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
(Board of Supervisors)**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Solano County Board of Supervisors will hold a **PUBLIC HEARING** to consider Major Subdivision Application No. S-21-01 (Wagner) which proposes to subdivide lands within the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan area into 322 parcels for future development, located along Green Valley Rd and Mason Rd, north of the City of Fairfield. The property is designated "Specific Project Area" in the General Plan.

On September 1, 2022, after a public hearing, the Solano County Planning Commission recommended that the Board of Supervisors approve Major Subdivision Application S-21-01. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the subdivision is consistent with the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan and is within the scope of the certified Middle Green Valley Specific Plan Program EIR, which adequately describes the activity for purposes of CEQA, and no new environmental document is required. The Board will receive public comments on the item identified above, and after the conclusion of the public hearing, may take action on the proposed major subdivision application. The certified EIR can be found online at: https://www.solanocounty.com/depts/rm/planning/middle_green_valley_specific_plan.asp, and the staff report will also be available online on September 29, 2022.

The Specific Plan area is located in the west-central portion of unincorporated Solano County, approximately one mile north of the Interstate 80/Interstate 680 interchange, north of the Fairfield city limits along Green Valley Road, and at the east edge of the western hills.

Any person wishing to review this information may do so at the Solano County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, County Administration Center, 675 Texas Street, Suite 5500, Fairfield.

The hearing will be held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Administration Center, 1st Floor, 675 Texas Street, Fairfield on **Tuesday, October 4, 2022 at 2:00 p.m.** or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: To submit public comments, please see the options below.

In-Person: You may submit public comments in person at the date and time listed. If you attend the Board of Supervisors meeting in person, you must abide by all State rules and public health guidelines regarding masking and social distancing in the Board of Supervisors Chambers.

Phone: You may submit comments verbally from your phone during the meeting by dialing **1-415-655-0001** and using Access Code **177 939 9414**. Once entered in the meeting, you will be able to hear the meeting and will be called upon to speak during the public speaking period.

Email/Mail: Written comments can be submitted to the Clerk of the Board at clerk@solanocounty.com or at Clerk of the Board, 675 Texas Street, Suite 6500, Fairfield, CA 94533 and must be received by 5:00 p.m. the Monday prior to the meeting.

If you challenge the proposed consideration in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Board of Supervisors at, or prior to, the public hearing.

The County of Solano does not discriminate against persons with disabilities and is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and you will require assistance to participate, please call the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at 707-784-6100 at least 24 hours in advance of the event to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

BILL EMLLEN
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of Solano, State of California

Daily Republic – legal ad/one-time – Friday, September 23, 2022